IHE at Twenty

Special 20th Anniversary Feature: Higher Education's Future

Pawan Agarwal: *Developing Country's Perspective*

Philip G. Altbach: *Massification and Global Knowledge Economy*

Jorge Balán: *Crisis of the Public Mission*

Roberta Malee Bassett: *Equity as Key Challenge*

Andrés Bernasconi: *Challenge of Effective Teaching*

Hans de Wit: *Is the International University the Future?*

Ellen Hazelkorn: *Sustainability Affordability: A Magic Bullet?*

Jane Knight: *From Soft Power to Knowledge Diplomacy*

Marcelo Knobel: *Sustaining Quality and Massification: Is it Possible?*

Daniel C. Levy: *Do Not Fall for It*

Simon Marginson: *Sustaining Resources*

Weifang Min: *China's Higher Education Future*

Goolam Mohamedbhai: *Graduate Unemployment in Africa*

Christine Musselin: *Forgetting the Social Benefits of Higher Education*

Patti McGill Peterson: *The Misuses of the University*

Gerard A Postiglione: *China Challenges*

Liz Reisberg: *The Complexities of Quality*

Henry Rosovsky: *Challenges to Research Universities*

Laura E. Rumbley: *"Intelligent Internationalization": An Imperative*

Jamil Salmi: *To Be or Not to Be: A World-class University?*

Damtew Teferra: *Africa: Expansion, Consolidation, and Un(der)employment*

Ulrich Teichler: *Decline of University Credibility*

Akiyoshi Yonezawa: *The Future of Rankings*

Maria Yudkevich: *Revisiting the Academic Marketplace*

Pavel Zgaga: *Conflicts in the Global Knowledge Society*

Editorial

Two Decades of News and Analysis

Exactly two decades ago, in the spring of 1995, the first issue of *International Higher Education* was published. As I wrote in the first issue, "*International Higher Education* is a forum for information, debate, and discussion about the central issues facing higher education." We identified a special focus on the Third World, which we felt was left out of the international mainstream, and noted that *IHE* would be a forum for independent analysis and opinion on the central higher education issues. Having published 80 issues and more than 1,000 articles over two decades, we have fulfilled these goals. We have provided information and analysis on countries unavailable elsewhere. We have considered some of the overarching themes, facing the world of higher education—from corruption to the impact of new technologies, from aspects of internationalization, and global student flows to the complexities of for-profit universities. We have often provided perspectives unavailable in the mainstream media.

When *IHE* was started, there was no internationally focused publication providing news and analysis on higher education. Now, several such publications exist, both international and regional—testimony to the importance of higher education and to a global perspective. Unlike most other outlets for such news and analysis, however, *IHE* persists as a completely noncommercial enterprise, and we remain steadfastly devoted to a critical and analytical perspective.

An independent, penetrating, and sometimes quirky voice is needed more than ever in the increasingly complex and contentious world of higher education. More of the elements of contemporary higher education are increasingly commercialized as governments withdraw support from the academic enterprise. The role of for-profit private higher education is increasingly prominent worldwide—with significant implications for access, quality, and maintaining an academic ethos. Internationalization is increasingly profit oriented, with international students, branch campuses, and other international initiatives seen as income earning for their sponsors.

IHE has grown and matured in many ways. From the beginning, we published on the World Wide Web as well as in a paper edition—and we were one of the first publications in our field to use the Internet as a key tool. We are today the only higher education publication to appear in several languages—now in Chinese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish as well as English. *IHE* is also published (in English) by the *Deutsche Univeritätzeitung*, which is the major publication for the German academic community. These editions are all sponsored by our translation partners—to whom we are indebted.

IHE has always been available without cost in both paper and on-line editions. Further, we are happy to permit other publications to reprint our articles and have an ongoing reprint relationship with *University World News*. We have benefited from 15 years of support from the Ford Foundation for assistance with publications costs and now have assistance from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Basic support has also come from Boston College, through the Lynch School of Education and the Monan University Professorship.

We have published three books containing articles: originally published in *International Higher Education*; Philip G. Altbach, *International Higher Education: Reflections on Policy and Practice* (Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for International Higher Education, 2006; Philip G. Altbach and Daniel C. Levy, eds., *Private Higher Education: a Global Revolution* (Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2005); and Philip G. Altbach, *The International Imperative in Higher Education* (Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2013).

Today, our readership extends across 149 countries, on all continents, and *IHE* articles are frequently referenced in the field worldwide. As *IHE* moves into its third decade of existence, we look forward to building on this unique foundation, and continuing to provide a crucial window on the world of higher education developments and debates across the globe.

Philip G. Altbach, Editor

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

SYMPOSIUM STATEMENT

Two decades ago, in Spring 1995, when the first issue of *International Higher Education* was published, no one had heard of MOOCs (massive open online courses), and much of the developing world still enrolled under 10 percent of young people in higher education. The private revolution in higher education was not evident. Massification, already affecting much of the globe, was not fully understood. And the global knowledge economy was in its early stages. As a result of these and other forces, plus severe economic disruption caused by the Great Recession, postsecondary education has been profoundly affected during the past two decades.

Now, the implications of many of the trends just on the horizon two decades ago, are evident—and shaping the contemporary environment. There is talk about "creative disruption"—many in academe see it as just disruption. We have asked 25 experts, all of whom have had an association with *International Higher Education* and the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, to reflect on a simple but profound question: *What will be the most important challenge facing higher education in the coming two decades?* This set of thoughtful mini-essays reflects some of the best global thinking on this theme.

Philip G. Altbach and Laura E. Rumbley

Next Two Decades of Higher Education: A Developing Countries Perspective

PAWAN AGARWAL

Pawan Agarwal is Joint Secretary, Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship, and formerly Adviser (Higher Education), Planning Commission, Government of India. E-mail: pagarwal.dsde@gmail.com.

Higher education in developing countries has undergone major changes over the past two decades; the next two decades would be truly transformative. Changes are expected at all four levels: within the classrooms, inside higher education institutions, in nation states, and at the global level.

Classrooms for the future would be based on a new learning paradigm. Focus will shift from content to pedagogy with technology and learning analytics playing a key role. Impact of technology on classroom instruction has thus far been marginal, but will be profound in the next two decades. Even with large class sizes, instruction will be customized to individual needs and preferences. Students will increasingly be engaged in experiential and interactive learning, learning from themselves, their peers, and their immediate environment—just as much as they would from their professors.

In terms of institutions, there would be a far larger number of players. Monopoly power of universities on knowledge creation and dissemination would be significantly diluted as a diverse set of nonuniversity actors emerge on the horizon. Moreover, the distinction between for-profit and nonprofit entities would get blurred. There will be an unbundling of functions of universities, with the focus on core functions of teaching and research. For most universities, a shift from the collegial to a managerial atmosphere is inevitable.

Higher education systems are at different stages of development in various countries. While most advanced nations have matured and fully developed systems with universal enrollment, developing nations have seen a dramatic expansion, primarily driven by the private sector, over the past two decades. The next two decades would be focused on consolidation and quality improvement instead of further expansion. With increasing cost pressures, there will be a convergence of national policies to pass on the costs of higher education to students and parents. Online platforms and learning will lead to democratization of knowledge and provide near universal access to higher education, even in the remotest areas and to the disadvantaged sections. While actual quality differentials would be much less, there would be more intense competition for top institutions especially in reputation and perception.

Higher education would be far more global in its scale and scope than today but with some difference. Today, perceived winners are those countries that are able to attract a large number of students to their home campuses or establish international branch campuses. However, it will be recognized that this is not a zero sum game, but all countries, even those countries that have outbound students of higher education tend to benefit through access to high-quality education.

With deepening global economic and cultural conditions and increased use of digital technologies, global networking and a participatory learning process will emerge with transnational education playing an important part. The present trend of cross-border mobility of students for full course of study would be replaced by part study abroad through semester exchanges, etc.

Overall, these developments would have positive consequences for higher education, but some negative implica-

tions cannot be ruled out. The next two decades would lay the foundations, on which higher education would evolve in the developing world for the many decades to come after.

∎

Massification and the Global Knowledge Economy: The Continuing Contradiction

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.

Two of the challenges of the past half century will continue to be among the key drivers of higher education realities, for the coming several decades—providing greater access to tertiary education and sustaining research centers that will contribute and disseminate the knowledge essential to modern societies. These two key forces are contradictory and pull academe in different directions.

Global enrollments now stand at more than 150 million, having doubled in just a few decades, and it is likely that there will be another 100 million added by 2020. A significant part of that growth will be in just two countries—China and India. Providing postsecondary education to larger segments of the population is not only necessary, as increasingly sophisticated economies demand higher levels of training, but as key to social mobility and more attractive employment.

Massification has placed great stress on government finances and has led to a rapidly growing private higher education sector. Shortages of qualified academic staff and newer, underresourced institutions often accompany this rapid expansion; as a consequence, overall quality has declined, in some countries dramatically. Yet, many millions have now obtained academic qualifications and in general achieved better lives as a result.

At the same time, the global knowledge economy requires more sophisticated and top-quality higher education to educate graduates who are capable of participating in the globalized 21st century economy. Universities must support research in the pursuit of new scientific endeavors, as well as serve as repositories of knowledge in all disciplines. Research universities, the engines of the global knowledge economy, are complex institutions, and are the foci of international networks. Although powerful, they are also fragile

institutions, requiring autonomy, shared governance, and academic freedom. These universities are expensive and complex. They are, with few exceptions, public institutions requiring unqualified state support; these are the world-class universities that dominate the rankings. Yet, it is often difficult for governments to understand these expensive yet necessary universities.

There is a seeming dichotomy between the necessity of providing postsecondary education for large numbers of students and, at the same time, supporting elite research universities. Yet, both are necessary parts of a differentiated academic system, and both serve important functions in the global knowledge economy—one to provide the increasingly sophisticated needs of the economy, as well as the general knowledge to function as effective citizens, and the other to educate the most able students, to provide both basic and applied research. Both are absolutely essential to a successful national economy, as well.

Supporting these two-core objectives is a necessity for the coming decades. Yet, there are signs in many countries, mass "demand absorbing" higher education is proving too heavy a burden for governments. Also, a growing private sector, often for-profit, tends to fill the gap, often providing lower-quality education. At the same time, expensive and largely public research universities are confronting alarming budget cuts. A key challenge is to ensure that both key aspects of higher education are appropriately supported.

∎

The Crisis of the Public Mission in Higher Education

Jorge Balán

Jorge Balán is senior research scholar, Columbia University. E-mail: jb3369@columbia.edu.

The major challenge for higher education worldwide is to strengthen and revitalize its commitment to the public mission, as a response to the overall-per-student decline in public funding, the shifting rationale, strategies, and instruments that governments subsidize and regulate higher education, and to cope with changes in student demand and in the society at large.

State ownership and funding of public institutions are often and erroneously identified with a public mission in countries where these institutions enjoy considerable prestige, autonomy, and political clout in shaping public policy. Administrators, faculty, and students are often critical of the

undesirable consequences of the rapidly expanding private sector for the public mission of higher education, but public institutions seldom become accountable to the fulfillment of their own public mission. Nonstate institutions require state recognition and legitimacy to operate, enjoy rights and privileges granted by public authority, and benefit from direct and indirect subsidies. The proliferation of new, profit-driven institutions responding to student demand, often with public support, does pose a major challenge to quality assurance in defense of the rights of students. A revisiting of the public mission is in order for all institutional segments and for the higher education system as a whole.

The definition of a public mission for higher education is subject to national and local politics and often becomes a very contentious issue, exacerbated when government support declines. The worldwide increase in income and wealth inequalities has highlighted the tension around fairness and equity in access to higher education, an important dimension of its pubic mission. The failure of massification to significantly reduce the gap between income groups among nations, where mass access is a recent phenomenon, is well documented. In many middle-income countries governments are allocating a disproportionate share of scarce resources to support public institutions with higher per-student costs, a strategy often justified in terms of the limited capacity of the private sector, in the production of basic research and advanced training. Fulfillment of the public mission requires greater transparency in the use of public funds, to make sure that benefits are not disproportionally enjoyed by better-off students and that higher education in all its functions serves the society at large.

There is also a universal dimension to the public mission of higher education, one that transcends the national, regional, and local settings but needs to be protected and nurtured by institutions and governments alike. Knowledge production, a centerpiece of that dimension, takes place on a global scale and crosses political boundaries, increasingly so thanks to the technological revolution in communications. Higher education institutions are key agents in the global production of knowledge, through basic scientific and humanistic research, and thus they are accountable to an evolving set of norms and values that drive and regulate knowledge production, its public, and increasingly collaborative nature. Although internationalization has become a buzzword among higher education institutions, its public-mission dimension—the safeguard and promotion of collaborative, reciprocal, and respectful relations in knowledge production and distribution across national boundaries—needs to be recognized more explicitly and implemented more carefully by institutions and public agencies. ∎

Equity Remains a Most-Important Challenge, Facing Global Higher Education

ROBERTA MALEE BASSETT

Roberta Malee Bassett is senior education specialist, Global Practice: Education at the World Bank. E-mail: rbassett@worldbank.org.

