

*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, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Links to all editions can be found at <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe>.

Partnership with **University World News** (UWN)

Beginning this year in January 2017, CIHE is partnering with UWN, a widely recognized and established online resource for current international higher education news and commentary. We are pleased to feature UWN on *IHE* and have *IHE* featured on UWN's website and monthly newsletter.

For weekly global higher education news and comment see our partner:

**University  
World News**



THE GLOBAL WINDOW ON HIGHER EDUCATION  
[www.universityworldnews.com](http://www.universityworldnews.com)

### International Issues

- 
- 2 US Student Mobility Trends in a Global Context  
**Rajika Bhandari**
  - 3 China and International Student Mobility  
**Hang Gao and Hans de Wit**
  - 5 Are International Students “Cash Cows”?  
**Rahul Choudaha**
  - 7 International Branch Campuses: Curiosity or Important Trend?  
**Richard Garrett**
  - 8 Twenty-first Century Mobility: International Faculty  
**Philip G. Altbach and Maria Yudkevich**
  - 10 Reframing Global Engagement  
**Marijk van der Wende**
  - 12 United States, Europe, Asia: Diversity in Nobel-Winning Affiliations  
**Elisabeth Maria Schlagberger, Lutz Bornmann, and Johann Bauer**
  - 13 Higher Education, Student Health, and Obesity in Developing Countries  
**Caitríona Taylor**

### Crises in Central Europe and Russia

- 
- 15 Requiem for a Dream: Academic Freedom under Threat in Democracies  
**Daniela Crăciun and Georgiana Mihut**
  - 16 Ukraine: Endemic Higher Education Corruption  
**Elena Denisova-Schmidt and Yaroslav Prytula**

### Africa Focus: Ethiopia and Uganda

- 
- 18 Quality Problems in Ethiopian Higher Education  
**Ayenachew A. Woldegiyorgis**
  - 19 Unusual Growth: Ethiopian Private Higher Education  
**Wondwosen Tamrat and Daniel Levy**
  - 20 Uganda: Higher Education Modernization Needed  
**Mukwanason A. Hyuha**

### Latin American Issues

- 
- 22 Creating a New Ranking: Colombian Challenges  
**Felipe Montes, David Forero, Ricardo Salas, and Roberto Zarama**
  - 24 Private Higher Education in Brazil: Fueling Economic Growth  
**José Janguiê Bezerra, Celso Niskier, and Lioudmila Batourina**

### Countries and Regions

- 
- 26 Higher Education Regionalization in East Asia  
**Edward W. Choi**
  - 28 China: A World Leader in Graduation Rates  
**Julian Marioulas**
  - 29 Politics and the Universities in Postrevolution Iran  
**Saeid Golkar**

### Departments

- 
- 31 New Publications

## US Student Mobility Trends in a Global Context

**RAJIKA BHANDARI**

*Rajika Bhandari is deputy vice-president, research and evaluation, Institute of International Education (IIE), New York, US. E-mail: rbhandari@iie.org.*

The demand for a US higher education among students across the world has grown steadily, with the United States hosting almost a million students from over 200 countries. In past years, much of the growth has been driven by Chinese undergraduate students, which has shifted the balance between international graduate and undergraduate students in the United States. Significant growth has also been driven by large-scale government scholarship programs that have sent their citizens to the United States primarily to study intensive English or pursue nondegree study in the STEM fields. Overall, the demand for a STEM education remains high, with most international students in the United States opting to pursue a STEM degree while also taking advantage of the 29-month poststudy Optional Practical Training. Against the backdrop of these overall trends, this article examines key developments currently shaping the mobility landscape in the United States and globally.

### **NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS: GROWTH OR DEMISE?**

National scholarship programs continue to drive growth in student mobility, but also raise important questions about the sustainability of investments in international education and exchanges. Many US institutions have come to rely on Saudi and Brazilian students and the resources they bring, and the waxing and waning of these programs will likely create a vacuum. For the US higher education sector at large, the question will be how to sustain the links that have been forged as a result of these programs, and how to adjust their enrollment strategies to account for fewer Brazilian and Saudi students. For the sending countries that now have a sizeable number of their youth that have been educated in the United States, the question remains as to how this globally trained talent will be absorbed into the labor economy and what the long-term impacts are of such significant investments.

### **GLOBAL STUDENT MOBILITY: SOME GRAVE CONCERNS**

**Gender disparity:** While an increasing number of women are globally mobile, sending and receiving countries need to work harder to close the international education gender gap, particularly in certain fields of study. The gender gap

in the numbers of male and female international students coming to the United States had narrowed significantly over the past three decades, but has widened again over the past two years. This probably has to do with more international students from male-dominated societies where women have traditionally not been encouraged to study abroad. But it also attributable to the increase of international students pursuing STEM fields, which have historically been male-dominated fields. Governments and institutions in key sending countries need to encourage more women to go abroad through their scholarship and exchange programs; US institutions, particularly those that attract larger numbers of international students in STEM, need to consider how they can attract more female international students to their programs.

**Academic displacement:** Beginning in 2015, the world has seen human displacement on a scale unknown in more than a generation, and those displaced face challenges in preparing for or accessing higher education. According to estimates from IIE, in Syria alone, well over 100,000 university students and as many as 2,000 university professionals are living amongst the refugee population, with their studies and academic careers interrupted indefinitely. In 2015, 21.3 million refugees were registered with the United Nations; half of them are under the age of 18 and have yet to enter tertiary education, and many others have experienced a disruption of their higher education studies. Only 1 percent of all college-age refugees are enrolled in higher education in comparison with 34 percent of tertiary-level age youth worldwide. Cost of tuition and travel, unavailability of identification and academic documents, lack of recognition of prior studies, language barriers, pressure to assume work or family responsibilities, host community discrimination, and difficulty obtaining information all limit access to education. While efforts are being made to provide financial and application support and to utilize technology to reach displaced students, the need remains great and is expected to continue for some time.

