

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

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

International Issues

- 2 Diplomacy and Education: A Changing Global Landscape
Patti McGill Peterson
- 3 How Corruption Puts Higher Education at Risk
Stephen P. Heyneman
- 5 MOOCs as Neocolonialism: Who Controls Knowledge?
Philip G. Altbach
- 7 Top Universities or Top Higher Education Systems?
Benoît Millot
- 8 Outcomes Assessment in International Education
Darla K. Deardorff
- 10 APEC's Bold Higher Education Agenda: Will Anyone Notice?
Christopher Ziguras

China: English and the Brain Race

- 12 China's Removal of English from the *Gaokao*
Yang Rui
- 13 "English Fever" in China: A Watershed
Wang Xiaoyang and Li Yangyang
- 15 Will China Excel in the Global Brain Race?
Qiang Zha

International Student Flows

- 16 Point Systems and International Student Flows
Jing Li
- 18 German Students Abroad
Jan Kercher and Nicole Rohde
- 19 Canada's Immigration Policies to Attract International Students
Anita Gopal

Africa: Quality Assurance and Regulation

- 21 Trends in Regulation in sub-Saharan Africa
A. B. K. Kasozi
- 22 Private Higher Education's Quality Assurance in Ghana
Linda Tsevi

Focus on Ukraine

- 24 Ukraine's Testing Innovation
Eduard Klein
- 25 Internationalization in Post-Soviet Ukraine
Valentyna Kushnarenko and Sonja Knutson

Departments

- 28 New Publications
- 31 News of the Center

Diplomacy and Education: A Changing Global Landscape

PATTI MCGILL PETERSON

Patti McGill Peterson is presidential advisor for internationalization and global engagement at the American Council on Education, Washington, DC. E-mail: PPeterson@acenet.edu.

Diplomacy—the art of international relations—was once the province of heads of state or their appointed representatives. Over the last century, its parameters expanded to include the concept of “public diplomacy,” a term that covers the actions of a wide-array of actors and activities intended to promote favorable relations among nations.

In the practice of diplomacy as well as domination, countries have extended their national interests through education. It played a central role in the long history of colonialism by those wishing to influence local populations. In the postcolonial era, education still plays an important role in the advancement of national influence.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOFT POWER

In more recent years, the role of education and academic exchange in building international relationships has been characterized by the term of “soft power.” Rather than employing force, soft power is dependent on the strength of ideas and culture, to influence the friendship and disposition of others. Higher education is an ideal vehicle for soft power.

The Fulbright Program—sponsored by the US Department of State—is an excellent example of public diplomacy, being furthered through higher education. Its principal goal is to foster mutual understanding between people and nations, and the program has always been a mix of government and people-generated soft power. It claims the largest movement of students and scholars across the world that any nation has ever sponsored. Government officials often cite it as one of the great diplomatic assets of the United States. Citizens and leaders of other countries who have participated in Fulbright frequently proclaim a familiarity with and a fondness for the United States and its people due to their experiences—a result that generates good will for the United States abroad.

While Fulbright has not been replicated by other countries, there are other well-organized efforts to extend national diplomacy through education. The British Council is a prime example. With offices around the world, sometimes operating as an affiliate of British embassies, the British Council describes itself as the United Kingdom’s international organization for educational opportunities

and cultural relations. Along the Fulbright model, it offers scholarships for study in the United Kingdom and sponsors educational exchanges between higher education institutions there and in other countries.

The German Academic Exchange Service plays a similar but less extensive role; and very importantly, non-Western countries have followed with their diplomatic efforts. China emerged with an idea for its own brand of educational diplomacy, in 2004. Its Confucius Institutes are designed to promote Chinese language and culture abroad. By 2011, there were 353 Confucius Institutes in 104 countries and regions.

DIPLOMACY OR HEGEMONY

Soft power relationships, informed by enlightened self-interest, often signal unequal relationships. This issue has been raised particularly with regard to East-West and North-South cooperation. Given the demand for higher education in developing countries, they are unwilling to discourage those who wish to help either through scholarships or assistance with the formation of institutions. In the best of all possible worlds, these offers can create development for the receiving country as a way to build human capacity. However, countries that are recipients of educational diplomacy need to understand the motivations of those wishing to build relationships.

As we enter a period of accelerated global engagement, country-to-country educational diplomacy is being overtaken by institution-to-institution relationships and a broad array of actors. This makes the educational diplomacy scenario even more complicated for those on the receiving end. It also means that governments are not the prime actors. While governments may view college and university cross-border activity as an important part of their diplomatic efforts, institutions are increasingly operating beyond sovereignty, based on their own strategies and motivations.

BEYOND SOVEREIGNTY?

A report on global higher education engagement from the American Council on Education depicted institutions as acting simultaneously on themes of competition and cooperation. While it did not dispute the role of higher education in public diplomacy, the report focused more on the need for colleges and universities to develop their own engagement strategies. This can lead to direct relationships and negotiations, not just with educational institutions outside the United States, but also with governments themselves. When the presidents of American universities travel to India, China, or any number of other countries, they often meet with government officials as part of their efforts—to build educational relationships with those countries.

When agreements for academic cooperation are signed by university presidents, the setting and formalities have all the trappings of an international agreement. The signing, as with all treaties, represents significant groundwork laid by institutional representatives. The celebratory moment is not always followed by sustainable relationships, and expectations are sometimes met with deep disappointment. The result can have a negative impact on institutional as well as national relations, although the latter may be an unintended consequence.

While colleges and universities must adhere to national laws and are wise to be well-aware of local customs, they operate mainly on their own reconnaissance when agreements are signed. In this dimension, they are moving beyond sovereignty but they may still be regarded as national representatives. For this vein of public diplomacy, it is extremely important, just as in official diplomatic negotiations, so that institutions develop protocols that recognize all the details, promises, and expectations that are critical to both parties before signing. And when unexpected developments cause tensions, it will be equally important to have ways to adjudicate these issues.

In the practice of diplomacy as well as domination, countries have extended their national interests through education.

SOUND DIPLOMACY FOR STRONG RELATIONSHIPS

It would be safe to say that in most educational diplomacy there are mixed motives for seeking engagement. The search for fee-paying students is a leading reason for greater cross-border activity. Institutions and governments in countries with well-developed higher education are creating initiatives to receive students from many developing countries. Some universities in spite of less well-developed higher education seek relationships with other institutions they view as more prestigious to increase their chances of a higher degree in global rankings.

Countering these more narrow motivations for engagement, many institutions are developing broader internationalization strategies, to seek cooperative agreements that define themselves as global institutions. They may want to pursue a variety of goals through engagement—to enrich their academic programs, enlarge the knowledge and experience base for their students, host a more internationally diverse student body and faculty, provide more opportunities for their faculty to join international research networks,

and ultimately to develop a wide spectrum of joint activity that will benefit both partners. As with all sustainable relationships, the character of the parties and the ethical framework in which they operate are all important. Countries and institutions engaging in educational diplomacy have an obligation to consider the benefits—not merely to themselves but also to their partners. This will be in the best spirit of international relations and internationalization of higher education. If done well, it will be a rising tide that lifts all ships.

How Corruption Puts Higher Education at Risk

STEPHEN P. HEYNEMAN

Stephen P. Heyneman is professor of international education policy at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee. E-mail: s.heyneman@vanderbilt.edu.

Competition for resources and fame place pressures on higher education institutions. Weaker institutions are more prone to corruption. In some instances, corruption has invaded university systems and threatens the reputation of research products and diplomas. Where this has occurred, corruption has reduced the individual and social economic rate of return on higher education investments. Some countries have acquired a reputation for academic dishonesty, raising questions about all graduates and doubts about all institutions.

Corruption can arise at the early stage of recruitment and admission. Students may feel they have to pay a shadow price, to be admitted to a particular university program. Some students pay bribes as an insurance policy, because they do not want to be left behind for not paying a bribe.

Financial fraud remains a major challenge. Reductions in public finance have affected systems of internal control to prevent fraud. Because each faculty may have separate cost centers, financial monitoring may be difficult. Nor is it easy to monitor student associations that handle money separately from the university administration.

Directly related to the global internet, access is an avalanche of so-called “degree mills”—thousands of them, located in all regions. There is a Wikipedia page that lists house pets that have earned degrees. How might one recognize a degree mill? They often promise a degree within a short amount of time and with low costs; they give credit for nonacademic experience; their Web sites often list their addresses as being a postbox. Equally, problematic are fake

accreditation agencies, promising quick assessments and permanent accreditation.

Cross-border educational programs raise questions in three areas: the recognition of degrees, the use of recruitment agents to encourage international students, and the establishment of programs abroad by institutions of dubious reputation. Though cross-border provision raises new risks of corruption, it may also be a conduit for cross-border integrity. Cross-border provision of excellence in higher education can offer a rare opportunity for local students and institutions to observe how a corrupt-free institution operates.

To attract students, institutions may exaggerate the success of their graduates. This may be a particular problem with the for-profit institutions and with particular low-quality programs in the vocations. Academic integrity consists of honesty, trust, respect, fairness, and responsibility and is fundamental to the reputation of academic institutions. A lack of integrity includes the practice of plagiarism, cheating, unauthorized use of others' work, paying for assignments claimed as one's own, the falsification of data,

Cross-border educational programs raise questions in three areas: the recognition of degrees, the use of recruitment agents to encourage international students, and the establishment of programs abroad by institutions of dubious reputation.

downloading assignments from the internet, the misrepresentation of records, and fraudulent publishing. It also includes paying for grades with gifts, money, or sexual favors.

AREAS NEEDING CAREFUL DISCUSSION

Definitional limits. When universities are not managed well, some suggest that it is a sign of corruption. Inefficiency, a concentration of power, slowness in making decisions, and a reluctance to share confidential information are not signs of corruption. When educational institutions seek nontraditional sources of income, some may confuse that with corruption—although wherever legal, it is not.

Differences in corruption levels. There are instances of corruption in every country, but this does not mean that corruption is distributed identically. In some circumstances it is endemic, affecting the entire system; in other cases it is occasional. In some circumstances it is monetary in nature;

in others it tends to center on professional transgressions, such as plagiarism. Where international students intend to study is relevant. In general, students act to leave places where corruption is rampant and prefer to study where it is minor.

Differences between institutional and individual corruption. Causes and solutions need to be differentiated. Institutional corruption—financial fraud, the illegal procurement of goods and services, and tax avoidance—are problems that can be handled through the enforcement of legislation. Individual corruption—including faculty misbehavior, cheating on examinations, plagiarism, the falsification of research results—constitutes transgressions of codes of professional conduct. In the first, the main control is through legislation and enforcement in court. In the second, control is internal to the university. Legislation should not attempt to include infractions of individual corruption, on behalf of individual students and faculty.

THE ENVIRONMENT AND CORRUPTION

Though competition for revenues places pressures on faculty, it is insufficient to use such pressures as an excuse to engage in corrupt practices. Nor, is it sufficient to suggest that, because corrupt behavior is common, one's own participation can be excused. Even in environments in which corruption is virtually universal there are "resisters" to corruption.

ARE ANTICORRUPTION MEASURES INTERNATIONAL?

Some individuals suggest that anticorruption measures should be based on domestic values and laws. Although numerous instances seem correct, there appear to be some instances in which universal measures are already the norm. For instance, in the case of universities ranked by the *Times Higher Education* magazine across 40 countries, 98 percent ethical infrastructure elements—on their Web sites—codes of conduct for faculty, students, and administrators honors councils.

FUTURE WORK

International agencies have an important role. Finding ways to combat higher education corruption is a viable candidate for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's attention and extrabudgetary support. UNESCO could assist countries to establish strategies covering examination procedures, accountability and transparency codes, and adjudication structures, such as student and faculty courts of conduct.

The Council of Europe and the European Union have important roles. To participate in the Bologna process, universities and the countries seek to be recognized. The recognition procedure could include mechanisms to com-

bat corruption. Development assistance agencies also have important roles. Among criteria for project, approval might be the corruption infrastructure noted above. In addition, countries might be held accountable for their anticorruption performance, based on the evidence that corruption had declined, that the level of transparency had increased, and that the public perception of corruption had shifted downward.

In regular surveys, Transparency International has assisted the understanding of general corruption by gauging the degree to which a nation's business and government are believed to be corrupt. A similar set of indicators could be used on higher education. It could be a matter of pride, to find that the level of participation and the public perception of corruption are on the decline. If governments encourage such surveys, it is a healthy sign; if governments forbid such surveys, it is a sign that they have not yet understood the level of risk involved by being passive.

Perception is all-important. It is common to deny wrongdoing. "Where is the evidence?" one might ask. This is the wrong approach. When an institution is perceived to be corrupt, the damage is already done. Perception is the only evidence needed for harmful effects to occur. This is one reason why all world-class universities post anticorruption efforts on their Web sites. This implies that any university, in any culture, that has ambitions to become world class is required to erect a similar ethical infrastructure. This may require a change of attitude on the part of many rectors and university administrators. It may require them to shift from a mode of self-protection and denial to a mode of transparency and active engagement, even when the evidence may be disturbing and/or painful. If the best universities in the world submit themselves to such ethical inspections, then the others can too. ■

MOOCs as Neocolonialism: Who Controls Knowledge?