The intersection of technology and higher education has been driving the headlines on "the future" of higher education, for the better part of the past two decades. Indeed, since the industrial revolution, popular culture has often equated technology with the future. But, education—for all its adaptations to the world around it—is a human endeavor, and supporting and promoting the "humanity" of higher education will remain the key challenge for higher education stakeholders in perpetuity.

What is the humanity of higher education? Stakeholders including future, current, and former students; families; academic and administrative staff; employers; policymakers? In fact, higher education reaches into the lives of every person on earth—through research, technology, teacher training, and others. But, the ability to directly contribute to and benefit from higher education remains largely limited to the global elite. Equitable access to the full benefits of higher education will, therefore, remain the single, most-important challenge facing global higher education for the foreseeable future.

Supporting the equity of opportunity to seek the benefits, afforded by tertiary education, is economically and socially important in light of the documented evidence on the public and private benefits of attaining a college degree. Individual, private benefits include improved health outcomes, increased earning potential and even greater life satisfaction and expectancy, while the public, societal benefits include lower unemployment rates, increased tax revenues, greater civic and volunteer participation, and lessened dependency on social services. Furthermore, expanded access to tertiary education among members of disadvantaged communities extends these public benefits into communities, most in need of supportive interventions.

In spite of expanded access worldwide, however, higher education—especially the most prestigious university sector—generally remains inaccessible, with the majority of enrolled students coming from wealthier segments of society. Although relatively few countries and institutions systematically collect data on the socioeconomic origin of students, where national statistics and household survey data are available, the pattern of inequality is clear. In Chile,

for instance, the higher education level-enrollment rate for the wealthiest quintile is almost four times higher than the rate for the poorest. In Argentina, the enrollment rate of the wealthiest is five times higher than the rate for the poorest, and in Mexico the rate is 18 times higher than that of the poorest. In the francophone countries of sub-Saharan Africa, the children of the richest quintile account for 80 percent of higher education enrollment, while those from the poorest 40 percent of the population group represent only 2 percent of the student population.

Enrollments are expanding in gross numbers across the globe, no question, but this massification has happened within privileged groups, not across all socioeconomic groups. Distributing the well-documented and important benefits of higher education to all strata of society will, therefore, remain the most-important challenge for higher education in the decades to come.   ∎

The Challenge of Effective Teaching

Andrés Bernasconi

Andrés Bernasconi is professor at the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. E-mail: abernasconi@uc.cl.

For a millennium now, higher education has fostered scholarship and educated people in advanced knowledge. To these core functions others have been added over time, varying in their definition and urgency—such as service to the mission of a church, training civil servants, cementing a national identity, pulling the train of development, spearheading technological innovation, etc. However, teaching and discovery have remained as the essence of the institution we typically associate with the idea of the university and similar centers of higher learning.

Yet, with the reinvention of the university in modern times, research has taken precedence over education as the defining feature of excellence and distinction in this field. True, in the 19th century Humboldtian model, education was to be carried upon the shoulders of the scientific endeavor. Yet, in the age of massification, such virtuous interaction between the activity of research and the environment for learning takes place almost exclusively in the ambit of doctoral training.

Moreover, as academic drift increasingly blurs the research-based definitional line that sets apart universities from nonuniversity tertiary institutions, we see colleges and universities of applied sciences (*fachhochschulen*)—as well as other institutions that are supposed to have a predominant or exclusive orientation to professional and technical education—veer away from that identity to embrace a research mission, at least in ambition.

Institutional prestige and the personal reputation of faculty are pegged solely to research accomplishments. This association is reinforced today by global rankings, thus the teaching function remains secondary in institutional and professional rewards, attention from the leadership, development of capabilities among the practitioners, and seemingly, in results as well.

This subordination of teaching to research is no longer tenable. For one thing, the overwhelming majority of institutions of higher education around the world carry out no research. For them, the only achievable excellence is of teaching and learning. Next, the minuscule proportion of the world's students who attend the most selective research universities worldwide are generally already quite capable of learning and intellectual development, regardless of the teaching talent of their professors. For the colossal majority of students not attending elite institutions, however, a capable cadre of teachers makes the difference between students dropping out (or graduating, but with minimal learning) versus real mastery of the discipline or the profession that the degree is meant to represent. Moreover, the patience of politicians, with the results achieved by institutions of higher education, seems to be at an all-time low, to judge from the general lack-of-confidence *zeitgeist* of public policy in the last 30 years, from Britain to Japan to Mexico. Also, this frustration comes not from lackluster research performance, but from poor or unknown effects of higher education over manpower development and productivity.

The time will come when teaching will be open to the same kind of exacting peer scrutiny and judgment as research. Student evaluations will be complemented with expert analysis and feedback over video recordings of classroom, seminar, or laboratory practice. Rewards and recognition will be bestowed upon those who excel in expanding the reach of the minds of their students.   ∎

Is the International University the Future for Higher Education?

Hans de Wit

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

In recent past years, international higher education has been inundated by a series of new terms, such as global citizenship, comprehensive internationalization and world-class university. There have been books, articles, and papers written on them; they are referred to in global, regional, and national rankings, and you find them in mission statements and policy documents all over the world. Still, the exact meaning of these terms is unclear, and they are only perceptions and interpretations, not commonly acknowledged indicators or defined concepts.

"International university" seems to be the new fashionable term that fits in this category. Recently, it has appeared in the sphere of rankings: the *Times Higher Education* ranking of the 100 most international universities in the world in 2015. Also, "U-Multirank" recently published a ranking of the international orientation of 237 universities. The last initiative differs from the *Times Higher Education* ranking, in that it does not talk about "international universities" but of international orientation; yet, it fits in the apparent trend to try to identify what an international university is.

What the two have in common is that they rank and that they use more or less the same quantitative indicators. *Times Higher Education* uses, as indicators, the number of international students, of international staff, and of internationally coauthored publications. These are quite similar to the four measures used by U-Multirank: strong incoming and outgoing mobility, a high proportion of international staff and doctoral graduates, and a strong record of research publication in collaboration with academics abroad. But is it possible to define what an "international university" is? Also, is their approach, using only a small number of quantitative indicators, making sense?

If we agree that internationalization is a process that helps universities to increase the quality of their education, research, and service to society and is not a goal in itself, how is it then possible to define an end product: the international university? When there is not a standard model for how universities internationalize, how is it then possible to define commonly what an international university means to be?

Jane Knight, responding to the trend, wrote a paper on "what is an international university"? in "The State of Higher Education 2014" of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. She starts saying that there is much confusion as to what it actually means for a university to be international. In fact, she states that the term is not important; important is the approach or model used. She identifies three "generations" of international universities: an internationalized university with a diversity of international partnerships, international students and staff, and multiple collaborative activities; universities with satellite offices in the form of branch campuses, research centers, and management/project offices; and most recent, stand-alone institutions cofounded or codeveloped by two or more partner institutions from different countries. But, besides the fact that in her typology there is no reference made to the dimension of internationalization at home, the typology, in particular the first category, is so broad that it does not really help to define an international university. It might even have an opposite effect—i.e., universities can easily state that they fall into one of these categories and thus are international. In my view, one could better say that the first category concerns universities that are internationally cooperative, the second group are universities that are internationally active, and the third internationally operative.

I am afraid that more and more universities in the future will refer, in their mission statements and policies, to the fact that they are an international university, without clearly explaining what they mean by it. They will make use of rankings like *Times Higher Education* and U-Multirank. Universities should not fall into the temptation of using a first-sight attractive, but vague terms, yet focus on the quality of what they are doing. But like in the case of the other terms, I am afraid we cannot stop them from doing so. ∎

Sustainability and Affordability: Is There a Magic Bullet?

ELLEN HAZELKORN

Ellen Hazelkorn is policy advisor to the Higher Education Authority (Ireland) and director, Higher Education Policy Research Unit, Dublin Institute of Technology. E-mail: ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie.

The transformation in the higher education landscape worldwide has been nothing less than dramatic. Underpinning these developments has been the remarkable growth in demand for higher education. When the first issue of *International Higher Education* was published, there were approximately 68 million tertiary students enrolled worldwide. Today, there are 196 million students with estimates of almost 430 million by 2030. Over the same time frame, the enrollment rate for 20–29 year-olds in Organization for Economic Coooperation and Development (OECD) countries has grown by 10 percentage points on average, with some countries (notably Denmark, Finland, Greece, and Iceland) enrolling more than 40 percent. As restructuring of the global-labor market continues apace, people will spend more time in education. All this illustrates that we are moving rapidly to becoming high participation societies, where the vast majority of the population is educated to advanced levels, because of the significance for social and personal achievement.

Yet, ironically, at the moment our societies are increasingly dependent upon an educated citizenry, the costs associated with being an active player in the global economy are also rising. While some countries can expand or at least maintain their expenditure, others are under severe pressure from public and private debt and a public critical of high(er) taxation and expansive public services. This is leading to situations in which expenditure per student is not keeping pace with expanding demand. Overall, the OECD (in 2013) says the share of the total cost covered by public funds for higher education has declined from 77 percent in 1995 to 68 percent in 2013.

Nothing that I have said here will be new to this audience. However, providing high-quality universal higher education at a time of decreasing public funding and escalating global competitiveness is the most important challenge facing us in the coming two decades.

Using global rankings to guide us will inevitably lead to increased inequality. The top 100 universities represent less than 0.5 percent of the current total of almost 18,000 higher education institutions. This in turn represents approximately 0.4 percent of total-tertiary students worldwide. As demand grows, selectivity is accelerating. This is because while overall student numbers are increasing, student numbers among the top 100 are relatively stable. Thus, each year, top rankings represent a decreasing overall percentage of the total number of students.

Some countries have sought to balance these demands by seeking to raise quality by concentrating resources, in a few "world-class universities," in the expectation that the benefits will trickle down to others. A minority of countries, such as Finland, have pursued a "world-class system" strategy, spreading the benefits of excellence equitably across its vast landmass, while ranking among one of the top-performing countries in the world.

What is the appropriate balance between educating the majority of our citizens, to be smart, creative, and entrepreneurial individuals, while ensuring the ability of the nation to compete in world science? Have we reached the end of the current model of mass public higher education?

∎

Moving from Soft Power to Knowledge Diplomacy

JANE KNIGHT

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

International higher education, in its role as a political actor, is strongly attracted to the concept of soft power. Developed by Joseph Nye about a decade ago, soft power is popularly understood as the ability to influence others and achieve national self-interest(s) through attraction and persuasion rather, than through coercion, military force, or economic sanctions—commonly known as hard power.

Many academics hail soft power as a fundamental premise of today's international education engagement. Common examples of soft power in higher education include the Fulbright Program, British Council activities, German Academic Exchange initiatives, Erasmus Mundus projects, and others. Clearly, these are respected and long-standing programs that make enormous contributions.

But why do we call them instruments of "soft power," when at their heart they promote exchange of students, faculty, culture, science, knowledge, and expertise. Yes, there are self-interests at play, but there is a mutuality of interests and benefits involved for all partners. International higher education is not traditionally seen as a game of winners and

losers—it focuses on exchange and builds on the respective strengths of institutions and countries. Importantly, it recognizes that benefits will differ among partners and countries.

In our highly interdependent world, higher education facilitates the cross-border flow and the exchange of people, knowledge, values, innovation, economy, technology, and culture. But why is it framed in a "power paradigm" like soft power? Are the values of self-interest, competition, or dominance going to effectively address issues of worldwide epidemics, terrorism, failed states, the bottom billion in poverty and climate change? The answer is no. This is based on the reality that solutions to worldwide challenges cannot be achieved by one country alone.

An alternative to the power paradigm is the framework of diplomacy. Diplomacy, interpreted as the management of international relations, focuses on negotiation, mediation, collaboration, compromise, and facilitation. These are different tactics and concepts than those attached to power dominance, authority, command, and control. Is knowledge diplomacy more appropriate to frame the role of higher education in international relations, than the soft power paradigm?

Knowledge is a cornerstone of today's interconnected world. The evolution from the new information and communication technologies of *cyberspace*, to the big data of *infospace*, to the knowledge processing of *knowspace* brings new opportunities and complexities to international higher education. However, there is no denying that knowledge can also lead to power imbalances within and among countries. This reality is exacerbated when higher education and knowledge are seen as tools of soft power. The alternative of using collaboration and mediation strategies of diplomacy requires serious consideration.

International higher education has the opportunity of moving beyond its preoccupation, with the knowledge economy, and takes a proactive role to ensure that knowledge is effectively used to address worldwide challenges and inequalities, by recognizing the mutuality of interests and benefits. Is higher education ready to take a lead in promoting the notion of knowledge diplomacy and not remain stuck, in the soft power frame of self-interest and dominance?

■

Sustaining Quality and Massification: Is It Possible?

MARCELO KNOBEL

Marcelo Knobel is professor at the Instituto de Física Gleb Wataghin, Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas, SP, Brazil. knobel@ifi.unicamp.br.