**Equity and access in mobility:** The adoption of the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 has brought a renewed focus to the critical issues of equity and access in higher education as well as international higher education, and the availability of a global experience to a diversity of students. Scholarship programs funded by governments and private foundations such as the Ford Foundation and the Mastercard Foundation often aim to provide international fellowships to marginalized individuals from developing countries. Research has shown that these types of targeted efforts have a significant impact in increasing access to international education, and can have a multiplier effect on communities and countries. An-

other aspect of the equity equation is that of brain drain and the loss of trained human capital. While many regions of the world that see large outbound ratios of their college-age population (such as Asia) have begun to see a shift toward “brain circulation,” with many of their foreign-educated citizens returning home, Africa continues to experience a significant loss of human capital through student mobility. This raises the issue of what obligations and responsibilities the international higher education sector and industry have toward balancing the needs of developing countries to retain their critical human capital, against the needs and aspirations of individuals to seek the best education possible regardless of where it is offered. This imbalance is addressed to some extent by scholarships in the form of development aid, awarded to students from developing countries by the governments of developed countries and monitored under Target 4.b of the SDGs. But according to a recent analysis of globally available scholarship data by IIE, the total number of such scholarships is small and serves only 1 percent of those from the developing world who seek a global education.

---

**National scholarship programs continue to drive growth in student mobility, but also raise important questions about the sustainability of investments in international education and exchanges.**

---

#### **AN ALTERED POLITICAL CLIMATE AND THE FUTURE OF MOBILITY**

One of the most significant developments over the past two years has been the rise of nationalism around the world, and what is perceived as a turning inward of many traditional host destinations that have typically attracted large numbers of students and scholars from around the world. The first such development was “Brexit” in the United Kingdom in 2016, which will likely have far-reaching consequences on student mobility into and out of the United Kingdom, and also on mobility between the United Kingdom and continental Europe. Similarly, political shifts in the United States and two travel bans against individuals from seven countries in January and March 2017 have raised many questions about whether the United States remains an attractive destination for international students.

While there is much speculation about this issue and

the scale of impact on student mobility to the United States, a recently released snapshot survey (March, 2017) conducted by AACRAO (the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) in partnership with IIE, the College Board, NAFSA, and NACAC (National Association for College Admissions Counseling, and international ACAC), indicates that 39 percent of 250 responding US campuses report declines in applications from international students, particularly from the Middle East. Declines were also reported from India and China at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It should be noted that while this survey provides some much-needed information during a period of uncertainty, it is a snapshot based on a modest pool of responding institutions.

What is critical is that the current developments in the United States have mobilized the international education community—including higher education institutions and associations—to develop joint strategies and outreach to underscore the value of international education even further. US institutions have launched coordinated efforts to emphasize to international students that they are still welcome through the #YouAreWelcomeHere campaign and other similar initiatives.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9756>

---

## China and International Student Mobility

HANG GAO AND HANS DE WIT

*Hang Gao is a PhD candidate in the Faculty of Education, Beijing Normal University (BNU), China, and is currently a visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: gaohang@mail.bnu.edu.cn. Hans de Wit is professor and director of CIHE. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu.*

**F**uture competition in the global knowledge economy will be based on the availability of talents. There is a clear trend that countries around the world look strategically into improving their domestic higher education systems, to become more attractive to talented international students. As the largest developing country and one of the most significant actors in the global economy, China needs to reform critical aspects of its current system and provide better services to international students, to enhance its cultural soft power as well as consolidate its international posi-

tion. China aims to receive 500,000 international students at the end of this decade and is already moving fast in this direction, bypassing Australia, France, and Germany, to become the third destination country for international students after the United States and the United Kingdom. With the current political climate in the main countries hosting international students, in particular the United Kingdom and the United States, China's prospectives to become a dominant player are more promising than a few years ago. Attracting international students and increasing their stay-rate after graduation is becoming a major political strategy at the national level and also for major cities and provinces, as well as universities. But for this effort to be sustainable, China needs to improve the quality of its higher education offer and services.

#### WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS FOR CHINA?

The Chinese higher education system is rooted in its domestic historical, political, and cultural background, and also in the current geopolitical context. These internal and external factors have a big influence on the way the higher education system is preparing to receive larger numbers of international students.

Economically, it can be predicted that China will benefit significantly from increasing the number of international students, through their contributions from tuition fees and from travel and living expenses. Increasing the stay-rate of international students—along with the policy to stimulate Chinese students who graduated abroad to return—can contribute to the development of China as a knowledge economy. The experience of countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States shows that international students can make valuable contributions to the development of the domestic economy.

Culturally, as a key bridge between China and the rest of world, international students with Chinese language proficiency will have a better basic understanding of China and will introduce the values of its traditional culture and economic development to the world. This is not only an opportunity for Chinese language, culture, and academy to enter the global stage, but also cultural soft power expansion.

Politically, international students will contribute to China's transfer from the global periphery to the center. Increased bilateral and multilateral cooperation in higher education and receiving talents from developing countries will consolidate south-south cooperation between China and developing countries.

Educationally, increasing the number of international students, optimizing conditions for their stay, and facilitating the communication between these students and domestic students, are important steps to enhance the internationalization and quality of the higher education system,

and provide an "internationalization at home" experience to Chinese students.

#### WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

Since the beginning of the new millennium, China has highly emphasized the importance of recruiting international students. As mentioned above, China has become the third largest study destination in the world. About 398,000 international students from 208 countries studied in China in 2015, and over 400,000 in 2016. What should be done to make this policy more effective and sustainable?

China needs to strengthen its policies of intergovernmental exchange and cooperation. Several core policies have already been developed over the past few years, including the "National Medium- and Long-Term Plan for Education Reform and Development (2010–2020)" of 2010, and, in 2016, "Some Suggestions to Improve the Opening and Reform of Education in the New Period" and "Pushing Forward the 'Belt and Road Initiative' Education Action." One can also mention intergovernmental cooperation projects like the "Silk Road University Association," stimulating higher education cooperation with developing and developed countries through bilateral agreements.

Providing scholarship support to international students is important. In order to increase financial assistance, especially to students from developing countries, China has created large and attractive scholarship projects at different levels including the central government, local governments, Confucius Institutes, multilateral development initiatives, and universities. At least 37,000 international students benefited from scholarships in 2014.

