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

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

Internationalization and Global Tension: Lessons from History

Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Hans de Wit is incoming director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. He continues as director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalization at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. E-mail: J.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl.

At the start of the year 2015, after a year of increased political and military tension growing in several parts of the world, including Europe, as well as the fundamentalist attacks in Paris, it is relevant to look at its implications for higher education. The current global climate will inevitably affect international higher education. Increased nationalist, religious, and ideological conflicts challenge the original ideas of international cooperation and exchange in higher education as promoters of peace and mutual understanding and of global engagement. Since the end of the Cold War, we have not been used to this type of tension and turmoil on a global scale. What lessons can we learn from the past in how to act and react in this new environment?

The War to End All Wars

In medieval times one could speak of a kind of European higher education space, similar to the current one, with mobile scholars and students and a common language—Latin. Universities in the 18th and 19th centuries for the most part became less international as they adopted national languages, sometimes even prohibited study abroad, and focused on national priorities. One can speak of a nationalization and de-Europeanization of higher education in that period.

The end of World War I brought a burst of internationalism. It is worth looking at the internationalization of the past century, because it helped to shape contemporary realities. In the wake of the trauma of World War I, there was a strong belief that the academic community could help build international solidarity and contribute to peace building. A century after the start of the Great War, it is particularly relevant to note the role and ultimate failure of academe in these idealistic efforts.

Europe emerged from World War I, deeply traumatized. Intellectuals and academics on all sides wanted to build solidarity among the European nations as a contribution to peace. Most were horrified that the academic communities on all sides had been so easily drawn into fervent nationalism at the beginning of the conflict, easily giving up the veneer of Enlightenment ideals.

The creation of organizations—such as the Institute of International Education (IIE) in the United States in 1919, the German Academic Exchange Service (*Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst* or DAAD) in Germany in 1925, and the British Council in the United Kingdom in 1934—are examples of political initiatives to stimulate peace and mutual understanding under the umbrella of the League of Nations. These efforts ultimately failed to stem the rise of fascism and Nazism in Europe or Japanese militarism in the Far East. Again, the goals of peace and cooperation were trumped by negative political forces. The most dramatic failure was in Nazi Germany, where the universities participated in Nazi ultranationalism.

A Truly Global Conflagration and Its Aftermath

Those who lived through World War I could not imagine a similar conflagration—but just 21 years later, World War II broke out. When the war came to an end in 1945, a wave of idealism again arose, this time accompanied by the establishment of the United Nations, signaling a commitment to both global security and development. The dissolution of colonial empires also created new realities for higher education in the emerging Third World. Again, higher education cooperation was identified as a means of fostering the development of mutual understanding, and modest exchange programs were established or strengthened, the Fulbright Program being the most dramatic example.

> **Since the end of the Cold War, we have not been used to this type of tension and turmoil on a global scale.**

In Europe, mobility of students and staff from the former colonial empires to western Europe were the main focus of international higher education activities, but they were rather fragmented and limited. At the national level, at least in Europe and North America, international cooperation and exchange were included as minor activities in bilateral agreements between nations and in development cooperation programs, driven by political rationales. Academic institutions were, in general, passive partners in these programs.

The Cold War and the Politicization of Internationalization

Higher education, as well as cultural and intellectual life generally, became pawns as well as important fronts in the ideological struggles of the period. The era of "good feeling" lasted just a few years, as the struggle between the Soviet Bloc and the West started to develop as early as 1946—lasting until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989. Ideology and power politics were very much part of the Cold War, with the struggle between communism and capitalism, as well as the political contest between the great powers at the center.

Influenced by the Cold War, ideology more than idealism set the agenda in international education, especially between the United States and the Soviet Union. Europe was not much affected since the Third World was the battlefield of international educational cooperation—and struggle: continuing dominance of Western models and systems of higher education, the influence of the English language, the impact of foreign training, the dominance of Western scientific products, ideas, and structures. In other words, neocolonial and Western higher education hegemony were linked to much of international higher education relations during this period. The Soviet Union, for its part, was similarly engaged in expanding its influence. In Europe, the Iron Curtain that divided eastern and central Europe from the west prevented all but the most rudimentary higher education cooperation.

Will we see again a de-Europeanization and nationalization of higher education in Europe emerging.

Only in the 1970s, when western Europe had sufficiently recovered from the impact of World War II and initiated its integration process, did a new type of academic cooperation and exchange emerge that was more focused on strengthening European cooperation and exchange within the countries of the emerging European Union. A modest warming in east-west relations opened doors for academic cooperation to some extent.

Western academic foreign policy, as in the case of the Soviet Union, was also directly linked to Cold War priorities. The former colonial powers—the United Kingdom, France, and to some extent the Netherlands—sought to maintain their influence in their former colonies through an array of scholarship programs, university collaborations, and other schemes. These initiatives also competed directly with the Soviet Union.

The United States, as the counterweight to the Soviet Union in the Cold War, developed active and far-reaching higher education "soft power" initiatives, such as the Fulbright Program, established in 1946, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (a direct reaction to the launch the year before of Sputnik I by the Soviet Union), and Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1960 intended to stimulate the development of area studies and foreign language centers as well as programs for international studies and international affairs. Many academic partnership programs, funded through the US Agency for International Development and other organizations, linked American universities with those in many developing countries. These initiatives have to be seen in the context of attempts by the United States to become the leader of the noncommunist world in its Cold War with the Soviet Union.

After the Cold War: Increased International Cooperation and Exchange

In the 1980s, the first signs of increased academic cooperation between central and eastern Europe and western Europe as well as with the United States became manifest. Still, academic cooperation was mainly a political issue and little institutional and personal autonomy was possible. Only after the fall of the Iron Curtain at the end of the 1980s, did international cooperation in higher education increase rapidly. Both the European Commission and national governments developed programs to enhance the quality of the sector and stimulate cooperation and exchange. The Transnational European Mobility Program for University Studies scheme (TEMPUS) of the European Community, established in 1990 for Hungary and Poland, extended to the other central and eastern European countries over the years. An important example of a national initiative is CEEPUS, a program of the Austrian government. These initiatives formed the basis, not only for the inclusion of these countries in the regular European programs like the Framework Programs for Research and Development and ERASMUS, but also can be seen as a testing ground for the integration of these countries in the European Union. Without question, the impressive array of European Union-sponsored exchange, research, and collaboration programs, both for the "core" EU community and a wider European audience, were related to the broader political and economic goals of the European Union.

The Combination of Politics and International Higher Education

Will we see again a de-Europeanization and nationalization of higher education in Europe emerging, in the light of greater criticism of European integration, the growth of

nationalist populist movements, and tensions between Russia and western Europe and the United States?

In the 20th century, politics and global ideological struggles dominated the international agenda worldwide. Academic cooperation and exchange have been in many cases, including during the Cold War, the main relations between nations: they continued to take place and even were stimulated so as to pave the way for further contacts. We have to learn from these lessons. International higher education is substantially different from earlier historical periods, as well as from the Cold War. Its scope is also different, with increasing political and academic power influences from other regions of the world, especially Asia. But, even though we should be realistic that international cooperation and exchange are not guarantees for peace and mutual understanding, they continue to be essential mechanisms for keeping communication open and dialogue active. Will the increasingly widespread global conflicts—based on religious fundamentalism, resurgent nationalism, and other challenges—harm the impressive strides that have been made in international higher education cooperation?

This is a shortened version of an essay published in the *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Vol. 19, No. 1, 2015. ∎

Perspectives on Global University Networks

Robin Middlehurst

Robin Middlehurst is professor at Kingston University, UK. E-mail: r.middlehurst@kingston.ac.uk.

For centuries, higher education has been an internationally connected sector, as scholars have sought to exchange ideas and gain new knowledge. However, such connectivity appears to be reaching new heights, doubtless aided by the ability to connect physically and virtually, but not entirely explained by this. Kris Olds of the University of Wisconsin–Madison, discussing the "seemingly endless thicket of associations, networks, consortia and alliances," argues that we are witnessing a process of *denationalization* as institutions reframe the scope of their vision, structures, and strategies beyond the national scale. Contrastingly, an analysis of key moments in internationalization from the late 19th to early 21st centuries finds approaches to internationalization to "denationalize" the university usually do not succeed (or not for long). So why are global networks proliferating and institutional efforts to reach out beyond national borders doomed to failure?

Collaborative historical research across Europe, Asia, Australia, and North and South America, undertaken by scholars within the Worldwide University Network, identifies the development of international consortia and networks as a response to major historical-structural changes in higher education. Universities have joined forces to meet new expectations and solve problems "on an ever-widening scale." They have done this in the light of fluctuating enrollments and funding resources associated with economic booms and busts; new modes of transportation and communication facilitating mobility—among students, scholars, and knowledge itself; increasing demands for applied science, technical expertise, and commercial innovation; and ideological reconfigurations accompanying regime changes. These challenges still resonate as drivers for establishing global networks, but there are also new ones.

Competitive pressures are encouraging institutions and countries to seek competitive advantage through collaboration. The coveted goods of "global reputation" and "world-class status" lead toward rankings, positioning, branding, and reputation management. In the 21st century, when the power and influence of global media are ubiquitous, this driver may be stronger than in the past, supported and extended through new social and mobile technologies. Associating with others that are successful, well resourced, or powerful is assumed to bring added value, both in substance and reflected glory. Being invited to join an exclusive network—(such as the League of European Research Universities or Universitas 21)—signals mutual recognition and a perceived hallmark of quality in the global research hierarchy. For other institutions in search of global partners, factors beyond the "scholarship of discovery" are important signifiers of differentiation and distinctiveness in a crowded marketplace of networks.

Diversity of Global Networks

Global networks are not just proliferating among institutions; they also cross sectors to engage new partners and leverage partnership assets to achieve benefits for businesses, citizens, and universities. "Triple helix" innovation systems are one example where traditionally separated innovation sources have come together—product development in industry, policymaking in government, and creation and dissemination of knowledge in academia—to facilitate development of new organizational designs, new knowledge, products, and services. A new bridge between Denmark and Sweden helped create the Oresund University Network, opening new research areas and educational possibilities. However, the original network of 11 universities has shrunk

to those institutions that have been able to gain most advantage from that network. New forms of cultural engagement between Birmingham (UK) and Chicago involve multiple linkages between museums, theaters, art galleries, and universities, utilizing long-standing "Sister-City" relationships. Businesses also take the lead in establishing networks: Santander Bank created Santander Global Universities Division to support higher education as "a means of contributing to the development and prosperity of society." There are now 1,000 university members in 17 countries and the bank has funded research, mobility, and scholarships. International associations have also facilitated global networks to pool resources, address pressing challenges, and contribute to the development of societies. The UNITWIN Networks and UNESCO Chairs—a program now involving 650 institutions in 24 countries—"serve as think tanks and bridge builders between academia, civil society, local communities, research, and policy-making".

Institutions coalesce and cooperate in global networks across multiple themes to exchange information and good practice

---

MULTIPLE THEMES
Institutions coalesce and cooperate in global networks across multiple themes to exchange information and good practice, benchmark their activities, create new knowledge through research and joint-degree programs, facilitate mobility of staff and students, optimize resources and increase capacity, and promote and advocate services and values. Thematic networks include UNICA (a network of 46 universities in 35 capital cities of Europe), UArctic (a cooperative network of universities, colleges, research institutes, and other organizations from 10 countries concerned with education and research in and about the north), UASNet (a network of universities of applied science from 9 countries represented by their national rectors' conferences) and the Asian Association of Open Universities focusing on distance learning. Shared values also drive global networks. With 320 institutional members in 72 countries, the Talloires Network is committed to strengthening the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education; the International Sustainable Campus Network with 67 member institutions across five continents is committed to sustainability in campus operations and research and teaching; the global Scholars at Risk Network of institutions, academic

associations, and associated networks advocates to protect academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and related higher education values.

SUSTAINABILITY
Some of today's global networks are new: some have lasted for decades; others have restructured, like the Oresund Network, and some have disappeared, like Scottish Knowledge, an e-learning consortium across 11 universities. Past experience offers some clue to sustainability—suggesting that where strategies either ignore or downplay cultural, political, or intellectual differences, failure will ensue—especially when the pursuit of new international connections is perceived to weaken national ties. A further lesson is that all partners must gain benefits from the network if trust, effort, and flow of institutional resources are to be maintained. Managing relationships respectfully and productively across international boundaries is likely to be a core competence for sustaining global networks. ∎

Are Double/Multiple Degree Programs Leading to "Discount Degrees"?

JANE KNIGHT

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

The number and types of international double and multiple degree programs have skyrocketed in the last five years. According to the 2014 International Association of Universities report on internationalization there has been a 50 percent increase in double-degree programs in professional areas, 19 percent increase in Natural Sciences and 14 percent increase in Social Sciences during the last three years. These figures are indicative and do not capture the total growth, especially in Asia and Europe. But they clearly demonstrate the role of double/multiple degree programs in the current landscape of international higher education and their popularity with students and institutions alike.