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

Massive open online courses, or MOOCs, are the latest effort to harness information technology for higher education. The concept takes advantage of the significant

advancements in technology that permits much more interactive pedagogy as well as more sophisticated delivery of content. While MOOCs are still in a nascent stage of development, their sponsors as well as many commentators and policymakers are enthusiastic, and see them as an inexpensive and innovative way of delivering content to vast audiences, while others see potential for profits.

One aspect of the MOOC movement has not been fully analyzed—who controls the knowledge. Considering where the content and the technology that support MOOCs originate, the answer is clear. MOOCs are largely an American-led effort and the majority of the courses available so far come from universities in the United States or other Western countries. The main providers are also in the technologically advanced countries. The technology in use was developed in Silicon Valley, Kendall Square in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and other hubs of information technology innovation. Early adopters have a significant advantage in this arena. While globalization has increased the sway of the academic centers in economically powerful countries, MOOCs promise to enhance this higher education hegemony by harnessing technology to the existing knowledge network.

Others, in diverse and less-developed regions of the world, are joining the MOOC bandwagon, but it is likely that they will be using technology, pedagogical ideas, and much of the content developed elsewhere. In this way, the online courses threaten to exacerbate the worldwide influence of Western academe, bolstering its higher education hegemony.

Two of the original MOOC sponsors, Coursera and EdX, are American initiatives—the first founded by Stanford professors and based in Silicon Valley in California and the second established by Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institution of Technology. Many other top universities, mainly in the United States, have joined these efforts. Coursera offers 535 courses in many fields of study—24 percent of the courses originate from outside the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia; EdX provides 91 courses—19 of which are from outside North America and the United Kingdom. Some of these courses enroll as many as 300,000 students, with average enrollments of approximately 20,000. The large majority of students come from outside the United States. Completion rates seem to be low—most less than 13 percent. Many in the MOOC movement are seeking to earn profits from MOOCs—a goal so far unmet.

WHO CONTROLS KNOWLEDGE AND WHY DOES IT MATTER?

The large majority of MOOCs are created and taught by professors in the United States. Companies and universi-

ties with the funds to develop good MOOC courses—and with high development costs—are American. Udacity, an American MOOC provider, estimates that creating a single course costs \$200,000, and is increasing to \$400,000. The University of California, Berkeley, estimates development costs at between \$50,000 and \$100,000, with access to sophisticated technology required.

For the most part, MOOC content is based on the American academic experience and pedagogical ideas. By and large, the readings required by most MOOC courses are American or from other Western countries. Many of the courses are in English, and even when lectures and materials are translated into other languages the content largely reflects the original course. The vast majority of instructors are American. It is likely that more diversity will develop but the basic content will remain.

Approaches to the curriculum, pedagogy, and the overall philosophy of education differ according to national traditions and practices, and may not reflect the approaches provided by most MOOC instructors or the companies and universities providing MOOC content and pedagogy. No doubt, those developing MOOCs will claim that their methods are best and reflect the most advanced pedagogical thinking. Perhaps, there are a range of approaches to learning and many traditions.

Why is this important? Neither knowledge nor pedagogy are neutral. They reflect the academic traditions, methodological orientations, and teaching philosophies of particular academic systems. Such academic nationalism is especially evident in many social science and humanities fields, but it is not absent in the sciences. While academics who develop MOOC courses are no doubt motivated by a desire to do the best job possible and to cater to a wide audience, they are to a significant extent bound by their own academic orientations.

Since the vast majority of material used comes from Western academic systems, examples used in science courses are likely to come from America or Europe because these countries dominate the literature and articles in influential journals, and are taught by well-known professors from high-profile universities. Modes of inquiry reflect the Western mainstream. While this knowledge base and pedagogical orientation no doubt reflect current ideas of good practice, they may not be the only approach to good scientific inquiry or content.

These issues come into even sharper focus in the social sciences and humanities. In fields such as literature and philosophy, most courses reflect Western traditions of knowledge, the Western literature canon, and Western philosophical assumptions. The social sciences reflect Western methodologies and basic assumptions about the

essentials of scientific inquiry. Mainstream ideas and methods in fields from anthropology to sociology reflect Western trends, especially the American academic community. The major academic journals, editors, and editorial boards, big academic publishers are located in the global centers of knowledge, like Boston, New York, and London. It is, under these circumstances, natural that the dominant ideas from these centers will dominate academic discourse, and will be reflected in the thinking and orientations of most of those planning and teaching MOOCs. MOOC gatekeepers, such as Coursera, Udacity, and others, will seek to maintain standards as they interpret them, and this will no doubt strengthen the hegemony of Western methodologies and orientations.

The large majority of MOOCs are created and taught by professors in the United States. Companies and universities with the funds to develop good MOOC courses—and with high development costs—are American.

English not only dominates academic scholarship in the 21st century, but also the MOOCs. English is the language of internationally circulated academic journals; researchers in non-English-speaking environments are increasingly using English for their academic writings and communication. Major academic Web sites tend to be in English as well. Because English is the language of scholarly communication, the methodological and intellectual orientations of the English-speaking academic culture hold sway globally.

The implications for developing countries are serious. MOOCs produced in the current centers of research are easy to access and inexpensive for the user, but may inhibit the emergence of a local academic culture, local academic content, and courses tailored specially for national audiences. MOOCs have the potential to reach nonelite audiences, thus extending the influence of the main academic centers.

THE NEOCOLONIALISM OF THE WILLING

Those responsible for creating, designing, and delivering MOOC courses in all fields are in general part of the academic culture of major universities in the English-speaking countries. They do not seek to impose their values or methodologies on others, influence happens organically and without conspiracies. A combination of powerful academic

cultures, the location of the main creators and disseminators of MOOCs, and the orientation of most of those creating and teaching MOOCs ensures the domination of the largely English-speaking academic systems. The millions of students choosing to participate in MOOCs from all over the world do not seem to be concerned about the nature of the knowledge or the philosophy of pedagogy that they are studying. Universities in the middle-income and developing world do not seem concerned about the origins or orientations of the knowledge provided by the MOOCs or the educational philosophies behind MOOC pedagogy.

I do not mean to imply any untoward motives by the MOOC community. I am not arguing that the content or methodologies of most current MOOCs are wrong because they are based on the dominant Western academic approaches. But I do believe it is important to point out that a powerful emerging educational movement, the Massive Open Online Courses, strengthens the currently dominant academic culture, perhaps making it more difficult for alternative voices to be heard. ■

Top Universities or Top Higher Education Systems?

BENOÎT MILLOT

Benoît Millot is an independent consultant. He is a former education economist at the World Bank. E-mail: benoitmillot2013@gmail.com.

International university rankings have become a familiar character on the higher education scene. As their impact has grown, reactions have followed suite, running from enthusiastic adherence, to passive resistance, and also to outright criticism. Thanks to the latter, methodologies are improving—guidelines and safeguards are being developed (e.g., Berlin Principles) and followed up (e.g., International Ranking Expert Group). Yet, serious criticisms relate to the fact that, by definition, these rankings focus exclusively on individual institutions—the world-class universities—to be found only in a small cluster of countries. Thus, university rankings ignore the vast majority of institutions worldwide that cannot compete on the same playing field as world-class universities. In turn, policymakers tend to prioritize a small number of institutions in order to improve their country’s position in the rankings, often at the expense of the rest of the country’s higher education system. To counter these unexpected and perverse effects, attempts are being made

to measure, rank, and compare national higher education systems, rather than individual institutions. To figure out whether these attempts are successful, this note compares their results with those obtained by university rankings.

THE TWO TYPES OF RANKINGS

As a first step in the comparison, university rankings and system rankings need to be selected. Regarding the Academic Ranking of World Universities, usually referred to as the Shanghai rankings, *Times Higher Education*, and the QS rankings are selected for being the most popular and well-established league tables. Because of its innovative aspect, the Webometrics ranking is added to these “big three.” As far as system rankings are concerned, the choice is limited, and Universitas 21 (U21, led by the University of Melbourne, Australia) stands out as an obvious pick, with currently no real competitor, even though earlier works have explored ways to assess entire systems. U21 uses 22 measures (“desirable attributes”) grouped into four categories or modules: resources, environment, connectivity, and outputs weighted, respectively (25%, 20%, 15%, and 40%).

In turn, policymakers tend to prioritize a small number of institutions in order to improve their country’s position in the rankings, often at the expense of the rest of the country’s higher education system.

Most measures draw from conventional and verifiable sources (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, University Information Systems, and SCImago data, etc.), and they provide a comprehensive view of the most important facets of higher education systems. Particularly interesting is the inclusion of the unemployment rates of university graduates to reflect external efficiency (even if the measure needs some fine-tuning). Another welcome feature is the effort to reflect the regulatory environment of higher education systems. However, the modalities to come up with an indicator for this dimension are elusive and rely on a combination of sources—a survey among U21 institutions, data from renowned institutions, and from Web sites. Finally, the use of an “overall” indicator built on the four modules indicators is highly dependent on the weights of its components and, therefore, remains controversial because of the arbitrariness of such weights—a pitfall shared by university rankings.

Then, the results of the four selected university rankings need to be normalized at the country level so that the size effect is neutralized. More specifically, the number of top universities in each country is weighted by the higher education–aged population of the country. This indicator can be seen as reflecting the “density” of world-class universities in each country. First, there is no significant correlation between the number of top universities in a country and their density. Second, the normalized results of the four-selected university rankings are very similar; their methodologies differ substantially on some points but also share common features. Third, countries that can boast at least one of the top 400 universities in each of the four rankings constitute a rather homogenous club of less than 40 members, mostly high-income economies. Across the four rankings, density of top universities is the highest in small and rich countries—Denmark, Switzerland, Sweden, and Finland, followed by Ireland, the Netherlands, and Hong Kong.

SIMILARITY OF RESULTS

The four normalized university rankings, produced by U21 (2012 edition), leads to a clear conclusion: a strong and positive correlation between the two sets of results. To double check this finding, correlations are also examined for the 2013 editions of both Shanghai and U21 rankings, and the results show an even stronger association. A further test is administered, correlating the results of each of the four U21 categories with those of the major university leagues. The correlations are significant, and the relationship is largely positive, regardless of the university league considered (Shanghai first) and the U21 category selected (resources and output strongest). The only noticeable exception to the convergence of the two types of rankings is the United States, which comes first under U21, but does not show among the winners of the university leagues when analyzed in terms of density.

THE CONVERGENCE OF RESULTS

These comparisons may lead to the idea that a high density of world-class universities guarantees a country as a world-class higher education system. They may also give the impression that the similarity of results between U21 and university rankings means that the former effects are not more informative than the latter. Three types of observations suggest that such conclusions are not warranted. A first one is that U21 selects 50 countries among the G20 members and countries which perform best in the National Science Foundation international ranking of research institutions: thus, although the pool of U21 countries is slightly larger than that of “the big three” university rankings, the mode of selection of these countries constitutes a twofold bias to-

ward wealthy countries and those heavily investing in research. Second, U21 incorporates some of the indicators of the university rankings (Shanghai and Webometrics) in its own measures and even counts the number of world-class universities among its measures of output, which certainly explains the US exception. Finally, a reclassification of all 22 measures confirms the heavy bias toward research. Therefore, the convergence of the two types of rankings is almost inevitable and is a logical consequence of the methodology used by U21. Finally, a critical element to keep in mind is that a world-class higher education system is an elusive concept including many dimensions, running from equity in access, to internal efficiency, to teaching and learning, to relevance within the socioeconomic fabric of the country, and to external efficiency. Indeed, these dimensions are difficult to capture, and despite U21’s laudable attempts to reflect several of them, they fall short of fully account for all the complexity and diversity of national higher education systems.

ROOM TO IMPROVE

Comparing national higher education systems across countries remains a priority. U21 has taken bold steps in that direction but needs to go further, to demonstrate its usefulness. Two routes are critical: first, digging further into the structure of the systems, so that the rankings are better contextualized; second, expanding the number and diversity of the countries to be ranked—data permitting so that the exercise is more inclusive. Taking these routes would certainly lead to results more clearly differentiated from those yielded by university rankings and would contribute to meeting the high expectations created by the U21 initiative. The U21 rankings illustrate the vast potential of system rankings, as important complements to university rankings and as contributors to better informed decisions by higher education policymakers. ■

Outcomes Assessment in International Education

DARLA K. DEARDORFF

Darla K. Deardorff is executive director of the Association of International Education Administrators and a research scholar at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, US. E-mail: d.deardorff@duke.edu.

Due to the growing trend in higher education accountability, many postsecondary institutions are now measuring student learning outcomes, related to global or inter-

cultural learning. However, a closer look is required at those assessment efforts, which although growing in popularity are not always designed well, executed effectively, or leveraged to maximum effect.

Often times, institutions engaged in outcomes assessment within international education will do the following: Have one person or one office “do the assessment”; use only one assessment tool (usually a pre/post tool); and use that particular tool because another university or all universities in a certain group are using it. Sometimes an institution will even design their own tool, often not vetting it for reliability or validity.