Building Chinese language proficiency is another tool. Foreign language proficiency is one of the biggest challenges for international students. It has a direct impact on the quality of their educational experience in China, and it deprives Chinese students from the opportunity to benefit from their contributions. The Chinese government has already taken measures to improve the Chinese language proficiency of international students. A Chinese language proficiency test named HSK has been launched in an effort to better serve international learners and boost international enrollments at Chinese higher education institutions.

Enhancing and popularizing Chinese language learning globally is another action. According to official statistics, 511 Confucius Institutes and 1,073 Confucius Classrooms have been established in 140 countries and regions. In 2016, Confucius Institutes and Classrooms around the world recruited 46,000 Chinese and overseas full-time and part-time teachers and enrolled 2.1 million students, hosting a total of 13 million participants in various cultural events. Chinese universities provide a one- to two-year preparatory education program for international students with

low language proficiency. The effect of this policy on the recruitment of international students has to be assessed and better coordinated with other policies.

#### **FUTURE CHALLENGES**

Although there has been a rapid growth of the number of international students in China in recent years, there is room for further increase, given the low percentage of international students in the overall enrollment. China's policy to attract international students is just starting up. Support measures at the national, local, and institutional levels are still insufficient. Several challenges have to be addressed.

The current curriculum is too limited to meet the needs of international students. Given that more than half of the current international students are nondegree students who stay only for a short period, it is essential to develop courses in other languages, in particular English.

Current criteria regulating tuition fee levels are another obstacle. The fact that the national higher education administration has the exclusive authority to set these criteria leads to a dilemma for the institutions. Some universities have a strong wish to expand enrollments of international students by improving services and the quality of the educational offer. However, under the current rigid tuition fee criteria, these universities cannot invest sufficient resources to provide quality education and services to international students.

Universities have ignored the development of services such as websites with information in foreign languages, library services, club activities, and psychological counseling. For security reasons and to avoid possible conflicts, Chinese universities usually provide better accommodation conditions to international students than to their domestic counterparts. But this limits the possibilities for daily interactions and mutual understanding between the two groups. There is still a long way to go in cultivating a mature, multicultural campus culture.

International students, especially those from developing countries, are eager to seize opportunities for employment or internships in China. However, as a result of unfavorable visa, immigration, and employment policies, these opportunities are limited, except for a few initiatives launched in more developed regions such as Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangdong.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9865>

## Are International Students “Cash Cows”?

**RAHUL CHOUDAHA**

*Rahul Choudaha is cofounder and CEO of DrEducation, LLC, and interEDGE.org. E-mail: rahul@DrEducation.com.*

The budget cuts faced by many American higher education institutions have compelled its leaders to find alternative sources of revenue to ensure the financial sustainability of their institutions. In search for solutions, many spotted the opportunity of recruiting international students as a new source of cash flow to fund operations and fill the budget deficits.

Between 2007–2008 to 2015–2016, the number of international students in the United States increased by 67 percent to reach 1,043,839. At the same time, the economic benefits from the presence of international students on American campuses increased by 111 percent to reach US\$32.8 billion. This clearly indicates that the financial contributions of international students have outpaced the increase in enrollment.

The Boston Consulting Group developed a framework in the 1960s to help companies think about their allocation of resources. One of the terms they used in the framework was “cash cows.” Broadly, it indicated a product or company that provided steady, reliable cash flows to fund its growth and the growth of a company's other business units.

By the recent trends we have been witnessing, are some American institutions treating international students as cash cows? Are they placing high priority on expanding international enrollment with the lack of corresponding investment of time, attention, and resources to support the success of these students?

#### **EXPANDING THE POOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS**

The intensity of budget cuts and the opportunity to replace those cuts with international student tuition revenue came together to invite new entrants in the recruitment marketplace. In the last decade, many institutions started focusing on increasing the total revenue by increasing the number of international students and charging additional service fees to these students.

However, many have realized that expanding enrollment is not easy, especially if the institutions lack the global visibility and rankings valued by students, or if their geographic location is not appealing. In addition to constraints of visibility, institutions also realized that the segment of students who have both the financial means and academic preparedness to study internationally have many choices to

consider, making this segment highly competitive.

Given that many institutions were not able to award more financial assistantships or scholarships to the student body at large, they started recognizing the importance of expanding the applicant pool to students who may be less academically prepared, but have the financial backing to invest additional time to prepare to study in the United States.

The lower academic preparedness might be in English or other subjects. To help international students gain English preparedness for admission, Intensive English Programs (IEP) became an important support mechanism. Between 2007 and 2015, the number of international students in IEP grew by 145 percent to reach 133,335 students.

As IEPs were experiencing growth to meet English preparedness, private third-party players started emerging to provide additional remedial support for academic preparedness beyond English, and offered an opportunity to earn transferable academic credits. These providers also brought with them additional funds to expand recruitment and related support services.

---

**The budget cuts faced by many American higher education institutions have compelled its leaders to find alternative sources of revenue to ensure the financial sustainability of their institutions.**

---

In response to this changing environment, NAFSA: Association of International Educators commissioned me as the principal investigator of a research study to understand the landscape of third-party pathway partnerships in the United States. The primary reason identified by survey respondents for partnering with third-party pathway providers was to access their recruitment network. In contrast, the top reason for not partnering was fear of loss of academic standards.

Despite the concerns for loss of academic standards, one cannot ignore the threat to financial sustainability faced by many institutions. An ecosystem of third-party providers, which partner with institutions aiming to grow enrollments, has been gaining stronger acceptance. This raises the question whether investments in recruitment and increases in tuition fees are matched with student success initiatives. Are institutions ready to support students who are coming with diverse levels of preparedness and expectations?

#### REINVESTING IN STUDENT SUCCESS AND CAMPUS READINESS

In its report *Integrating International Students*, the American Council on Education noted that “while efforts to recruit international students are on the rise, the data do not show a commensurate increase in support services for these students.” The last decade of student enrollment in the United States has exposed the lack of readiness among many campuses in engaging and supporting international students.

At many campuses, support services for international students mostly distill down to immigration and visa compliance. For example, while career advancement is a key consideration for many international students, for institutions it is the last priority. By continuing to increase tuition and fees for international students without a proportionate reinvestment in their success, some institutions are on the slippery slope of treating international students as cash cows.