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE DEGREES
A few words about what a double/multiple degree program

actually means and involves is important, as there are multiple interpretations and hence mass confusion about the meaning of the term. An international double-degree (or multiple-degree) program involves two or more institutions—from different countries collaborating to design and deliver an academic program. Normally, a qualification from each of the collaborating institutions is provided. They differ from joint-degree programs or co-tutelle arrangements. A joint-degree program offers one qualification jointly issued by two or more collaborating institutions, while a co-tutelle arrangement involves partner universities working together on the development and delivery of a program; but only one degree is offered by the institution of registration. This discussion recognizes the contribution of all three approaches but focuses on the issues related to double/multiple degree programs only.

Double Counting of Academic Work for Two or More Degrees?

As an internationalization strategy, double/multiple degree programs address the heartland of academia—the teaching/learning process and the production of new knowledge between and among countries. These programs are built on the principle of international academic collaboration and can bring important benefits to students, professors, institutions, and national/regional education systems. The interest in double degrees is exploding but so is the concern about those programs, which double count the same credits for two or more degrees.

An international double-degree (or multiple-degree) program involves two or more institutions—from different countries collaborating to design and deliver an academic program.

A broad range of reactions to double-degree programs exists due to the diversity of program models; the involvement of new (bona fide and rogue) providers; the uncertainty related to quality assurance and recognition of qualifications; and finally, the ethics involved in deciding the required academic workload and/or acquired new competencies for granting of double/multiple degrees. For many academics and policymakers, double-degree programs are welcomed as a natural extension of exchange and mobility programs. For others, double/multiple-degree programs are perceived as a troublesome development, leading to

double counting of academic work—thus, jeopardizing the integrity of a university qualification and moving toward the thin edge of academic fraud.

Attractive to Students

Students are attracted to double-degree programs for a variety of reasons. The opportunity to be part of a program that offers two or more degrees from universities, located in different countries, is seen to enhance their employability prospects and career path. Some students believe that a collaborative program is of higher quality because the expertise of two or more universities has shaped the academic program. Other students are not so interested in enhanced quality but are attracted to the opportunity to obtain two degrees "for the price of one." Students argue that the duration is shorter for a double-degree program, the workload is definitely less than for two single degrees, and there is less of a financial burden. This argument is not valid for all programs of this type, but there is an element of truth in these claims.

Even the traditional twinning arrangements, where an academic program and qualification from the parent/home institution is being offered in a different country through cooperation with a local host higher education institution, are now morphing into double-degree programs—one from the home institution and another from the host institution, even though the credits for only one academic program are completed. Not all double-degree programs involve student mobility, as it is more economical to move professors than students, and virtual classrooms are becoming more popular. Finally, the status factor cannot be ignored. There is a certain sense of elitism attached to having academic credentials from universities in different countries, even if the student never actually studied abroad.

Benefits and Challenges For Institutions

For institutions, academic benefits in terms of curriculum innovation, exchanges of professors and researchers, and access to expertise and networks of the partner university make these programs especially attractive. Another important rationale is to increase an institution's reputation and ranking as an international university. This is accomplished by deliberately collaborating with partners of equal or greater status. Interestingly, some institutions prefer double-degree programs with higher-ranked partners, in order to avoid domestic accreditation procedures. For others, counting students from double-degree program cohorts can increase their graduation numbers and throughput rates.

While the benefits of double-degree programs are many and diverse, so are the challenges. Different regulatory systems, academic calendars, quality assurance and ac-

creditation schemes, credit systems, tuition and scholarship programs, teaching approaches, entrance and examination requirements, language of instruction, thesis/dissertation supervision are a few of the issues that collaborating institutions need to address.

A challenge facing the higher education community around the world is to develop a common understanding of what double/multiple programs actually mean.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS

My analysis of double/multiple-degree programs, by several national higher education organizations, shows that there is no one model. Nor, should there be one standard model as local conditions vary enormously. However, important new questions are being raised as the number and types of double/multiple programs increase. For example, which is the best route for accreditation of double/multiple-degree programs—national, binational, regional, or international accreditation? Can one thesis/dissertation fulfill the requirements of two research-based graduate programs? Are international collaborative programs encouraging the overuse of English language and the standardization of curriculum? Will status building and credentialism motives eventually jeopardize the quality and academic objectives of these international collaborative degree programs? Are these programs sustainable without additional internal or external supplementary funding?

INTEGRITY AND LEGITIMACY OF QUALIFICATIONS ARE AT STAKE

A challenge facing the higher education community around the world is to develop a common understanding of what double/multiple programs actually mean, the academic requirements and qualifications offered, and how they differ from joint-degree programs. Joint-degree programs are very attractive alternatives but face legal and bureaucratic barriers, as it is impossible in many countries to offer a joint qualification with another institution. Most importantly, a rigorous debate on the vexing questions of accreditation, recognition, and "legitimacy" of the qualifications needs

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

to take place to ensure that international double/multiple-degree programs are respected and recognized by students, institutions, and employers around the world and that double/multiple-degree programs do not become known for offering "discount degrees." ∎

Is the United States the Best in the World? Not in Internationalization

MADELEINE F. GREEN

Madeleine F. Green is senior fellow at the International Association of Universities and at NAFSA: Association of International Educators. A longer version of this article appears in NAFSA's e-publication, Trends and Insights. *E-mail: madeleinefgreen@gmail.com.*

The American narrative about its higher education system is "the best in the world." This assertion is largely based on the US research output, but other nations are closing the gap. Can the United States claim any worldwide preeminence in internationalization? Data from the *4th Global Survey of Internationalization of Higher Education*—conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU), providing a unique opportunity to compare US perceptions and practices with those of other countries—suggests that the answer is *no*.

THE IAU SURVEY

Conducted in 2013, the survey elicited responses from a total of 1,336 institutions worldwide (approximately a 20% response rate), of which 209 were from the United States (approximately a 14% response rate). For comparability of data with the worldwide population of institutions that IAU surveyed, community colleges were not included in the US survey group. Within the US respondent group, 49 percent were doctorate-granting institutions; 26 percent master's-degree level, and 25 percent granted baccalaureates only. Nearly 55 percent were private, not for profit; 3 percent private for profit; and 42 percent public. The IAU respondent population included 66 percent doctoral institutions.

The full report analyzes global responses, as well as regional ones, and highlights changes from previous surveys. In the regional analyses, the United States and Canada comprise the North American region. Of the 253 respondents in North America, 209 were from the United States.

This summary highlights a selected group of responses to questions about the overall institutional commitment to internationalization, including perceptions of leadership commitment, the presence of an internationalization strategy, and infrastructural supports. It also looks at the interest in the United States on the part of institutions in other regions, as a focus for their internationalization efforts, as well as the geographic targets of interest for US institutions.

Internationalization Strategy

Although the overwhelming majority of American institutions mention internationalization in their institutional mission statement and/or strategic plan, US respondents were less likely to do so than all respondents (86% vs. 92%). (Note that "all respondents" or "global respondents" include US respondents.) US respondents were also less likely than all respondents to indicate that their institution had a strategic plan for internationalization (43% vs. 53%). About an equal proportion of US respondents and all respondents indicated that such a plan was being prepared (22% for the United States compared to 23% for all). It is interesting to note that of all regions, Europe was the most likely to have a strategy in place (61%).

The most striking difference is the proportion of US institutions that do not have an internationalization strategy (15%)—double that for all responding institutions (7.5%).

Some institutions choose to incorporate internationalization in the overall institutional plan rather than create a separate one for internationalization. A slightly lower proportion of US institutions, than of all institutions, reported having internationalization as a part of the overall institutional strategy (16% vs. 19%).

Importance of Internationalization to Institutional Leaders

The findings about institutional strategy align with the relative level of importance of internationalization for institutional leaders. Respondents reported that US institutional leaders were less likely to assign a high level of importance to internationalization than were all respondents. 69% of all respondents indicated that internationalization was of high importance to their institutional leaders, compared to 53 percent of US respondents. More than twice as many US respondents as compared with all respondents indicated that internationalization was of low importance to institutional leaders (11% to 5%).

Internationalization strategies and infrastructural supports

Institutional capacity to support internationalization is another useful measure of institutional commitment to internationalization. US institutions were less likely than all in-

stitutions to have any of the typical infrastructural support mechanisms for internationalization, including dedicated office, dedicated budget, monitoring or evaluation framework, or explicit targets or benchmarks. Additionally, US institutions were less likely to include an international dimension in other institutional policies.

Geographic Priorities for Internationalization

Increasingly, institutions are focusing their internationalization efforts in specific geographic regions. Slightly more than half of US institutions (52%) indicated that they had specific geographic priorities for internationalization, compared to 60 percent of all respondents. European higher education institutions were the most likely to have such a priority (66%) and African higher education institutions were the least (44%).

The IAU survey reveals that cooperation with North America is not a priority for most regions. An important finding is that intraregional cooperation was the top-ranked geographic priority for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe. Europe was a top priority for Latin America, the Caribbean, and the Middle East. Only Latin America and the Caribbean respondents indicated that North America was the top-regional priority for internationalization. North America was ranked second by the Middle East, and third for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe.

Although the overwhelming majority of American institutions mention internationalization their institutional mission statement and/or strategic plan, US respondents were less likely to do so than all respondents (86% vs. 92%).

About half of the US respondents ranked Asia and the Pacific as one of their top three geographic priorities (first by 34% of respondents, second by 11%, and third by 4%). The second overall regional priority, Latin America and the Caribbean, was not as strong, with a total of 38 percent ranking it as one of their top three geographic priorities. Only 7 percent ranked it first, 17 percent second, and 14 percent third.

The Asia and Pacific region was North America's top-priority region for recruitment of international students. Latin America and the Caribbean were ranked second and the Middle East third. Looking in the other direction, no region selected North America as its top-target region for

recruiting international students.

Conclusion

The IAU global survey reveals that US institutions do not assign as high a priority to internationalization, as others around the world. They are less likely to have a strategic plan for internationalization in place or under development; and their leaders are perceived as assigning less importance to internationalization. In all measures of infrastructural supports, US institutions lag behind, including the likelihood of having a dedicated office, dedicated budget, monitoring and evaluation system, or explicit targets or benchmarks.

A sobering note for the United States is its relative status, as a potential priority for the internationalization efforts of institutions from other regions. When institutions do look outside their regions, North America is not generally a first choice. Europe is first or second for all regions, except North America.

The data from the IAU survey suggest that the United States cannot rely on the old narrative that it is leading the way in higher education. Institutions and governments around the world are intensifying their internationalization policies and strategies. Is the United States up to this challenge?

■

Private Higher Education's Distinctive Niche in New Zealand

Malcolm Abbot

Malcolm Abbot is an associate professor at Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia, and PROPHE Associate Senior Colleague, University at Albany, State University of New York. E-mail: mabbott@swin.edu.au. IHE regularly publishes articles from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See http://www.albany. edu/dept/eaps/prophe/.

Most developed countries have solid, traditionally established, public higher education institutions. These institutions are generally well-resourced, have subsidized enrollments, and possess solid reputations. They thus leave little space for the private sector to develop at that level. Typical of this state of affairs is New Zealand, whose higher education sector is dominated by a number of government-owned universities and polytechnics. Despite this dominance over the past 25 years it has been legally possible for private providers to deliver higher education (diploma and degree) programs. In doing so, these private providers have developed a number of characteristics that distinguish them from the government providers. This means that the private sector is a small, but significant part of New Zealand higher education sector. In 2013 there were 265,362 equivalent, full-time students in higher education in New Zealand (degrees and diplomas); 38,964 of such students were enrolled by private providers or 14.7 percent of the total (New Zealand, Ministry of Education, Education Counts).

To enable the private higher education sector to come into existence, legal reform first had to occur. Before 1989, the only providers permitted to deliver higher education programs were government-owned ones (universities delivered degrees and polytechnics diplomas). The *Education Act 1989* then allowed for the private delivery of both degree and diploma higher education programs, as well as the delivery of degrees by polytechnics. From the old Department of Education, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority was created, which was given the role of accrediting new diploma and degree programs of the government polytechnics as well as that of the private providers.

Restricted Private Niches

During the 1990s the policy of the National Party Government was to promote growth of the private sector, by increasing its funding of enrollments in the sector. At this time it was accepted by the government that private providers would compete directly with the public providers, both for funding and for students. This attitude changed in 1999 when the Labour Party came to office. Gradually from 2001 a freeze on the number of funded places in the private sector was imposed. The view of the government then was that funding should be directed toward those providers that could show that they were meeting demands not adequately met by the government sector. The National Party's return to office in 2008 was accompanied by expectations of increases in funding for the private sector and a loosening of restrictions on the private sector applications. In general, this did not occur, partly because of the financial restraints placed on the government after the 2008 global financial crisis and partly because of the general acceptance by the National Party of the previous government's skeptical attitude to private education.