Higher education has experienced rapid expanding enrollment worldwide for the last 40 years. This growth will probably continue for the next 20 years, with predictions of 400 million students in 2030 (compared with 100 million in 2000). Is it possible to make this massification more equitable, while insuring minimum standards of quality?

Different countries and regions of the world are at different stages of higher education development. Gross enrollment ratios depend on a nation's degree of economic development, social environment, history, and policy priorities. While many countries still struggle to guarantee access to higher education for a predominantly young population, other countries face the challenges of an aging population and/or decrease of government support.

In the case of Latin America, for example, all countries still struggle with strong-social inequality. Increasing participation and degree attainment at the tertiary level are not only fundamental for forthcoming development but also key to social mobility, particularly for underrepresented groups—disadvantaged socioeconomic sectors, Afrodescendants, and indigenous people. There has been progress in the region in terms of student enrollments, growing from 1.6 million students in 1970 to 20 million in 2009. The gross enrollment ratio is around 30 percent in the region, indicating that there is yet room to further growth. In addition, growth remains uneven, mainly favoring certain segments of the population.

The funding sources of higher education—governments, students, and families, or for-profit ventures—has a strong influence on the quality provided. For example, there are many concerns regarding higher education quality, when it is focused on financial return. Unfortunately, the appetite for short-term financial gain often distracts attention from long-term planning, leading to a lack of investment in infrastructure, faculty qualifications, and program stability, and thus jeopardizing quality. Additionally, although the for-profit sector has had an important "demand-absorbing" role, these institutions are often given too much latitude by national authorities for the quality of services they provide.

Finally, massification inevitably presents the challenge of teaching a more diverse group, increasing the share of students with substantial gaps in their previous education.

Higher education institutions must develop specific programs to guarantee not only the access but the success of every student, reducing the failure and dropouts rates. This must be done without compromises to the quality of the final degree awarded.

Countries must implement policies that provide access to education for socially and economically disadvantaged sectors; that establish and insure robust-quality assurance and monitoring processes; and that create a framework to encourage institutional diversity and innovative, equitable funding mechanisms. It is difficult to imagine a comprehensive solution, but each different country must try to find a good balance between funding, access, and quality in this complicated wrangle. A long-term, sustainable solution for the growth of the higher education sector is mandatory for the economic and social stability of any nation. ∎

Do Not Fall For It

Daniel C. Levy

Daniel C. Levy is a State University of New York Distinguished Professor, University at Albany, New York. E-mail: dlevy@albany.edu.

Zaniness is required to try to answer a question about higher education's greatest imminent need, so I consult and paraphrase comedian Groucho Marx: "A four-year-old child could answer this question. Run out and find me a four-year-old child, I can't make head or tail out of it." Or maybe I could escape by discrediting the question, or at least declaring it unanswerable? But those might be ungracious responses to a gracious invitation. Most of us are interested in the answers given by colleagues who have spent their professional lives studying higher education.

Does the question's reference, to what higher education needs to deal with, concern higher education's self-interests or serving others? Only the likes of university presidents and magical solution policypushers can present these interests as nearly identical. Also, how could any answer make sense across the hugely varied realities of societies, political systems, economies, levels of development, interests, and values on the one hand and of higher education structures and functions on the other? However, many colleagues may answer with research universities in mind. I could not be comfortable with a singular substantive and prescriptive action answer for all of higher education.

Higher education's biggest need is to steer clear of, or significantly modify, seductively attractive idealistic visions or policy proposals. Obviously, we want to resist insidious or meritless proposals; when they are imposed on us, we go

kicking and screaming. But even the visions and proposals, which have alluring merit and should be seriously considered, come our way with vastly exaggerated claims of likely benefits. In some places, between no and inadequate allowance for the myriad costs, those that can be anticipated and those that cannot be. Compose your own list from yesteryear and today. Unfortunately, yesteryear's inflated claims remain—what increased funding of higher education will do for development, how rapid and diversified expansion of access will bring equity and productive benefits, how government money will achieve mutually held progressive aims. These claims are now joined by grand visions of how to build world-class universities and what will be reaped from quality-assurance agencies, benchmarks, massive open line courses, or increased market competition.

This is not an ivory-tower rant against outsiders. My answer holds for bold visions and proposals springing from inside academia, including from higher education studies experts. I would trust more to invisible hands—in which I have only limited trust—than to prescriptions from gurus, let alone from wise-guys outside academia, to determine what higher education needs to do. ∎

Sustaining Resources

Simon Marginson

Simon Marginson is professor at the Institute of Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: s.marginson@ioe.ac.uk.

The key challenge facing higher education in the next decade is mundane but central: sustaining resources. Behind that lies a deeper historic problem, relations between higher education and the nation state.

Worldwide modern higher education systems are the product of the nation-building strategies of governments. Tuition arrangements vary markedly, but overall, up till now, government has funded most of the infrastructure and most of the operating costs of better institutions in one way or another. Governments subsidize the growth of access to newly participating families and foster opportunities for social mobility through higher education. Government is also essential to funding research, a public good subject to market failure. However, matters are now changing in many countries. Research still depends on public funding, and governments want to concentrate resources there to maximize national competitiveness. But teaching can be either public or private good.

With tertiary participation now more than 50 percent in countries with above average per capita incomes, a tipping point has been reached. Higher education has become an essential passport to full-time work and effective social status. It has become increasingly difficult for middle-class families (and in some countries, for any families) to stay outside the higher education system. There is often strong resistance to tuition increases, yet in their hearts people know they have to enroll their student-age children, even if they have to pay much of the cost themselves. The round of funding reductions in the recession of 2008 did not trigger a decline in participation as many feared: in fact the worldwide growth of participation has never been stronger. While there are some continuing instances of demand elasticity, overall, many governments are learning that they can cut back their subsidies for higher education and force tuition rises, without paying a political price, and without reducing participation in the long run. This can only mean "we ain't seen nothing yet" and state funding will fall much further. What then happens to the public character of higher education? The public mission has always rested on the funding role of the state. Without a strong state presence is it realistic to expect institutions alone to sustain quality and social mobility?

In high participation systems the question shifts from *access?* to *access to what?* All else equal, a major shift to private costs is associated with growing stratification of quality of provision, and greater inequality of opportunity, with the upper middle class concentrated in leading institutions. Some would say we are there already, but the more important point is that as the state withdraws, the quality of mass public education collapses and it can no longer function as a springboard for mobility. Private for-profits have low completion rates and their credentials lack zing in the labor markets. In two thirds of countries, economic inequalities are increasing. If higher education worsens social stratification and blocks social empowerment, it has lost its moral foundation in the common good. It becomes an obstacle to be removed. Is this where we are heading? ∎

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

The Challenge Facing Chinese Higher Education in the Next Two Decades

WEIFANG MIN

Weifang Min is professor and director, Institute of Higher Education and former executive vice president, Peking University. E-mail: wfmin@pku.edu.cn.

One of the most striking aspects of higher education in the past 20 years is the rapid expansion of enrollment. In 1995, the world total enrollment was 79 million with 5.2 million in China. In 2012, it was 196 million and 32.6 million respectively, 2.5 times of 1995 for the world, 6.2 times for China. China is the home to the world's fastest-growing higher education.

However, the state appropriation and quality inputs could not keep up with the quantitative expansion, which resulted in large class size, crowded classrooms and labs, decreased teaching equipment and library books per student, and lowered quality of teaching. Since many universities enlarged enrollment in low-cost programs—such as literature and history, instead of engineering technologies and sciences—it made the structure of graduates by expertise mismatch the labor market needs. Many graduates had difficulties to find jobs. The Chinese Ministry of Education came to realize the problems of overspeeded expansion of higher education and issued a document in 2012, trying to stabilize the size of enrollment. However, with ever-increasing private and social demands for higher education, the expansion momentum was still forceful. In 2013, the total enrollment increased to 34.5 million. It is estimated that the total enrollment will exceed 40 million by 2020. Chinese higher education is currently characterized as "big but not strong."

Thus, the challenge for the coming 20 years of Chinese higher education is to balance the quantitative development and qualitative improvement and to make Chinese higher education "big and strong." This will be a quite difficult task. On one hand, China has to keep a certain growing rate to meet the huge unmet demand; on the other hand, it has to adjust the higher education structure and improve the quality, to make graduates well fit in the human resource needs of the changing economic situation. Many policy measures will have to be taken. First, expansion of enrollment has to slow down to make the number of graduates be absorbed by the economy.

This issue was not seriously taken into account, before. For example, in the coming summer of 2015, China will have 7.5 million higher education graduates, while

the economy is slowing down; thus, employment of these graduates will become more challenging. Second, high priority has to be attached to raising higher education quality. This needs more quality inputs including more state appropriation, strengthening faculty development, enhancing accreditation, and total quality management and evaluation programs. Third, the institutional isomorphism has to be changed through adjusting the structure of higher education, according to labor market demand by appropriately differentiating the institutions into different levels and different types, with each serving different human resources needs of the society. Fourth, for information technologies they should widely share the high-quality educational resources, such as making on-line courseware of the best teachers for nationwide use. Fifth, promote international exchanges and cooperation, and assimilate high-quality programs, such as Shanghai New York University. ∎

The Challenge of Graduate Unemployment in Africa

Goolam Mohamedbhai

Goolam Mohamedbhai is former secretary general of the Association of African Universities. E-mail: g_t_mobhai@yahoo.co.uk.

Sub-Saharan Africa is the region with the lowest higher education enrollment—barely 8 percent. Conscious of the importance of higher education for socioeconomic development and in response to the ever-increasing demand for higher education, African countries have made huge efforts—in spite of many constraints and challenges—in increasing access to higher education. Enrollment in most countries has increased by several folds. The outcome was as expected—the greater output of graduates. Perhaps not expected was the increasing unemployment of these graduates, and this is true for almost every African country. In some countries, the unemployment figure is alarming. The social and political consequences of large unemployment, especially among the educated youth, can be serious, as evidenced by the 2011 "Arab spring" in North Africa.

The causes of graduate unemployment are known. First, in concentrating on increasing access—but with inadequate financial, physical, and human resources—public universities have sacrificed quality for quantity. This has had a direct impact on the qualifications awarded. But more than good qualifications, employers look for attributes and competencies referred to as "soft skills"—these are quasi inexistent in the graduates. Also, the linkages between the university and the community—business and industry, public bodies, and the rural areas—are poor, and the university in many ways is cut off from the world of work.

But not all the causes can be laid at the doorstep of institutions. Other stakeholders have an equal share of responsibility. The private sector, which is fast becoming the main employer of graduates, must assist by providing short student internships, graduate training, soft-skills training and even funding as part of its social responsibility. The largest private companies in Africa are foreign owned and they must give priority to employing locally trained graduates.

Most countries also lack a differentiated higher education system that produces a diversified workforce in response to Africa's development priorities. African governments have, often for political reasons, replicated existing institutions or upgraded polytechnics and postsecondary colleges to universities, basically creating "more of the same" institutions. Yet, the labor market demand is more for lower-level, practically trained diploma holders than for academically-qualified degree holders.

Africa is currently the fastest growing region in the world, both economically and demographically. It has the world's youngest population, with huge expectations for education. The region needs highly skilled human capital for its sustained economic growth, so it must continue to expand its higher education sector. But development cannot be achieved by merely producing large numbers of graduates; it must be ensured that they are productively employed. Africa therefore needs to resolve its major challenge of graduate unemployment. What is needed in each African country is a concerted, well-defined strategy and action plan, at both national and institutional level. This strategy should also be motivated by reliable and up-to-date statistical data, which are severely lacking at present, to create a vibrant higher education sector can play its meaningful role in enabling Africa to overcome its development challenges and become a major pole of global growth. ∎

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

The Danger of Forgetting the Social Benefits of Higher Education

CHRISTINE MUSSELIN

Christine Musselin is vice president for research at SciencesPo, Paris, France. E-mail: Christine.musselin@sciencespo.fr.

One of the main assumptions behind the discourse on the increasing need for more higher education—a discourse that proved to be very effective when one looks at the exponential increase in student numbers during the 20th century—was that higher education will have strong social benefits. Indeed, some studies show that educated people get higher wages, have better living conditions and better health, and are more open-minded.

A key challenge for higher education in the coming decades will be to maintain these beliefs and to convince society that education and training do more than produce human capital—but also have a larger social function and purpose. Knowledge is not only important for its economic value but also for society.

Recently, the social contribution of higher education has been ignored or even distained by policymakers, the governments of developed countries, as they stressed the need for more knowledge and innovation in order to promote economic progress. Training more highly qualified workers, able to understand and produce knowledge, was presented as a challenge for countries involved in the global knowledge economy. What was learned at universities was considered to be less important than the job one could obtain at the end of their studies.

My point here is not to say that preparing students for the job market is not an important mission for universities, or that transforming research into economic relevance should not be assumed by higher education. Yet, this should not mean the abandonment of other missions and activities, the development of purely instrumental training programs, the end of "blue sky" research, or the end of disciplines that may have no direct economic impact.