American higher education has a strong reputation for excellence and quality among international students. Institutions that are only considering the revenue side of the equation without commensurate investment in campus readiness and student experience are not only threatening the appeal of the United States as a destination, but also pursuing an unsustainable way of expanding international enrollment.

To build a sustainable and inclusive model of enrolling and integrating international students with local students and campus communities, institutions of higher education must invest in training campus staff to effectively work with the culturally diverse students. They must understand the diversity of student needs and continually invest in improving student experiences and outcomes.

Asking for additional resources in times of fiscal constraints is unrealistic. What is needed is an innovative approach to reframe and reimagine the strategies that reinvest in supporting student success. In my article “Three Waves of International Student Mobility 1999–2020,” I argue that institutions are heading towards hypercompetition for international students not only from traditional destinations but also new destinations like China. This will require institutions to become innovative in allocating resources and supporting student success.

In sum, while cash flow challenges are a reality for many institutions, treating international students as cash cows is unethical and detrimental to the hard-earned reputation of American higher education. Institutions must innovate to balance recruitment with reinvestment in student experiences and outcomes. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9927>

# International Branch Campuses—Curiosity or Important Trend?

**RICHARD GARRETT**

*Richard Garrett is director, Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. E-mail: richard.garrett@i-graduate.org. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE) has teamed up with the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT at SUNY Albany and Penn State University) to put together a new report on international branch campuses. Part 1 is available now for Observatory members and can be purchased by nonmembers.*

International branch campuses (IBCs) have emerged as a distinctive aspect of the internationalization strategies of governments and higher education institutions. These entities captured a great deal of attention during the 2000s as institutions rushed to set up shop—particularly in certain Middle Eastern and Asian countries—anticipating some mix of recruitment, revenue, research, and branding gains. Some of these adventures ended in well-publicized failures and others have become very successful. Today, we count 249 branches operating around the world—up from 66 in 2011, with around 20 believed to be in development.

Examples include University of Nottingham's campuses in Malaysia and China, Georgia Tech's campus in France, RMIT's campus in Vietnam, and the Philippines AMA International University campus in Bahrain.

True IBCs are still quite rare but continue to open with some frequency. If we include IBCs that have changed status or closed in the past, of which there are at least 42 documented instances, there have been 291 IBCs created in total.

## WHAT IS AN IBC?

The new report, which was published in November 2016, defines an IBC as “an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; and provides an entire academic program, substantially on site, leading to a degree awarded by the foreign education provider.”

Gathering information about IBCs is difficult, as there is no governmental or nongovernmental entity that officially tracks such activity. Few countries systematically collect information on the foreign activities of their higher education institutions. Attempts were made to gather data from every IBC in existence, through the institutional website, online news articles and press releases, or via e-mail with institutional leaders. Not every institution had data readily

available or were willing to share, and some offered incomplete data. More comprehensive and publicly available data would be of great benefit to all stakeholders in IBC ventures. Our data set offers the most comprehensive picture of the IBC landscape to date.

The full Part 1 report provides a complete list of known IBCs in operation and under development, along with data on year established, degrees and programs offered, and student numbers. It also offers analysis of typologies, government rationales and motivations for opening IBCs, and the various quality assurance models in place.

## HOW MANY STUDENTS ARE ENROLLED? WHERE ARE IBCS LOCATED?

The OBHE and C-BERT teams estimate that at the end of 2015, about 180,000 students worldwide were enrolled in IBCs as defined in this report. This is a significant number in absolute terms, but it is equivalent to less than 4 percent of the five million international students in the world—students who study in another country—and a tiny fraction of the more than 150 million higher education students globally. In a few countries, such as the United Arab Emirates (UAE), IBCs constitute a significant proportion of the total higher education enrollment; but, in most, they are niche players.

---

**International branch campuses (IBCs) have emerged as a distinctive aspect of the internationalization strategies of governments and higher education institutions.**

---

Overall, there are now 33 “home”—or source—countries for IBCs, up from 28 at the start of 2011. The top five home countries are the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, France, and Australia. Together, these countries account for 181 branch campuses, or 73 percent of the world's IBCs. There are now 76 host countries, up from 69 countries at the start of 2011. The top five host countries are China, the UAE, Singapore, Malaysia, and Qatar, which together host 98 IBCs, or 39 percent of the world's total IBCs.

## DO IBCS MATTER?

IBC rationales span revenue, institutional internationalization and two-way mobility, prestige, and securing a base for research. There is little evidence that IBCs generate atypical surplus, and much, if not all, net income is ploughed back

into the operation. Short-term benefits are few, and, inevitably, it takes many years for an IBC to become established, and to judge its impact.

IBCs are pursued both by elite institutions that see an international campus as a high-status differentiator, and by less well-known institutions that may be freer from tradition and see an international presence as a way to create fresh brand perceptions in new markets.

Institutions that invest in IBCs are playing the long game, betting on a more globalized future where deep international presence is seen to define a university. Today, most IBCs are still reshaping the model, concerned largely with in-country students and seeing little two-way mobility or single-brand enhancement. As has happened in the past, some IBCs may gradually become independent of the parent institution and transform into a domestic university. The added value of an international network of campuses, where the sum is greater than the parts, is still a horizon for institutions engaged with IBCs.

What is certain is that if IBCs do emerge as important indicators of institutional effectiveness and reach, it will be very difficult for other institutions to catch up. A global intercampus network at which all students pursue their studies, or close government and corporate relationships fostered over decades, cannot be replicated overnight. Some universities are banking on smaller international centers as a better balance of risk and reward. Ohio State University's *Global Gateways* model is a good example.

The Observatory and C-BERT will continue to track the IBC phenomenon. Indeed, Part 2 of the IBC report, to be published in 2017, will be based on interviews with institutional leaders at a sample of IBCs in operation for at least a decade. It will investigate motivations and operations of mature IBCs, explore the question of how to judge success from different perspectives, and what combination of conditions breeds success.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9743>



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

## Twenty-first Century Mobility: The Role of International Faculty

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND MARIA YUDKEVICH

*Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Maria Yudkevich is associate professor of economics and vice-rector at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. E-mail: zyudkevich@gmail.com. This article stems from research done for International Faculty in Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives on Recruitment, Integration, and Impact, edited by M. Yudkevich, P. G. Altbach, and L. E. Rumbley. (Routledge 2017).*

In the era of globalization, it is not surprising that growing numbers of academics are working outside of their home countries. Universities are themselves increasingly globalized—they are perhaps the most globalized of all prominent institutions in society. Even though the global percentage of international academics is small, this group is quite important. We broadly define international faculty as academics that hold appointments in countries where they were not born and/or where they did not receive their first postsecondary degree. In most cases, they are not citizens of the country in which they hold their academic appointment. They are drivers of international consciousness at universities, they are often top researchers, and, in some countries, they constitute a large percentage of the academic labor force.