In 2013 there were over 300 formally registered private providers in New Zealand, compared to a government sector made up of 8 universities, 18 polytechnics, and 3 *wananga* (tertiary institutions with a Maori cultural emphasis). The private providers, obviously of smaller average size, tend to be more specialized and concentrate on providing programs in niche areas. They are—as they typically are in private higher education globally—mainly in business

and information technology, though also culturally oriented programs, including the creative arts and education. This specialization is a product of both their smaller size and narrower range of offerings. After all, the government providers have left only a restricted range of opportunities. Another aspect of the growth of the private sector—also a product of how private higher education is restricted to niches—is its heavy concentration on the diploma, rather than the degree level. Private providers have over 35 percent of all diploma enrollments in New Zealand, compared to only 3 percent of degree enrollments.

Further Niche Opportunities

Yet, private niche development, resulting from publicly imposed restrictions, is not the full story. Public-sector policies also open private opportunities. Government polytechnics have tended to shift their emphasis away from traditional vocational courses, toward the development and delivery of degree-level programs. This represents the well-known concept of academic drift. Understandable in terms of academic ambition, status, and self-interest, such drift tends to undermine intended differentiation. But, if there is a kind of public failure or change here, it is one that has provided a gap for the private sector. If society does not get one of its major demands, met in the government's own (public) sector, it may find a useful contribution from the private sector.

> **Typical of this state of affairs is New Zealand, whose higher education sector is dominated by a number of government-owned universities and polytechnics.**

In a number of countries, the growth of the private higher education sector has helped to create opportunities for students from traditionally unrepresented groups in higher education. This may hold especially in nonuniversity level offerings. Indeed there is a higher proportion of enrollments in private providers of Maori and Pacific Island students, which is a reflection of the fact that a number of private education providers specialize in the delivery of programs that target students of those ethnic groups. This role in New Zealand, however, is restricted due to the presence of the Maori institutions.

Overall, private higher education providers in New Zealand are niche institutions. They are relatively small, focus on diploma rather than degree studies, and concentrate on vocational courses at that diploma level. This has

meant that private higher education in New Zealand, by both policy design and natural development, has identifiable functions and is simultaneously both important and yet not challenging to the public sector's academic and status dominance. The private sector often responds quickly to changes in market demand and to demand for vocationally orientated programs, giving it a role that the public institutions are either slow or unwilling to take on. This niche configuration has wide validity for the developed western countries, especially those of the Commonwealth, which have mature education systems. ∎

India's Private Universities: Solutions or Problems?

Krishnapratap B. Powar

Krishnapratap B. Powar, former secretary general of Association of Indian Universities, is the Chancellor of the Dr. D. Y. Patil University, Pune, India. E-mail: kbpowar@gmail.com.

India, often described as the land of diversity, has a confusing variety of universities. The degree-awarding, university-level institutions are generally grouped into five categories—institutions of national importance, central universities, state universities, state private universities, and deemed universities. Their mode of establishment, sources of finance and even functioning are different, as is the relative emphasis on teaching and research. The first two types are established by Acts of Parliament and the next two types by Acts of State Legislatures. The deemed university (more correctly, deemed-to-be-a-university) status is granted by the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India under Section 3 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956. While the first three types are public institutions, the state private universities and the majority of the deemed universities are "self-financing" (i.e., private).

The Role of the Private Sector

In 2006, the National Knowledge Commission, in its report to the prime minister, stressed the need to set up 50 national universities, and to increase the number of universities (then about 360) to 1,500 by 2015. In educational circles, the recommendations were considered impractical in view of the huge financial and human resources requirements. The governments (central and state) simply do not have the wherewithal to make meaningful contributions. The finance, therefore, has to come from the private sector.

A major stumbling block to the private sector making meaningful contributions is the legal arrangements that decree that education is a not-for-profit venture. A Supreme Court judgment does allow higher education institutions to have a "reasonable" surplus from revenue generated through tuition and other fees, but the term "reasonable" has not been quantified. Moreover, the condition is that the surplus has to be ploughed back for the development of the institution. For the hard-nosed but honest businessman this does not make sense, unless the money is to be invested as a part of the mandatory contribution under corporate social responsibility or spent as philanthropy.

The National Knowledge Commission did appreciate this difficulty and had recommended that efforts should be made to re-create the tradition of philanthropic contributions, of the late 19th and early 20th century, on which the Indian higher education system is based. It pointed out that there have to be incentives for both universities and donors. The present tax laws and trust laws were a disincentive, and they needed to be modified. Moreover, the Indian higher education system is highly regulated with diverse statutory bodies having a say, even in routine academic matters. The system as a whole is overregulated and undergoverned. Unfortunately, no action has been taken by the government on these issues.

Facilitating Private Initiatives

The educators' skepticism is not shared by all businessmen. Many of them see professional higher education as a lucrative business, provided one is prepared to tweak rules—and grease palms. The government has tried to promote increased private participation in higher education, by introducing appropriate legislation. However, the failure of the central government to get the Private Universities Bill of 1995 passed by parliament was a setback that led to the emergence of the "deemed university route." The deemed university status was traditionally granted to institutions having a long tradition of excellence in teaching and research. In the first 42 years, between 1958 and 2000, it was granted to 44 institutions. However, between 2000 and 2003 the status was granted to 42 institutions, mostly self-financing professional institutions; and subsequently to 55 others, again largely self-financing. There are presently 129 deemed universities of which 89 are private.

The Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India did a rethink toward the end of the last decade and stopped granting deemed university status to new institutions. It also started demanding from the existing deemed universities quality teaching and substantial research output. A new route, for the private sector to enter higher education, was found in the form of state private universities established through Acts of State Legislatures.

The eligibility conditions are in most states minimal; and, consequently, there has been a proliferation of state private universities. There are now 189 state private universities in 21 states and union territories and the number is fast increasing.

Society and community are divided regarding this proliferation of private institutions. Some see in the private institutions a solution, at least for the economically upper and middle classes, to the problem of access to relatively better-quality education. Others believe that the private institutions are the fountainhead of inequality and the source of corruption.

A major stumbling block to the private sector, making meaningful contributions, is the legal arrangements that decree that education is a not-for-profit venture.

Characteristics of Private Universities

The private universities largely offer education in the professional disciplines—engineering & technology, medicine and related health-care sciences, management and teacher education. By and large they have excellent physical infrastructure. In many universities the teachers are highly qualified and experienced, thanks to the statutory councils allowing individuals to teach till the age of 70—even though the age of retirement for teachers, in public universities, is 58/60/62. A good teacher, after retirement from a public institution, can now teach for a decade more in a private institution.

Pressure from the Ministry of Human Resource Development has compelled the deemed universities to promote research that leads to publications in highly rated journals. This has had a positive effect and many deemed universities are now engaged in frontline research. If one goes by the assessment of the National Accreditation and Assessment Council, the quality of education in private-deemed universities is better than in the majority of public universities. At a rough estimate, the quality of education imparted in about two-thirds of the private deemed universities is good, or at least satisfactory. The state private universities are essentially teaching universities and only a few have undergone assessment. Unfortunately, the quality of education is in many cases suspect. Like the for-profit universities in the United States, they provide the minimum, cutting out frills. A disturbing fact that has emerged is that many of the pri-

vate universities make use of external research supervisors and enroll a large number of doctoral students. These institutions are heading toward becoming doctoral-degree mills.

The main problems of the private universities relate to the de facto management—the trustees of the sponsoring societies or trusts. They control all financial transactions from the purchase of stationery, to purchase of the most sophisticated equipment. They also have a say in the appointment of faculty. Admissions in many universities are manipulated, though they are supposedly made on merit—determined by annual entrance tests, conducted by the university. The attempts of the government to make admissions on the basis of a single national entrance examination have repeatedly failed. Reportedly, large amounts pass under the table in the form of a "capitation fee" that goes not to the institution, but to the sponsors. The tuition fees are high. The fact of the matter is that a student belonging to a family of average means does not get admission to the well-known private universities. Many private universities, though legally not-for-profit, are actually for-profit institutions. For the "haves" private universities provide a solution to the problem of access to higher education. For the "have nots private universities are a social evil responsible for the widening of the economic and social divides.

■

UK Research Excellence: Getting Better All the Time?

Simon Marginson

Simon Marginson is professor of International Education at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, and joint editor-in-chief of Higher Education. *E-mail: s.marginson@ioe.ac.uk.*

Each half decade, the UK higher education system puts itself through a massive exercise run by the national higher education regulator, designed to catalogue, compute, and judge university research. This time consuming and intensely competitive process, once known as the Research Assessment Exercise, has become the Research Excellence Framework (REF). The results of the first REF were published just before Christmas.

Purposes of Research Assessment
The REF has a number of purposes, not always consistent with each other. It is used to allocate research-specific funding support and to concentrate resources in the highest per-

forming institutions and disciplines, stretching the national research dollar, as far as possible. It shapes the academic labor market, encouraging researchers to shift to high-performing units, and universities to bid for the best researchers. It is also meant to strengthen the focus on high-quality work—researchers submit their four-best publications for evaluation—and to compare UK research against global standards, while at the same time showcasing that same UK research before the world. It also encourages researchers to focus on the economic and social impact of research, as universities are required to submit evidence of such impact.

Any system of research assessment is only partly reliable as an indicator of the real quality of research. Research assessment has a dual character. On one hand it is rooted in material facts and objective methods. On the other hand, it favors some norms, activities, and interests above others—no assessment can cover everything in the same way, each assessment uses specific and partial methods, and the experienced and high-status players are best at gaming the system.

Some aspects of research, such as citations in top journals, are easier to standardize than other aspects, such as the long-term impacts of research on policy and professions. Comparisons between disciplines, between universities with different missions, between experienced professors and early career researchers, and between established ideas and new ideas are all fraught.

The outcome of the UK REF was partly shaped by the universities that selected and fashioned the data for competitive purposes, and the REF's own subject area panels that defined the research judged to be outstanding on a global scale. Precise league table positions in the REF should be taken with a grain of salt.

Measuring Research Impact?
In the UK REF the indicators for "impact," new to the 2014 assessment, are the most vulnerable to manipulation. This is partly because of the intrinsic difficulty of measuring the changes to society, economy, and policy induced by knowledge, especially in the long term. It is also because of the kind of crafted "impact-related" data that were collected during the REF assessment process. A sophisticated industry has emerged in the manufacture of examples of the relevant "evidence" of impact. The REF assessed simulations of the impact of research, rather than actual impact.

At best, it got everyone thinking about real connectivity with the users of research, which was one of the starting points when producing impact documentation. At worst, the measures of "impact" collapsed into a smoke and mirrors exercise, producing data that bear as much relation to reality as the statements of output made by Soviet factories

in response to official targets.

Inevitably, those universities most adept at managing their response to performance measures of all kinds, performed especially well in producing impact documentation. One suspect there was also the "halo" effect, always associated with all measures contaminated by prior reputation. Thus, research at the University of Cambridge was more likely to be seen to have impact precisely because it was from Cambridge.

Measuring the Quality of Outputs

In the REF output quality was measured using a four-star system, producing a ranking based on the average star level of an institution's researchers (the "grade point average"), and another ranking based on the proportion at 4 star level. These assessments of output quality were grounded in considered judgments of real research work, by panels with expertise. But the standardized value of the output indicators, especially as measures of *comparative* quality, are subject to two caveats.

Some aspects of research, such as citations in top journals, are easier to standardize than other aspects, such as the long-term impacts of research on policy and professions.

Between the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise and the 2014 REF, there was a remarkable inflation of the proportion of UK research outputs judged to be "world leading" (rated 4 star) and "internationally excellent" (rated 3 star). Universities could game the assessment by being selective about whose work they included in their REF submission. Including only the best researchers pushes up the grade point average and the proportion of research ranked 4 star. Universities that do this pay a financial price, in that their apparent volume of research is reduced and their subsequent funding falls. Nevertheless, it is good for reputation, which has many long-term spinoffs, including financial benefits.

In 2008, 14 percent of research outputs were judged to be 4 star, and 37 percent were judged to be 3 star, meaning 51 percent of work was in the top two categories. Six years later in 2014, the proportion of work judged to be world leading or excellent had somehow jumped to 72 percent, with 22 percent judged to be 4 star and 50 percent at 3 star. This phenomenal improvement happened at a time when resources in higher education were constrained by histori-

cal standards. "It's getting better all the time," as that Beatles song puts it. But *is* UK research getting better?

While real improvement no doubt occurred in at least some fields, the scale and speed of *this* improvement beggars belief. One suspects that it reflects a combination of factors that generate boosterism. Universities have a vested interest in maximizing their apparent quality. Subject-area panels have a vested interest in maximizing the "world-class" character of their fields. UK higher education is competing with other nations, especially the United States, for research rankings, doctoral students, and offshore income. The system, as a whole, benefits from "it's getting better all the time."

The marketing purpose of the REF appears to have overwhelmed its purpose as an assessment of the global position of UK research. This does not impair the other purposes of the REF, including its roles in funding allocation and research concentration, mediating the internal labor market in researchers, and driving performance through competition. But if competition is intensified while the bar is too low, this is more likely to reward competitiveness per se, than reward genuine global-research excellence.