This challenge is all the more important because obscurantism, ignorance, intolerance, and fanaticism are unfortunately expanding. Recent events in Europe, terrible conflicts in some African and Middle-East countries, and the civil war in Ukraine all prove that higher education institutions still have to promote humanistic values, prepare for citizenship, and to be socially responsible. These missions have never been sufficient to prevent from all misconducts and abuses—some well-trained individuals have in some cases proved to be as fanatic as noneducated ones—but they have nevertheless been largely effective. They, therefore, absolutely must be maintained and even reinforced. This might be a difficult line to hold at a time when higher education policies first of all promote the economic and instrumental roles of universities. However, it is a battle to lead and win in the coming decades, if universities are to remain a place where knowledge and humanistic values are protected and diffused. ∎

The Misuses of the University

PATTI MCGILL PETERSON

Patti McGill Peterson is Presidential Advisor for global initiatives at the American Council of Education and former executive director of the Council for the International Exchange of Scholars—The Fulbright Program. E-mail: ppeterson@acenet.edu.

We live in an age where understanding your core mission and being true to it are fundamental concepts for healthy organizations. My concern for the future of higher education is the number of stakeholders, who place upon it an ever-expanding list of competing demands and their impact on its core mission.

When Cardinal Newman wrote about universities in the 1850s, he wanted to define not only their purpose for students but also their purpose in society. Central to Newman's conception was the student and the environment for teaching and learning. It was connected to society but not driven or heavily shaped by it.

Fast forward to Clark Kerr about 100 years later—the uses of the university trump the idea of the university. His "multiversity" is a mega purpose institution—a place of competing visions and, according to Kerr, is so many things to so many other people that it must be at war with itself.

Juxtaposing Newman and Kerr is not merely an act of nostalgia. It is a signal that demands on universities, and higher education in general have grown exponentially. Higher education has been placed increasingly in the position of providing the antidote for whatever issues governments, business and industry, major donors, and other stakeholders define as needing solution.

In this scenario, it is very difficult to be true to a core educational mission and to plan strategically to enhance it over time. Institutions are like Napoleon on the Russian front, with their line of advance too wide and their supply

lines too short.

All higher education institutions, not just those tertiary institutions with vocational missions, are increasingly held accountable for matching their education offerings with workforce needs and the employability of their graduates. This has led to the steady "vocationalization" of higher education at the undergraduate level.

The dangers of designing higher education curricula for immediate usefulness are real. Gearing degrees to the contemporary workplace and training students for specific jobs can potentially pave the way to chronic unemployment. The forces of globalization and new discoveries can shutter factories, bypass entire industries, and throw graduates who are narrowly educated on the slag pile of human obsolescence.

While we need not return to the *Studium Generale* to be true to higher education's core mission, it is time to consider how to balance relevance with timelessness and short-term usefulness with long-term competency. As we look to the future, we need to reckon with what "useful" means in considering higher education's obligations to its students and society. If the core mission is to educate students well for a lifetime, its usefulness will include an intellect developed for a personally rewarding life, the wherewithal for informed citizenship, and the ability to move productively between multiple jobs and careers.

Great universities and well-developed higher education systems will legitimately be asked to respond to societal needs. The challenge will be in managing those demands without losing the very thing that has made them great. ∎

Chinese Higher Education: Future Challenges

GERALD A. POSTIGLIONE

Gerard A. Postiglione is chair professor and associate dean, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong. E-mail: gerry.hku@gmail.com.

For 2020, the key question is: Will China be a major or fractional power in international higher education with a unique and exportable university model? Several contemporary book titles indicate that it is a question worth asking: *When China Rules the World; The Post-American World and the Rise of the Rest; Will China dominate the 21st Century?*

As China inches toward becoming the world's largest economy, there are indications of an economic slowdown and concern about how this will affect higher education. China already has the most students in higher education, more scientific publications, and a larger budget for research and development than any country in the world, except the United States. Several flagship universities have gained a world-class ranking, though the system as a whole does poorly on quality indicators. It bodes well for the future of Chinese higher education, which prospective students in its largest city outperform counterparts in mathematics and science in a 60-country Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development assessment.

While the debate continues in China about how to build a unique university model to compliment the Beijing Consensus, efforts to shape universities with indigenous ideas are stymied by the race for global rankings. Meanwhile, universities struggle with uninspiring teaching that is reflected in media outlets that report students are sleeping through lectures. Recent research shows many teachers liven up their classes by criticizing government and the Communist Party, leading to a call for more teaching of Marxism. China's leaders also understand that its universities are not only instruments of knowledge creation and dissemination, but also instruments of international competition. Initiatives are under way to foster soft skills in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields to drive industrial innovation and China's economic globalization. Despite such efforts, the transition to mass higher education is plagued by a burgeoning of unemployed graduates.

The global influence of China's universities in 2025 will hinge on how it handles a precarious balance between domestic demands and aspirations to go global. The domestic demands include those by employers for knowledge and skills to upgrade production, by urban, middle-class households for status culture that distinguished their children, and by the rural poor, migrants, and minorities for equitable access and jobs. These demands remain subsidiary to the state's demand for national prosperity, power and strength, stability and unity. The state orchestrates the aspirations of universities to going global by demanding that internationalization does not sacrifice educational sovereignty, even while the state must eventually cede more autonomy to universities.

By 2020, more Chinese citizens will have a college education than the entire workforce of the United States. While sending more students to the United States than any other country, China itself is fast becoming one of the most popular international destinations for overseas study. Harvard's Vogel may be right that the result of China's opening and reform for higher education has been an intellectual vitality as broad and deep as the Western Renaissance. But the extent to which China will have a unique and exportable model that powers international higher education in 2020 remains a key question. ∎

Quality: More Complicated Than Ever

LIZ REISBERG

Liz Reisberg is a higher education consultant at Reisberg & Associates. E-mail: reisberg@gmail.com.

Quality education used to be so simple—carefully select qualified students, provide them with content in an academic area, and award a diploma to reflect an acceptable level of knowledge and performance. Changing realities have muddied the meaning and measure of quality.

Gross enrollment ratios have increased nearly everywhere. Although this is a good thing for developed and developing countries alike, expanded enrollments inevitably mean enrolling students with wide-ranging prior preparation. In most cases, universities are presented with huge gaps in knowledge and skills that impede academic success. Institutions must either allocate resources for remedial instruction—with limited promise since the deficiencies accumulated over 12 years are not easily remedied; lower performance expectations; or accept high attrition rates. Each strategy has implications for institutional quality.

Financial pressures on higher education are increasing. Where higher education is provided at public institutions at low, or no cost, enrollment capacity is limited. This has led the expansion of a "demand-absorbing" private sector, with a growing for-profit subsector. Private institutions are dependent on fees paid by students and their families. The need to fill classrooms to cover costs or (often) to generate profit risks to compromise the quality of both students and instruction in the interest of financial goals.

As international qualities have become a factor in how institutions are perceived and compared, many universities are taking shortcuts, paying third parties to enhance their international dimension and produce measurable results quickly. Greater international enrollment has also become an important source of income. Allowing third-party actors to have a significant role in institutional management has opened the door to substandard, as well as unethical activity.

The purpose of higher education has also become more confused. There is a growing expectation that a university education is a guarantee of future employment and that if a university graduate is unemployed, the education provided was of poor quality.

Universities are being pressed to produce more research to improve placement in international rankings, at the same time that professors are being pushed to demonstrate impact on students through clearly defined "learning outcomes." Increased pressure on faculty coincides with fewer tenured or secure positions, more part-time professors, and limited infrastructure to help develop the capacity to deliver on these augmented expectations.

So, the question remains—what is university quality? Should all institutions be expected to enroll a diverse student body, insure that they all rise to a comparable level of demonstrable performance—while the faculty produces internationally indexed publications, assures learning outcomes and assures employment to all graduates, all with smaller budgets? As always, quality means different things to various people. The complex realities that surround higher education today demand to build an ever stronger case for aligning measures of quality with institutional mission. If universities are going to produce "quality," however, it is defined: politicians, employers, and parents must criticize less and assume some responsibility for financing and otherwise supporting the necessary means to meet their expectations.

Some Nonpecuniary Challenges to Research Universities

HENRY ROSOVSKY

Henry Rosovsky is Geyser University Professor Emeritus and former Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University. E-mail: henry_rosovsky@harvard.edu.

An answer is based on the question limited to research universities—the institutions that emphasize research, undergraduate and graduate instruction, and the arts, sciences, and professional schools. Higher education is not sustainable without schools of this type.

More than anything else, the quality of research universities depends on two closely related factors: academic freedom and shared governance, a suggestion made by me in these pages, quite recently. How are university leaders, faculty, and students selected? Does the government enforce limitations on certain types of scholarship or scholarly point of view? Who has a voice in determining curriculum and research directions? In China, the Communist Party may condemn excessive Western influence in teaching and research; in much of the Arab world fundamentalist religion prevents women from contributing their talents to society; in the United States it may be legislatures and occa-

sionally donors that attempt to bypass priorities, developed internally and on academic grounds, etc. I have never seen an outstanding research university that does not enjoy academic freedom or a form of shared governance.

One has to be clear. I am in no way implying that all people who share in governance should be university insiders; but internal academic voices need to be heard and considered. It should also be stressed that academic freedom—the freedom of teachers and students to teach, study, and pursue knowledge without unreasonable interference—is not the same thing as political freedom, although they are practically twins. The ever-present challenges are obvious.

Twenty years is not a very long time, and one can assume that the intellectual climate will not be subject to abrupt change. And that introduces another predictable challenge: professionalism and/or an increasing anti-intellectualism. In the United States, and elsewhere also, I am referring to the view that learning for its own sake is somehow a frivolous activity—perhaps a luxury and not deserving of support. From the point of view of the student, the purpose of education is job and career. That is how curriculum is frequently structured—accounting: Yes; computer science: a shouted Yes; Shakespeare: if there is a little spare time. From the point of view of the state what matters are "human resources to meet workforce needs." Basic science needs support because the study of biology may lead to a cure of some disease, especially the diseases that afflict funders. There is some truth in all of these propositions, but why does it also imply that sociology is quite useless and that the humanities are not deserving of support?

I am, of course, familiar with the more standard challenges to higher education: disruption caused by technology, high cost, massive open online courses making residential education a useless indulgence, and others. I do not dispute their great importance, but I add disinterested learning—for undergraduates we would call it liberal education—because it is only rarely mentioned. Yet, fundamental intellectual progress has most often started with disinterested investigators attempting to solve a problem, because it is fascinating and has not been done before. In the social sciences and humanities where problems are very rarely solved in definitive form, each generation of students and teachers needs its own reinterpretation of the big questions asked by these fields of study and investigation. These endeavors are the intellectual essence of research universities.

∎

"Intelligent Internationalization": A 21st Century Imperative

Laura E. Rumbley

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu.

One of the most important issues facing higher education around the world for the next two decades is the crucial need for "intelligent internationalization."

Internationalization—as a response to globalization, as a strategy for enhanced quality or visibility, or as an isomorphic response to developments in the environment—is arguably one of the most significant phenomena, currently affecting higher education institutions across the globe. Internationalization may be seen as both a cause and an effect of the advent of the global knowledge economy. To varying degrees across national and institutional contexts, it is also the manifestation of fundamental—and still evolving—changes in the way we think about what constitutes relevant, high-quality tertiary education today.

Mobility is still "king" in most internationalization discussions, and growing student mobility numbers worldwide indicate that mobility will continue to be highly significant for the foreseeable future. However, in many countries, crucially important aspects of the internationalization agenda are now moving from the periphery to the center, in matters of both policy and practice. We see this clearly in the long-overdue, rising prominence of the discussion around "internationalization at home," the increasing importance placed by universities on developing and sustaining international partnerships of both breadth and depth, and growing interest in providing more internationally and interculturally oriented training and support for faculty and staff.

Meanwhile, these developments are unfolding against a backdrop of unprecedented complexity and flux for higher education, more broadly. Political, economic, and social developments are exerting enormous pressures on higher education to (among other things) "perform," "respond," "innovate," "incubate," "evaluate," and "lead." The internationalization agenda is deeply implicated in these processes. Dealing effectively with this complexity requires a commitment to "intelligent internationalization," which is grounded in a body of knowledge that coherently encompasses both theory and practice aimed at improving our understanding of the complex realities of internationalization locally and globally. It demands a commitment to the train-

ing of thoughtful practitioners in the field, working in tandem with researchers, policymakers, and institutional leaders who are sensitive to the practicalities that reside within the "big issues" dominating so many strategic discussions about internationalization today.

Around the world, there are research centers and programs devoted to the education and training of higher education professionals, many of which seem to be concerned about matters of internationalization. But, the scope of these research and training efforts is very unclear, as is the quality of the products they produce or the training they provide. Equally, there is a very uncertain connection between the needs for information and expertise by policymakers and practitioners, and what researchers and educators/trainers actually produce.

"Intelligent internationalization" demands the development of a thoughtful alliance between the research, practitioner, and policy communities. Those participating in the elaboration of internationalization activities and agendas have access to the information, ideas, and professional skill-building opportunities that will enhance their ability to navigate the complex and volatile higher education environment of the next 20 years. ■

To Be or Not to Be—A World-Class University?