Far too often the assessment effort is an afterthought or an ad hoc effort, without sufficient work exerted at the planning stage, without clearly articulated goals and outcome statements, and without an assessment plan in place. Furthermore, the institution or program may simply shelve the data it has collected, claiming to have done assessment, ending the process there, and repeating this process again in subsequent years, as long as funding or staffing is available. The assessment data are rarely provided back to the students for their own continued learning and development that are crucial in intercultural learning. We outline several principles to ensure quality assurance in the student learning outcomes assessment practice in international education.

A ROAD MAP

Higher education institutions embarking on assessment efforts will often start by asking, “Which tool should we use?” While this may seem like a logical place to start, it is important to first ask “What is it that we want to measure?” This question will lead to a closer examination of stated mission and goals that determine the appropriate assessment tools. When considering an assessment agenda for an international education program or initiative, it is helpful to step back and reflect on the following three questions, to help create an assessment road map: (1) Where are we going? (mission/goals); (2) How will we get there? (objectives/outcomes); and (3) How will we know when we have arrived? (evidence). Possibly, the evidence of student success goes beyond counting numbers (which are the outputs) to *perceptions* of students’ learning (indirect evidence such as through surveys or inventories) and actual learning (direct evidence of student learning such as assignments in e-portfolios). This crucial alignment of mission, goals, and outcomes will naturally point to which tools/methods are needed to collect evidence that these outcomes have been achieved.

NO PERFECT TOOL

Assessment tools must be aligned with stated objectives

and selected based on “fitness for purpose,” rather than for reasons of convenience or familiarity. Too often, institutions or programs seek the one “perfect tool,” which simply does not exist, especially for intercultural learning. In fact, when assessing something as complex as global learning or intercultural competence development, rigorous assessment involves the use of a multimethod, multiperspective approach that goes beyond the use of one tool. Furthermore, it is critical that institutions thoroughly explore existing tools in terms of exactly what those measure (not just what tools *say* they measure), the reliability and validity of the tools, the validity of the tool in that particular institutional/programmatic context, the theoretical basis of the tools, and including how well the tools align with the specific outcomes to be assessed. The prioritized outcomes will vary by the institution, so there is no one-size-fits-all approach when it comes to assessment tools.

Far too often the assessment effort is an afterthought or an ad hoc effort, without sufficient work exerted at the planning stage, without clearly articulated goals and outcome statements, and without an assessment plan in place.

As to decisions about assessment at preliminary (“pre”) versus concluding (“post”) stages of a program or course, good assessment means efforts are also ideally integrated into programming on an ongoing basis, avoiding the reliance on snapshots only at the beginning and/or end of a learning experience. Furthermore, the most meaningful and useful assessment of intercultural learning arguably contains a longitudinal component and provides feedback to students.

WORKING FROM THE PLAN

Another key principle of good assessment is that efforts need to be holistically developed and documented through an assessment plan. An assessment plan outlines not only what will be measured and how the data will be collected, but also details about who will be involved (which needs to be more than one person or office), the timeline, implementation details, and how the data will be used and communicated. This last point is crucial: there must be a use for the data (i.e., for student feedback, program improvement, and advocacy) or there is no need to collect the data. In particular, offices should not be collecting data and then trying

to determine “what to do with it.” Spending 10 percent of the time in the beginning to develop an assessment plan and thinking through these issues is time well invested in the later 90 percent of the effort that goes into assessment.

A TEAM EFFORT

Often, assessment can seem quite overwhelming and daunting, especially if only one person or office is tasked with doing it. Effective assessment actually involves an in-trainstitutional team of stakeholders, which is comprised not only of international education experts but also assessment experts, students, faculty, and others who have a stake in international education outcomes. Senior leadership and support play a critical role in the success of assessment efforts. Once assembled, this intrainstitutional team prioritizes outcomes to be assessed, conducts an audit of assessment efforts already underway, and adapts current assessment efforts to align with goals and outcomes—no need to reinvent assessment efforts or add expensive ones when they may not be necessary—before seeking additional assessment tools/methods that collect evidence needed to address stated goals and outcomes.

Higher education institutions embarking on assessment efforts will often start by asking, “Which tool should we use?”

CONCLUSION

There are other principles of effective assessment that might include utilizing a control group, best practices in terms of sampling, the use of longitudinal studies, and so on. This article has outlined a few principles as a call for further reflection and discussion on what truly makes for rigorous outcomes assessment in international education. While it is commendable for institutions to be engaged in outcomes assessment, it is important to take a closer look at the quality of the assessments being done. Guiding questions can include: How well are assessment tools/methods aligned with mission and goals? (Exactly what do those tools measure and why are they being used?) Is there more than one tool being used? Is there an assessment plan in place? How are assessment efforts integrated throughout a course or program, beyond pre/post efforts? How are the data being used? Is more than one person or office involved in assessment efforts? Is the assessment plan itself being reviewed regularly for improvement?

If higher education institutions are serious about in-

ternationalization, assessment, and student learning, such efforts are effective, resulting in outcomes that are meaningful for all involved, including our students. ■

APEC’s Bold Higher Education Agenda: Will Anyone Notice?

CHRISTOPHER ZIGURAS

Christopher Ziguras is deputy dean, at the School of Global, Urban and Social Studies, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia. E-mail: chris.ziguras@rmit.edu.au.

Since the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation organization (APEC) was established in 1989 to foster economic cooperation across the Asia Pacific it has not been particularly interested in higher education, but that might be changing. During Russia’s chairmanship of APEC in 2012, the organization’s leaders committing to promoting cross-border cooperation, collaboration, and networking. But whether the organization’s new aspiration for regional engagement can be translated into practical measures that affect institutions, students and educators remain to be seen.

A TRADE LIBERALIZATION MEETS CHINESE REGULATION

Since at least the mid-1990s, APEC expressed an interest in expanding foreign investment in education and training. Australia, a key provider of cross-border higher education in the region, was the driving force behind early APEC international education projects, while playing a similar role within the World Trade Organization and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In an effort to engage APEC in the Millennium Round of the General Agreement on Trade in Services negotiations, it organized a “Thematic Dialogue on Trade in Education Services” in Hanoi in 2002 and sponsored a series of research projects: *Measures Affecting Trade and Investment in Education Services in the Asia-Pacific Region* (with New Zealand, 2001), *APEC and International Education* (2008), and *Measures Affecting Cross-Border Exchange and Investment in Higher Education in the APEC Region* (2009).

China was much more interested in projects focusing on effective national regulation of cross-border provision. After introducing new guidelines for foreign providers in 2003, China sponsored a project that Australia and New Zealand were keen to partner in, culminating in an awkwardly titled report, *Improving the Institute Capacity of*

Higher Education under Globalization: Joint Schools among APEC (2004). More recently, China held an APEC seminar in Shanghai followed by the report *Capacity Building for Policies and Monitoring of Cross-Border Education in the APEC Region* (2011).

While coming at the challenge of governing cross-border higher education from opposite poles, both the Australian and Chinese-led projects emphasized the importance of national regulation and quality assurance. In an effort to develop such capacity across the region, Australia and the United States led APEC projects on the development of national quality-assurance regimes in 2006 and 2011, respectively.

These various forums and reports provided some opportunities for information sharing between midranking officials from across the region, which may have contributed in some small part to policy convergence, especially by exposing officials in emerging economies to the practices of more developed systems. However, such concerns did not figure large on the agenda of APEC’s education ministers. There was rarely even a mention of higher education in the statements of APEC Education Ministerial Meetings before 2012.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN VLADIVOSTOK?

In 2012, education ministers agreed to ramp up APEC’s role in educational cooperation, dubbed the “Gyeongju Initiative,” and immediately the Russian Federation volunteered to lead a higher education initiative during the year in which Russia assumed the rotating leadership of the organization. APEC trade ministers then called for both expanding “cross-border *trade* in education services and deepening educational *cooperation* in the Asia-Pacific” (my emphasis). They asked officials to examine ways to “better facilitate mobility of students, researchers and providers in the region.” A month later, the Russian-sponsored higher education conference in Vladivostok “Shaping Education within APEC” adopted the trade ministers’ list and added two more points: “increasing the interaction between higher education institutions and increasing data collection on trade in education services.”

In committing to “educational cooperation and promoting cross-border exchange in education services,” APEC has wisely framed aspirations in terms that are broad enough to be meaningful within both the education and trade sectors. These aspirations were duly endorsed by APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting in Vladivostok in late 2012. Russia had since sponsored a second APEC Conference on Cooperation in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific Region early in 2013, again in Vladivostok.

So Russia seems to have very successfully put cross-border higher education on the top of the APEC agenda.

Russia does host a large number of international degree students, 129,690 in 2010 according to UNESCO figures; but a small proportion of these are from APEC member economies, with the vast majority coming from former Soviet states. Also, Russia has not previously been active in this space within APEC.

The location may provide some clues. The Leaders’ Summit took place on the newly built island campus of the Far Eastern Federal University, which was constructed in time to host the summit and will then provide facilities for the university. The university’s Web site states that “The main target of the FEFU Strategic Program for 2010–2019, supported by extensive federal funding, is to make FEFU a world-class university, integrated into the education, research and innovation environment of the Asia-Pacific region.” So, the city of Vladivostok and this international university, in particular, appear central to Russia’s efforts to expand its educational engagement with the region.

Since at least the mid-1990s, APEC expressed an interest in expanding foreign investment in education and training.

ONGOING TENSIONS

In August last year, I facilitated an APEC forum in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, sponsored by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade that brought together trade and education officials, scholars, and representatives of educational institutions from 14 countries. Much of the discussion focused on ways to enhance institutional capacity, to support a widespread desire for greater international engagement—for recruiting international degree students, engaging in exchange relationships, collaborating with foreign institutions to deliver international programs, internationalizing research, or teaching. However, in order to further opening education systems to allow more mobility for students, scholars, and providers, there are still clearly significant differences of opinion between and within countries. Several participants argued that because of the different stages of development of national systems there is not a level playing field; and that introducing greater international competition for domestic providers would undermine their national development strategies.

It is not uncommon for incumbents in any protected industry sector to oppose measures that would allow competitors to enter their markets. In some ways, universities behave no differently than the events of other service pro-

viders, such as banks or airlines. But the education sector plays a unique role and is of critical importance in fostering social and economic development. Thus, governments are wary of introducing changes that key institutions see as weakening their positions, especially if those institutions are operated by the ministry of education.

We may not be on the verge of another Bologna Declaration, but APEC’s interest is one more indication of a growing political will to intensify the integration of higher education systems across the region. ■

China’s Removal of English from *Gaokao*

YANG RUI

Yang Rui is professor and director, at the Comparative Education Research Center, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: yangrui@hku.hk.

Embracing the English language exemplifies China’s vigorous engagement with the outside world, especially in respect to Western societies. The attitude is not only unprecedented in Chinese modern history, but is also different from other developing countries’ interactions with the developed Western world. At both national, and individual, career development levels, English-language education has been a subject of paramount importance in China since its reopening to the outside world. Proficiency in English has been widely regarded as a national, as well as a personal asset. English-language education has been viewed by the Chinese, both the leadership and the people, as having a vital role to play in national modernization and development.

Seeing the dominant status of English as a historical fact, China has initiated various policies to adapt to it, instead of resisting it, in an effort to promote internationalization. Learning English is no longer just important within China. It is the bare minimum for any serious student. China is home to more speakers of English than any other country. Examinations in Chinese schools at all levels include English proficiency tests. English is widely required in the professional promotions of academics, including many whose work requires little use of English. With the proposed changes in the *gaokao* (China’s national college entrance examination), the extraordinary phenomenon of a huge option in China of learning English is likely to fade.

THE REFORM PLAN

As part of China’s reform plan to change its notorious once-in-a-lifetime examination system, the Ministry of Education foreshadowed in late 2013 that the English test will be removed from the *gaokao* by 2020. Instead, tests will be held several times a year for students to choose when and how often they achieve the examination so as to alleviate study pressure, and only the highest score they obtain will be counted. It will be piloted in selected provinces and cities and promoted nationwide from 2017, with a new examination and an admission system projected to be established by 2020.

Even before the Ministry of Education’s release, the Beijing Municipal Commission of Education had said that the scores for subjects in Beijing’s *gaokao* will change as of 2016. The overall score of English language will drop from 150 to 100, while the total points for Chinese language will rise from 150 to 180. Mathematics remains unchanged at 150 points. Arts and sciences overall increased from 300 to 320 points. The English-language test can be taken twice a year. If a student gets 100 points in the first year of high school, for example, then she or he can be exempted from English courses in the second and third years.

Other regions, including Jiangsu and Shandong provinces and Shanghai municipality, are also preparing their own *gaokao* reforms. Shandong was reported to cancel the listening part of the English-language examination in its *gaokao*. In Jiangsu, there have been discussions of excluding English in *gaokao* in the future. While details remain to be finalized, the general direction is clear: less English, more Chinese for *gaokao*.