For UK research, grade inflation is a worrying sign of a system becoming complacent about its own self-defined excellence. This is not the best way to drive long-term improvement. Less hubris and more hardnosed Chinese-style realism would serve the United Kingdom better. The next REF should enhance the role of international opinion in the subject panels and place more emphasis on those areas where improvement is most needed.

The next assessment should also require universities to include all of their researchers or, alternately, a fixed proportion, such as the top 75 or 90 percent. With individual institutions pursuing a variety of strategies on inclusion, the REF did not compare like-with-like. This undermines the validity of the REF as a league table of comparative performance, though everyone treats it that way.

For example, the leader on the volume of high quality research was University College London, a large institution that included 91 percent of its researchers. Oxford was second in the volume of high-quality work and did especially well in measures of average researcher quality. It included 87 percent of its researchers in the count. Oxford's great rival, Cambridge included 95 percent of its researchers, generating a grade point average just below Oxford.

Almost certainly, the best 87 percent of Cambridge researchers outdid those at Oxford, but the REF allowed Oxford to game the process so as to present itself as the best research university in the United Kingdom. Meanwhile the University of Cardiff pushed itself up to equal seventh in the land on grade point average by including just 61 percent of its researchers in the count. ∎

Transnational Pathways to English Higher Education

Janet Ilieva

Janet Ilieva is on the staff of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), United Kingdom. E-mail: j.ilieva@hefce. ac.uk. Note: a full version of this article is titled "Directions of Travel: Transnational Pathways into English Higher Education" and it is available on the HEFCE Web site at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/ year/2014/201429/.

There is a wealth of anecdotal evidence that suggests that transnational education (TNE) is increasingly used as a recruitment tool by higher education institutions. TNE is broadly defined as education provision delivered in a different country from that of the education institution. This research is the first attempt to estimate the contribution of UK TNE to first-degree programs in England. TNE programs leading to enrollments in England are referred to as transnational pathways; respectively TNE students who have progressed from TNE programs to courses delivered onshore are referred to as transnational students. Our analysis shows that in 2012–2013 over a third of all international entrants—34 percent or 16,500 entrants—to first degree programs in England transferred directly from TNE programs.

> **TNE is broadly defined as education provision delivered in a different country from that of the education institution.**

The transnational entrants fuelled the growth from China in the period from 2009–2010 to 2012–2013. Transnational entrants from China increased by 55 percent (almost 3,000 entrants) compared with 18 percent growth—1,000 entrants—in direct recruitment to first-degree programs in England. Malaysia is the second largest country of origin for transnational progressions. About 63 percent (3,200 entrants) of the Malaysian students in England used transnational pathways when commencing first-degree programs.

Overall, transnational students from China and Malaysia account for an estimated 70 percent of the total transnational entrants to first-degree programs in England. Except for Singapore, China and Malaysia are among the largest countries for British TNE.

There are some significant differences in the length of study that transnational students spend in England. The majority of transnational entrants from China—66 percent, 5,450 entrants—were enrolled in programs with a reported length of between two and three years in 2012–2013. In contrast, the majority of entrants from Malaysia (56%) were enrolled in programs of one year or less. The next largest transnational populations came from Nigeria and Hong Kong, which contributed 550 and 500 entrants, respectively. Transnational entrants from Nigeria appear to have mitigated the bigger declines experienced in direct recruitment to first-degree programs.

Shorter Programs Lead to Declines in Overall Period of Study

One of the key characteristics of transnational entrants is that they spend significantly shorter periods of study in England, compared with the standard first-degree population. The highest growth was observed in programs with a duration of one academic year or less, which proportions increased from 28 percent (3,700 entrants) in 2009–2010 to 33 percent (5,500 entrants) in 2012–2013. This shift toward shorter study may be partly attributable to the impact of the global financial crisis of 2008–2009 on middle-class incomes. Shorter programs are more affordable— through savings on tuition fees and lower cost of living associated with shorter period spent abroad—for families who otherwise would have been unable to do so and those whose disposable income declined in the aftermath of the crisis.

Are Transnational Students Contributing to Demand For Postgraduate Programs?

About a third of all transnational students who started first-degree programs through transnational programs continued their studies at the postgraduate level. Given the limited time series dating back to 2009–2010, we are only able to track students who commenced first-degree courses in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011 and continued into postgraduate programs two years later. Some 5,100 students from the population, who started their first degrees in 2010–2011, continued at the postgraduate level by 2012–2013. The majority of these students—82 percent or 4,130 entrants— were from China.

Of all transnational students from China who started their first degree program in 2009, 59 percent continued their studies at the postgraduate level. We can now attribute 45 percent of the growth in Chinese students enrolling in taught master's degrees in 2012–2013, compared with the previous year, to an increase in the number of transnational students continuing their studies at the postgraduate level (1,100 students). This finding highlights the importance of postgraduate degrees, as a component of student decision making for transnational entrants from China to undergraduate programs.

At this stage we are unable to establish how many international students from UK TNE programs transfer directly into postgraduate programs in England.

Conclusions

China and Malaysia are the countries with the highest proportions of transnational students starting undergraduate degrees in England and are also among the largest TNE markets. While the expected course length of transnational entrants poses some recruitment and financial challenges for higher education institutions, it has also emerged as a cost-efficient route to English higher education for aspiring middle-class families in East Asia. Similarly, shorter programs may have widened the access to English higher education for families who otherwise would have been unable to afford English degrees.

The enabling environment for TNE in East Asia will continue to improve in the long run. Malaysia is the only country in the region whose higher education degrees awarded through TNE are recognized in China. Further harmonization of higher education systems across the region is set to take place with an additional boost through the Association of the South East Asian Nations Economic Community in 2015. While not many students in this region outside Malaysia use transnational routes to English higher education, their number is expected to grow.

Global universities through their TNE provision are more likely to be well embedded in the education landscape of the host country. As a result, they are set to benefit in the long run from increasing intra-regional levels of student mobility, and equally, harness deep and comprehensive collaborative partnerships with institutions in the region. ∎

How Much is a Full Professor Worth?—The Challenge of Attracting the Best Talent

Marcelo Knobel

Marcelo Knobel is a full professor at the "Gleb Wataghin" Physics Institute of the University of Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: knobel@ifi.unicamp.br.

In a recent book, Philip G. Altbach and colleagues attempted a careful comparison of salaries of faculty members in different countries (Altbach et al., eds., *Paying the Profes-*
soriate: A Global Comparison of Compensation and Contracts, Routledge, 2012). Despite their research, one of the main conclusions of the report was that this kind of information is incredibly difficult to find and even more difficult to analyze, owing to different discounts and benefits provided by each country and the fact that individual career paths are reflected in differentiated salaries. Many countries have been struggling to develop a solid higher education system, and the attraction of young and motivated talent is key to the further development of a culture of excellence—to support the education of future generations. However, in Brazil and in many Latin-American countries there is a strong trend against compensation based on academic merit, particularly in public research-intensive universities. In this article, I will offer the example of a public policy of the State of São Paulo that will certainly affect the attraction of young talent to its universities, putting at risk an effort to build a high-quality higher education system, which has been evolving over the last 60 years.

In principle, data regarding salaries and compensations should be easy to track in Brazil, where an "equality" code has governed salaries in the higher education system. Regardless of productivity, impact or success in attracting additional financial resources, policy dictates that faculty members at the same level of their career should receive the same monthly stipend. In practice, the situation is much more complex, not only because there are salary increments for longevity at the institution, but also when remuneration for administrative assignments is added. Furthermore, some faculty members receive additional income from grants or consulting work. To make things more complicated, salaries vary by institution type—private for-profit, private nonprofit public federal, public state, or public municipal.

Limitations at the Top

A recent debate in Brazil has raised interesting issues related to the salaries of senior faculty at public universities in the state of São Paulo (University of São Paulo–USP, University of Campinas–Unicamp, and University of the State of São Paulo–Unesp), institutions generally considered among the best in Latin America as evidenced in different rankings. Since 2003, responding to federal regulation, the State of São Paulo has tied public-sector salaries to the compensation of its governor, whose compensation represents the maximum salary allowed for a public servant—the so-called "*teto*" or "ceiling." Not suprisingly, this ceiling can be adjusted down for political expediency, particularly to prevent an increase of state expenditures. It also opens the door to populist-oriented policy, although in truth the governor does not depend on a monthly salary as he/she receives many nonmonetary benefits (housing, driver, meals, etc.).

In the state of São Paulo the salary of the governor is currently R\$20,662 (approximately US\$8,000) with 38 percent deducted for taxes. Thus, the maximum net salary in the state of São Paulo is about US\$5,000 per month, which leads to annual net stipend of around US\$67,000 (based on 12 months plus a one-month bonus). This establishes the maximum salary allowed for full professors and senior administrative staff at São Paulo's state institutions, regardless of years of service and independent of merit, prestige, administrative duties, or any other factor.

Although the current law establishing the "ceiling"

> **Since 2003, responding to federal regulation, the State of São Paulo has tied public-sector salaries to the compensation of its governor.**

dates back to 2003, the nation's Supreme Court recently decided that it must be enforced, even in the cases when salaries were above the maximum allowed value prior to 2003. In the short term, it is expected that a rather large number of faculty and staff members who already qualify for retirement will proceed with it, once their salary is reduced. Worse still, it will be difficult to find senior faculty willing to occupy administrative positions, such as department chairs, undergraduate coordinator, etc., without the possibility of additional compensation.

The Challenge of Attracting and Retaining Talent

Obviously, complaints about the limitation of faculty salaries can be considered "politically incorrect" in a country where the minimum wage is R\$724 (US\$280), and the average salary is below R\$2,100 (US\$800). A gross salary of more than R\$20,000 is considered to be at the top quintile. In a country of huge social inequalities, it is clear that being a faculty member of a public university immediately puts one at the top of the socioeconomic pyramid.

However, from a different perspective, there has been a concentrated effort during the last six decades by the state of São Paulo and the nation to develop at least a few world-class universities. These research universities are essential to the socioeconomic development of the country and, paradoxically, fundamental to reducing the strong inequalities in Brazilian society.

The current "equitable salary structure" imposed on the universities hinders the possibility of attracting the best young talent needed to support the development of this still young university system. Indeed, brilliant young faculty members are fundamental for the future quality of research, teaching, and services and to keep pace with a globalized world. How can the state universities of the state of São Paulo maintain their current success and momentum if they will not be able to attract and maintain top talent?

How much is a senior faculty member worth? What makes a young talent choose an academic career track? In Brazil, as in many other countries, the apparent freedom to pursue scholarship of an individual's choosing is usually part of the answer. However, at least in Brazil, this came with other benefits, including a retirement with full salary (no longer offered) and job stability. Even though stability remains, the salaries at the top of the career ladder are no longer competitive with companies in the private sector (commerce, service, etc.). In addition, if one compares the maximum salary attained after many years of dedication to a university, with international equivalents, the gap is rather large. In a competitive global market, this has tremendous importance.

National Policy and Academic Excellence

The universities are, in principle, a privileged space, where meritocracy should play an important role. In most of the Brazilian higher education system, a faculty member can make a rather good salary, without necessarily demonstrating good performance. This fact drains motivation from the more productive faculty. Furthermore, the existence of a predefined maximum salary is a drawback to the already difficult path to hosting world-class institutions. The universities of the state of São Paulo will have to come up with creative solutions in order to overcome this significant handicap.

Limiting salaries at the top of the career ladder for political reasons, so that they compare negatively to alternatives in the national and global job markets, will certainly damage a nascent university system built with concerted effort during recent years. Unfortunately, this issue is demonstrated by other developing countries struggling to establish a good higher education system. In the case of many countries in Latin America, public universities are the main players in the development of research and innovation. These universities are strongly regulated by national policies that hinder academic differentiation supported by rational financial compensation—making it difficult to attract young talent to the academic life, as well as faculty members with specific profiles. Although it should be clear, it is worth highlighting that professors are the core of the academy, and their engagement, retention, and motivation are key elements for the survival of the universities themselves. ∎

Crisis and Homesickness: A New Opportunity for Brain Gain in Latin America?

IVÁN F. PACHECO

Iván F. Pacheco is an independent consultant and visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: ivanfpacheco@gmail.com.

There is growing pressure on Latin American countries to produce larger numbers of highly skilled talent. A solid base of teachers with the qualifications to train such talent is imperative to serve that demand. However, these countries' ability to produce, retain, or attract high-level faculty has been historically poor. The universities produce insufficient numbers of doctoral-degree holders, and those doctoral programs that do exist are often of poor quality. In addition, brain drain remains a problem. Yet, things might be changing: overproduction of PhDs and deteriorating working conditions for faculty, particularly for adjuncts, in industrialized countries may represent an opportunity for the developing world.

There seems to be a surplus of PhDs in many fields in some industrialized countries, and in some of them a deterioration of the academic profession has been observed. The majority of the professoriate in the United States are adjuncts, non-tenure-track professors, or contingent faculty. Recently graduated PhDs in many fields are having trouble finding good jobs—that would compensate for the time, effort, and money invested in the doctoral studies—or finding a job at all. For some, these are signs of the emergence of "academic proletarianization."