International faculty seem to cluster into five broad categories. A small but highly visible group of international faculty hold appointments at top research universities around the world, especially in the major English-speaking countries—Australia, Canada, the United States, and to some extent the United Kingdom. They are the global superstars, and some hold Nobel and other important prizes. A second group is employed by midrange or upper-tier universities in a small number of countries that, as a matter of policy due to their size, geographic location, or specific perceived needs, appoint top-quality international faculty—such as Hong Kong, Singapore, and Switzerland. A third group teaches at universities in countries where there is a shortage of local staff—such as Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries, some African countries, and a few others. Here, international academics are frequently hired to teach lower level courses, often come from Egypt, South Asia, or other regions, and frequently from nonprestigious universities. The fourth category, which overlaps with the first three, consists of diaspora academics that immigrated from



one country to another, often obtained citizenship in that country, and are lured “home.” In some ways, they may be considered “pure” international faculty, while in other ways they are not. A final group includes academics that have obtained their doctorates abroad, perhaps have had a postdoc abroad, and continue on to make their careers abroad as well—they might be labeled “transient academics.” Some international faculty can be found in virtually every country in the world.

#### **INTERNATIONALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL FACULTY**

Many countries and institutions see employing non-native academics as a key part of internationalization strategies. Indeed, international faculty are often seen as the spearhead of internationalization. Further, increased numbers of international faculty are seen as a key marker of internationalization by the global rankings, and often by ministries and other policy makers within countries.

It is assumed that international faculty will bring new insights to research, teaching, and perhaps to the ethos of university. But, of course, the effectiveness of the contributions of international faculty depends on the organizational arrangements of the university, the expectations on both sides for contributing to internationalization, and other factors. Often, international faculty are not effectively integrated into the internationalization programs of many universities. They teach in their subject areas, but are asked to do little else for the university. And, in many cases, the lack of familiarity of international faculty with the norms and perhaps the politics of the local academic system and institution may limit their participation in governance and other university functions.

International faculty in non-English speaking environments are often key contributors to increasing the number of English-taught courses and degree programs, and in general essential for boosting the English-language orientation of the university. The use of English for both teaching and research is seen by many as a key factor in internationalization.

#### **NATIONAL AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL FACULTY**

Some countries and universities welcome international faculty, and even implement initiatives to attract them. Others are much less welcoming. Universities in Hong Kong, Singapore, and Switzerland have as a goal to hire about half of their faculty on the international market—and, not coincidentally, do well in the rankings. Others, such as China and Russia, have provided extra funds and other incentives to hire internationally.

More than a few countries, including some that officially welcome international academics, place various obstacles

in the way of hiring international faculty. Many have extremely complicated and bureaucratic procedures relating to obtaining work permits, procedures concerning security and other issues, and visa regulations, which are sometimes combined with numerical quotas relating to specific job categories, sometimes including academic and research positions. In some cases, bureaucratic and other procedural and legal barriers at the national level are a serious detriment to appointing international academics, and may restrict the number and also the kinds of appointments available.

There are also examples of national policies that are aimed against international academic appointments. India, until quite recently, had national regulations that prevented offering permanent academic appointments to non-citizens, and even now only a handful of foreigners can be found in Indian universities. Canada, from time to time, has imposed “Canada first” hiring policies, under which universities have had to painstakingly prove that each individual international appointment was not taking the place of a comparably qualified Canadian. However, in general, Canada has been welcoming to international faculty—and it is relatively easy to obtain citizenship. While the United States is quite open to hiring international academics, the bureaucratic hurdles of work permits and immigration are often problematical and sometimes insurmountable. Saudi Arabia offers only term contracts to international academics.

---

**It is assumed that international faculty will bring new insights to research, teaching, and perhaps to the ethos of university.**

---

Despite the fact that many countries have opened their borders to highly qualified professionals, including professors, in recognition of the realities of globalization, the practical challenges of rules and regulations remain. The current wave of nationalism, and in some cases xenophobia, may in the coming period create further problems for international academic mobility.

#### **PART OF A COMMUNITY, OR AN ISOLATED GHETTO?**

There are many important trade-offs for universities that consider attracting international faculty. Should these faculty be hired to teach or to do research? Should their salaries differ from the remuneration received by their local colleagues? Should requirements for their promotion and contract extension be different than those of domestic aca-

demics? Should they be required to learn the national/local language or are they allowed to teach in English? Should they be offered the same contractual arrangements as local staff?

Among such important questions, there is one that is of primary importance for academic life: should international faculty be deeply integrated into the general university environment (bearing all related costs and enjoying all associated benefits), or should they be placed in a kind of “international ghetto,” with special conditions where competitive “international standards” are maintained? In some countries (such as Australia, Canada, or the United States), this question does not arise. In many others, however—such as China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia—this question is of great importance and does not have an obvious answer. Deep integration of international faculty into “ordinary” university life should contribute toward improving the research and teaching culture, exposing the host institution and local academic community to new perspectives, and generally increasing diversity. At the same time, there may also be risks associated with this process, including the possibility of social tensions between international and local faculty, and low levels of satisfaction among international scholars, due, for example, to nontransparent bureaucratic rules that dominate in many academic systems.