THE DEBATE

The reform initiative has won overwhelming support from the general public. In a survey of over 220,000 respondents updated in December 9 last year by Phoenix Online, when asked about their views on Beijing’s *gaokao* reform, 82.82 percent supported it while only 13.55 percent were opposed. Similarly, when asked if they would support lowering the point value for English language and increasing the point value for Chinese language, 82.79 percent supported and 13.01 percent opposed.

In contrast, the plan has divided education experts, who disagree on whether placing less emphasis on English-language skills is a good idea. The decision has aroused heated discussions among those who doubt the reform would reduce the burden of learning English or if the substitute test could reflect a student’s English skills and help students learn English better. An important aspect of the reform lies in what and how to test, as suggested by Yu Lizhong, chancellor of New York University Shanghai. The education ministry adds to the complex of the debate by viewing

removing English from *gaokao* as an indicator of China’s cultural confidence.

Most debates focus on whether or not the reform could relieve the burden of *gaokao* and how to distribute time to study the native language and a foreign one (English). Hu Ruiwen, who is based at Shanghai Institute for Human Resources Development and a member of the National Education Advisory Committee, said such a change would be a signal to students that they should pay more attention to their mother tongue than a foreign language. To him, students now spend too much time studying English. There is a need for them to learn their native language well. He believes the changes will help students better to learn the Chinese language.

English-language education has been a subject of paramount importance in China since its reopening to the outside world.

Cai Jigang, a professor at Fudan University’s College of Foreign Languages and Literature and chairman of the Shanghai Advisory Committee for College English Teaching at Tertiary Level, opposes any plan to reduce the status of English language in the college entrance exam because it fails to take into account China’s demand for foreign-language ability—as a means to accept the challenge of globalization and the internationalization of higher education. He worries that Chinese students may no longer work hard on English, which will have an adverse effect in the long run.

MISSING THE POINT?

The central emphasis on the strategic role of English in the modernization process and the high priority given to that language on the national agenda of educational development has proven to be beneficial. China’s efforts are already paying off. The communicative and instrumental function of English as a global language has accelerated China’s foreign trade and helped China’s economic growth in the past decades. It has also promoted China’s exchanges with the outside world. Chinese scholars and students in major universities have little difficulty in communicating with international scholars. Their English proficiency has contributed to China’s current fast, successful engagement with the international community. Peer-reviewed papers in international journals written by Chinese researchers rose 64-fold over the past 30 years.

China’s modernization began with foreign-languages

learning. In consequence, it could be argued that attitude toward foreign language has been the harbinger of China’s internationalization. Instead of demonstrating confidence, the decision reveals a degree of cultural indulgence. The *gaokao* is likely to remain the most important indicator for college admissions: de-emphasizing English, rather than taking the chance to make it less test-based, with a greater emphasis on practical proficiency, will reduce schools’ and students’ efforts to learn English, at a time of rising demand for proficient English-speaking Chinese employees. If this was the result, would it limit the chance for China to continue its recent success story? ■

“English Fever” in China Has Reached a Watershed

WANG XIAOYANG AND LI YANGYANG

Wang Xiaoyang is associate professor and director of Higher Education Research Institute, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. E-mail: wangxy@tsinghua.edu.cn. Li Yangyang is a graduate student in the same institute.

Recently, several provinces in China have proposed an initiative for reforming the national college entrance examination (*gaokao*)—reducing the importance of the English-language part of the examination as one of the targets. This move has subsequently aroused extensive debate in public, with both support and oppose views. Some supporters argue that English teaching and learning in primary and secondary schools cost too much of students’ time, thus decreasing the time spent on Chinese language, and therefore agree with lowering the English emphasis in the *gaokao*. Others argue that English is still important for students to read Western scientific books and journals, participate in international economic activities and exchanges, and thus oppose lowering the score of that language in *gaokao*. The Jiangsu province was the first to declare withdrawing the English test from the *gaokao*. The English test will be given twice a year and its score will be in the form of letter grades. Beijing has also now invited public comments on its reform plan, which proposes that the full mark of the English test will be reduced from 150 to 100 points and that of Chinese test will be increased from 150 to 180 points. Why does the English score fall while the Chinese score rises? Has “English fever” in China reached a watershed?

WHY DOES THE *Gaokao* REFORM START WITH ENGLISH?

Concerning the fact that English-language education in China is time consuming and low efficiency, reforming the English exam can easily be understood and supported by both the public individuals and educators. English education in China is now becoming more test oriented, which urgently requires reform. Chinese students have invested the most time and efforts in learning English; however, it has not yielded positive results. Many students have been learning English for years, constantly memorizing words and doing exercises, but so far have only managed to learn so-called “broken English.”

Now, far too few students can handle cross-cultural communication in a fluent and concise manner. One of the aims of the *gaokao* reform in Beijing is to dilute the selection function of the English test and restore the function of English as a tool of communication. Therefore, as revealed in the reform plan, Beijing decided to increase the proportion of the listening comprehension in the English text in

Compared with English, it is more demanding for teachers to guide students to appreciate the charm of Chinese culture, as students and parents have been more devoted about learning English than Chinese.

gaokao; and the content of the test will be limited to basic knowledge and ability. Another important issue that deserves our attention is the government’s attitude to deliver the power of organizing examination to third-party social institutions. If the reform plan is implemented nationally, the English part of *gaokao* will be sponsored by social institutions like the Educational Testing Service in the United States, twice a year in 2016. Students will then be able to participate in up to six times the exam in a high school three-year period, which greatly reduces the pressure of taking the exam and hopefully leads students to learn English for the communicative use rather than just purely for getting a higher score on an examination.

WILL THE IMPORTANCE OF ENGLISH FALL WHILE THAT OF CHINESE RISES?

Over the years, Chinese educators have been concerned that English has too much importance attached to education and that people are sometimes overlooking the importance of studying Chinese. Given this worry, along with de-

creasing the score of the English exam, the Beijing *gaokao* reform is designed to increase the score of Chinese by 30 points, to emphasize the fundamental role of Chinese as a mother tongue and basic core subject. The great attention paid to Chinese language and culture by the policymaker is evidently expressed in the reform. Compared with English, it is more demanding for teachers to guide students to appreciate the charm of Chinese culture, as students and parents have been more devoted about learning English than Chinese. As *gaokao* is the baton of primary and secondary education, policymakers wisely use it to guide teaching and learning. We believe by adjusting the weights of English and Chinese, students and teachers can be guided to focus more on the learning of Chinese to a large extent.

“ENGLISH FEVER” AT A WATERSHED IN CHINA

The reform concerning English in *gaokao* to some extent also implies that “English fever” has reached a watershed in China. Since the *gaokao* was restored in the late 1970s, the importance of English scores in *gaokao* has been gradually raised from 30, 100 to 150 points, becoming one of the three-core subjects together with mathematics and Chinese. Correspondingly, a wave of “English fever” swept the nation, and English training has become a huge industry. Now, China has the world’s largest English-speaking population.

In recent years, with the further build-up of China’s comprehensive national strength, China has been increasing trade activities with nations around the world. Following the development of the nation, there are more students around the world who choose to learn Chinese, including President Obama’s daughters and Vice President Biden’s granddaughter. After a recent visit to China, British Prime Minister David Cameron indicated that schools in the United Kingdom should not teach kids so much French and German, but should rather focus on Chinese. To accommodate this need, strengthening cultural exchanges with foreign countries and trying to propagate Chinese language have become an increasingly pressing issue. “Chinese fever” abroad also urges education authorities to reflect and adjust language and culture education policies, so as to enhance the education of Chinese language and culture, and to a certain extent cool the excessive “English fever” at home. ■



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

Will China Excel in the Global Brain Race?

QIANG ZHA

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

In the past decade, China appears to have been taking a strong position in the global brain race. Following the well-known “Thousand Talent Program” (including “Thousand Young Talent Program” and “Thousand Foreign Talent Program”), which aims to lure back expatriate and international talent, the Chinese government recently launched a “Ten Thousand Talent Program.” This program, unlike the former, focuses on home talent and pledges to select and support 10,000 leading scholars in the next 10 years in fields of sciences, engineering, and social sciences—among whom the top 100 will be compelled to aim at seizing Nobel prizes. So, China now explicitly raised its ambition up to the standard of an innovation leader, to rely more and more on domestic talent. Indeed, the “Thousand Talent Program” did not really meet the expectations. So far, the high caliber expatriate talent did not go back to China in a large scale. Among the returnees, those possessing doctorate, master’s, and bachelor’s degrees show an odd ratio of 1:8:1. However, a majority of returnees are those who spent a short while overseas, to study for a master’s degree. Statistics show that over 1.5 million Chinese scholars and students remain abroad. What caused China’s global brain strategy (famous for handsome salaries, generous start-up packages, and other financial incentives) to not have produced the expected outcomes?

PERSPECTIVES

An adoption of the views of human, cultural, and social capital may offer an insightful interpretation of this puzzling scenario. For example, an impetus that inspires Chinese scholars or students to go back to China might be the limitation associating with human capital logic, which puts emphasis on technical and tangible knowledge gained from various education and training. Supposedly, Chinese expatriates feel they are largely treated as human capital in their host countries and see few opportunities to fulfill their cultural and social capital in that specific context. Then, do the initiatives like the “Thousand Talent Program” provide the equivalent pull factor?—not necessarily, as such programs are also primarily based on human capital logic. Many Chinese expatriates may see better chances to enjoy their cultural capital back in China, which distinguishes from human capital as the implicit knowledge gained from the cultural tradition and environment, and often defines a

higher status in society. However, when it comes to accomplishing social capital, they will find they have “ceilings” in China, too.

Arguably, modern social capital conceptualization attaches more importance to individual free choice, in order to create a more cohesive society. In the Chinese social context, however, social capital has been closely linked with the concept of *guanxi* (personalized networks of influence), in particular connections with powerful bureaucrats. In this regard, most returnees do not enjoy an advantage but rather suffer a disadvantage, given their spatial separations from China (for a couple of decades in some cases). This is particularly true in recent years when the Chinese model for development has showcased some successful aspects (China quickly rises as the world’s second-largest economy) and garnered confidence (China is anticipated to surpass the United States and become the wealthiest nation around 2020). Against this backdrop, those policies and practices that bear the Chinese characteristics are hardly allowed to be changed by ideas and personnel from the outside.

THE CASES OF RAO AND SHI REVEALS A PARADOX

Two prominent returnee scientists were Rao Yi and Shi Yigong. Rao Yi was a professor of neurology at Northwestern University in the United States. He returned to Peking University in 2007 to take up the position of dean of the College of Life Science. Shi Yigong was the Warner-Lambert/Parke-Davis professor at Princeton University. In 2008, he

“[T]o obtain major grants in China, it is an open secret that doing good research is not as important as schmoozing with powerful bureaucrats and their favorite experts.”

resigned his position at Princeton University and started pursuing his career at Tsinghua University—as the dean of life science there. They are both regarded as the top-flight talent lured back by the “Thousand Talent Program.”

Apparently, both Rao Yi and Shi Yigong did not prepare to go back to China as a pure researcher. Rather, they wish to make a difference and to better China’s research culture and university education, riding on their social capital. This is evident in their responses to questions as to why they chose to go back to China, as well as in their own writings. In a coauthored article published in 2010 in *Science*, Shi and Rao openly claimed that China’s current research culture “wastes resources, corrupts the spirit, and stymies innova-

tion.” Specifically, they cited the bureaucratic approach to deciding research funding as the source that “stifles innovation and makes clear to everyone that the connections with bureaucrats and a few powerful scientists are paramount.” They went on to disclose that “[T]o obtain major grants in China, it is an open secret that doing good research is not as important as schmoozing with powerful bureaucrats and their favorite experts.” They became frustrated to observe that such a problematic research culture “even permeates the minds of those who are new returnees from abroad; they quickly adapt to the local environment and perpetuate the unhealthy culture,” and called for a meaningful reform in order to build a healthy research culture.

While Shi and Rao were disturbed to see that many colleagues choose to be silent in face of such an “unhealthy culture” for fear of “a losing battle,” they seem to have become victims of their own proclaimed war against a perceived unhealthy academic culture. After two unsuccessful attempts in a row, Rao announced his boycott of competing for a fellowship at the Chinese Academy of Sciences, while Shi is still waiting for the result of his second bid. If prominent returnees, like Rao and Shi, suffered from vulnerability of their social capital in face of the corrupt research culture, how could domestic talent selected by the “Ten Thousand Talent Program” be able to break it?

In the cases of Rao and Shi, their cultural capital appears to be estranged into publicity resource of the government. Despite their fight against the bureaucracy, they are now often cited as part of the success of the “Thousand Talent Program.” In the cases of many others, their social capital is mostly assimilated to the current research culture in China, which in turn prompts them to become the so-called “elegant egoists.” In short, without overhauling the current research system and culture in China, it is not an easy task for the initiatives such as the “Thousand Talent Program” or “Ten Thousand Talent Program” to accomplish their goals. Last but not least, a message could also be sent to Western systems that have been absorbing a bulk of global talent. If no sufficient attention is paid to cultural and social capital of global talent, then there could be a looming crisis that will shake the magnet position of those systems to global talent.