JAMIL SALMI

Jamil Salmi is Global Tertiary Education Expert. E-mail: jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org.

With the 2003 publication of the first international ranking by Shanghai Jiao Tong University and the subsequent emergence of competing global league tables (*Times Higher Education*, Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan, QS, and others), more systematic ways of identifying world-class universities have appeared. As a result, a major concern of governments has been to find the most effective method for inducing substantial progress in their country's top universities. While a few nations—Kazakhstan and Saudi Arabia, for example—have opted for establishing new universities from scratch, most countries have adopted a strategy combining mergers and upgrading of existing institutions.

In order to accelerate the transformation process, several governments have launched so-called "excellence initiatives," consisting of large injections of additional funding to boost their university sector. The recent excellence initiatives have been launched mainly in East Asia and Europe. These programs usually have a limited number of beneficiary universities and focus on research upgrading.

Many of these excellence initiatives mark a significant philosophical shift in the funding policies of the participating countries. In France, Germany, and Spain—for instance, where all public universities have traditionally been considered equally good in terms of performance—the excellence initiative represents a move away from the principle of uniform budget entitlements toward a substantial element of competitive funding.

Measuring the effectiveness of excellence initiatives is not an easy task for at least two reasons. First, upgrading a university takes many years. Since many excellence initiatives are fairly recent, attempts at measuring success would be premature in most cases. The second challenge is related to attribution. Even if a correlation could be identified on the basis of a large sample of institutions, establishing elements of causality would require an in-depth analysis of case studies.

In the meantime, it is possible to identify a number of risks and challenges associated with the ongoing race to establish world-class universities. The overemphasis on research sends the wrong signal that the quality of teaching and learning is not important. International rankings clearly favor research-intensive universities at the cost of excluding excellent undergraduate teaching institutions. In the United States, for instance, liberal arts schools such as Wellesley, Carleton, Williams, and Pomona Colleges, and engineering schools such as Olin College are all recognized as outstanding colleges, but fail to be included in the rankings.

The focus on world-class universities is likely to further promote elitism. In the search for academic excellence, top universities are very selective, which bears the risk of keeping away talented students from families with low-cultural capital. With a 1:100 success ratio, the Indian Institutes of Technology are the most selective institutions in the world. Similarly, the Ivy League universities are the most selective universities in the United States.

The search for academic excellence is in danger of being thwarted by restrictions on academic freedom in nondemocratic countries. While it may be a lesser constraint in the hard sciences, it certainly hinders the ability of social scientists to conduct scientific inquiries on issues that are politically sensitive in China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia, for example.

At the end of the day, instead of focusing exclusively on building world-class universities, governments should worry more about developing well-balanced tertiary education systems that encompass the whole range of institu-

tions necessary to address the variety of learning needs of a diverse student population. ∎

Africa's Troika Conundrums: Expansion, Consolidation, and Un(der)employment?

Damtew Teferra

Damtew Teferra is professor and leader of Higher Education Training and Development and founding director, International Network for Higher Education in Africa, University of Kwazulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa. E-mail: teferra@ukzn.ac.za.

African higher education has recorded an impressive growth in the last decade. Currently, an estimated 14 million students study in higher learning institutions in the region with Egypt, Nigeria, South Africa, and Ethiopia enrolling the highest number of students. Over 500 public and 1,500 private universities operate in the region. Yet, still the enrollment rate, at around 6 percent, stands as the lowest in the world.

If expansion of access could be triumphantly described as African higher education success, the grim realities of its quality diminish this declaration. As enrollments in the system have grown exponentially, quality of teaching, learning, and research has suffered precipitously. Massive expansion has meant that class sizes ballooned, academics overloaded, resources declined, activities trimmed, and facilities deteriorated—creating a perfect storm for quality crisis.

The implications of massive growth are probably nowhere clearer than on the research landscape. Africa's figures on research productivity are depressingly low hovering at above 1 percent. Despite the impressive growth of the system, the region has little to show for its knowledge productivity—an agonizing reality in the knowledge era. Poor quality and knowledge productivity continue to depict the system—necessitating consolidating excellence, while pursuing expansion. Ameliorating the situation requires sustained commitment and meaningful resources to research and development.

As expansion is rapid and consolidation is staggering, a once reluctantly tolerated predicament of unemployment for university graduates has surfaced—with a vengeance. The continent is now awash with unemployed and underemployed graduates, in some cases prompting organized action. As Africa still counts its enrollment rates in single digits—and still needs to catch up with the rest of the world—the massive unemployment of graduates has emerged as a serious national, regional, and international conundrum, following the Arab Spring allegedly sparked by unemployed graduates.

Higher education expansion is part of national development plans, though their implementations are increasingly tempered with narrow political whims. Thus, opening new public institutions are more influenced by political imperatives than relevance and appropriateness. Opening a university has become part of a political manifesto across the region, pursued both by incumbents as well as oppositions in the hope of scoring electoral votes. Such crass politics tend to undermine the possible differentiation of the system—putting more pressure on the delicate relationship between expansion and consolidation, quantity, and excellence. Egalitarian views of all public institutions in a country as equals are not only flawed, but also costly.

The triple conundrum of African higher education is as complex as it is forbidding—with no immediate relief in sight. Thus, meaningful system differentiation, expanding delivery modes, diversified financing, vigorous quality regimes, sound institutional autonomy, and "robust" curricula help address the confounding predicaments.

Sustained macroeconomic growth, attractive investment opportunities, declining internecine conflicts, more accountable and transparent governments and institutions—attributed to ever-growing African self-confidence and its global image—and most importantly the favorable higher education perceptions increase optimism in the outlook for higher education development in the continent. ∎

Is the Decline of the Universities' Credibility Irreversible?

Ulrich Teichler

Ulrich Teichler is professor emeritus at the University of Kassel, Germany. E-mail: teichler@incher.uni-kassel.de.

As modern societies are moving toward knowledge societies, the hope is that universities will be the main benefactors of this trend. Some experts warned: universities will loose their monopolistic or oligopolistic role of knowledge production and utilization and keep only the single power of awarding degrees. In the mean time, even this power is

not certain anymore, because trust in the validity of their assessments is challenged.

In recent years, an inflation of assessments occurred in academia: indicators, evaluations, reviews, rankings, ratings, and tests, etc. The credibility of these assessments is on the decline, because universities yield to pressures of bad evaluations rather than counteract collectively.

For example, irresponsible producers of rankings succeed by and large in dictating erratic criteria of world class universities. Moreover, they reinforce the view that the future of higher education and research depends on its elite, whereas mass higher education is residual.

Similarly, universities yield to the notion that academics should strive for visibility in peer-reviewed journals thus indicating their productivity. Again, they accept by and large that erratic lists of top journals are manipulated. Thereby, they reinforce the view that quality according to the internal views of academia is important and relevance can be ignored in the knowledge society.

There is an additional problem of a structural nature: can universities preserve trust as regards the key element of student assessment—i.e., the granting of degrees? Actually, the courses of study become more flexible. Some students acquire relevant competences prior to enrollment and get credits for prior learning. Moving from one university to another during the course of study, a highly appreciated tradition in Germany, gets more popular in various countries. Internships—i.e., periods of learning and experience outside higher education—often become mandatory. Opportunities increase to take individual courses at other universities—e.g., through Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Study periods abroad gain popularity. In sum, the proportion of study time spent at the degree-granting institution declines. As a consequence, single universities might loose their credibility. Their capability might be questioned of assessing properly the competences acquired at different locations. Subsequently, a need might be felt for organizations in charge of consulting and assessing students, which are independent from universities.

Institutions of higher education face a decline of status on the way toward the knowledge society, not only as a consequence of their shrinking share in the overall knowledge production and dissemination, but also because trust declines that academics and higher educations institutions themselves assess the results of research, teaching, and learning properly. The multitude of evaluations, rankings, and indicators actually might be increasingly externally controlled, if the visible distortions cannot be counteracted by universities and academic profession. Moreover, the last resort of academic power—that of degree granting—might erode as well, if the changing context of teaching and learning does not lead to new ways of guidance and assessment ∎

Will the Ranking Game Continue After a Decade?

Akiyoshi Yonezawa

Akiyoshi Yonezawa is associate professor, Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University, Japan. E-mail: yonezawa@ gsid.nagoya-u.ac.jp.

Approximately 15 years ago, when international university rankings were still in their infancy, only a limited number of experts expected the wide and significant impact world university rankings would have on universities, governments, and the public. Currently, ranking status is considered mandatory information when seeking university partnerships and collaborations. Even if a country does not have universities with top rankings, governments frequently refer to ranking positions when they award national scholarships or recruit new staff members. Will the ranking game still continue after 10 years? Yes, but probably in a very different form.

The ongoing phenomenon of universities and individuals seeking world-class environments for learning and researching will continue. Therefore, the number of universities striving to establish world-class status will increase further. For example, in 2014, the Japanese government began a 10-year project to support "Top Global Universities," which aims to get 10 universities ranked within the top 100 in the world.

At the same time, the environments surrounding universities have changed dramatically since the introduction of the Internet. Almost all newly created knowledge now becomes immediately accessible from anywhere in the world. Language barriers still exist, but the automation of translation is nearly at the stage of practical use. Even analyses and writings, a core part of knowledge creation, are becoming automated. Audiovisual materials and cloud-based learning tools are already merging into daily teaching, learning, and researching. Detailed activities of researchers can be monitored with relation to what he or she publishes, what kind of literature is published, which citations are used, and the impact of specific work. This information is often reported to the authors and also to university managers.

The ranking methodologies have also changed frequently, which has occurred partly through the rapid increase in information concerning university activities and also through a significant increase in "rankers" with diversified backgrounds. The results of university rankings are also becoming diversified. For example, in 2014, only two Japanese universities were ranked in the top 100 *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings and Best Global Universities from *US News and World Report,* while three

ranked in the Academic Rankings of World Universities by Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and five ranked in the QS World-Class University Rankings. What do these rankings mean? The results of international university rankings vary according to selected indicators and weights. The U-Multi-rank does not provide comprehensive rankings, and some rankings now allow users to choose indicators and weights. It is becoming common for ranking providers to publish subject-based rankings and other rankings based on specific themes.

The golden age of university ranking providers has likely passed. Users, including universities and governments, now have more options for searching ranking results that fit their purposes. If it works for a better understanding of the rich context of universities, then it is good. However, further convergences or standardization of diversified university characteristics should be avoided through the efforts of various stakeholders. ∎

Revisiting the Academic Marketplace

MARIA YUDKEVICH

Maria Yudkevich is vice rector at the National Research University-Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation. E-mail: 2yudkevich@gmail.com.

For many decades, our image of the university was associated with the metaphor of the ivory tower. While this metaphor is deeply embedded in our minds, we do not challenge it. However, it is neither ivory nor tower anymore. Indeed, university identity and borders become more and more unclear and illusory. There are several reasons for that.

First, new teaching and learning technologies challenge the university monopoly on both fundamental and applied knowledge. The number of students that follow courses on major online educational platforms grow exponentially, and faculty in many universities have to think about adjusting their courses in a way that they are still attractive to students. While advantages of a strong university in the provision of teaching services are evident, massive middle-tier institutions must identify how to compete for the attention of prospective students—not only with other universities but also with online providers. With lower transaction costs of combining curriculum from different providers in different universities, will the best and most demanding students still enroll in one university or will they combine experiences from different universities?

Second, traditionally junior faculty hired to tenure-track positions had a good chance of obtaining tenure. Today, chances are substantially lower. The share of permanent positions is getting significantly smaller in many countries and the age of obtaining a first stable position is increasing.

The monopoly of universities in producing basic research is also challenged by nonuniversity research organizations and corporations. These organizations compete for the best scholars and offer them competitive conditions—in some cases, including long-term employment—both in terms of salaries and opportunities for research.

Finally, there is an increasing pressure of productivity performance criteria and the need for constant search of external funding opportunities. This pressure may negatively affect academic norms of excellence, which assume the intrinsic motivation for the search of new knowledge and push universities toward considering faculty more as employees with clear performance indicators than as a community of scholars.

Massification of higher education leads to a substantial growth in a number of universities and also contributes to their diversity. Will universities from different parts of the quality continuum still recognize each other as species of one type in 20 years? Will there be much in common between top-tier research universities and those elsewhere in the academic hierarchy? Are we about to have traditional research universities becoming rare exceptions among numerous institutions of "used-to-be-university organizations"?

Since universities have been among the most stable organizations across the centuries, we might expect they will exist into the future. However, the questions are what will be their borders, how will their organizational identity be defined, and will the best and brightest minds be willing to come to work there. ∎

The Global Knowledge Society: Conflict Between Instrumental and Principled Reason?

PAVEL ZGAGA

Pavel Zgaga is professor at the Center for Educational Policy Studies at the University of Ljubljana and former minister of education, Slovenia. E-mail: pavel.zgaga@guest.arnes.si.