#### CONCLUSION

International faculty are an increasingly important part of the global academic environment of the twenty-first century. Part of both the symbolic and practical aspects of internationalization, international academics constitute a diverse subset of the global academic labor force. At the top, distinguished senior professors are recruited by highly ranked research universities worldwide. Elsewhere, many international faculty are a necessary part of the teaching staff in countries with shortages of local academics. The motivations for institutions—and countries—to recruit international academics vary, as do the reasons why individuals seek positions outside of their home countries. One thing is clear: international faculty are a growing and increasingly important part of the global academic labor force, bringing diversity, new perspectives, and skills wherever they go. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9760>

## Reframing Global Engagement

MARIJK VAN DER WENDE

*Marijk van der Wende is professor of higher education at Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands. E-mail: m.c.vanderwende@uu.nl.*

#### REVIEWING ASSUMPTIONS AND SCENARIOS

At a time when walls are being built up and borders closed down, higher education is facing new challenges in its role towards the realization of an open, democratic, and equitable society. Recent geopolitical events and intensified populist tendencies are promoting a rejection of internationalism. Support for open borders, multilateral trade, and cooperation are weakened, globalization is criticized, and nationalism is looming. Brexit, the prospect of a disintegrating European Union, and of the United States turning its back on the world create waves of uncertainty in higher education regarding international cooperation and the free movement of students, academics, scientific knowledge, and ideas. At the same time, China is launching new global initiatives such as the “One Belt One Road” (or “New Silk Road”) project, which could potentially span and integrate major parts of the world across Eurasia, but likely on new and different conditions, also for higher education.

These changes require a critical review of our assumptions regarding globalization and the international development of higher education. Could we have imagined, a decade ago, the possibility of a less interconnected and integrated world? Definitions of globalization were inherently progressive; they referred to the widening, deepening, and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness, with growing interdependence and convergence between countries and regions. But serious warnings have been given along the way, signaling notably the risks of inequality and of globalization generating not only winners, but also losers.

In fact, a decade ago, in the OECD publication *Four Future Scenarios for Higher Education*, the one entitled “Serving Local Communities” mentioned as key drivers of change “a backlash against globalisation. [...] growing skepticism in regard to internationalisation in the general population for a variety of reasons, including recent terror attacks and wars, concerns about the growth in immigration, frustration about outsourcing and the feeling that national identity is threatened by globalisation and foreign influence.” Further, it mentioned ambitious new military research programmes launched by governments for geo-strategic reasons, and security classification given to an increasing number of research topics in natural sciences, life sciences, and engineering (OECD, 2006, <https://www.oecd.org/>)

edu/ceri/38073691.pdf, p. 5). While this scenario, at the time, was not seen as a very likely direction for change, a decade later it is exactly the one that is unfolding, including the recently announced multibillion EU fund to stimulate defense-related R&D.

Growing skepticism against internationalization can be heard in public and political debates on trade, open borders, migration, or refugees, and indeed also inside academia. Critical voices retaliate against internationalization as an elite, cosmopolitan project, against the use of English as a second language, against global rankings and the resulting global reputation race with its annual tables of losers and winners, against the recruitment of international students for institutional income, and other forms of “academic capitalism.”

#### **GLOBALIZATION, INEQUALITY, AND HIGHER EDUCATION**

Scholars such as Thomas Piketty in economics and Branco Milanovic in sociology, developed our understanding of the paradoxical outcomes of globalization. They analyzed that while economic and social inequality has decreased at the global level, mostly due to the growth of Asian economies, notably China, it has increased within certain countries and regions. To quite an extent, these patterns are reflected in higher education.

Decreasing global inequality results from the rebalancing effect of China’s rise on the global higher education and research scene, as is demonstrated by its share in world expenditure on R&D and its world share of researchers (both in second position after the United States and Europe respectively). But the resulting competition leads to a stronger concentration of resources in fewer hubs, thus creating bigger inequalities and contributing to the further stratification of the higher education landscape in Europe. Global inequality also decreases as student numbers explode around the world, more than half of them in China and India alone. At the same time, however, public financial support for higher education is under pressure in many Western countries. The American model with important private contributions is increasingly followed, while strongly criticized at home on issues of equity and decreasing value for money. The importance of higher education in accounting for income differences is decreasing and family background and social connections may matter more, especially in societies that are already close to the upper limit of educational participation.

#### **GLOBAL POSITIONING AND LOCAL COMMITMENT**

Thus, while global inequalities in higher education tend to decrease, its potential to compensate for increasing inequalities in rich countries, i.e. its meritocratic role, is called into question. The resulting pressure on the sector is twofold:

enhanced competition at the global level and a growing critique on local commitment and delivery. Especially the pursuit of global positioning in rankings is criticized for jeopardizing universities’ national and local mission and for separating them from society, as a cosmopolitan academic jet set.

A decade ago, it was already clear that globalization was creating economic imbalances with detrimental effects on social cohesion, and that it was necessary to rebalance globalization. Universities should then have broadened their mission for internationalization, to address migration and social exclusion and be more inclusive; to redefine their social contract in a globalized context, i.e., to enhance local access for minority students and embrace diversity as the key to success in a global knowledge society; and to become truly international and intercultural learning communities where young people can effectively develop into global citizens.

---

**Support for open borders, multilateral trade, and cooperation are weakened, globalization is criticized, and nationalism is looming.**

---

#### **SILK ROADS TO THE FUTURE**

Some universities succeeded better than others did, yet no one anticipated the problems we are facing today. In Europe, these were unimaginable in our optimism during the heydays of internationalization following the fall of the Berlin Wall, and even in the years after 9/11. Thinking about the way forward, we are presented with an array of big questions, notably regarding the impact of the European Union, the United States, and China on the higher education landscape.

The celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome on March 25th was characterized by fierce debates on the scenarios for Europe’s future, some more promising for higher education than others. Meanwhile, EU–China cooperation is being established through research hubs and higher education agreements, and China’s impact on the global higher education landscape is growing. How will China’s values impact higher education, and do we actually understand these values at all? How can we prepare our students for safe travels on these new silk roads toward the future? This is another major challenge for internationalization; to enrich our vision and understanding of the world, to widen our focus from being predominantly or even exclu-

sively Western, to open it toward a new history. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9807>

## United States, Europe, and Asia: Diversity in Nobel Prize-Winning Affiliations

ELISABETH MARIA SCHLAGBERGER, LUTZ BORNMANN, AND JOHANN BAUER

*Elisabeth Maria Schlagberger is information specialist at Max-Planck-Institute of Biochemistry, Martinsried, Germany. E-mail: schlagberger@biochem.mpg.de. Lutz Bornmann is scientist at the administrative headquarters of the Max-Planck Society, Munich, Germany. E-mail: lutz.bornmann@gv.mpg.de. Johann Bauer is scientist and information specialist, Max-Planck-Institute of Biochemistry, Martinsried, Germany. E-mail: jbauer@biochem.mpg.de.*

What factors promote the reputation of a university? As “research laboratories,” universities, research institutions, or even companies support future Nobel Prize winners by giving them the possibility to conduct research. In return, these institutions may later profit from the laureates’ reputation. However, in many cases, the institution with which a Nobel laureate is affiliated when receiving the award is not identical to the institution(s) where he or she did excellent work in the past. Which of these institutions is really supporting excellent science is therefore debatable. The last researcher, in the literature, to focus on research institutions where (future) Nobel Prize winners did their scientific publications leading to the Nobel Prize, was the sociologist Harriet Zuckerman, in 1976. She included a ranking of institutions based on data from 92 US-“Nobelists” in her book *Scientific Elite. Nobel laureates in the United States* about Nobel laureates from 1901 to 1975.

In our study (Schlagberger et al. *Scientometrics*, 2016, DOI: [10.1007/s11192-016-2059-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2059-2)), we evaluated all 155 Nobel laureates between 1994 and 2014 in chemistry, physics, and physiology/medicine. We tried to identify at which institutions Nobel laureates did their prize-winning work. We based our study on an analysis of biographical information on the laureates. Recently, we extended the analysis to Nobel laureates from 1994 to 2016 (n=170).

### COUNTRY RANKING OF THE LAUREATES’ PUBLICATIONS LEADING TO THE NOBEL PRIZE

In our study of the prize-winning work and the countries where that work was done, we found that, between 1994 and 2016, the United States came first (n=94.5), followed by the United Kingdom (n=20.5), and Japan (n=12.5). France and Germany ranked close to each other, with n=8 and n=6.5 respectively. The numbers are not integers because we fractionally counted if the laureates were affiliated with more than one country.

### NOBEL LAUREATES’ DECISIVE WORK AT FAMOUS RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

The United States also dominates the institutional ranking, with, on top of the list, the University of California, Berkeley and the research institute AT&T Bell Labs in Murray Hill, New Jersey (both n=6); Harvard University (n=5) and the Rockefeller University (n=4). Notably, only physics prize winners did their excellent work at the AT&T Bell Laboratories.

---

**As “research laboratories,” universities, research institutions, or even companies support future Nobel Prize winners by giving them the possibility to conduct research.**

---

The second most important country is the United Kingdom, where the Medical Research Centre, Cambridge (n=5) and the University of Cambridge (n=3) count the most Nobel Prize-decisive work, in chemistry and medicine/physiology. There is a significant variety among British “Nobeled” universities, with the University of Birmingham, the University of Edinburgh, and the University of Manchester all counting n=2; and University College London, the University of Nottingham, the University of Oxford, the University of Sheffield, and the University of Sussex counting n=1 each.

In France and Germany, well-known research institutes have hosted laureates when they did their decisive work. In France, we identified the Institut Pasteur, Université de Paris, Université de Strasbourg (all n=2), and École Normale Supérieure (Paris) and Institut Français du Pétrole, Rueil-Malmaison with n=1 each. Germany is represented by two universities, the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich and the Albert-Ludwigs-University of Freiburg (both n=1), and by non-university research institutions such as the Eu-

ropean Molecular Biology Laboratory in Heidelberg (n=2), the Max Planck Society (n=1.5), and the Jülich Research Centre, a member of the Helmholtz Association of German Research Centers (n=1).

In Israel (n=4.5), the Technion Institute of Technology (n=3) in Haifa is an important institution for Nobel Prize research. Other countries where Nobel Prize winning work was done are Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Russia, and Sweden, and further down the list, with at least one Nobel Prize winner, Belgium, China, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Switzerland.

#### PATENT WORK LEADS TO NOBEL PRIZE

Another way of becoming an elite researcher and Nobel Prize winner is to innovate with patents. We identified at least one Nobel Prize winner, the engineer Jack Kilby (Nobel Prize in Physics, 2000) who pursued this route. Kilby developed the integrated circuit at the company Texas Instruments (Bell licensee), and registered a US patent in 1959, leading to the Nobel Prize.

#### LAUREATES FROM EAST ASIA

In recent years, several laureates have done their research in East Asia. In the past 16 years, twelve Japanese and the only laureate from China, Tu Youyou, made their prize-winning discoveries in their home countries. The University of Tokyo and the University of Nagoya stand out with n=3, as well as the University of Kyoto (n=2.5). The physician Shin-ya Yamanaka conducted research at the University of Kyoto with CREST, a government program at the Japanese Science and Technology Agency. The microbiologist Satoshi Omura did his research at Kitasato University, but sent his later discovery, cultured new strains of soil bacteria, to the Merck Sharp & Dohme research laboratories, a company in Kenilworth, New Jersey, in the United States.

#### ELITE UNIVERSITIES FOR DOCTORAL TRAINING SUPPORT FUTURE "NOBELISTS"

Not surprisingly, the United States is home to most universities and research institutions at the top of the list of institutions where scientists, who later became Nobel laureates, did their PhD or M.D.: Harvard University (n=14), the University of California, Berkeley (n=8), and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (n=6) ranking first. In the United Kingdom, the University of Cambridge and the Medical Research Center, Cambridge come in first with n=7.5. A number of elite universities selected and/or trained five future Nobel laureates: University of Chicago, Cornell University, Stanford University, and Yale University in the United States; the University of Oxford in the United Kingdom; and Nagoya University in Japan.

#### LAUREATES WITHOUT A DOCTORAL DEGREE

Several laureates received the Nobel award without having a doctoral degree. Besides Kilby and Youyou, the Belgian "Nobel" Yves Chauvin finished his education with only an undergraduate degree in chemical engineering. He wrote that, in retrospective, he regretted that fact most of his life. Nobel physicist Koichi Tanaka finished his university education with only a degree in engineering, before starting to work at Shimadzu Corporation, a company for scientific and industrial instruments in Kyoto.