Note: On December 19, 2013, Shi Yigong was appointed a new member of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, following his elections into both the US National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in April 2013, as a foreign associate or foreign honorary member. ■

Point Systems and International Student Flows

JING LI

Jing Li is a doctoral student at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. E-mail: jing.li@tc.columbia.edu.

The mobility of international students is currently an important policy issue over the world. Part of the reason is that international students, especially those who in science and engineering fields, provide a stable source of human resources in science and technology. Since the 1960s, Canada and other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries started to use a point system—of evaluating academic achievement—to select highly skilled immigrants. These point systems, which assign “points” to assess the quality of applicants, favor international students who received higher education in the host country, and facilitate them for citizenship after graduation. Therefore, the point system is believed to attract potential students from abroad.

WHAT IS A POINT SYSTEM?

As a method for selecting immigrants, point systems are burgeoned in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Basically, this is a system for evaluating merits of immigrant applicants based on awarding points. Three key elements are included in the point-system design: criteria, weight, and threshold. Criteria vary by countries, but five main sources are commonly used: education, occupation, work experience, language, and age. Usually, the weight is assigned with a scale to measure that criterion. If the maximum score of the criterion is 100, weight can be evenly distributed in a scale. Finally, based on past experience and/or forecasting on the number of potential applicants, one can set a pass mark with a certain percentile (75% or above). Applicants awarded with points above the pass mark are selected.

EVIDENCE OF IMPACT FROM RECEIVING COUNTRIES

The United Kingdom used to have a highly restrictive immigration policy and in some respects still does. Before 2008, there were 80 different routes into the United Kingdom to work, train, or study. These 80 entry schemes are mainly categorized into three channels: work permit employment; permit-free employment; and the Highly Skilled Migrant Program. Before the program, there are 462,609 noncitizen students and 341,791 nonresident students enrolled in United Kingdom’s tertiary education. One year later, both enrollments increased with an 8 percent growth rate.

In Canada, point systems were initiated in 1967 under the Immigration Act of 1952, as a method for selecting immigrants. The original purpose of this system was to address the shortage of skilled labor. Prior to June 11, 2002, higher weight was assigned to special vocational preparation. That means, if an applicant has a job offer for a position that no Canadian ready, willing, and able to fill, the probability for him/her to exceed the threshold (70 points) is higher. Canada changed its point systems in June 2002. More points are assigned to language, working experience, and ability of integration since then. This change can be interpreted as an adjustment to the demand of high skilled in the labor market. Under current systems, there are six selection factors: education, language, experience, age, employment, and adaptability. The maximum number of points that a person can accumulate is 100, and the current pass mark is 67. The number of international students in Canada was under 40,000 in 2002. After the high-skill-favored policy change in 2002, that number tripled to 125,000. The average annual foreign student enrollment in tertiary education from 1998 to 2002 is 36,340. This average also tripled after 2002. As a matter of fact, Canada’s point system does attract more international students to receive higher education since 2002.

These point systems, which assign “points” to assess the quality of applicants, favor international students who received higher education in the host country, and facilitate them for citizenship after graduation.

The point systems in Australia and New Zealand are similar. This paper uses the Australian system to demonstrate the design of Oceania point systems. Based on the Canadian framework, Australia introduced the Australian General Skilled Migration program in 1982. That program’s main characteristic is that points are awarded according to Skilled Occupation List, which is a list of occupations that Australia needs to fill job shortages. An applicant must have recent skilled work experience; otherwise, it is relative difficult for one to be eligible for immigration as a skilled worker. In terms of international students’ flow to Australia, it is hard to find a cutoff after 1998 since Australia’s point system remains relatively stable since the 1980s. The international flow indicated a clear drop around 1990. It turned out that the Migration Amendment Act (1989) set the talent

pool, which lowers the passing mark at one hand and increases the wait time at the other hand. So, the amendment indeed intimidates prospective skilled immigrants.

EVIDENCE OF IMPACT FROM SENDING COUNTRIES

As the point systems are in receiving countries, the impact on sending countries is usually ambiguous and hard to distinguish from other factors. In this section, change in the outflow from sending countries to the United Kingdom and Canada is used as an indicator of the possible impact.

China is the largest home country of international students. Using the data from China’s Ministry of Education, I calculated the average annual outflow of years before/after the policy to see if policy matters. Result indicates that the average annual outflow from China to Canada doubled after Canada’s revised point system (from 5,187 to 11,509). The outflow to the United Kingdom after the Highly Skilled Migrant Program increases by 18 percent, as well.

India holds the second-largest population. The primary source of data on students’ outflow is the Ministry of Labor. The number of Indians outflow to both the United Kingdom and Canada increases after the implementation of point systems in the host country. Numbers doubled in the United Kingdom and tripled in Canada.

Russia is not a traditional sending country but significantly has sent students abroad since 1990. Again, the before-after comparison indicates a positive change in the average number of outflows from Russia to the United Kingdom and Canada. The increase rate is 25 percent to the United Kingdom and 57 percent to Canada.

CONCLUSION

As policy implications, policymakers usually refer to either “brain drain” or “brain gain,” when they think about the migration of international students or highly skilled workers. More recently, some researchers coin “brain competition.”

To put point systems into a larger picture, these systems are indeed a method of talent classification and selection. At national level, a country needs a National Talent System to build up the nation’s core competitiveness in the global competition for talent. The competition could turn out to be “brain share” only if universities, industry, and the government work together to recruit talents worldwide. Meanwhile, government needs to work on talent development of both foreign-born and native-born individuals so as to build up the nation’s competitiveness. ■

German Students Abroad

JAN KERCHER AND NICOLE ROHDE

Jan Kercher and Nicole Rohde are experts for international student mobility at the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), Bonn, Germany. E-mail: kercher@daad.de and rohde@daad.de.

In April 2013, the federal and state governments adopted a common strategy for the internationalization of the German higher education institutions. A central goal defined in this strategy—albeit without a target date—is for every second graduate to gain study-related experience abroad and for at least one in three to complete a visit abroad, lasting at least three months, and/or eliciting at least 15 European Credit Transfer System points.

With this national goal, Germany considerably exceeds the mobility targets set on the European level: The European Union and the countries committed to the Bologna process set themselves the goal that by 2020; at least 20 percent of all graduates in the European Higher Education Area should have completed a study- or training-related visit abroad.

IS STUDY ABROAD ESSENTIAL?

Study abroad is considered to be very beneficial to drive self-development, to equip students with intercultural competences. The students work within an international labor market, as well as to prepare them to identify issues shared across borders—such as, curing diseases, finding energy solutions, and fighting hunger, and thus to know how to engage in an increasingly globalized working world. According to Allan E. Goodman of the Institute of International Education, “globalization is here to stay, and students who want to work in our interconnected global world should study abroad.”

Study abroad means leaving the comfort zone, which if done correctly empowers students. Empowerment means that students learn how to take responsibility for their own lives as well as for society. It is important for them to realize their role in society and how to participate and shape it. Therefore, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) is promoting the idea that international experiences should become an essential part in higher education studies. International mobility is not only an asset to the personal curriculum vitae but also a unique experience and formative module for one’s own personality.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOBILITY

There are two types of international student mobility: short-term stays (often referred to as credit mobility) and long-term stays with the purpose of obtaining a degree abroad

(often referred to as degree mobility). Mobility studies show that this distinction is not only a terminological one: For some important aspects the available data for German students show noticeable differences between the two types of mobility. For example, while Austria, the Netherlands, and Switzerland are among the four most important destination countries for degree-mobile students (together with the United Kingdom), they do not play a major role when considering temporary study-related visits abroad. Countries that play an important role for credit-mobile students are the United Kingdom, the United States, France, and Spain. Also, while students of language and cultural studies belong to the most mobile group referring to temporary study-related visits abroad, they are underrepresented among students studying abroad to pursue a foreign degree.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOBILITY IN GERMANY

The number and proportion of degree-mobile German students have increased steadily since the early 1990s—in both absolute and relative terms. Specifically, the number of German students enrolled abroad increased from about 34,000 in 1991 to about 134,000 in 2011. Interestingly, the increase in degree-mobile students from Germany has ac-

The European Union and the countries committed to the Bologna process set themselves the goal that by 2020; at least 20 percent of all graduates in the European Higher Education Area should have completed a study- or training-related visit abroad.

celerated sharply during the last years. Between 2005 und 2011, the number of internationally mobile students from Germany rose by 10.6 percent on annual average. While from 1991 to 2004, the mean growth per year was only half as high (5.3%). However, in 2011, the growth rate was only 4.6 percent, compared to 10.2 percent in 2010. The next years will show if this decline in the growth rates was only temporary or if this is the beginning of a long-term trend of lower growth rates.

Data on credit mobility of German students, collected in national graduate surveys, show that about 30 percent of all graduates at German higher education institutions in 2010 spent study-related affairs abroad, with a minimum duration of three months. In contrast to the constantly ris-

Canada’s Immigration Policies to Attract International Students

ANITA GOPAL

Anita Gopal is a researcher at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada. E-mail: anita.gopal@gmail.com.

Universities around the world engage in an intense competition to compete in the knowledge economy due to globalization. This situation has served as a catalyst for Canada to engage in immigration strategies and initiatives designed to attract and recruit international students. As also an urgent need for highly skilled individuals, since there is a concern that once baby boomers retire, there will be severe labor shortages, which will have negative implications for Canada’s growth and nation building. Attracting and retaining international students is a way to boost Canada’s economy, while promoting a welcoming international landscape. According to Citizenship and Immigration Canada, the government’s priority is to seek highly skilled individuals (e.g., India, China) who are likely to succeed in Canada and to promote its economic growth, long-term prosperity, and global competitiveness. International students, who pursue their studies in Canada, are an ideal population because they would have already been integrated into Canadian society.

Recognizing that international students are vital to Canada’s growth, the Citizenship and Immigration Canada has set out to transform Canada’s immigration system as one that is faster, more flexible, and tailored to students’ needs—a major distinguishing factor from other countries. Therefore, new immigration policies and programs have been specifically created to make it easier for international students to study, work, and become permanent residents in Canada, especially for graduate students. For instance, international students are permitted to work on and off campus, without a work permit to a maximum of 20 hours per week. They can also apply for a Post-Graduation Work Permit, a three-year open work permit, which enables students to work for any Canadian employer in any industry. International graduate students can apply to the Provincial Nomination Program for permanent residence in Canada—during their master’s or doctoral program or upon completion of their degree.

Canadian universities are also interested in gaining its “market share” of the best and brightest international students in science and technology and acquiring a competitive advantage over countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom, which are major destination coun-

ing numbers for degree mobility, credit mobility quotas have stabilized at this level during the last decade. This means that while the Europe-wide target (20% credit mobile graduates in the European Higher Education Area in 2020) has already been reached with regard to Germany, the national mobility goal of the Joint Science Conference and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) (50% credit mobile graduates in the midterm) remains to be fulfilled.

Finally, some important structural developments are linked to the Bologna process. Some students now spend time abroad at an earlier stage, stay for slightly shorter periods on average, and make use of the so-called “bridge mobility.” These are mobility units in the phase between bachelor’s and master’s degrees or between master’s and PhD. A bridge mobility unit could be designed, for example, as a year-long direct exchange program with a partner institution, where each partner sends one (or several) highly qualified students to the other institution.

POSSIBLE FURTHER PROMOTION IN GERMANY

With its numerous programs, the DAAD is constantly working to lower the hurdles for international student mobility—the main ones being funding problems, concerns about losing studying time, and difficulties reconciling a visit abroad with the requirements of the study program at home. Two particularly promising measures involve enhancing the number of programs with double or joint degrees and integrating so-called “mobility windows”—i.e., time slots reserved for mobility—into bachelor’s and master’s degree programs. Combined with an adequate number of scholarships, these measures should help Germany revive the upward development for study-related visits that were observed during the 1990s.

Note: Together with the German Centre for Research on Higher Education and Science Studies (DZHW), the DAAD compiles and presents data on outgoing and incoming, as well as international student mobility—on the Web site wissenschaft-welttoffen.de (in German and English)—adding further information to the correspondent publication. ■



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

tries for international students. Moreover, international students generate a substantial amount of revenue to Canada. According to a report conducted by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, in 2010, international students in Canada spent in excess of Can\$7.7 billion on tuition, accommodation and discretionary spending (up from Can\$6.5 billion in 2008). More than Can\$6.9 billion of this revenue was generated by the 218,200 long-term international students in Canada. The report also indicated that the revenue from international student spending in Canada is greater than the Canadian export value of unwrought aluminum (Can\$6 billion), or helicopters, airplanes, and spacecraft (Can\$6.9 billion).

IMMIGRATION POLICIES IN THE UNITED STATES

After the 9/11 attacks, the United States’ traditional open-door policy for international students was curtailed. Immigration policies have become more stringent due to the government’s tightening of the border and strict visa requirements. As outlined in the 2013 *International Student Mobility Trends* report, the United States has been slow to revisit their immigration and visa policies. However, it still remains the top choice for international students to study due to its prestigious universities’ degree programs.