Within a few decades after its creation, the concept of the knowledge society is no longer an exclusive concept of the social sciences; it became common in politics, the media, and everyday language. It has gained new meanings and interpretations, even opposing definitions and uses, thus raising a number of questions. For example, what consequences does it bring for traditional forms of knowledge, such as academic knowledge?

Academic knowledge, recognized and appreciated for centuries, has gotten a new accent that may be well illustrated in a frequent phrase: "This is only academic knowledge." The attribute "only" expresses certain reluctance. It suggests that in addition to the "traditional" academic knowledge there is yet another knowledge—"modern" knowledge of higher value. It is promoted as "useful," "effective," and "productive," as opposed to "useless," "abstract," and "theoretical," that is, "only academic" knowledge. Academics around the world, especially those who work in the humanities and social sciences, are more and more frequently placed in a position to prove the "significance," "relevance," and "usefulness" of their allegedly suspicious "traditional" research. Did knowledge, for the sake of knowledge, become an endangered species in the knowledge society?

The knowledge society appreciates "useful knowledge," which is characterized by a high degree of *reliability*. Today, this kind of knowledge drives the economy. In the knowledge society, risk has been transferred to the managers, while reliability and certainty are expected from "knowledge workers." Useful knowledge, produced by them, is based on a specific research endeavor that is restricted to *certainties* only. This knowledge is being produced on campuses worldwide but also elsewhere: the production of "useful knowledge" is increasingly expanding into nonuniversity institutes and commercial enterprises.

Throughout their history, universities have been a space that permitted and encouraged another kind of research endeavor, which cannot be restricted to certainties only. Universities promoted themselves as places of intellectual confrontation—with the unknown spaces. Research confrontation with these dark spaces is confrontation with *uncertainty, with the unknown*. This is what really attracts a true researcher. Unfortunately, knowledge that is the outcome of this kind of research endeavor is today easily considered "useless."

But principled and instrumental knowledge, if we use a different set of words, are not a necessarily mutually exclusive forms of knowledge. They are just two forms of knowledge: two out of several epistemologies. One of the challenges universities face today is the profane interpretations of the concept of the knowledge society, which generate conflicts and a hierarchical relationship between "useful" and "*only* academic" knowledge. From a higher education perspective, it is therefore necessary to retheorize and reconceptualize the idea of the knowledge society—including criticism of its normative and ideological dimensions. This issue has major implications for the purposes of higher education, as well as the mission of higher education institutions.

∎

The Carnegie Classification of American Higher Education: More—and Less—Than Meets the Eye

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. For many decades, our image of the university was associate.

The Lumina Foundation and Indiana University's Center for Postsecondary Education will be taking over the important Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Lumina announced that its Degree Qualifications Profile will inform the 2015 edition of the classification. This development is yet another step away from the original intent of the classification—to provide an objective and easy-to-understand categorization of American postsecondary institutions.

In recent years, the Carnegie Foundation made its categories more complex: in part to suit the foundation's specific policy orientations at the time, and in part to reflect the increased complexity of higher education institutions. As a result, the classification became less useful as an easy yet reasonably accurate and objective way to understand the shape of the system, and the roles of more than 4,500 individual postsecondary institutions. Among the great advantages of the original classification were its simplicity and its objectivity, and the fact that it did not rank institutions but rather put them into recognizable categories. Unlike the *U.S. News and World Report* and other rankings, the Carnegie Classification did not use reputational measures—asking academics and administrators to rank competing colleges and universities.

It is not clear how the classification's new sponsors will change its basic orientation, and its new director says that the 2015 version will not be fundamentally altered. Yet, giv-

en Lumina's strong emphasis on access, equity, and degree completion, as well as designing a new national credential framework—highly laudable goals of course—it is likely that the classification in the longer term will be shaped to be aligned with Lumina's policy agenda, as it was more subtly changed in its later Carnegie years.

The original Carnegie Classification contributed immensely to clarifying the role of postsecondary institutions and made it possible for policymakers as well as individuals in the United States and abroad to basically understand the American higher education landscape as a whole and see where each institution fit in it. The classification was also quite useful internationally—it provided a roadmap to America's many kinds of academic institutions. An overseas institution interested in working with a research university, a community college, or a drama school could easily locate a suitable partner. We are likely to lose this valuable resource.

A Historical Perspective

The classification dates back to 1973, when the legendary Clark Kerr, having devised the California Master Plan a decade earlier and leading the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, wanted to get a sense of America's diverse and at the time rapidly expanding higher education landscape. The original classification broadly resembled Kerr's vision of a differentiated higher education system, with different kinds of institutions serving varied goals, needs, and constituencies. It included only five categories of institutions—doctoral granting, comprehensive universities and colleges, liberal arts colleges, two-year colleges and institutes, and professional schools and other specialized institutions, along with several subcategories.

Because the classification was the first effort to categorize the system, it quickly became influential—policymakers valued an objective data-based categorization of institutions and the academic leaders found it useful to understand where their own institutions fit. The classification had the advantage of simplicity, and its sponsor was trusted as neutral. Although the classification was not a ranking—it listed institutions by category in alphabetical order, many came to see it in competitive terms. Some universities wanted to join the ranks of the subcategory of "research university–I," those institutions which had the largest research budgets and offered the most doctoral degrees—and were overjoyed when their school was listed in that category. Similarly, the most selective liberal arts colleges were in "liberal arts colleges–I," and many wanted to join that group. Over time, the classification became a kind of informal measure, if not of rank, at least of academic status.

Fiddling and Changing

The classification's categories and methodology remained quite stable over several decades of major transformation in American higher education. In 2005, with new leadership at the Carnegie Foundation, major changes were introduced. Foundation leaders argued that the realities of American higher education required rethinking the methodology. It is also likely that the foundation's focus changed and it wanted to shape the classification to serve its new orientation and support its policy foci. The foundation revised the basic classification, added new categories such as instructional programs, student enrollment profiles, and others. The classification became significantly more complex, and over time became less influential. People found that the new categories confused the basic purpose of the classification and introduced variable that did not seem entirely relevant. The basic simplicity was compromised. Indeed, people still refer to "Carnegie Research 1" (top research universities) even though the category has not existed in the Carnegie lexicon for two decades.

> **As a result, the classification became less useful as an easy yet reasonably accurate and objective way to understand the shape of the system, and the roles of more than 4,500 individual postsecondary institutions.**

There may well be more fiddling—the US federal government's desire to rank postsecondary institutions by cost and degree completion rates may add a new dimension to the enterprise. A further dilemma is the role of the for-profit higher education sector—these entities are fundamentally different in their orientations and management from traditional non-profit institutions—so also are the new on-line degree providers. Should these new additions to the higher education landscape be included in the classification? These elements will contribute to "classification creep"—a bad idea.

Another Turning Point

It is likely that the coming period will see the largest change in the classification's history—and if recent statements from the new sponsors are indicators for the future, it is likely to be transformed beyond recognition and essentially destroyed in terms of Clark Kerr's original vision of providing a simple and objective analytic classification of

American academic institutions. The past several decades have seen the classification shaped to meet the policy objectives of the sponsors—the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The new sponsor, the Lumina Foundation, will no doubt shape the classification to suit its needs and advance its agenda—and the result is unlikely to be relevant to the original purpose of the classification.

What Is Really Needed

It is surprising that, in the four decades since Clark Kerr conceptualized the Carnegie Classification, no one has stepped forward to provide a clear and reasonably objective and comprehensive guide to the more than 4,500 postsecondary institutions in the United States. Resurrecting the basic purpose and organization of Kerr's original Carnegie Classification is not rocket science, nor would it be extraordinarily expensive.

It is of course true that the postsecondary education has become more complex. How would one deal with the for-profit sector?—probably by adding a special category for them. Many community colleges now offer four-year bachelor's degrees, but their basic purpose and organization has not essentially changed. There are a larger number of specialized schools, and many colleges and universities have expanded and diversified their degree and other offerings. Technology has to some extent become part of teaching programs of some postsecondary institutions—and the massive open online course (MOOC) revolution continues to unfold. Research productivity has grown dramatically, and research is reported in more ways. Intellectual property of all kinds has become more central to the academic enterprise—at least in the research university sector.

Yet, the basic elements of the original classification—those that help to determine the main purposes and functions of postsecondary institutions—remain largely unchanged, if somewhat more complicated to describe. The key metrics are clear enough:
- Student enrollment
- Degrees awarded
- Types of degrees offered
- Number of faculty, full-time and part-time
- Income from research and intellectual property
- Research productivity
- Internationalization as measured by student mobility.

A few more might be added—but again, simplicity is the watchword.

The types of institutions—6 main and 8 major sub-categories—seem about right. These might be expanded somewhat to accommodate the growth in complexity and diversity of the system. Later iterations confusingly expanded the categories, in part to reflect the policy and philosophical orientations of the foundation. The basic purpose of the

classification will be best served by keeping the institutional typology as simple and straightforward as possible.

While it is clear that these metrics may not provide a sophisticated or complete measure of each institution—and they require additional definitions—they will provide basic information that will make reasonably categorization possible. They lack the philosophical and policy orientations that have crept into the Carnegie Classification in recent years, and return the enterprise to its original purpose—describing the richness, diversity, and complexity of the American higher education landscape.   ∎

MOOCs in the Developing World: Hope or Hype?

BEN WILDAVSKY

Ben Wildavsky is director of higher education studies at the Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, State University of New York, and policy professor at the State University of New York-Albany. This essay is adapted from an article in the May/June 2014 issue of International Educator. *E-mail: ben.wildavsky@suny.edu.*

The first university class to carry the unwieldy acronym of the massive open online course (MOOC) was created in 2008 at the University of Manitoba. But the much-touted MOOC revolution did not truly take off until several years later, with the emergence of the Big Three: for-profits Udacity and Coursera—educational organizations, and the nonprofit Harvard-Massachusetts Institute of Technology collaboration EdX—an online course. They remain the best-known players today, typically featuring free noncredit classes that offer some mixture of short video segments, quizzes, online discussion boards, and writing assignments graded by peers.

From the start, the global potential of MOOCs, particularly in the developing world, was a large part of what made them so captivating. When two renowned computer scientists at Stanford University took their Introduction to Artificial Intelligence class online and offered it free to students anywhere in the world, they quickly attracted 160,000 students from 190 countries. There were famously more students from Lithuania enrolled in the class than there are members of Stanford's entire student body.

Since then, other MOOCs have expanded on a massive scale. Coursera, the largest MOOC provider, has registered 10 million students in courses offered by more than 100 universities. Its business model remains unproven, but it

is a sufficiently attractive prospect to have received $85 million in venture funding. Along with growth has come ever-greater ambition. Coursera proclaims a vision of the future in which "everyone has access to a world-class education that has so far been available to a select few."

THE SKEPTICS

However, if the advent of MOOCs was accompanied by enormous enthusiasm about their potential to democratize access to high-quality education in poor countries, it was not long before MOOC hype gave way to MOOC hate, or at least intense skepticism. Critics argue that MOOC boosters have made vastly overblown claims about who really benefits from free, large-scale online classes. Moreover, they see MOOCs as poorly tailored to non-Western cultures and even as instruments of neocolonialism.

From the start, the global potential of MOOCs, particularly in the developing world, was a large part of what made them so captivating.

Are MOOCs really a boon to the developing world, or have they been oversold? The critics cite much evidence to bolster their cause. For one thing, most MOOC students already have degrees and live in developed countries. When the University of Pennsylvania surveyed the more than 400,000 active users of its Coursera classes, it found that two-thirds came from the United States and other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development nations. These 34 industrialized countries account for a modest 18 percent of the world's population.

However, MOOCs do not appear to be reaching students with little postsecondary education. The same survey found that 83 percent of students taking Penn's Coursera classes already have two- or four-year degrees (and that about two-thirds of those in developing countries are male).

Moreover, MOOCs have notoriously high dropout rates. Just 5 percent of those enrolled in 17 EdX classes in 2012 and 2013 earned certificates of completion.

Last, detractors maintain the democratization of education promised by MOOC boosters falls short because it is based on the flawed assumption that the rest of the world will benefit from what MOOCs are selling. Critics call MOOCs elitist instruments of Western academic dominance that are not appropriately tailored to non-Western

cultures and risk undermining local institutions and academic traditions.

MORE GOOD THAN HARM

It is surely no surprise that the MOOC craze that peaked in 2012 has given way to so much skepticism. Some of the warnings critics offer deserve serious scrutiny. But MOOCs will likely do more good than harm in the developing world, particularly if they are not viewed as static but as evolving forms of technology-enabled pedagogy.

MOOC myth-busters are correct to note that non-Westerners with little education from low-income countries make up a distinct minority of MOOC students, and that completion rates are low. But these observations can themselves be misleading. MOOC enrollments are so large that even, say, a 90 percent noncompletion rate can still result in an eye-catching 10,000-plus students with certificates of completion. Also, many students counted as "dropouts" may have sampled course offerings without ever intending to complete.

Students' educational backgrounds, too, are not as universally privileged as first appearances might suggest. While two-thirds of EdX course registrants in 2012 and 2013 reported having post-high school education, that still leaves 223,000 with a high school education or less.