Academic proletarianization is not unique to the United States. Spain is an interesting case to explore. Despite significant differences across regions, academic salaries for tenured professors in Spain are competitive in the European Union context. In contrast, compensation for professors hired on fixed term contracts is usually very low. A study by the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP) showed that in Catalonia, monthly salaries for full-time non-tenure track faculty are in the range of US$409 (for *profesores asociados*) to US$1,637 for post-docs. This situation, combined with the general economic difficulties that the country is facing, has prompted many potential professors to leave the country in search of a better future. This trend has been illustrated several times in *El País*—one of the main Spanish newspapers—and other media.

In contrast to the surplus of people with doctoral degrees in the United States, Spain, and other industrialized countries, most developing countries have the opposite problem: the number of scholars and scientists with doctoral degrees is very low compared to the countries' needs; and the pace at which local higher education systems are producing their own doctoral-degree holders is not sufficient to fill the gap. Brazil, a heavyweight in Latin America and the country with the most doctoral-degree holders and doctoral students in the region, has a shortage of PhDs. Despite producing 12,000 PhD graduates per year, it only has 1.4 doctorates per 1,000 inhabitants aged 25 to 64 years old, compared to 23 in Switzerland, 8.4 in the United States, or 6.5 in Canada.

> **In contrast to the surplus of people with doctoral degrees in the United States, Spain, and other industrialized countries, most developing countries have the opposite problem.**

YOUR CRISIS, MY OPPORTUNITY?

This situation seems to be a perfect case for a supply/demand solution. There are some countries with a surplus of highly skilled talent and other countries with a great demand for such talent. However, it is not that simple. Academic mobility is not as fluid as the mobility of unskilled labor, and attracting talent has proved to be challenging.

Some Latin American countries have designed programs to entice international professors and researchers. The Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Chile launched PAIR, the International Regular Academic Program, which has attracted approximately one hundred Spanish professors, as well British, Italian, Mexican, and Argentinian academics. Ecuador is perhaps the country with the most aggressive strategy to attract talent in the region. As part of an ambitious plan to improve the country's education, some Ecuadorian public universities have launched international calls aimed at highly qualified faculty (i.e., master's- and doctoral-degree holders). Recently, the Universidad Nacional de Ecuador launched an international call to attract 500 professors from all areas of knowledge, to be expanded to 5,000 in the next five years. Even though the call was open for all nationalities, the Ecuadorian government focused its efforts on Spain, where it placed full-page invitations in local publications. Salaries offered were competitive when compared to those paid to adjunct faculty in Spain. This, and the economic crisis in Spain, motivated a good number of Spaniards to apply and, for those hired, move to Ecuador. Having Spanish as a common language has contributed to

the success of this initiative.

In contrast, Venezuela is suffering a massive case of brain drain. SciDev.Net reported that the Universidad Central de Venezuela had lost approximately 700 professors between 2011 and 2012, and the Universidad del Zulia has not been able to fill 1,577 vacant teaching positions. Working and living conditions in Venezuela are deteriorating, and most of those who went abroad to complete advanced training programs have decided not to come back to the country. Researchers, teachers, and highly skilled workers have migrated to different countries in the Americas, Europe, and Oceania.

Homesickness May Not Be Enough

Many countries are focusing their efforts and resources on attracting home expatriate academics who left the country to study abroad and decided to stay. At the end of 2013, *Colciencias*, the Colombian government's agency for research and innovation, launched "Es Tiempo de Volver" (It is Time to Come Back), a program aimed at attracting approximately 200 researchers from the diaspora. In addition to a relatively good salary—although not competitive with the remuneration typical of the countries where most of the expatriate researchers were based—the program offered tax exemptions, a relocation allowance, and a research grant. In April 2014, there were over 10,000 applications, 900 of them from holders of doctoral degrees.

Argentina, through its program *Raices*, has repatriated over 1,000 scientists since its creation in 2003. In addition to the repatriation component, the program also includes a networking strategy, by which Argentinian researchers who are not willing to come back to the country can keep in touch through short research stays or by directing research projects—such as theses and dissertations—from abroad.

The success of these initiatives varies from country to country but, in general, they all have the same weakness: they address only their own conationals, overlooking potential candidates from other countries who might be willing to migrate in search of better economic and academic opportunities.

Conclusion

Salaries are by no means the only variable that professors take into consideration when deciding to move to a different country, but they are an important factor. The existence of a solid academic community, infrastructure for research and teaching, and other elements also carry weight in any decision to relocate. The overproduction of doctoral-degree holders in many industrialized countries, together with the poor job availability for young professors entering academia in those places, may play to the advantage of nations with less-established academic communities, which are willing to attract members of the diaspora as well as international talent. Confining recruitment efforts to their own nationals can be a mistake for countries with low numbers of PhDs, as there is a growing stock of highly skilled researchers and professors willing to cross borders in the quest for a reasonably good working opportunity. ∎

The Struggle to Rebuild and Transform Higher Education in Afghanistan

Fred M. Hayward and Mohammad O. Babury

Fred M. Hayward is senior higher education specialist at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst and has been advisor to the Ministry of Higher Education since 2009. E-mail: haywardfred@hotmail.com. Mohammad Osman Babury is deputy minister for Academic Affairs at the Ministry of Higher Education Afghanistan and Professor of Pharmocognosy, Kabul University. E-mail: deputyminister.mohe@gmail.com. This article is drawn from "Afghanistan Higher Education: The Struggle for Quality, Merit, and Transformation" by the authors in Planning for Higher Education Journal, 42, January–March 2014.

The higher education system in Afghanistan was one of the casualties of more than 30 years of war, with more than one million people killed, over 6 million who fled, most of its higher education institutions damaged, many of its institutions closed, women excluded from education and more than half its faculty members and staff lost. Its academic programs are a shell of its once proud history as a higher education leader in the region. The Ministry of Higher Education faced an enormous task to repair and rehabilitate the system once the Talibans were removed.

Confronting the Challenges

Among the most difficult challenges were the human cost of the war, including a high incidence of posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and other mental health issues affecting more than half of the student population. Replacing the half of the faculty members who were lost to the war was another challenge. The personnel processes lacked transparency. Ideology, ethnicity, and region had become the most important factors in these decisions. The entrance examination (the Kankor) had also been compromised and people had lost faith in it. Higher education had broken down in other ways. No research was underway, and the universities had little to offer the government in solu-

tions to critical problems. Teaching also suffered with the remaining staff being badly out of touch with the current state of their fields.

By 2009 enough progress had been made in repairing the worst institutional damage, and it was possible to think about systematic plans for rehabilitation and change. Under the leadership of the Deputy Minister for Academic Affairs, a steering committee developed the *National Higher Education Strategic Plan: 2010-2014* (NHESP). Its two primary goals were to increase access and improve quality focusing on the curriculum, governance, faculty development, and facilities. That led to new policies to make major quality improvement in the system. The foundation for accreditation was finalized in July 2011. By 2013, 12 universities had completed institutional self-assessment, 50 peer reviewers were trained, and in September the first 6 universities achieve candidacy for accreditation, the first step in the three stage process. Another goal of the NHESP was met when enroll-

---

The higher education system in Afghanistan was one of the casualties of more than 30 years of war.

---

ments doubled from their 2008 level of 54,683 to 130,195 in 2013, one year ahead of the target. Private higher education, which had been illegal until 2006, was flourishing—though of mixed quality—with 90 institutions and more than 130,000 students by 2014. The Kankor process had been streamlined and the corruption eliminated. A major review and upgrading of the curriculum was underway. By 2014, more than half the curricula of public higher education institutions had been reviewed, rewritten, and upgraded for the first time in history

A Higher Education Gender Strategy was released during 2013, reflecting close cooperation between the Ministry of Higher Education and the Ministry for Women's Affairs. The number of women students went from zero in 2001 to 30,997, almost 19 percent of the students. The effort to recruit women faculty members was not as successful, partly because of the small number of women graduate students, reaching only 15 percent of total faculty members. The Ministry of Higher Education worked to overcome one of the major barriers to the increase of the number of women students the lack of adequate, safe housing, with three women's dorms under construction, two funded through the US State Department, and one using funds from the US Army. They will provide accommodations for almost 1,600 women students.

One of the key problems for quality improvement was that only 5 percent of the faculty members had PhDs and 32 percent master's degrees. The Ministry of Higher Education sent more than 1,000 faculty members without advanced degrees to study for master's and PhD—750 abroad. The first of these faculty members are returning, bringing new energy and enthusiasm to teaching, and an eagerness to carry out research. For the first time in decades, research funding became available to faculty members in 2012, through the World Bank.

CONTINUING CHALLENGES

A major continuing problem for the improvement of higher education is the lack of funding. While the government has higher education on its priority list, this is not reflected in funding for higher education, where allocations have declined on a per capita basis in recent years to only US$443 from US$522 in 2010. Part of the financial problem is the lack of donor interest with only the US Agency for International Development and the World Bank as major donors. Most donors are focused on primary education as part of the worldwide effort to bring about universal primary education by 2015 through *education for all*. While we laud that success, the long-term effects are an increase in graduates from secondary school bringing greater demands for admission to higher education.

Continuing war, corruption, and mismanagement has led to a loss of trust and hope for many students who wonder if there is a future for them. The enthusiasm and optimism we saw in 2003 has turned to an almost universal distrust of the government. Another challenge is the high level of centralization of higher education. The Ministry of Higher Education is committed to increase decentralization. In November 2013 the Ministry of Higher Education's measures to allow financial decentralization were approved. That will give universities much more autonomy, flexibility, and allow them to keep funds from entrepreneurial activities.

As we look back on the changes over the past five years, we see many fundamental changes in the system that have transformed it in significant ways. Major changes still must be made to recreate a culture of research, provide better student-focused teaching, challenge students to be creative and innovative, foster gender equity, and to expand decentralization.

The Ministry of Higher Education has focused on critical areas for quality improvement: the establishment of accreditation, faculty development, curriculum upgrading, and a commitment to merit recruitment and promotions. Challenges remain, in particular limited financial resources, corruption, and political interference. Nonetheless, there is a cadre of committed, hardworking academics and

administrators who are dedicated to the transformation of the system. While successes are fragile, they just might succeed in sustaining, expanding, and institutionalizing these changes. That is the challenge for 2014–2015. We think the chances of continued success are good. ■

The Challenges of Developing an Autonomous Higher Education System in Afghanistan

Joseph B. Berger and Hanni S. Thoma

Joseph B. Berger is professor at the University of Massachusetts Amherst College of Education. E-mail: jbberger@educ.umass.edu. Hanni S. Thoma is a graduate assistant at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. E-mail hthoma@educ.umass.edu.

It is well documented that until 2001 higher education in Afghanistan had been severely impacted by the effects of a nearly three-decade long period of violent conflict. However, since 2001 there have been ongoing efforts to reestablish high quality tertiary education capable of meeting the rapidly growing demands of the country's emerging democracy, with a developing economy and a bourgeoning cadre of young men and women thirsty for higher education. Demand for higher education has increased dramatically in Afghanistan over the past decade, with the number of students growing from approximately 6,000 in 2001 to almost 100,000 in 2012, and over 300,000 projected by 2020 in the public higher education system alone, with an additional 100,000 students expected to be enrolled in private institutions as of 2015. Public universities continue to be the dominant higher education institutions in Afghanistan and remain the first choice for all qualified students—given that access is free to all students who qualify and that the public institutions are viewed as the legitimately prestigious academic institutions in the Afghan society. Private institutions enjoy significant autonomy, but most of these institutions are quite small, not highly regarded, and fail to meet minimal standards for academic quality. Thus, a more autonomous public system and greater regulation of private institutions are essential conditions for the further development of a high-quality higher education system in Afghanistan.

Institutional Autonomy

The public higher education system in Afghanistan is one of the most highly centralized systems in the world, and until two years ago the Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) controlled virtually every aspect of decisionmaking for individual campuses. With support from the international donor community, the MoHE made significant strides towards improving the scope and quality of higher education in Afghanistan, driven by this highly centralized approach. But in order to further support campus growth and development, in 2009 the MoHE initiated a National Higher Education Strategic Plan (NHESP) that called for, among other priorities, increased autonomy for public postsecondary institutions.

Until recently, there has been no clear strategy for how to move forward with increased autonomy on individual public campuses. A great deal of effort has been invested in the improvement of policy frameworks that provide a system-wide framework for increased autonomy, which is an important foundation for then moving to the development and implementation of (a) procedures and infrastructure for implementing policy and (b) enhanced human capacity in the ministry and the constituent university campuses. Recent efforts have been implemented to improve the capacity of Afghan universities to be more autonomous in three strategic areas: academic, administrative, and financial.

Academic autonomy focuses on increasing the role of

> **The public higher education system in Afghanistan is one of the most highly centralized systems in the world, and until two years ago the Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) controlled virtually every aspect of decisionmaking for individual campuses.**

faculty and administrative leaders in an improving quality assurance system, based on twelve national standards that are evaluated through self-studies and peer reviews within the campuses. This shift increasingly moves the role of the MoHE from rigid academic control to coordination.