Unlike Canada’s multiple pathways to work and become permanent residents, international students enrolled in academic programs in the United States holding F-1 student visas can only gain work experience by applying for Optional Practical Training.

Unlike Canada’s multiple pathways to work and become permanent residents, international students enrolled in academic programs in the United States holding F-1 student visas can only gain work experience by applying for Optional Practical Training, a temporary employment program that is related to a student’s major area of study. Students can apply to this program after completing one academic year of their studies and could receive up to a total of 12 months of practical training, either before and/or after completing their program. Students in fields such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics are entitled to a 17 month extension. If students are eligible to change their student status (F-1 visa status), they must apply for an H-1B visa (a nonimmigrant temporary working

visa), which allows the holder to work in the United States for up to six years. However, the student must first have a job offer and an employer who is willing to file a “petition” or request with the Immigration and Naturalization Services.

CHANGES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Recent government policies in the United Kingdom have imposed tighter international student visa restrictions—affecting entry requirements, services available to students during their studies, and work options available to students after completing their program. According to *The Funding Environment for Universities* report, reforms to student immigration to the United Kingdom and to student visa applications will come into effect in the 2013/2014 academic year. This includes tougher, English-language skills requirements and an increase in the amount of credibility check interviews in terms of students’ immigration history, education background, and financial support. The government has also discontinued the Post Study Work scheme. These changes make it more challenging for international students from non-European countries to qualify for a work permit to stay in the United Kingdom after graduation. Such policies do not promote permanent residence, postgraduate or labor retention, and have mainly impacted overseas recruitment of students from India, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

While Canada is focusing on competing with the United States and the United Kingdom for its share of international students through its flexible immigration policies and pathways, higher education institutions have yet to come up with a strategy to manage highly skilled migration. Canadian universities are being urged by federal policies to double international student enrollment from 240,000 in 2011 to 450,000 by the year 2022. If Canada will compete for its share of international students, organizational mechanisms must be implemented to prepare for this shift in recruitment. Concurrently, Canadian higher education institutions must develop competitive programs and degrees to meet the needs of the target student population and provide access to relevant institutional resources (e.g., faculty, research funding, student services, library resources, etc.). Otherwise, how productive are immigration policies, if inadequate resources are available at Canadian universities, to support international students? As of yet, there are no official national strategies in place to prepare for and manage these changes.

It is clear that Canada has primarily focused on its own national interest of attracting international students to remedy its skilled labor shortages. As a result, it has not paid

much attention to the problem of brain drain and the overarching consequences of luring highly talented students from developing nations to developed Western nations. For instance, the United Nations Development Program points out that brain drain has caused approximately 100,000 of the best and brightest Indian professionals to move to North America each year, which is estimated to be a \$2 billion loss for India. As Canada continues to siphon intellectual capital from developing regions, it has neglected to think about its moral responsibility to these nations or how it could be harming their economic growth and well-being. Meanwhile, it is unclear as how developing nations will recover the loss of their human capital.

Trends in Higher Education Regulation in sub-Saharan Africa

A. B. K. KASOZI

A. B. K. Kasozi is the founding Executive Director of Uganda’s National Council for Higher Education, which he steered for 10 years, from 2002 to 2013. E-mail: abkkasozi@yahoo.com.

Since 1980, many sub-Saharan African countries have established government funded, but also semiautonomous, higher education regulatory agencies to help governments in the establishment, management, and supervising of higher education institutions. These agencies ensure that citizens receive quality higher education and institutions of higher learning help to generate new knowledge for the improvement of higher education, innovation systems, and economic development. Experience has shown that these agencies have minimized direct government micromanagement by acting as midway bodies between the state and the various higher education institutions of higher learning.

MAINTENANCE OF QUALITY

Most sub-Saharan African English-speaking countries have delegated the responsibility of the maintenance of quality higher education in institutions of higher learning to these agencies. Current quality assurance mechanisms in most African countries have two major components: an external regulatory component based on a government-funded, but autonomous regulatory agency, and an institutional component within each university. The two components work together but the agency is the senior partner. The external

(regulatory agency) sets and enforces uniform benchmarks for all university institutions. The internal unit, usually a quality-assurance office within the university, makes sure that the benchmarks are implemented. Benchmarks designed by, and specific to a given institution itself, could also be implemented within that institution.

THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL COMPONENT

The regulatory frameworks at the external national levels are enforced by regulatory agencies which oversee the following areas: institutional accreditation, accreditation of individual programs, merit-based admissions into higher education institutions, credit accumulation and transfer, the quality of teaching staff; examination regulations, standardization of academic awards, research and publications, infrastructure of institutions, education facilities, and regulating cross-border higher education.

Regulatory agencies realize that the maintenance of quality is best done by the institution itself. Thus, institutions are asked to have an administrative unit to oversee quality in all the divisions of a university institution. Universities are asked to carry out institutional audits on a regular schedule of about 3–5 years in east and southern Africa to assess performance. These internal audits include looking at the following areas: the general audits, institutional governance, the quality of teaching and learning, the quality of the academic staff, sufficiency of education facilities, research and publications, the quality of outputs, financial management, relations with the surrounding community, and other pertinent items.

Since 1980, many sub-Saharan African countries have established government funded, but also semiautonomous, higher education regulatory agencies to help governments in the establishment, management, and supervising of higher education institutions.

Regulatory agencies, in cooperation with institutions, are supposed to carry out an external institutional audit after an institution has completed the internal one. The aim of the external audit is to fill any quality gaps identified by the internal audit. Unfortunately, many regulatory agencies have not fulfilled their responsibilities of conducting external institutional audits.

ACCREDITATION OF INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS

Regulatory agencies have helped governments in the process of establishing universities. They have done this through a process known as institutional accreditation. Institutional accreditation—permitting institutions to exist and deliver higher education—is a tool of quality assurance and therefore relevant to higher education support. It is a rigorous but necessary exercise and covers all aspects of institutions ranging from land, staffing, educational facilities, governance, infrastructure, and the financial health of institutions.

All programs taught in universities in most of sub-Saharan Africa are accredited (or approved) by regulatory agencies. In a number of countries, agencies inspect the infrastructure and facilities, in which the programs will be taught, before accrediting a program. In others, the write-up of the program is considered sufficient. Regulatory agencies ensure that programs meet minimum requirements, are written in acceptable formats, and allow the students to get value for money.

INSTRUCTIONAL AUTONOMY AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Most universities decide that they should have the freedom to manage the governance of their institutions, without interference by external powers—including the owners of the university to hire and discharge staff, to design and teach academic programs, to admit students and discontinue them for good cause, to design and manage their budgets without interference by the owners of the university, to source for funds from anywhere possible, to make statutes and regulations that govern the activities of the university, and to be assured of protection based on a legal framework in the form of statutes or acts of parliament.

Academic freedom on the other hand is the individual freedom of university workers: to teach; do research; speak and publish without interference; penalty or intimidation from internal or external authorities. Many leaders of regulatory agencies accept all the above aspirations but see themselves as guardians of young institutions that need nurturing to maturity. Further, they also realize that there are many rogue institutions that should not be allowed to deliver inferior higher education.

INTERVENTION BY AGENCIES WILL PROBABLY SHRINK

It is hoped that areas of intervention into universities by regulatory agencies will gradually shrink, as African universities develop capacity to deliver quality education. Until the many universities in sub-Saharan Africa deliver good quality higher education, regulatory agencies will remain relevant to steer the latter through the various storms of growth. This task is particularly vital, as many of the private institutions that have expanded in sub-Saharan Africa lack

capacity to improve higher education. Many of them lack academic traditions, staff, infrastructure, research capacity, and what it takes to be a “universal” institution. Many are teaching institutions, their infrastructure meager, and financial bases very poor. They still need the guidance of their founders and the state represented by regulatory agencies to mature. When they become world-class university institutions, the work of regulatory agencies should narrow depending on the political dimensions within each state.

Private Higher Education’s Quality Assurance in Ghana

LINDA TSEVI

Linda Tsevi is a PhD candidate at the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, State University of New York. E-mail: ltsevi@albany.edu.

IHE regularly publishes an article on private higher education from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/>.

Quality assurance in higher education institutions in Ghana began in the early 1990s—in response to an increase in the number of private institutions, providing postsecondary education and concern over their level of performance. As elsewhere in Africa, government felt a need to act.

Also as in much of Africa the backdrop involved a growing population’s rising demand for higher education, government failure to meet it, and therefore government acquiescence in a surge of private higher education. However, the government would have met rising demand in any case. Its capacity was undermined by the economic downturn of the 1980s and pressure from the World Bank, to shift public educational expenditures to schools and thus leave the financial burden for expanding higher education more to private stakeholders. Ghana experienced decreased government funding for higher education in the 1990s, the full-time equivalent funding per student decreasing from US\$2,500 in 1990 to US\$900 in 1997.

This private higher education growth did not mean that government initially established a formidable public design for it. Instead, its basic posture was to permit private stakeholders to blaze the way. That would be a route to accom-

plish the public interest goal of rapidly expanding access. Current accredited private institutions included 3 chartered universities, 53 university colleges, 5 distance learning institutions, 12 tutorial colleges, and 11 training colleges. During the 2008–2009 academic year, these institutions enrolled approximately 25,000 of the system’s 177,000 total enrollment, a 14 percent share.

THE QUALITY CONCERN

Typical of such situations of private proliferation, government, student, and public concerns soon mounted about quality. By quality assurance, government and others generally envisioned reviews of programs and institutions that involve some systematic measuring performance against standards of academic and infrastructural matters. Whatever the concerns over general or declining quality in public higher education, the widespread view was that the public sector already had internal quality-assurance mechanisms and norms in place. Then, too, political dynamics sometimes made it uncomfortable for government to challenge entrenched public university practices and interests.

Quality assurance was envisioned on two fronts: internal and external. The internal part would make certain that a program or an institution has policies that guide its standards and objectives. On the other hand, the external part would be conducted by outside organizations. External quality-assurance mechanisms would include accreditation, quality audit, and quality assessment. Whatever the motivation of government, private institutions often recognized the quality-assurance process as an opportunity to establish their legitimacy.

THE NATIONAL ACCREDITATION BOARD

In 1993, the government of Ghana enacted Provisional National Defence Council law 317 under policy guidelines to establish the National Accreditation Board, as the nation’s quality-assurance body for higher education institutions. This legislation was substituted by other government acts in 2007 and 2010; these regulations constituted part of the “delayed regulation” of private higher education. Generally, the National Accreditation Board’s quality assurance involves both institutional and program accreditation. Higher education institutions must meet certain minimal requirements that are verified through self-study documents prepared, followed by panel visits from that board.

A particular configuration in the Ghanaian case is that private universities begin as university colleges affiliated to public universities, which serve as mentors for a number of years. The quality-assurance rationale is to guard against proliferation of freestanding private institutions that lack the ability, will, or offer adequate quality. The application has the proposed name of the university college, academic

resources available, and timetable—indicating how within the next three years the objectives of the institution are to be achieved. The premises of the new private university college are inspected, verified, and subsequently issued with a letter of interim authority. A private institution qualifies for institutional accreditation—only if among other things, it meets minimum admission requirements for certificate, diploma, and degree levels; minimum number of students enrolled; and minimum qualifications of faculty. Institutional charters are granted by the president of the country. A private institution qualifies for an institutional charter if it has been affiliated to a mentoring institution for at least 10 years and has fulfilled all necessary requirements.

A private institution’s program qualifies for accreditation; if, among other things, it states minimum student admission requirements, description of courses, and provides rules on student performance. In addition, educational programs have to align with national education policies to qualify for accreditation.

Also as in much of Africa the backdrop involved a growing population’s rising demand for higher education, government failure to meet it, and therefore government acquiescence in a surge of private higher education.

Linked to the National Accreditation Board, quality-assurance mechanisms are efforts to deal with quality based on financial integrity. In Ghana, private institutions are owned by individuals or through partnerships; they are tax exempt. However, there have been proposals to have this tax privilege withdrawn, leaving a tax-exempt status only for institutions engaged in more academic than commercial pursuits. These proposals have generated anger among the private institutions. They offer courses that require very low infrastructural and equipment investment, and their specific curriculums are tailored to the labor market. For example, they see their reliance on a faculty composed mostly of adjuncts appropriate for linking with the market; whereas critics see dependence on part-timers as evidence of limited academic quality.

Problems of the National Accreditation Board include its ability to keep pace with accredited institutions offering programs that have not been authorized. Similarly, it has to regularly monitor accredited private institutions, to ensure they do not admit students lacking the minimum qualify-

ing requirements, a common occurrence at some private institutions. The board also has the challenge of monitoring private institutions and their satellite campuses that are not accredited but start advertising to the public as if they had accreditation.

CONCLUSION

Ghana’s private higher education system has been impacted by policies as well as other precipitating factors in its current situation. Quality assurance in Ghana on both the institutional and program accreditation fronts is mandatory for public and private institutions. Quality assurance has indeed brought a true measure of quality to accredited institutions. The National Accreditation Board has been vigilant in monitoring private institutions. Nonetheless, it still has to be continually alert in order to protect the unsuspecting consumer. ■

Ukraine’s External Independent Testing Innovation

EDUARD KLEIN

Eduard Klein is a PhD candidate at the Research Centre for East European Studies, at the University of Bremen, Germany. E-mail: eklein@uni-bremen.de.