Moreover, it should be no surprise that wealthier, better-educated people have dominated the first waves of MOOC enrollment. After all, the personal computer and Internet revolutions started with elites before gradually transforming broad swaths of society.

What about of alleged Western neocolonialism in MOOCs' academic content, institutional affiliation, and pedagogy? Perhaps the first response to such ideologically freighted criticism is that no one is being forced to sign up for MOOCs. Just as Western universities are enormous magnets for students from developing countries who have the means and motivation to attend them in person, online courses from the likes of Stanford University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology hold significant appeal.

WORKS IN PROGRESS

It is fine, to ask whether MOOCs can be effective pedagogically in a range of cultural contexts. Yet, the most useful way to think about MOOCs in the developing world is to view them as works in progress. In short, we are in a period of experimentation on a massive scale.

As in the United States, some MOOCs could end up leading to short-term, practical certificates rather than full-blown degrees. Some will end up appealing to learners who are primarily "browsers," akin to library users. For more engaged students, there is growing attention to blended models that make the best use of high-quality course con-

tent, while giving students face-to-face instruction tailored to their own strengths and weaknesses.

In Africa, for example, where 93 percent of the college-aged population is not in college, a range of MOOCs and MOOC-like ventures is serving students with blended-learning classes. Finding the most appropriate technology is a challenge. Broadband Internet connections are often hard to access, making mobile phones the best way to reach some students. Development expert Guy Pfefferman notes that 25 million Africans had mobile phones in 2001—a number that jumped to 280 million by 2013. In countries such as Ghana, Cameroon, Nigeria, and Tanzania, 80 percent or more of the population now owns mobile phones.

Against this backdrop, EdX has announced a partnership with Facebook to create a project called SocialEDU. The idea of the pilot program, which will start in Rwanda, is to go beyond today's MOOC technology to build a platform that capitalizes on readily available and inexpensive mobile devices. Content, provided by EdX, will be free. Facebook will handle the app and create the kind of mobile learning environment that many believe will be crucial to taking free, high-quality course offerings to scale in the developing world.

The combination of expanding educational aspirations, greatly improved technology, and more creative pedagogy will inevitably lead to more global experimentation with MOOCs, naysayers notwithstanding. MOOCs will surely need to evolve to serve students more effectively. But, the standard for new forms of higher education should not be whether they are perfect. It should be how they compare to the highly imperfect alternatives faced by many students, particularly in the world's poorest countries. ∎

Improving Engineering Education in Sub-Saharan Africa

Goolam Mohamedbhai

Goolam Mohamedbhai is former Secretary General of the Association of African Universities. E-mail: g_t_mobhai@yahoo.co.uk. This article draws from a report commissioned by the World Bank: "Improving the Quality of Engineering Education in Sub-Saharan Africa," by Goolam Mohamedbhai. A longer version will appear in the International Journal of African Higher Education.

Sub-Saharan Africa has been experiencing robust economic growth in recent years, attracting significant foreign investment. However, the foreign investment projects are handicapped by an acute shortage of domestic skilled labor, making it necessary to import foreign skills. For Africa to sustain its unprecedented economic growth and become competitive, the development of its human capital is paramount, especially in the areas of engineering and technology.

There is, in particular, an urgent need of engineering capacity in Africa for several reasons: For its infrastructural development to accompany its growth trajectory; for accelerating its industrial development, especially in manufacturing, so that it becomes a net exporter rather than importer of manufactured goods; for producing its ever-increasing needs in terms of energy to overcome the acute power shortages it experiences regularly; for empowering it to take control of the mining of its rich natural resources; and finally, for achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

CURRENT STATE OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION

Several reports have been recently published on the provision of engineering education and training in African countries. In 2012, the Royal Academy of Engineering published a comprehensive report on identifying engineering capacity needs in sub-Saharan Africa, based on an electronic survey of 113 professional engineers and 29 decision makers from 18 African countries, as well as interviews with 15 engineering project leaders in various African countries. In 2005, the African Technology Policy Studies Network published a report on the capacity of engineering education in Nigeria, Ghana, and Zimbabwe—using data obtained from questionnaires and interviews with a wide range of stakeholders. Also, in 2010, UNESCO published a landmark report on engineering, with contributions from 120 experts around the world and with a special emphasis on the role of engineering in international development.

These studies reveal two key findings. First, there is a severe lack of engineering capacity in Africa, which has to rely heavily on imported expertise. This lack of capacity results from several sources: insufficient output from the training institutions to meet the countries' requirements; poor quality and lack of practical experience and skills of the graduates produced, which often make them unemployable; local presence of foreign engineering firms who prefer to import their own skilled labor; and the reluctance of the graduates to take up poorly paid positions in rural areas.

Second, there is an acute shortage of engineering technicians. Generally, for the effective operation of the engineering industry, the ratio professional engineers: technicians should be of the order of 1:5 or 1:6, indicating the need for a far greater number of technicians than engineers. In Africa, however, this ratio is more of the order of 1:1 or 1:1.5. This could imply that a number of qualified engineers are underemployed and are working as techni-

cians. There is even a risk that the ratio will worsen, as the majority of countries are upgrading their polytechnics and technical colleges to university status for offering degrees, without providing a replacement. While Africa unquestionably needs an increased pool of excellent professional engineers, it equally needs an even greater number of practically trained, versatile technicians do not only support the professional engineers but equally service and initiate small- and medium-scale industries in order to create employment, improve the quality of life, and make fuller use of local resources.

Publicly funded African tertiary education institutions have for several decades suffered from the lack of investment, and this has led to a deterioration of their infrastructure.

Improving Engineering Education

The reports identify a number of steps to be taken for improving engineering education and training. There is, first of all, an urgent need to upgrade the infrastructure and laboratories of the existing institutions. Publicly funded African tertiary education institutions have for several decades suffered from the lack of investment, and this has led to a deterioration of their infrastructure.

The curricula of engineering courses also need to be revised. Most of them have been copied from universities in Europe or the United States, have not been updated, and are not necessarily relevant to African situations.

The teaching methodology needs to be improved. Because of large student numbers, the subjects are mostly taught by the magisterial mode with hardly any opportunity for the students to discuss and interact with the lecturer or among themselves. It has been suggested that the Problem-Based Learning approach in engineering education could result in noticeable improvement in the students' ability to solving problems and, in addition, help them to acquire certain "soft" skills such as good communication, team spirit, creativity and adaptability, and key requirements for graduate employability.

Closely linked to improving teaching methodology is the need for pedagogical training of engineering lecturers. Many of them, although they may have a doctorate degree in their field, are ill-equipped to help students to learn using appropriate pedagogical techniques. Many African universities are now insisting that all their lecturers should have a PhD. This may not necessarily be the right approach for all engineering lecturers and, in any case, may not be feasible. For many of them, having a good master's degree in the appropriate field, acquiring some industrial experience and undergoing pedagogical training would better equip them for their teaching. Pedagogical training of academic staff in African universities is not widespread, although some institutions have made attempts to introduce it.

Finally, all the studies highlight the importance of strong university-industry linkages. These linkages can take different forms: involving industry in advising on curricula reform; inviting representatives from industry to serve on the Faculty of Engineering board or even on the higher administrative bodies of the institution; and using professionals from business and industry as adjunct professors. Perhaps the most important role of industry is to provide practical training to the students at two different stages: during the course in the form of industrial attachments, which exposes the students to the world of work and subsequently facilitates their employment; and on completion of the course, to meet the necessary professional registration requirements. Several universities in Africa have unfortunately abandoned the in-course industrial attachments, because of the difficulty in placing the ever-increasing number of students—leaving the students to acquire training on employment after graduation.

Potential for Industrial Development

Africa stands at a crossroads in its development trajectory. It is widely acknowledged that its youthful population and abundant natural resources are key aspects that need to be fully exploited. Education and training, especially in engineering and technology, are necessary tools for the continent to unlock its potential.

Engineering is probably an area requiring most attention, as it provides highly skilled personnel for industrial development. It, however, faces a number of challenges, which need to be addressed jointly and urgently by African governments, engineering education institutions and representatives of industry and the private sector.

In parallel to improving the quality of engineering education and training, there is a need to create a dynamic industrial environment in African countries. Only then can engineering thrive and achieve its full potential. Several foreign countries, which have significant industrial and manufacturing investments or are involved in major infrastructural development in Africa, can be enormously helpful by providing professional training to African engineering students and by employing local engineering graduates whenever possible; in short by empowering African engi-

neers and effecting technology transfer, vital for Africa's economic and industrial development.

To some extent, this is a "chicken-and-egg" situation, as industrial development can only take place when there is a pool of trained technical manpower, and the training of technical personnel is dependent of industry's absorptive capacity. A national assessment of both engineering capacity and needs in African countries can be of great help toward this end.

Is There a Chinese Model of a University?

Qiang Zha, Jinghuan Shi, and Xiaoyang Wang

Qiang Zha is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca. Jinghuan Shi is a professor and executive dean of Institute of Education, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. E-mail: shijhuan@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn. Xiaoyang Wang is an associate professor and director of Higher Education Research Institute, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. E-mail: wangxy@tsinghua.edu.cn. This article is an abridged version of a chapter to be published in Handbook of the Sociology of Higher Education, *Routledge.*

In the past decade and a half, Chinese higher education struck the world with its amazing pace of expansion. The aggregate enrollment grew at an annual rate of 17 percent between 1998 and 2010. In the meantime, the Chinese government has been investing hugely in elite university schemes, in order to raise some universities and programs to a world-class level. This move has triggered a worldwide competition, in efforts to create world-class universities. China's current triumph in higher education expansion has aroused some discussions and debates, over whether or not there might be an emerging Chinese model of the university. This essay provides an overview of the inquiries into this theme.

Two Major Approaches to Discerning the Chinese Model

Two major approaches underlie the exploration of the Chinese model: the historical-cultural approach and the sociopolitical approach. The former embeds this discourse in the Confucian knowledge tradition. In the methodological sense, a knowledge tradition embodies the enduring modes of thinking or the salient features of cultural self-understanding, which would inevitably function to shape the particular contour of development in any given society. So, it is with the Confucian scholarly tradition with respect to Chinese universities. Though the university as an organizational form has been imported to Chinese soil only for a century or so; yet, as an organization of learning, it is naturally connected to the ethos of Confucian scholarship, which dominated Chinese education for over 2,000 years. Along the tradition line, the notion of liberal education now appears to be an optimal antidote to decadence in Chinese universities. Liberal education could be connected to the Confucian knowledge tradition that places emphasis on humanistic education, and thus implies learning from the past, rather than borrowing from the West. A Chinese name is often given to such practices, *tong shi* education, in order to differentiate it from the Western concept. Historically, China enjoyed profounder humanistic education, than Renaissance humanism in Europe. Hence, the past decade witnessed that Chinese universities had been increasingly encouraged to adopt the idea of liberal education and reorganize and broaden their curricula. Notably, many liberal education units in Chinese universities name themselves *shuyuan* (private academies of classical learning that flourished in the Tang and Song dynasties), in a deliberate effort at linking themselves to the Confucian tradition.

The historical-cultural approach draws heavily on the conception of the ideal type. The ideal type is often a useful tool to analyze historically unique configurations, by means of generic concepts. Nonetheless, it is argued that the current Chinese university may hardly be able to claim an ideal type formed from characteristics of and elements in the Confucian tradition—after a century of experimenting with various Western and Soviet patterns and absorbing their influences. The *shuyuan*, even if recovered, has lost its cultural milieu in contemporary Chinese society. So, not surprisingly, research has indicated the impact of *tong shi* education in a current context as superficial, based on its utilitarian approaches associated with political agenda of creating "world-class" universities or marketing the goal of particular branding campaigns. As such, *tong shi* education has become more a matter of rhetoric than reality and failed to bring about significant transformation in the students' learning experiences.

The contemporary sociopolitical approach holds that the Chinese model for sociopolitical development (or the "Beijing Consensus"), which constitutes the normative environment in which Chinese universities operate, denotes a central role of the state and places emphasis on efficiency for the sake of accelerating economic growth. This model certainly finds its expression in Chinese universities. It carries advantages with respect to effective mobilization of resources and the capacity to expand and upgrade infrastructure dramatically in a short timeline. Consequently, the

Chinese system stands out in the sense of simultaneously pushing for rapid enrollment growth, constituting new governance structures, and seeking to build world-class universities. These features concerning Chinese universities all mirror the strong state initiatives and momentum. During the peak years of expansion, China's fiscal appropriations for higher education increased annually at 17.4 percent between 1998 and 2006. In 2012, China's top 50 research-intensive universities averaged their nominal research revenue at approximately US$200 million, a figure far exceeding the singular highest in 2000—Tsinghua University's roughly US$70 million that year. As a result, Chinese

---

Two major approaches underlie the exploration of the Chinese model: the historical-cultural approach and the sociopolitical approach.