Administrative autonomy is focused on capacity development activities in six critical areas required for the Public Financial Management Risk Assessment (PFMRA). These areas include organizational leadership, internal auditing,

finance and accounting, human resources, procurement, and information technology. The MoHE is focusing on building parallel capacity in the ministry and each of the major public universities in order to pilot increased administrative autonomy across the essential administrative functions.

Financial autonomy is closely linked to some areas of administrative autonomy, but the current focus is on changing the higher education finance law in Afghanistan that mandates free tuition and prohibits the retention of any funds earned by a university. This legal arrangement does little to incentivize institutions to develop innovative programs; rather such efforts are typically perceived as a superfluous drain on faculty and institutional resources. The inability to generate and manage funds has been particularly problematic given the lack of resources of the Afghan government to adequately fund higher education. In fact, 80 percent of the national budget comes from the international donor community, a very limited and tenuous resource base at best. Four institutions are piloting limited financial autonomy and there has been a push to change the law, but the process is highly complex, involving reviews by multiple government agencies and committees.

Conversely, private higher education institutions have been extremely autonomous as they are almost wholly unregulated. However, MoHE began to address this issue with the first ever review of private institutions in 2013-2014 in which almost all of the private institutions were found to be of dubious quality. Unfortunately, MoHE lacks the political and financial resources to enforce any types of standards in the largely unregulated and historically underdeveloped private sector.

The formal higher education system is just beginning to define the roles and responsibilities of four types of organizational units—MoHE, the Commission on Quality Assurance, public universities, and private institutions. First, the MoHE is firmly entrenched as a central administrative unit comprised of various subunits (divisions, directorates, and departments) that provides highly centralized governance and coordination of all higher education activity in the country. Second, semiautonomous national coordinating committees and commissions, such as the national Commission on Quality Assurance, are just beginning to emerge; and the development of these bodies will be essential for coordinating and aligning policies, procedures, and practice throughout a more autonomous higher education system. Third, public institutions remain semiautonomous academic units (each of whom have subunits in the form of faculties and departments) that are responsible for the direct delivery of higher education throughout the country, but still have limited autonomy to make strategic and operational decisions related to academic, administrative, and financial functions. Fourth, private institutions are highly autonomous and MoHE is considering ways to bring them in under the emerging quality assurance system.

CONCLUSION

Higher education, like most aspects of Afghan life, has made significant progress in the last decade. Policy frameworks and procedures are being implemented to increase institutional autonomy in the public sector; however, it will take several more years before individual leaders and academic staff have the capacity to take full advantage of the opportunities for increased autonomy. At the same time, Afghanistan will struggle to manage the lack of control within the private sector. It is clear that the discrepancy in quality, cost, and autonomy between the public and private sectors of higher education presents another layer of complexity that must be addressed in the near future as the private sector continues to grow in size and potential importance. The higher education system has been firmly reestablished, and these changes will slowly contribute to improving the quality and relevance of an accessible and sustainable higher education system that can more capably contribute to the myriad of challenges to loom as Afghanistan increasingly charts its own course as a sovereign state. ■

Institutionalization of Community Engagement at African Universities

HENRY MUGABI

Henry Mugabi is researcher, Higher Education Group, University of Tampere, Finland. E-mail: Henry.Mugabi@uta.fi.

Although the earliest universities in Europe began as teaching-only institutions, many have expanded to embrace teaching, research, and community outreach and engagement. African universities are also expected to teach, conduct research, and serve society. At the 1962 UNESCO conference on the "Development of Higher Education in Africa," African higher education institutions were urged to be in constant touch with society and to adapt their teaching and research activities toward African problems. In fact, a number of African universities—such as, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Makerere University, University of Botswana, University of KwaZulu-Natal, University of Mauritius, University of Ghana, and University

of Dar es Salaam—include community engagement among their functions and priority areas. In addition, most of the universities have organizational structures—such as, consultancy bureaus, continuing education centers, business incubation centers, and technology development and transfer centers—and personnel to promote community engagement and/or coordinate community related activities.

Community engagement remains marginally institutionalized at most African universities: most universities have not yet fully integrated community engagement into their budgets, teaching and learning, and research activities. Their faculty hiring and promotion practices either ignore or insufficiently recognize faculty contributions to the external communities. The report of the management board committee—set up by the University of Nairobi to review the university's policy on training and promotion, for example—ignores the contributions of the faculty to community engagement but instead emphasizes publications, supervision of students, and teaching experience among others, as the criteria for faculty promotions to senior academic positions. Even universities, such as Makerere Uni-

> **The creation of specialized organizational units, the integration of community engagement into university budgets and activities, and the presence of supportive leadership at all levels alone cannot guarantee the full institutionalization of community engagement.**

versity in Uganda, with community engagement among the criteria for faculty hiring and promotions to senior academic positions, allocate few points to faculty engagement, and service to external communities. In addition, funding for community engagement is largely sporadic, insufficient, or reliant on foreign funding sources. Therefore, most community related projects are initiated by individuals or groups of faculty members and are thus less institutional, but more personal in nature. Hence, the question is: What can African universities do to institutionalize community engagement?

Suggestions for Improvement

Community-related projects at most universities often rely on the involvement, commitment, and expertise of the faculty, staff, and students. Thus, such projects usually die out or become unsustainable when individuals leave or are no longer involved. The institutionalization of community engagement at African universities necessitates the creation of university-wide agendas and institutions—policies, structures, and practices—to guide and facilitate the involvement of the academic units, faculty, staff, students, and external communities in community engagement. It also calls for the integration of community engagement into institutional budgets, teaching, and research activities—through service learning, collaborative research, and internships—and the deliberate involvement of the external communities in curriculum development among other activities. The institutionalization of community engagement also necessitates the vision and commitment of university leaders, whose support can help to address the concerns of the uninterested and/or suspicious faculty, staff, students, and external communities. Thus, the decision by Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University to create the office of the deputy vice-chancellor in charge of research and engagement is commendable. However, community engagement should not be left to individual leaders, lest such dependence curtail the sustainability of community related activities, when such leaders are no longer in charge.

The creation of specialized organizational units, the integration of community engagement into university budgets and activities, and the presence of supportive leadership at all levels alone cannot guarantee the full institutionalization of community engagement, unless the involvement of the faculty is properly rewarded. The institutionalization of community engagement at any university is evinced by and benefits from the involvement and commitment of the faculty, staff, students, and external communities. Indeed, many community related activities—continuing education, consultancy, contract research, service learning, and collaborative research—rely on the connections, involvement, knowledge, and commitment of the faculty. Therefore, unless African universities integrate the contributions of the faculty to community engagement into their faculty hiring, evaluations, and promotions processes and reward them appropriately, faculty members will continue to regard community engagement not as an essential duty, but as a distraction to career development.

Observations

Although community engagement offers undeniable benefits to universities and external communities—for example, accessibility to external sources of funding, the enrichment of students' learning experiences, and accessibility to academic expertise and other resources of universities—institutionalizing community engagement at African universities requires a deeper understanding of the phrase "community engagement." Community engagement is often interpreted

in terms of collaborations between universities and industry, the transfer of technology from universities, and creation of spin-off firms. Yet, the term also embraces ways through which external communities, such as government and local communities, engage with and contribute to the welfare of universities and the involvement of universities in policymaking and social and cultural life. Accordingly, any approach to the institutionalization of community engagement that focuses only on the commercialization of technology is likely to limit the ways through which African universities can engage with, and/or serve, external communities because African universities are not yet key players in cutting-edge innovation. In addition, although African universities should support and encourage the production of socially and economically relevant knowledge as well as the commercialization of inventions, their research agenda should emphasize not only application-oriented research, but also basic research because a number of science systems on the continent—Namibia, Botswana, Swaziland, Mali, Angola and Mozambique—rely on universities for the production of scientific knowledge and, therefore, have no viable alternative producers of knowledge.

Furthermore, much as the institutionalization of community engagement requires that the universities should, among other things, create specialized units—for example, the Food Technology and Business Incubation Center at Makerere University, the Center for Academic Engagement and Collaboration at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, the Center for Continuing Education at the University of Botswana, and the Management and Consultancy Bureau at Dar es Salaam University. To promote community engagement and coordinate engagement-related activities, African universities should avoid creating silo systems that restrict community engagement to specific units, disciplines, and individuals. Similarly, the institutionalization of community engagement at African universities requires each university to pay attention to its institutional context—for example, history, disciplinary focus, location, ownership, mission, culture, values and priorities, and national policy agendas. Because universities, even those in the same country, cannot have the same institutional environments, the focus, forms, and organization of community engagement cannot be the same for all universities. In this regard and considering the insufficiency of funding that characterizes many African universities, the funding allocation system for community engagement at each university should reflect, conform to, and support the vision, mission, objectives, and community engagement agenda of the specific university.

■

Australian Universities Under Neoliberal Management: The Deepening Crisis

Raewyn Connell

Raewyn Connell is professor emerita, University of Sydney, Australia. E-mail: raewyn.connell@sydney.edu.au.

Australian higher education dates from the second half of the 19th century, when a few small universities were set up in raw and violent settler colonies. The rationale was that universities transmitted stabilizing cultural traditions—such as the ability to quote Horace in Latin—and gave young lawyers, engineers, and doctors some technical skills with a portion of European humane education on top. Indigenous knowledge, like indigenous students, were utterly excluded.

In the mid-20th century, the universities were transformed under an agenda of national development. The country was industrializing. To be fully modern, Australia needed a bigger secondary and tertiary education system and wider recruitment of students. After World War II the Australian federal government, previously little interested in universities, put growing amounts of taxation revenue into expanding the small colonial-era universities, and building many more in the "greenfields" around Australian cities. A massive growth in student numbers followed.

A change in the character of universities accompanied this growth. The idea spread that the society needed technology, cutting-edge science, even social science. The research university is the great modern producer of knowledge. So, Australia needed expanding research capacity. A national research university was launched in the late 1940s, and the other universities soon began expanding higher degrees. As well as new lecture theaters, the plate glass windows of research institutes were seen in the land.

Four decades of expansion produced a public university workforce, which by the 1970s and 1980s was an important presence in Australian society. It was the main base for the country's intellectual life, and probably did help economic growth. The university system created in this time was a remarkable social resource—not large compared with the United States or Europe, but of good quality, all public, and enjoying wide popular support.

The Neoliberal Turn

In the 1980s, Australian universities' conditions of existence changed. The country's political and business elites turned toward neoliberalism, with its bracing agenda of privatization, deregulation, tax cuts, management power,

and short-term profit. Like other countries in the global periphery, Australia moved back toward a colonial economic structure. The country deindustrialized, and large-scale mining for export became the leading industry. There was little economic need for autonomous production of knowledge in Australia at the time.

University reforms were launched by the Labor Party government at the end of the 1980s—as in other parts of the South, neoliberalism in Australia was introduced by "left" parties. The policies were intended to expand the university further, for social reasons—but on the cheap. The first step was to fold the nonresearch Colleges of Advanced Education into the university sector. Not by rational planning, but by a frenzy of entrepreneurial takeovers—with vice-chancellors and their staffs cast as entrepreneurs.

The next step was to find someone else to pay, and a neoliberal solution was at hand: fees. The federal government share of university funding began an astonishing collapse, from around 90 percent of university budgets at the start of the 1990s to around 45 percent now. Student fees have risen, decade after decade, to compensate.

An advantage was getting foreigners to pay. Australian universities from the 1950s to the 1970s had offered free education to Asian students as development aid. Under the neoliberal governments of the 1990s and 2000s, the university sector was redefined as an export industry—the cultural equivalent of the mining sector. Overseas students, mainly from Asia, were the rich customers to be charged as much as the market would bear. Some attempts have been made to set up branch campuses in the overseas markets. This has not flourished: perhaps Australian universities do not have enough prestige; or the attraction of study in Australia is partly the prospect of immigration. Most of the income from overseas students comes from students who have come to Australia to study.

The Changing Institutions

Neoliberalism has done more than change funding arrangements. It has transformed universities as institutions. Vice-chancellors have operated more and more as corporate chief executive officers. They are now the elite managers in a managerial workforce that works on corporate lines and is paid on corporate scales—a million dollars a year, including bonuses, for the more fortunate vice-chancellors.

Crucially, the top managers and their immediate support staff at the business end have become increasingly separated, on a day-to-day basis, from the academic, maintenance, and technical staff. A cultural gap has been opening.

In business, a standard way to raise profits is to lower labor costs. In universities the first to feel the cutting edge were the nonacademic staff. More and more of their work

has been "outsourced"—contracted out to companies unconnected with the university. This possibly saved money, but it certainly severed everyday connections of the workers involved with the academic staff.

Labor costs also had to be lowered in teaching. One way was to thin out the commitment to teaching. Across the sector, the student/teacher ratio almost doubled between 1990 and 2010. Another way was to casualize the workforce. Managements do not reveal this information—it would be bad for marketing—but the National Tertiary Education Union calculates that about 50 percent of all undergraduate teaching is now done by casual staff.

In the mid-20th century, the universities were transformed under an agenda of national development.