As most post-Soviet states, Ukraine introduced a new student assessment system in the last decade. Since 2008, all school graduates who want to enter universities have to take the External Independent Testing (EIT). This was a fundamental shift from the Soviet legacy of corrupt university admission exams, which are replaced by an objective testing procedure. The main aims of the EIT were to combat corruption, increase equal opportunities, provide equal access to high-quality tertiary education, and create a national assessment system to monitor educational quality.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE EIT

In times of transition and economic crisis of the 1990s and early 2000s, public higher education budgets were radically cut; faculty’s salaries decreased below the subsistence level; and wage delays were commonplace. Informal payments and duties compensated the absence of formal funding and became institutionalized at many universities. At certain prestigious institutions, bribes up to \$10,000 were demanded for admission, adding up to an annual admis-

sion corruption volume of approximately \$200 million. As the selection of new students became increasingly based on money, instead of merit, even middle-class families could not afford to send their children to high-quality universities.

Each university had its own admission procedure. Mostly these were nontransparent oral tests that were prone to corruption. In 2008, the Western orientated and reform-minded Viktor Yushchenko government introduced an independent assessment and admission system, similar to the American Scholastic Aptitude Test. The Ukrainian Center for Educational Quality Assessment was established to develop and control the new testing. It introduced a written standardized test that puts the students under same conditions and reduces opportunities for corruption. In contrast to other postcommunist countries, where analogous reforms seem to have failed, the EIT was successfully implemented. For example, in Russia only 16 percent of the population believe that the Unified State Exam (EGE) has reduced admission corruption. Experts as well as the society regard it as the most effective educational reform, since Ukraine’s independence. This is remarkable, since the political context after the Orange Revolution was dominated by instability and standstill; but the reform has been carried out carefully and was backed by a broad coalition of then President Yushchenko, the Education Ministry, the international donor community, and domestic civil society.

The EIT significantly decreased corruption during admissions.

EFFECTS ON CORRUPTION AND PUBLIC OPINION

The EIT significantly decreased corruption during admissions. Before its implementation, up to every third student was affected by admission corruption; nowadays only 1 percent of Ukrainian students report about corruption during the admission testing. This leads to an improvement in social and geographical mobility of the students. Because admission became based on merit instead of money or informal relations, universities started to register significantly more students from lower-income households and remote areas. At leading universities in Kyiv, for example, the share of Kyivians before the reform was up to 75 percent—due to corruption and informal agreements. After the implementation of the EIT, their share decreased to 25–30 percent, and students from allover the country and social backgrounds got the chance to study at the top universities of the capital.

These improvements are acknowledged by the majority of the society, as new survey data from October 2013 show: While in the 2008 introductory year, the share of EIT proponents was 42 percent (compared to 34% who did not support the reform), in 2013 already 53 percent favor the new exam (the number of opponents decreased to 25%). The acceptance is even higher in the target group (students and their parents), where 65 percent approve the new system (24% oppose the EIT). Questioned about their personal experiences with the new testing, 68 percent of the target group say they are satisfied with the enforcement of the exam. In addition, 58 percent believe that the new admission system reduces corruption. Current students, who entered university after the reform process, already consider the EIT-based admission system as completely normal.

However, the new system not only had positive effects on corruption. It seems that to some extent corruption has diverted: More and more students complain that now they do not have to pay to get inside the university, but they are extorted to pay for not being expelled. How this problem can be solved still remains unclear.

THE FUTURE OF THE EIT

After the presidential elections in 2010 the political forces in the country changed. The EIT opponent, Viktor Yanukovych, who had promised in his election campaign to abolish the exam, became president. The new education minister, Dmytro Tabachnyk, was also a strong opponent of the EIT. Therefore, it was no surprise when the new government decreased the role of the EIT. New loopholes for corruption and informal procedures in the admission process were the consequence. Students who fear the return of corruption practices initiated an “admission without bribes” campaign.

However, in order to obtain more control, the Ministry of Education is trying even further to decrease the role of the EIT. In the current conflict about a new law on higher education, the ministry and the government support the most reactionary of three drafts. They plan to dispose the EIT for paid university programs and to allow “National Universities” (currently these are 116) to reintroduce their own admission exams again. This draft would definitely lead to a revival of corruption practices. Two more progressive bills are under discussion, one proposed by the opposition, the other by an expert group of academics and members of civil society. In contrast to the governmental bill, these drafts intend to strengthen the EIT. By now, the opposition has agreed to support the bill of the expert group, expecting the government to make concessions too, and agree to the independent expert’s bill.

By now, the dispute considering the new law is ongoing for five years, but an agreement is still not in sight. New political issues—such as, the rejection of the association agreement with the European Union and the following mass protests—overshadow the current political agenda. Thus, the future of the EIT remains unclear. ■

Internationalization of Higher Education in Post-Soviet Ukraine

VALENTYNA KUSHNARENKO AND SONJA KNUTSON

Valentyna Kushnarenko is research associate at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: val.kushnarenko@utoronto.ca. Sonja Knutson is director at the International Centre, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada. E-mail: sknutson@mun.ca.

The Ukrainian Ministry of Education, Science, Youth, and Sports has been encouraging international initiatives that support Ukraine’s aspirations to be recognized in the global higher education arena, primarily focused on Europe. While the recent decision is not to sign a trade agreement with the European Union, the country is facing increasing pressure to choose its future alliances, and this will have an impact on the directions of internationalization. On November 24, 2013, Ukrainian students declared a strike and marched from their universities to the central squares of the major Ukrainian cities, protesting the decision not to sign the EU Association Agreement at the Vilnius Summit-2013. Such pressures urge post-Soviet universities to become specific in defining their internationalization priorities and to enhance the articulation of an international purpose, vision, and operations.

BACKGROUND

Ukraine is located between the European Union states and Russia and while not a central player in international education, it maintains a reputation as a country with high standards of teaching and learning. Higher education is perceived by Ukrainians to achieve professional distinction, economic independence, and freedom. During the first week of the 2013 university admission campaign, Ukrainian public universities registered more than 600,000 applications. At an April 2014 international education fair, organized by the Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and

Sports of Ukraine, foreign universities are advised that they can access over 8,000 potential students over a three-day period in Kiev alone (edu-abroad.com.ua). While law, business management, economics, and marketing have traditionally been the most popular fields of study, Ukrainian students today are looking to study abroad in finance, information technologies, hotel/hospitality management, tourism, fashion and interior design, and other fields new to the average Ukrainian postsecondary offering. In contrast to the Soviet period when students prioritized entering any university (preferably a Kyiv one) to earn a diploma, current Ukrainian high school graduates choose a particular university with a competitive field of study and affordable international outreach programs. Universities that can provide pathways to a quality international credential encourage Ukrainian freshmen to prefer schools with strong international partnerships.

For a growing demand to intensify students' international opportunities, Ukrainian universities are motivated to regroup and balance available resources, to secure their own international niche. Searching for internationalization markets, Ukrainians anticipate European Union and Russian directions. While criticized for protracted partnership negotiations, universities respond with their careful approach to international standards and quality assurance and the importance of prioritizing national versus international in reorganization of their institutions into "world class" universities.

While the recent decision is not to sign a trade agreement with the European Union, the country is facing increasing pressure to choose its future alliances, and this will have an impact on the directions of internationalization.

When Ukrainians mention "internationalization" of higher education, they usually mean "Europeanization." Faculties define internationalization in the regional European terms and highlight the importance to sustain a future oriented process of bringing up their students in the spirit of the "United Europe: the Economy of Knowledge and Pan-European Cultural Heritage." In May 2005, Ukraine accepted an official European Union invitation to join a Bologna declaration in order to participate in "the harmonization of a European higher education's architecture via

compatibility and comparability of the regional education systems." An increase in the interest of online courses or courses conducted at partner institutions, which can supplement home university curricula—for example, through participation in the European Union Tempus-Tacis's projects and programs, the Erasmus-Mundus Programme on research, pedagogy, and professional training, the Grundtvig Programme on adult education, and the Comenius Sub-Programme on the Lifelong Learning.

For a growing demand to intensify students' international opportunities, Ukrainian universities are motivated to regroup and balance available resources, to secure their own international niche.

CURRENT CONTEXT

A new version of the Law on Higher Education (December 2012) and the National Doctrine for Development of Education: Ukraine-XXI Century (April 2002) calls for the creation of more innovative and effective international academic partnerships in the Ukraine. Partnerships that create opportunity for joint research and mobility of researchers allow universities to respond to the new context of competition on a global scale—in particular, when it comes to employability of graduates and the attraction of research partners and external funding. Ukrainian faculty and students express some skepticism about government interventions or proclamations around internationalization, but an overwhelming majority of students have indicated a desire to go abroad for studies, with the expectation of increased employability. Currently, more than 25,000 students from Ukraine study abroad (Study.ua). They mention Malta, Italy, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada as preferred future academic destinations.

Institutionally, Ukrainians concentrate in three directions: (a) senior administration-led strategic internationalization, (b) development of international components of the national curriculum, and (c) organizational restructuring. Programmatically, they prioritize joint curriculum development initiatives. Yet, Ukrainians are also engaged in faculty and student exchanges, International Summer Institutes, cocurricular activities (conference presentations, campus events, and visiting international faculty, etc.), foreign lan-

guage studies, and international research. The creation of the International Consortium of Ukrainian Universities, "The Knowledge Triangle: Education–Research–Innovation," is a major step forward in cross-border collaboration to promote knowledge and technologies transfer—in this case with Poland, primarily. New efforts aimed at collaboration with Great Britain, Switzerland, France, Germany, Spain, Sweden, Austria, and others will see the ongoing development of joint/dual degree science and technology programs. Canada is also on the radar with its growing expertise in natural resource exploration, to extraction and accompanying environmental research. The current evolution of joint/dual degree projects depicts the Ukrainian universities' most ambitious aims to harmonize degree qualifications with the West.

To promote global academic interconnectedness while avoiding brain drain, most Ukrainian universities need serious structural and organizational changes. Several issues impede a coordinated, strategic approach to sustainable internationalization and reciprocal mobility. Clumsy or ambiguous ministerial internationalization policy directions reduce motivation. University administration, with labor-intensive operational regulations, creates a growing pressure on resources. The demand for accountability compounded by weak international program management means few will risk comprehensive change. Universities are already performing at maximum infrastructural, financial, and human resource potential—making it difficult to explore opportunities to po-

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

sition themselves globally. Collaborating on missions abroad to network in new countries, as in the recent delegation to the 2013 Conference of the Canadian Bureau for International Education in Vancouver, provides hopeful directions but requires strong leadership and foreign funding assistance.

Internationalization of the Ukrainian academic agenda parallels the journey of many other countries in their roles as drivers for general reform of higher education. Without a motivating factor, national educational reform (in terms of streamlining credit transfer, institutional internal restructuring processes, etc.) is difficult to initiate and achieve. Internationalization, encompassing as it does the positioning of an institution within the global context, becomes a driver for general reform. Without this reform, internationalization is hindered by lost momentum—due to existing barriers in strategic planning, productive distribution of financial and human resources, and identification of operational activity targets. If done constructively, with the continued support of international partners, such improvements may offer Ukraine as a model for innovations in higher education among post-Soviet states. ■

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.

CORRECTION:

In the article on "thinking capacity in higher education" in our Winter, 2014 issue, it was stated that the journal *Higher Education Policy* was closed by the OECD. This is not correct. *Higher Education Policy* is very much alive. It is spon-

sored by the International Association of Universities and published by Palgrave. OECD did close *Higher Education Management and Policy*. We apologize for this error.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Farrugia, Christine A., and Rajika Bhandari. *Open Doors: Report on International Student Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2013. 112 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-367-9. Web site: www.iie.org.

The annual analysis of trends in student mobility to and from the United States, Open Doors, provides comprehensive data and some analysis concerning mobility trends. Detailed information concerning the numbers and origins of students studying in the U.S., as well as the number and destinations of Americans going abroad, is provided.

Freeman, Sydney, Jr., Linda Serra Hagedorn, Lester F. Goodchild, and Dianne A. Wright, eds. *Advancing Higher Education as a Field of Study: In Quest of Doctoral Degree Guidelines*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2014. 340 pp. \$45 (hb). ISBN 978-1-62036111-5. Web site: www.Stylus-pub.com.

The focus of this book is on doctoral study in the field of higher education in the United States and issues relating to the development of the field of higher education research. An analysis of a 2012 survey of doctoral programs in higher education in the United States and Canada is provided. Among the themes discussed are professional practice in the field of student affairs, the development of the field of higher education studies, the role of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education Programs, and others.

Greeley, Andrew W. *The Changing Catholic College*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2013. 226 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4128-5286-9. Web site: www.transaction-pub.com.

Originally published in 1967, this classic discussion of Catholic colleges and universities in the United States has been republished with a comprehensive new introduction by Kevin Christiano. The volume discusses the social and historical development of Catholic higher education,

an analysis of several colleges and universities, and considerations of faculty, administration, and students. The introduction discusses the significant changes that have taken place in the past half century.