---

universities now confer nearly a quarter (24%) of world's science and engineering degrees, which are perceived to be of greatest importance to a knowledge-based economy. Between 2001 and 2011, China's share of refereed science and engineering journal articles almost quadrupled, from 3 percent to 11 percent of the world total. This renders China now as the second-largest science and engineering article producer country (only behind the United States), and China's share of the top 1 percent articles enjoyed a six-fold increase over this period. These figures suggest China's great leap in higher education development, both in terms of quantity and quality, owes much to generous support from the state.

The contemporary sociopolitical approach adopts the open-system theory. The open-system theorists hold that higher education is a system essentially located within a suprasystem—consisting of the social, political, and economic environment. This system is open always with interaction of the environment—through which universities come to accept certain values and adapt to structures and processes judged to be important by the environment. However, the practice-based reasoning behind the "Beijing Consensus," which stresses and pursues tangible interests, has caused pragmatism and utilitarianism to prevail in Chinese society and academia. Furthermore, the integral gradualism (exemplified best in the phrase "crossing the river by groping for stepping stones") has arguably held back critical efforts at institutionalizing a regulatory environment. Consequently, there appears to be a paradox: on one hand, in recent years Chinese universities have been accorded an increas-

ing degree of decision-making power over their own affairs (in exchange for their performance and accountability); on the other hand, the Chinese government may tighten its control over the universities, whenever it feels necessary.

Methodological limitations of these two approaches
Notwithstanding the merit of the historical-cultural approach, it has the flaw of lacking a sound contextualization of the discourse of the Chinese model with coherence and interconnections among traditional and contemporary elements, albeit that this approach should indeed be context bound. More precisely, it suffers from the discontinuity of the Chinese cultural tradition in the current "disrupted society." The current context for the Chinese university is much different from the traditional one, in which the historical culturalists stage this discourse, and a pure traditional context can hardly be restored. Such a fundamental change should affect the validity of the tradition determinism that underpins the historical-cultural discourse.

The contemporary sociopolitical approach enjoys the merit of situating the Chinese model discourse in current and real-life conditions, which in turn provides a useful means to include a wide array of social, political, and economic factors into the analysis. Put explicitly, it literally identifies the Chinese experience as unparalleled, peculiar only to the Chinese milieu, while not duplicable elsewhere. If that is the case, the Chinese experience can hardly claim the status of a Chinese model, as a model needs to provide for others inspirations and an impetus toward progress.

Conclusion
Both the approaches described above place the emphasis on a kind of Chinese exceptionalism, either reflecting the traditional cultural context or the current sociopolitical patterns. This in turn has caused a standstill in the scholarly inquiry into the phenomenon in question, resulting from such perceived dichotomies: the Confucian tradition vs. modern axiology, the Chinese characteristics vs. the world culture. We believe that to set the Confucian tradition, as opposed to contemporary values, may lose sight of the enduring modes of tradition and the salient features of cultural communications. As a matter of fact, contemporary Confucian discourse itself is now constituted globally as an integral part of the ideology of globalization. The close articulation, observed in China, between operation of the university and political agenda of the state can also be linked to one principal philosophy that legitimate the university in the West: the political philosophy of higher education, which justifies the university due to its far-reaching significance for the body politic. We thus suggest situating this discourse in a broader context of globalization, which opens the door for observing and investigating the (evolution of)

interactions between the Chinese elements and those in the Western systems of higher education ever since the 19th century or an even earlier point. From there, we argue that a possible Chinese model of the university should arise from a creative and organic engrafting of elements in the Confucian tradition and the Western patterns, as well as in different cultures. Put in another way, the emerging Chinese model of the university is by no means peculiar to the Chinese context, but resembles certain characteristics of other systems or models. This approach might shed light on the notion that it is the combination of different characteristics (Confucian and Western) that makes the Chinese model unique. Nevertheless, it remains a question if the Chinese model is a variant of the global model of the university or an alternative.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

Center director Philip G. Altbach spoke at two conferences in Tokyo, Japan, in February—one on liberal arts and the other concerned with internationalization. His visit was sponsored by Toyo University. He continues to serve on the Russian 5–100 Committee and will be participating in a session in Tomsk, Russia, in March. Philip G. Altbach, along with Kara Godwin, CIHE visiting scholar, will participate in a conference on liberal arts in Shanghai, China, in May. Altbach's edited book, *Liderazgo para Universidades de Clase Mundial*, has been published in Spanish by the Universidad de Palermo in Argentina.

Philip G. Altbach has been given the 2014 Lifetime Contribution Award in Comparative, International, and Development Education by the Institute of International Studies in Education at the University of Pittsburgh. Altbach is speaking at a workshop for all of the rectors of universities in Saudi Arabia, in April, and continues to serve on the planning committee of the International Conference on Higher Education for the Saudi Ministry of Higher Education. He will participate in an international conference on the liberal arts in Shanghai, China, sponsored by the Harvard China Fund and the Amsterdam University College.

Academic Inbreeding and Mobility in Higher Education: Global Perspectives, coedited by Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley, has been published by Palgrave Macmillan. Even more recently, *Young Faculty in the 21st Century: International Perspectives*, coedited by Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley, has been published by the State University of New York Press. These books are the product of the Center's continuing collaboration with the Laboratory for Institutional Analysis at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. This collaboration is also enabling the elaboration of another project currently underway, which focuses on rankings and their impact on specific universities in 11 countries. This project will result in a book, as well.

In April 2015, the Center will copublish, with the American Council on Education's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, a new number in the "International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders" series. Number 5 in this series will focus on the subject of international joint- and dual-degree programs. An American Council on Education-sponsored webinar, also in April, will complement this publication.

The Center is pleased to announce that its extensive 2014 publication, *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, and Journals* (3rd edition), will be freely available for download from the CIHE Web site, as of April 2015. The Center is currently conducting a small follow-up survey from that inventory work, this time focusing explicitly on the profiles and activities of those research centers around the world that are in some way undertaking research specifically in the field of "international higher education." This work is being undertaken by Center associate director Laura E. Rumbley and doctoral research assistants Ariane de Gayardon and Georgiana Mihut.

In early March, Laura E. Rumbley delivered a keynote address at the Norwegian Conference on Internationalisation 2015, organized by the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Education (SIU) and held in Tromsø, Norway.

Philip G. Altbach and Laura E. Rumbley will both be participating in several NAFSA: Association of International Educators annual conference sessions in Boston in May. The Center will also host an invitation-only event at Boston College on May 28, 2015, to mark the 20th anniversary of the Center's establishment.

We warmly welcome newly arrived visiting scholars Julie Mathews-Aydinli (Bilkent University, Turkey) and Zhao Liu (Peking University, China).

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Araya, Daniel, and Peter Marber, eds. *Higher Education in the Global Age: Policy, Practice in Emerging Societies*. New York: Routledge, 2014. 351 pp. (hb). ISBN: 978-0-415-871768-4. Web site: www.routledge.com.

The focus of this volume is on emerging societies—countries that have developing academic systems even though, such as the Gulf nations, they maybe wealthy. Seventeen essays on such themes are as emerging higher education in East Asia, the global influence of Europe's Bologna initiatives, regional networks in Russia and Eurasia, for-profit universities in Mexico, the role of rankings, and others.

Fisher, Donald, Kjell Rubenson, Theresa Shanahan, and Claude Trottier, eds. *The Development of Postsecondary Education Systems in Canada: A Comparison Between British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec, 1980–2010*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 2014. 450 pp. Can$39.95. (pb). ISBN 978-0-7735-4308-9. Web site: www.mqup.ca.

Canada's higher education system is based on its provinces. This book compares the systems of the three-largest provinces, British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec, and analyzes the differences among them. The results are especially interesting, since they show quite different orientations to higher education within a single country. The book will be especially interesting for analysis of other countries based on a federal system.

Geiger, Roger L. *The History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II*. Princeton. NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014. 584 pp. $35 (hb). ISBN 978-0-691149394. Web site: www.press.princeton.edu.

Roger L. Geiger is, without doubt, the most distinguished scholar writing on the history of American higher education today. This comprehensive volume covers the entire scope of the development of higher education until World War II. The book follows the saga of higher education from the colonial colleges, through the development of universities in the latter 19th century to the emergence of mass higher education in the 20th century.

Higgins, John. *Academic Freedom in a Democratic South Africa: Essays and Interviews on Higher Education and the Humanities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2014. 272 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-61148-598-1. Web site: www.rowman.com.

A series of loosely connected essays include several chapters concerning academic freedom in South Africa, several essays on the humanities, and interviews with three prominent intellectuals.

Jiang, You Guo. *Liberal Arts Education in a Changing Society: A New Perspective on Chinese Higher Education*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014. 301 pp. $149 (hb). ISBN 978-90-04-28230-8.

Liberal arts and general education are seeing a modest growth in China, as educators seek to increase the independent thinking and broad perspective of students to suit them for the global knowledge economy. This book examines the history and development of liberal arts education in China and provides several case studies to examine how it is developing.

Kelly, Andrew P., and Sara Goldrick-Rab, eds. *Reinventing Financial Aid: Charting a New Course to College Affordability*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2014. 278 pp. $29.95 (pb). ISBN: 978-1-61250-714-9. Web site: www.harvardeducationpress.org.

The issues of financial aid, student loans, and related fiscal issues are central to current US higher education debate. These issues are related to broad themes of access to higher education, particularly for lower-income students. This volume focuses on the complex financial aid system in the United States, issues of loan repayment and institutional assistance to students, and related topics.

Kennedy, Michael. D. *Globalizing Knowledge: Intellectuals, Universities, and Publics in Transformation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015. 406 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-8047-9343-8. Web site: www.sup.org.

This wide-ranging volume focuses on the intersection between knowledge, social movements, universities, and societal forces. Case studies from a range of recent social movements, such as the "Occupy" movements in many countries, are used to illustrate these relationships. Additional discussion of how knowledge is globally communicated and used is also provided.

New Books from CIHE

In cooperation with the American Council on Education (ACE), *Global Opportunities and Challenges for Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes,* has recently been released. This volume is part of CIHE's ongoing collaboration with ACE on a series of essays and webinars concerning key higher education themes. Further information concerning this book can be obtained from Sense Publishers (www.sensepublishers.com).

We have also just published (with Lemmens Media) *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers,* *Academic Programs, and Journals and Publications (3rd Edition)*. Two versions of the book are available—full-length (358 pages) and abridged (80 pages). The full-length e-book is available for purchase (€12) from Amazon.com. A full-length version of the book is also available in PDF format (€18) directly from Lemmens (info@lemmens.de). Finally, the abridged version of the book may be purchased as a hard copy, plus a free PDF (€28); again, see info@lemmens.de.

CRITICAL INTERNATIONAL NEWS AT A GLANCE ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER

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

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

Unlike most Facebook and Twitter sites, our pages are not about us, but rather "newsfeeds" updated daily with notices most relevant to international educators and practitioners, policymakers, and decision makers. Think "news marquis" in Times Square in New York City. Here, at a glance, you can take in the information and perspective you need in a few minutes every morning.

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

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

IMPROVEMENTS FOR *INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION*

This issue of *International Higher Education* marks a significant change in our publication arrangements. We have joined the "Open Journal System," a publication network of the Boston College library. This new arrangement provides easier access to, and searchability of, *IHE* and more effective archiving of our issues. It also provides significantly improved visibility on Internet-search engines. While there may be an adjustment period for some of our readers, this new system greatly improves our reach.

We invite you to explore our new *IHE* homepage (http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe), which currently features this issue of *IHE*, as well as the previous six issues. All back issues of *IHE* will eventually migrate to the new site, and we will inform subscribers of this development at the appropriate time. For now, all back issues of *IHE* can be found in their more familiar location on the CIHE Web site: http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/research/cihe/ihe/issues.html.

A NEW INITIATIVE: HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION THEME ISSUE

Beginning at the end of 2014, *IHE* will add a fifth issue each year, specifically focusing on internationalization issues. This issue will be edited by Hans de Wit, director of the Center for Higher Education Internationalization at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. This issue will bring *IHE*'s analytic perspective to the broad issues of internationalization. For further information, please contact Hans de Wit. His e-mail address is: j.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl.

ALTBACH FESTSCHRIFT PUBLISHED

The Forefront of International Higher Education: A Festschrift in Honor of Philip G. Altbach, edited by Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett, has been published by Springer Publishers—Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 333 pp. $129 (hb). Web site: www.springer.com. This volume, which was prepared to coincide with a conference to honor Philip G. Altbach on April 5, 2013 at Boston College, features chapters focusing on themes relating to research undertaken by Philip G. Altbach. The authors are either students who worked with Professor Altbach or colleagues involved with the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Colleagues include Ulrich Teichler, Jane Knight, Martin J. Finkelstein, Hans de Wit, Simon Schwartzman,

Jorge Balán, D. Bruce Johnstone, Judith S. Eaton, Akiyoshi Yonezawa, N. Jayaram, Heather Eggins, Frans van Vught, Nian Cai Liu, Jamil Salmi, and others. Former and current students include Patti McGill Peterson, David A. Stanfield, James J.F. Forest, Robin Matross Helms, Sheila Slaughter, Liz Reisberg, Laura E. Rumbley, and the two coeditors of the book: Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett.

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

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

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.