With the social integration of the university in steep decline, management has proliferated *indirect* mechanisms of control. Computer-based control systems are impinging deeply on day-to-day university work. They embody distrust of the workforce, they often do not fit higher education or research processes very well, and they create cynicism.

The universities are now full of fake accountability. At the same time, they have turned to public-relations techniques to attract potential students and donors and burnish the organization's image. The corporate university now projects to the world a glossy fantasy of broad lawns, relaxed students, happy staff, spacious buildings, and eternal Australian sunshine. The cultural rationale of universities as bearers of truth, of rigorous thought, is becoming deeply compromised.

A Crisis of Purpose and Reproduction

The key to much of this change is that the Australian ruling class does not need a first-rate university system, in the neoliberal era. The transnational corporations that dig up the ore and coal are happy to import their technology. The profitable local industries, from construction to gambling, do not need a broad professionalized workforce.

The rich, who can afford high fees, do need a few local universities with enough reputation to get their children into international business schools. A select group of older universities has arisen, calling themselves the Group of Eight and purporting to be a South Seas kind of Ivy League. The rest of the country's universities, as far as the Group of

Eight is concerned, can eat the scraps.

Meanwhile, graduate students and recent graduates, who now do half of the undergraduate teaching, are under extraordinary pressure. They try to cobble together a living wage from fragments of teaching, often on different campuses, at odd hours, with zero security. Australia is producing a lot of graduates; but the academic workforce of the future is being eroded, not fostered.

Although the policy discourse of neoliberal management in Australia is optimistic—market strategy requires it—the reality beneath the glossy advertising is a growing crisis in viability of the workforce and in the production and reproduction of an intellectual culture. This will not be solved by neoliberal policymakers, who do not even recognize it. The new extractive and financial corporate elites have no particular interest in having it solved.

If the growing crisis is to be solved, it will be by a qualitative shift in the way decisions about higher education are made by popular demand for a first-rate university system for the whole society, and by university staff protecting the remarkable resource that earlier generations have created.

∎

Joint-Venture Universities in China: Shanghai and Shenzhen Comparisons

Ruth Hayhoe and Julia pan

Ruth Hayhoe is professor and Julia Pan is senior research associate in the Higher Education Program, Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. Ruth Hayhoe E-mail: ruthhayhoe@sympatico.ca. Julia Pan E-mail: julia.pan@utoronto.ca.

China's newly developing joint venture universities have two unique characteristics. Firstly, China's Ministry of Education requires a formal partnership between a Chinese and a foreign university for approval to be given. This policy reflects a Chinese concern over sovereignty that goes back to the indignities suffered at the hands of foreign powers in the late 19th century. Secondly, cities and towns in China's prosperous coastal regions are prepared to provide land and building costs for such institutions, as a means of raising their profile. Here we overview joint-venture institutions in the Shanghai region and then compare emerging initiatives in the southern city of Shenzhen.

Early Sino-British Cases

The earliest joint-venture universities in China are the University of Nottingham-Ningbo in a vibrant port south of Shanghai and Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University in the nearby garden city of Suzhou. A recent article in *Higher Education* by Yi Feng (2013) provides a brief history, while drawing fascinating comparisons between these two institutions.

Nottingham partnered with a modest local university, which gained support from the town of Ningbo to build a beautiful campus. Liverpool University, by contrast, chose a top-level national university of engineering as its partner, and the Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University is funded by a Suzhou-based foundation. Students at the University of Nottingham-Ningbo are exposed to a broad liberal arts curriculum offered in English, close to that of Nottingham itself, while students of Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool are enrolled in a range of engineering and management programs with a focus on innovative approaches to teaching and research. Both have around 4,000 students at present, with the aim of reaching about 8,000. They arose from relationships between leading scholars/administrators on both sides, the most celebrated being the Fudan University president, Yang Fujia. Yang's hometown of Ningbo supported the new venture, while Nottingham appointed him as their 6th chancellor, a position he held from 2001 to 2012.

> **The earliest joint-venture universities in China are the University of Nottingham-Ningbo in a vibrant port south of Shanghai and Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University in the nearby garden city of Suzhou.**

Recent Sino-American Cases

Americans have been swift to follow the British lead. In May of 2014 we visited two new Sino-American joint ventures, also in the Shanghai area. New York University Shanghai and Duke Kunshan University recruited their first students in autumn of 2013 and 2014, respectively. While the former is a partnership between New York University and the East China Normal University (ECNU), with Shanghai's new Pudong district providing a Manhattan-style campus, the latter is a partnership between Duke University and Wu-

han University—with the town of Kunshan in Shanghai's suburbs building a campus that mirrors features of Duke's campus.

The vice dean of Arts and Sciences at New York Shanghai is a professor of comparative education at ECNU. He works closely with Provost Joanna Waley Cohen, a highly respected sinologist from the New York University's history department, who is now resident in Shanghai. New York University Shanghai enrolled its first 300 students in autumn of 2013, with classes on the ECNU campus until the new Pudong campus opened in autumn of 2014. Student numbers are now 600, with 500 new recruits planned for 2015 and 2016. The total number will be capped at 3,000, with a small number of master's students starting in 2015. Of the first class, 151 were students from all parts of China, 65 percent from the Shanghai area, while 149 were international students, 60 percent American. English is the medium of instruction but all students learn Chinese as well. The curriculum covers humanities and social sciences, sciences, mathematics, languages, and writing skills. All students are required to take two courses, global perspectives on society and on culture, and to spend one semester studying abroad. Forty percent of faculty are New York University professors on short visits, another 40 percent are recruited internationally for long-term positions, and 20 percent are adjunct professors from all parts of the world. Four research institutes will retain their current location on the ECNU campus, facilitating long-term collaborative research between faculty of both institutions in the areas of neuroscience, applied mathematics, statistical chemistry, and social work.

Duke Kunshan University recruited its first class of students in 2014, with 150 students in master's degree programs in management, medical physics, and global health. Unusually, it was allowed to recruit graduate students first, but an undergraduate program is being planned, with an intended future number of 4,000 students. A Duke committee has been convened to design this program in ways that reflect Duke's unique characteristics as a liberal arts research university. Teaching in the first autumn term is being undertaken by 30 visiting faculty from Duke, and a call is out for long-term faculty positions. Two collaborative research centers have been established in global health as well as environment and energy. The fact that Mary Brown Bullock, a distinguished sinologist and high-profile figure in Sino-American relations, serves as resident Executive Vice-Chancellor augurs well for an approach that blends China's rich traditions with those of the West.

New Shenzhen Initiatives

In November of 2014, the southern city of Shenzhen hosted the fifth annual conference on Chinese-foreign Cooperation in Running Schools. Participation in this conference gave us a glimpse into Shenzhen's approach to attracting joint-venture universities. The city came into being as a result of Deng Xiaoping's Open Door Policy in the late 1970s and was the place Deng announced China would reopen to the world after the 1989 Tiananmen Square tragedy in Beijing, on a historic trip there in January of 1992. A highlight of the conference was a roundtable of seven vice presidents from top national universities, who introduced the joint ventures they were planning for Longgang, the new urban district designated by the Shenzhen government as a university city: Tsinghua University collaborating with the University of California, Berkeley, Beijing Institute of Technology with Moscow State University, Jilin University with the University of Queensland, and Hunan University with the Rochester Institute of Technology, among others. All were responding to the invitation to set up small-scale specialized institutions, focusing on areas relevant to Shenzhen's employment needs. The intention is to attract excellent students from China and abroad and keep the top graduates in Shenzhen. The focus on institutions characterized by specialist fields of knowledge marks the Shenzhen approach as distinct from the joint-venture universities in the Shanghai area. Perhaps, that is the reason that representatives of institutions such as New York's New School, the Otto Belshem Institute of Management, and the Zurich University of the Arts had come to the conference to explore future possibilities.

Critical Concerns over Faculty Recruitment

Probably the most crucial concern for these new collaborative institutions is the recruitment of high-quality faculty for the long term. While the University of Nottingham-Ningbo mainly uses faculty from Nottingham, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University has managed to recruit faculty from all over the world. New York University Shanghai is now depending heavily on faculty from New York University but reaching out to recruit a more permanent faculty, and Duke-Kunshan University is doing the same. It may be easier to attract world-class scholars to the Shanghai area than to the new city of Shenzhen, so it will be interesting to observe how the newly emerging joint venture institutions there manage this challenge.   ∎

Japan's "Top Global University" Project

Yukiko Shimmi and Akiyoshi Yonezawa

Yukiko Shimmi is assistant professor at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, Japan. E-mail: yshimmi@gmail.com. Akiyoshi Yonezawa is associate professor at Nagoya University, Japan. E-mail: yonezawa@gsid. nagoya-u.ac.jp.

In September 2014, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan (MEXT) listed 37 Japanese universities selected to the "Top Global University" project. These universities will receive governmental funding for up to 10 years to improve their global competitiveness or to lead the internationalization of Japanese universities through the university reform (e.g., governance, management, structure, curriculum, and admission). Although the government's support for the internationalization of Japanese universities is essential, there are some concerns regarding the current project: such as, micromanagement of the government on the university reform, isomorphic standardization of the internationalization approach, and the widening gap among universities.

The Characteristics of the Top Global University Project

The MEXT's Top Global University Project consists of two categories. Thirteen large research universities were selected to the status of Type-A institutions, which particularly focuses on the improvement of universities' globalization and their presence in the top 100 of the world university rankings. The government clearly referred to the world university ranking as one of the numerical goals for the Type-A institutions. The Type-A institutions included all seven former imperial universities, four other national universities, and two prestigious private universities. They will receive 500 million Japanese yen (approximately US$4.3 million) annually for up to 10 years. Twenty-four universities were selected to the Type-B institutions, which will lead to the internationalization of Japanese higher education by leveraging their strength. The Type-B institutions included 10 national, 2 local public, and 12 private universities. They will receive 200 to 300 million Japanese yen (approximately US$1.7 to 2.5 million) annually for up to 10 years.

Compared to the universities' total budget and some excellence initiatives in other countries, the amount of funding of the current project is not large. Unlike some other excellence initiatives, the current funding is not directly allocated for research activities, but rather for the enhancement of the international presence of the universities through the internationalization and reform of governance, management, and personnel policies to fit the global competition. Chosen universities could also use their status to attract domestic and international students as well as other stakeholders, by arguing that they are among a few universities selected as models of international universities by the national government.

Plans for Selection and Implementation

Each university had to submit a strategic plan, in which the universities outlined how they planned to achieve the internationalization and the university reform, based on their own strengths and resources. For example, Nagoya University, a top national university, submitted a plan to become "Asian university-hub for developing a sustainable world in the 21st century" and launched satellite campuses in several Asian countries, to offer doctoral programs to the future national leaders. Keio University, a top private university, submitted a plan to strengthen its practice-oriented research, through the university-industry linkage.

> **Compared to the universities' total budget and some excellence initiatives in other countries, the amount of funding of the current project is not large.**

The proposed activities in the plans of the selected universities, however, mostly resemble each another. Most of the universities referred to the internationalization of various educational aspects: providing interdisciplinary courses, joint-degree programs, and English-taught courses; instituting admission reforms by utilizing external language tests and research functions; internationally promoting international research collaboration, fostering university-industry cooperation, developing international networks, and leveraging overseas research hubs; and other activities, such as faculty and staff development for internationalization.

These similarities occurred partly because the government requested the applying universities to fill a form that exemplifies the main activities. They were requested to report their current situation and future projection based on about 40 performance indicators. Adding to the typical indicators related to internationalization (e.g., the numbers of international students, exchange students who study abroad, institutional international agreements, and foreign faculty members), the universities were also required to re-

port on various internationally-related activities (e.g., providing international residence halls, offering courses and degree programs in foreign languages, providing various Japanese-language courses, introducing Grade Point Average systems, making syllabi available in English, providing university information in foreign languages, and conducting admissions that are convenient for potential applicants overseas). In addition, some indicators were not relevant to internationalization but were relevant to a wider university reform—such as, the degree to which implementing the achievement-based salary system, the tenure-track system, and the evaluation system aligned with international standards.

Some Concerns

This project can be a strong support for making these universities more internationally competitive. From the viewpoint of taxpayers, it must be reasonable that the government should monitor the progress of the publicly funded project with clear performance indicators. However, there are also some concerns regarding the consequences of this elaborately designed project.

This project may lead to an inefficient micromanagement of leading universities that need strong independence in nature. In principle, the current project appears to respect the importance of the universities' autonomous decisions, by agreeing on a strategic plan that is based on their mission and profiles. However, through the prescribed multiple indicators with rigorous monitoring and assessment for a long period, the universities may loose flexibility in their institutional decisions.

The prescribed indicators may lead to a similar standardization in the approach to internationalization, especially among the top-research universities selected as "Type-A." Most of the indicators requested from the government are numerical, making it easy to compare one university to another and often emulating the indicators used for international university rankings.