Higgins, John. *Academic Freedom in a Democratic South Africa: Essays and Interviews on Higher Education and the Humanities*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Wits Press, 2013. 272 pp (pb). ISBN 978-1-86814-751-9. Web site: www.witspress.co.za.

A series of essays and interviews, by prominent South African humanities scholar John Higgins, concern themes such as the role of the humanities in higher education, academic freedom, and institutional culture. Interviews with Terry Eagleton, Edward Said, and Jakes Gerwel are included.

Iram, Yaacov, Yehuda Friedlander, and Shimon Ohayon, eds. *The Role of a Religious University*. Ramat Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2013. 152 pp (hb). ISBN 978-965-226-439-8.

This bilingual volume, in English and Hebrew, features essays on the role of religious universities. Chapters focus on Bar-Ilan University in Israel as a religious university, religious universities worldwide, Christian universities in the United States, a Protestant perspective from Germany, and others.

Kehm, Barbara, and Christine Musselin, eds. *The Development of Higher Education Research in Europe: 25 Years of CHER*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense, 2013. 134 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-94-6209-399-7. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

The Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER), founded 25 years ago, is one of the key groups of higher education researchers in the world, with a special emphasis on Europe. This volume focuses on CHER's development, and includes discussions of the changing topics at annual conferences, European programs and training courses for higher education management, and others.

Kezar, Adrianna. *How Colleges Change: Understanding, Leading, and Enacting Change*. New York: Routledge, 2014. 255 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-53206-8. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Basing her guidelines for change in higher education, Kezar examines the relevant literature concerning designing and implementing change in American colleges and universities, and adds examples of how change works. Stemming from Robert Birnbaum's classic *How Colleges Work*, this book focuses on implementing change in the 21st-century American context. Theories about change are also discussed.

King, Roger, Simon Marginson, and Rajani Naidoo, eds. *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2013. 762 pp. \$415 (hb). ISBN 978-1-78100-169-1. Web site: www.e-elgar.com.

This comprehensive, and quite expensive, compendium of 37 key essays on all aspects of globalization provides a range of perspectives. All of the chapters are reprinted from previously published sources. Among the broad themes are the role of rankings, international student and faculty flows, trends in management and administration, national and global competition, marketization, and others. A range of points of view are reflected in the chapters.

Kline, Kimberly, ed. *Reflection in Action: A Guidebook for Student Affairs Professionals and Teaching Faculty*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2014. 185 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-57922-829-3. Web site: www.Styluspub.com.

Writing from an American perspective, the authors in this volume focus on dealing with controversial issues in the context of student affairs in higher education. Using action research, the authors discuss such topic as the evolution of a moral and caring professional, relevant literature in student affairs, race and culture issues, teaching professional development in higher education, and others.

Knight, Jane, ed. *International Education Hubs: Student, Talent, Knowledge-Innovation Models*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 251 pp. \$129 (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-7024-9. Web site: www.springer.com.

Education hubs, the efforts by some countries to bring together foreign education resources to build a center to attract students, build higher education and, for other reasons, are analyzed in this volume. Perhaps the first study on this topic, Jane Knight provides a perspective on the definition and role of hubs. Case studies from the Persian Gulf, Hong Kong, Singapore, Botswana, South Korea, and several other countries are presented as well.

Kuder, Matthias, Nina Lemmens, and Daniel Obst, eds. *Global Perspectives on International Joint and Double Degree Programs*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2013. 247 pp. \$39.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-363-1. Web site: www.iie.org.

Joint and double degrees are increasingly widespread globally. This volume provides several chapters offering a broad perspective and definitions. Most of the volume focuses on case studies of these programs in numerous countries and universities. Among them are considerations of joint and double degree programs in Latin America, collaboration in degree programs in China, joint degrees in the European Union's mobility strategy, and discussions of programs in Germany, South Africa, Brazil, and other countries. The volume concludes with a discussion of quality-assurance issues.

Lane, Jason E., and D. Bruce Johnstone, eds. *Higher Education Systems 3.0: Harnessing Systemness, Delivering Performance*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2013. 323 pp. \$24.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4384-4978-4. Web site: www.sunypress.edu.

The focus of this volume is on how public higher education systems in the United States can be made more effective. While the data are American, the analysis will be useful internationally as many

countries seek to develop effective and differentiated academic systems. Among the themes discussed in the book are the historical development of higher education systems in the United States, autonomy and authority in state higher education systems, the role of systems in higher education finance, board governance and systems, the role of systems in academic governance, and others.

Lombardi, John V. *How Universities Work*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. 220 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1122-4. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Lombardi, one of America's most successful university presidents, provides a short book focusing on the American research university. Based on his experience as president of several top institutions as well as observation and research, Lombardi focuses on the key themes at the heart of the research university—the faculty, governance, management, finances and budgets, teaching, and others. Although this volume relates to the American experience, it is broadly relevant.

Medina, Leandro Rodriguez. *Centers and Peripheries in Knowledge Production*. New York: Routledge, 2014. 238 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-415-84079-8. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Using the perspective of the French sociologist Bourdieu, this study focuses on the training and subsequent careers of Argentine political scientists from the perspective of how they develop interaction with the international community of social science. Publication patterns, challenges to international involvement, and the perspectives of Argentine political scientists are analyzed.

Morris, Michael H., Donald F. Kuratko, and Jeffrey R. Cornwall. *Entrepreneurship Programs and the Modern University*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2013. 289 pp. \$125 (hb). ISBN 978-1-78254-462-3. Web site: www.e-elgar.com.

This book provides a practical guide

to the emerging field of entrepreneurship education in the context of American higher education. Usually located in schools of management, these programs are rapidly expanding. Among the themes discussed are curriculum, outreach and co-curricular programs, and rationales for these programs.

Muborakshoeva, Marodsilton. *Islam and Higher Education: Concepts, Challenges, and Opportunities*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2013. 179 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-415-68750-8. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Focusing largely on the Pakistani context, this volume provides a general discussion of how Islamic ideas have intersected with Western higher education and colonialism, as well as Islamic approaches to higher education. Case studies of several higher education institutions in Pakistan are profiles in the context of how they relate to Islamic thought.

O'Shea, Joseph. *Gap Year: How Delaying College Changes People in Ways the World Needs*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. 183 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1036-4. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

This book argues that young people will benefit from a “gap year”—taking a year for volunteer service or other activities between secondary school and university study. Using data from British research, the benefits of a gap year are illustrated. Additional support for the idea is discussed through literature on psychology and young adult development.

Rothblatt, Sheldon, ed. *Clark Kerr's World of Higher Education Reaches the 21st Century: Chapters in a Special History*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2012. 249 pp (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-4258-1. Web site: www.Springer.com.

A set of essays honor the late Clark Kerr, the legendary president of the University of California and key thinker behind the California Master Plan. Colleagues who worked with Kerr reflect on his contributions, including analyzing the California

Master Plan, Kerr’s leadership of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and other themes. Several European authors reflect on the influence of the California Master Plan on global higher education.

Synott, Marcia Graham. *Student Diversity at the Big Three: Changes at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton since the 1920s*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2013. 370 pp. \$49.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4128-1461-4. Web site: www.transactionpub.com.

American universities have in the past half-century tried to build more diverse student and faculty populations and to serve a broader selection of the population. These pressures are present even at the most prestigious universities, such as those analyzed in this volume. Among the themes discussed are how Jewish students and faculty have moved from the margins to the mainstream, the development of coeducation, analyses of gay students, and students with disabilities.

Trachtenberg, Stephen Joel, Gerald B. Kauvar, and E. Grady Bogue. *Presidencies Derailed: Why University Leaders Fail and How to Prevent it?* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. 184 pp. \$34.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1024-1. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

The focus on this book is on “what can go wrong” for American college and university presidents—and how to create an environment where success is likely. Case studies are

provided, and analysis of the nature of failure discussed. While focusing on the United States, this book has relevance to academic leaders everywhere.

Williams, Damon A. *Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating Change and Transformation in Higher Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers, 2013. 481 pp. \$49.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-57922-819-4. Web site: www.styluspub.com.

Diversity, ensuring that American higher education institutions reflect the ethnic, racial, and gender composition of society in general, is a significant concern. Recently, diversity has also come to include different social class and economic backgrounds, as well. This book, written by a chief diversity officer at a prominent American university, discusses the various elements of creating a diverse academic institution and the challenges involved.

Wyner, Joshua S. *What Excellent Community Colleges Do: Preparing All Students for Success*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press. 2014. 184 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-61250-649-4. Web site: www.harvardeducationpress.org.

This book provides a brief guide to successful community colleges in the United States, drawing from the experiences of many colleges. Among the themes examined are completion and transfer, equity and developmental education, learning outcomes, labor

markets, and the role of the community college president.

Zgaga, Pavel, Ulrich Teichler, and John Brennan, eds. *The Globalization Challenges for European Higher Education: Convergence and Diversity, Centers and Peripheries*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 2013. 387 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-3-631-63908-5. Web site: www.peterlang.de.

A wide ranging discussion of globalization’s impact in Europe, this volume includes discussions of the effects of Europeanization on institutional diversification, international mobility in Europe, European influences on Austrian higher education, access issues in Poland, and a series of analyses of southeast Europe.

Zgaga, Pavel, Manja Klemencic, Janja Komljenovic, Klemen Miklavic, Igor Pepac, and Vedran Jakacic. *Higher in the Western Balkans: Reforms, Developments, Trends*. Ljubljana, Slovenia: Center for Educational Policy Studies, University of Ljubljana, 2013. 99 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-961-253-107-2.

Essays concerning higher education in the Western Balkans provide analysis of such themes as the implementation of the Bologna agenda, governance and the fragmentation of universities, equity issues, the role of students in governance, private higher education, internationalization, and others.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

CIHE, in partnership with Global Opportunities Group (GO Group), and with funding from the British Council and the German Academic Exchange Service, has completed work on a report—“The rationale for sponsoring students to undertake international study: An assessment of national student mobility scholarship programs.” Laura E. Rumbley (associate director), David Engberg (executive director, GO Group and PhD graduate from CIHE), and Gregg Glover (director of program development, GO Group) were the key researchers. The report will be released at the British Council’s Going Global conference in Miami, Florida, in April. CIHE director Philip G. Altbach will make a presentation at Going Global of the project results.

The Center’s partnership with the Laboratory of Institutional Analysis at the National Research University-Higher School of Economics in Moscow continues to flourish. Our collaborative volume, *The Future of the Academic Profession: Young Faculty in International Perspective*, has been submitted to the State University of New York Press. Our newest joint research project, on faculty inbreeding, is in its final stage of completion. The research group met in Boston to discuss the chapters, which are now being revised for publication. Professor Maria Yudkevich, vice rector for research at HSE, is our key partner.

The fourth installment of *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders*, CIHE’s joint publication with the American Council on Education’s Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), will be published in April. This edition is titled “Argentina, Brazil, Chile: Engaging with

the Southern Cone,” and will be freely available for download from both the CIHE and CIGE Web sites. The Center has also completed work on *A Worldwide Inventory: Higher Education Research Centers and Academic Programs (3rd edition)*. Publication details will be forthcoming.

In late March, the Center will be hosting a delegation of faculty and administrators from Saudi Arabia’s Princess Nora University, the largest women’s university in the world, for a professional development seminar. In February, we were pleased to host as a visiting scholar Dr. Cecilia Adrogué, a postdoctoral researcher at the National Council of Scientific and Technical Research (CONICET), San Andrés University (Argentina). Our visiting scholar roster currently includes Dr. Kara A. Godwin and Dr. Iván F. Pacheco.

Laura E. Rumbley has become coeditor of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* and is also chair of the publications committee of the European Association for International Education. She recently chaired an Association of International Education Administrators annual conference session on national policies for internationalization in Europe and the United States; Philip G. Altbach delivered a keynote address at the same conference. He also recently spoke at the Winter Enrichment Program at the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology in Saudi Arabia. He will participate in a rector’s conference for Saudi academic leaders and will participate in a meeting of the Committee on the Competitiveness of Russian Universities, appointed by the minister of education, in Moscow.

ALTBACH FESTSCHRIFT PUBLISHED

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

students include Patti McGill Peterson, David A. Stanfield, James J.F. Forest, Robin Matross Helms, Sheila Slaughter, Liz Reisberg, Laura E. Rumbley, and the two coeditors of the book: Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett.

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

PROTECT YOUR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION SUBSCRIPTION!

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

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

Click on:
“Subscribe to IHE” in the navigation panel on the left

side of the screen.
Click on the link:
[Click here for our subscription form.](#)

Choose your subscriber status:
New Subscriber/Existing Subscriber/Not a Subscriber
[If you are not sure, choose “New”]

Skip “Expert Status”

Complete the remainder of the form and click “Submit”

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



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

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

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

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

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

CIHE WEB SITE

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

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

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

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

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

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina Kopellas

EDITORIAL OFFICE

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

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

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

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

ISSN: 1084-0613
©Center for International
Higher Education