In addition, another part of the current project could be a problem among Japanese universities. Including the current funding, a limited number of universities—mainly, prestigious large-scale comprehensive universities—have continuously received government's competitive funds for internationalization. While these universities have gradually developed internal systems and administrative capacities for the university reform and internationalization, the other universities have been left out. In parallel with this Top Global University project, the government is guiding a discussion on functional diversification and on the restructuration of the whole education system. Although it is difficult for the government to provide funds for all the universities to become "world-class" or to be internationalized, it is undesirable to leave the majority of students of this country out of the international learning environment.

While there are some potential concerns, this project will provide ideas and ways to achieve the internationalization and the university reform for both the selected and nonselected universities. The plans of the universities and the selection results are accessible online, and the interim and final reports by the universities will be also published online in Japanese and partly also in English. With the transparency of the whole selection and evaluation processes of the current project, the government and universities should make further efforts in the dissemination of good practices of internationalization reforms. ∎

NEW PUBLICATIONS

American Association of University Professors. *Policy Documents and Reports, 11th Edition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 408 pp. $49.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1637-3.

This volume contains official statements and position papers of the American Association of University Professors, the organization representing the US academic profession. Among the themes discussed are academic freedom, the evaluation of faculty members, faculty work, intellectual property and copyright, collective bargaining, discrimination, and others.

Arabljeradmand, Ali, et al. *An Introduction to Internationalization of Higher Education: Essential Topics*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2015. 132 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-7618-6470-7. Web site: www.roman.com.

This book, by a group of Iranian academics, provides a general discussion of higher education internationalization based on the international literature on the topic. There is no discussion of the situation in Iran itself.

Blumenstyk, Goldie. *American Higher Education in Crisis?: What Everyone Needs to Know*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. 196 pp. $16.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-19-

937408-3. Web site: www.oup.com.

A short, clearly written broad analysis of the key issues facing American higher education by a senior writer for the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, this volume discusses such key themes as costs and debt, the changing student population, and leadership pressures. The book concludes with discussion of future trends such as MOOCs, "big data," and other key themes.

Crow, Michael M., and William B. Dabars. *Designing the New American University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 344 pp. $34.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1723-3. Web site: www. press.jhu.edu.

Arizona State University president Michael Crow and William Dabars develop the idea of the New American University that includes innovative practices, a commitment to research and an overarching concern with relevance. They provide a discussion of the current state of American higher education as well.

Cummings, William K., and Ulrich Teicher, eds. *The Relevance of Academic Work in Comparative Perspective.* Dordrecht, Springer, 2015. $150 (hb). 252 pp. ISBN 978-3-319-11766-9. Web site: www.springer.com.

The 13th volume in the series on "The Changing Academic Profession," this book focuses broadly on the key elements of academic work—teaching and research. Among the topics considered are gender differences in scholarship, the impact of government policies on academic attitudes, coping with crisis in Greece, teaching and research in binary systems, and others.

Farrugia, Christine A., and Rajika Bhandari. 2014. *Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange.* New York: Institute of International Education, 2014. 142 pp. $69.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-371-6. Web site: www.iie.org.

The Institute of International Education's annual report on international education exchange provide detailed statistics relating to international students coming to the United States as well as American students studying abroad. Information concerning countries of origin, fields of study, US institutions hosting students, and many other variables are discussed.

Klabunde, Niels. 2014. *Wettlauf um internationale Studierende. Integration und interkulturelle Hochschulentwicklung in Deutschland und Kanada.* Weisbaden, Germany: Springer Fachmedien. 410 pp. €49,52. ISBN 978-3-658-04622-4. Web site: www.springer.com.

This book, published in German, describes trends in the competition for international students, in a comparative analysis of Germany and Canada. The book looks at policies for mobility, integration of international students in the two countries, and tal-ent attraction strategies in both Germany and Canada.

Kehm, Barbara M., and Ulrich Teichler, eds. *Higher Education Studies in a Global Environment, vol. 2.* Kassel, Germany: International Center for Higher Education Research, 2014. 293 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-3-934377-81-3.

A series of papers based on master's theses completed in the higher education program at the University of Kassel. Among the topics are governance in Kenyan universities, internationalization in Lebanon and in Vietnam, world-class universities in China, and others.

Kuder, Matthias; Nina Lemmens, and Daniel Obst, eds. *Global Perspectives on International Joint and Double Degree Programs.* New York: Institute of International Education, 2014. $39.95 (pb). Web site: www.iie.org.

This book is the first in a new "Global Perspectives" series jointly published by Institute of International Education and DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) that will explore pressing issues in international higher education. The publication provides an overview of current trends and developments—as well as institutional case studies, and regional perspectives concerning joint- and double-degree programs. The book also includes chapters on the student perspective and on issues of accreditation and quality assurance.

Lacroix, Robert, and Louis Maheu. *Leading Research Universities in a Competitive World.* Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 2015. 281 pp. $49.95. (hb). ISBN 978-0-7735-4477-2. Web site: www.mqup.ca.

This volume is an analysis of the development and current status of research universities, in a global perspective written originally in French. The authors discuss the history of the research university and the impact of rankings. Academic systems in the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and France are analyzed, and a broader analytic theme is proposed.

Lambert, Matthew T. *Privatization and the Public Good: Public Universities in the Balance.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2014. 332 pp. $29.95 (pb). ISBN: 978-1-61250-731-6. Web site: www.harvardeducationpress.org.

A research-based essay concerning privatization trends in the United States. The author laments the growing privatization and defends the importance of the public mission of American public universities. Case studies of North Carolina and Virginia are included, although with broader national analysis.

Nelson, Cary and Gabriel Noah Brahm, eds. *The Case Against Academic Boycotts of Israel.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2014. 552 pp. $34.99 (pb). ISBN 978-0-990331605. Web site: www.wsupress.wayne.edu.

The academic movement to boycott Israel because of Israeli policies relating to the Palestinians has engendered considerable debate in the United States. This volume provides a range of essays and statements in opposition to the anti-Israel boycott movement.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. *Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators.* Paris: OECD Publishing, 2014. 567 pp. (pb). ISBN: 978-92-64-21132-2. Web site: www.oecd.org/publishing.

OECD's landmark annual publication of data, on all aspects of education from member countries of the OECD and a small number of additional nations, provides statistical data on more than 100 aspects of education. This is the most thorough and comprehensive coverage for the 34 OECD countries and a dozen or so partner nations.

The Center For International Higher Education Welcomes a New Director

Laura E. Rumbley

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

As of September 1, 2015, the Boston College Center for International Higher Education will be under the leadership of Professor Hans de Wit. A Dutch national, de Wit currently serves as Professor of Internationalization of Higher Education at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. He is also affiliated in a research capacity with Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

As his professional titles imply, Hans de Wit's academic work has centered heavily on examining the phenomenon of internationalization in higher education—including its historical manifestations and rationale, its conceptual and practical dimensions, its contemporary complexities and contradictions. De Wit has published widely on this subject, and is responsible for establishing the premier scholarly publication focused on this field, the *Journal of Studies in International Education*.

Hans de Wit has been a leader in the professional arena, as well. He was a founding member of the European Association for International Education (EAIE) and is a past president of that organization. He has received awards for his contributions to the field from a wide range of practitioner organizations around the world, and was selected as a Fulbright New Century Scholar in 2005–2006.

De Wit replaces founding director Professor Philip G. Altbach, who established the Center in 1995 and guided its development over two decades into a globally recognized resource for information and analysis on trends and developments in higher education worldwide. Altbach will remain actively involved in CIHE activities as a research professor at Boston College's Lynch School of Education, and as editor of *International Higher Education*, CIHE's widely circulated quarterly newsletter.

Altbach has described Hans de Wit as "Mr. Internationalization" in the world of higher education," and both the CIHE team and the Boston College community at-large are delighted to welcome him. Indeed, Maureen Kenny, dean of the Lynch School of Education where the Center is housed, has said of de Wit that—in addition to his status as a globally recognized scholar in the internationalization of higher education—he "brings extensive experience in program development and administration that will facilitate our reach across our campus, the nation, and to universities worldwide, including the wide network of Jesuit and Catholic institutions."

The enthusiasm around the appointment seems mutual. Hans de Wit has expressed a special affinity for Boston College, where he spent a year as a visiting scholar in 1995. He notes, "I am excited about this new challenge, as it brings together all I have done over the years as a scholar and practitioner, allows me to walk in the footsteps of a great scholar and dear friend, and work with a qualified and enthusiastic team of scholars and doctoral students at CIHE and in the Lynch School of Education."

CIHE now moves into its third decade of existence under the new leadership of Hans de Wit, with energy and excitement for possible new directions and initiatives, rooted in a shared appreciation for the Center's distinguished past.

New CIHE-Related Books

We are pleased to note that several books have recently been published that reflects research conducted by the Center for International Higher Education and our research partners. These three books speak to our longstanding interest in the academic profession and our conviction that academics are at the heart of any successful university. The research that underlies three of these volumes has been cosponsored by our continuing collaboration with the National Research University-Higher School of Economics–Moscow. The fourth is related to work cosponsored with the American Council on Education.

•*Young Faculty in the Twenty-First Century: International Perspectives*. Edited by Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 364 pp. $90 (hb). This book consists of 10 national case studies—Russia, United States, South Africa, Portugal, Norway, India, Brazil, France, Germany, and China, as well as several comparative analyses. A paperback edition will be released later.

•*Academic Inbreeding and Mobility in Higher Education: Global Perspectives*. Edited by Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 264 pp. $100 (hb). Faculty inbreeding is a common practice in many countries. This book discusses the problems and realities of this topic in 8 countries—Argentina, China, Japan, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa,

Spain, and Ukraine. Comparative analysis is also provided as well as a detailed review of the literature on this topic.

•*The Global Future of Higher Education and the Academic Profession.* Edited by Philip G. Altbach, Gregory Androushchak, Yaroslav Kuzminov, Maria Yudkevich, and Liz A. Reisberg. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 264 pp. $40 (pb). Note that this is a newly released paperback edition of our 2012 volume. Analyses of the challenges facing universities in the BRIC countries with special reference to the academic profession.

•*Global Opportunities and Challenges for Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes.* Edited by Laura E. Rumbley, Robin Matross Helms, Patti McGill Peterson, and Philip G. Altbach. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense, 2014. 251 pp. $45 (pb). Short essays aimed at higher education leaders are provided on 4 key themes—global engagement, China, India, and the "Southern Cone" of Latin America. The essays focus on the current challenges and opportunities of universities in these countries, the role of internationalization, the development of partnerships, and related themes. While the essays were written to inform American higher education leaders, they are globally relevant.

News of the Center

We are in the process of welcoming Hans de Wit as the new Center director—see an article about Hans elsewhere in this issue. He will be joining the Boston College faculty in September and will teach a course on internationalization in the fall semester. Among our many plans is to build a master's program focused on international higher education as part of the Boston College higher education administration graduate program.

Philip G. Altbach remains a research professor at Boston College and takes the title of Founding Director of CIHE. He will remain active in the Center's work and will continue to edit *International Higher Education.*

On April 23, 2015 Philip G. Altbach (as keynote) and Laura E. Rumbley (as panelist) participated in an international higher education seminar at Northeastern University. On April 29, 2015 the Center co-sponsored an event at Harvard University on "Global assessment of higher education learning outcomes." Convened by Manja Klemenčič, the session speakers included Dirk van Damme (OECD), Henry Rosovsky (Harvard University), Marjik van der Wende (former dean of Amsterdam University College), and Philip G. Altbach. Also in April, Altbach spoke at a workshop for all of the rectors of universities in Saudi Arabia. He continues to serve on the planning committee of the International Conference on Higher Education for the Saudi Ministry of Higher Education.

In May, Philip G. Altbach, along with Kara Godwin, CIHE visiting scholar, will participate in a conference on liberal arts in Shanghai, China, sponsored by the Harvard China Fund and Amsterdam University College.

The Center has recently copublished, with the American Council on Education's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, number 5 in the series "International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders." This Brief focused on the subject of international joint- and dual-degree programs.

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*), is now freely available for download from the CIHE Web site. Work on the Center's small follow-up survey from that inventory—focused 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"—is moving forward, under the direction of Center associate director Laura E. Rumbley and doctoral research assistants Ariane de Gayardon and Georgiana Mihut.

Laura E. Rumbley, Philip G. Altbach, and Hans de Wit are all active in the May conference of NAFSA: Association of International Educators, which takes place in Boston. They will be speaking at several sessions. CIHE will host a small invitational seminar at Boston College, as well, to mark the 20th anniversary of the Center's establishment. Featured speakers include Eva Egron-Polak (International Association of Universities) and Francisco Marmolejo (World Bank).

CIHE will again be collaborating with the Centre for Internationalisation of Higher Education (CHEI)—based at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy—to produce a special issue of *International Higher Education* focused on the theme of internationalization. All inquiries about this special issue (including deadlines, article requirements, and style guide information) should be directed to Fiona Hunter, CHEI Research Associate, at chei@unicatt.it.

We warmly welcome summer 2015 visiting scholars Daniel Kontowski (University of Warsaw, Poland) and Armağan Erdoğan (Social Sciences University of Ankara, Turkey).

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.