#### CONCLUSION

Overall, our results show that Nobel laureates are mostly affiliated with elite institutions. Most of them have an outstanding university education, did their decisive work at famous research institutions, and were affiliated with excellent institutions or universities when they received the Nobel award. The future will show if Nobel Prize winners will be educated and work increasingly at smaller and less-known institutions inside and outside the United States. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9928>

## Higher Education, Student Health, and Obesity in Developing Countries

CAITRÍONA TAYLOR

*Caitríona Taylor is associate athletic director at Boston College, US. E-mail: [caitriona.taylor@bc.edu](mailto:caitriona.taylor@bc.edu).*

The world is experiencing a rapid rise in obesity rates. The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that global obesity has more than doubled since 1980. In developing countries, obesity rates have tripled over the past 20 years, due to increased consumption of high caloric foods and a sedentary lifestyle. Obesity, excessive weight, and their corresponding ailments are responsible for 5 percent of global mortality.

Fighting this alarmingly rapid rise in obesity is now a policy priority for the WHO. In May 2004, the WHO published the "WHO Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health." In an address on February 8, 2017, Dr. Margaret Chan, director-general of the WHO, notes that while hunger remains a global issue, "most of the world got fat"

over the last decade.

This is an issue for everyone, irrespective of education or income level. However, it is particularly salient for institutions of higher education throughout the world, as they are charged with educating and developing the young adults of tomorrow. Further, these institutions possess the resources and facilities to develop programs to foster and promote cultures of health.

In North America, there is a positive correlation between education and income and a decrease in obesity; data indicates that people with more than high school education are less likely to have a problem with excessive weight. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) reports that among their member states, adults with higher literacy and a higher level of education regard themselves as being in good health 33 percent more than those with lower literacy and educational attainment.

---

**Fighting this alarmingly rapid rise in obesity is now a policy priority for the WHO.**

---

This is less the case in the developing world, where the younger generation arising from a new and rapidly growing middle class is experiencing a growth in obesity rates. In a 2014 study published in the *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, covering 15,746 undergraduate students at 22 universities in low-income, middle-income, and emerging economy countries, researchers found that, on average, 22 percent of the sample population was either overweight or obese. Higher education institutions in developing countries provide students with improved economic prospects. They are also responsible for addressing the trend of increased higher education without corresponding drops in obesity.

**THE CASE OF EGYPT**

According to a 2010 WHO report, 70 percent of Egyptians are overweight or obese, the highest rate in Africa. The highest rates within Egypt are among the educated and wealthy. Thus, Egypt is a suitable developing country to study.

The Egyptian government itself is aware of this rising health epidemic. The ministry of health and population conducted an “Egypt Health Issues Survey” in 2015 in order to understand the extent of health issues among the population. The results are astonishing. For ages 15–59, the rate of excessive weight or obesity among women is 76 percent and among men 60.7 percent. Contrary to Europe and the

United States, in Egypt, higher education does not shield against obesity. For Egyptian men with no education, the rate of obesity or excessive weight is 60.9 percent, compared to 68.2 percent among those that have completed secondary education or higher education. Egyptian women with no education are found to be overweight or obese at a rate of 83.1 percent, but the rate is still a disturbing 77.3 percent for those who completed secondary education or higher education—again, an issue that higher education institutions should address.

Furthermore, as wealth increases in Egypt, rates of excessive weight or obesity also rise. When comparing the lowest wealth quartile to the highest quartile, rates for men move from 51.9 percent to 67.8 percent, respectively, and for women from 70.9 percent to 78.4 percent, respectively. As Egypt is increasing access to higher education, aiming to increase enrollment from 32 percent to 40 percent by 2021–2022, and as the enrollment growth is expected to be absorbed principally by fee-based private universities, higher education institutions, especially private universities, will enroll those most at risk of being overweight or obese: the educated and wealthy.

**CURRENT PHYSICAL ACTIVITY INITIATIVES IN EGYPT**

Lack of physical activity is one of the main contributing factors to overweight and obesity. Egyptian universities already recognize the importance of physical activity. Cairo University, the country’s flagship institution, includes athletics in its student activity mission. The private American University in Cairo (AUC) incorporates a Western system of athletics and recreation into its approach to education. The availability—and careful use—of suitable facilities is at the core of any strategy to increase opportunities for physical activity among students.

Compared to Western universities, however, access hours for available resources are limited. Universities need to develop plans to increase usage of their facilities. The usage of AUC fitness facilities by undergraduate students is very low, at only 10 percent. If this is the case at AUC, the elite private Egyptian university, one could conclude that the other private and public institutions in Egypt are seeing similar or even lower levels of engagement by students. In contrast, in North America, 75 percent of students use on-campus recreation facilities and programs. If Egyptian universities could increase the number of hours of access and develop specific physical activity and health educational programs, they would increase physical activity among students and address one of the main contributing factors to obesity.

**CONCLUSION**

Developed countries show positive correlations between

higher education levels and lower levels of excessive weight and obesity. This correlation is not causation. Developing countries may encounter the opposite, so it is important for universities in these countries to make health and wellness central to their institutional mission. Developing countries must intensify their efforts to increase student engagement in physical activity programs, a key plank in dealing with an obesity crisis that can only be halted and reversed through education and participation. Developing countries lag behind in regard to economic performance and education levels; in addition, the overall health of their populations will continue to fall behind if educational institutions do not prioritize the health of their students. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9751>

---



---

## Requiem for a Dream: Academic Freedom under Threat in Democracies

DANIELA CRĂCIUN AND GEORGIANA MIHUT

*Daniela Crăciun is a doctoral candidate at Central European University, Budapest, Hungary. E-mail: Craciun\_Daniela@phd.ceu.edu. Georgiana Mihut is a doctoral candidate in higher education at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: mihut@bc.edu.*

Academic freedom is both a core value and a governing principle of higher education institutions. It is so ingrained in research and teaching—especially in democratic states—that it has been taken for granted. More recently, there have been a number of retaliatory actions taken by democratic governments toward academics and higher education institutions.

### ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENTS

In Poland, President Andrzej Duda is threatening to strip a renowned historian of a high state decoration because his work uncovered Polish involvement in the Holocaust. More worryingly, the recently elected right-wing government has proposed legislation that would impose a five-year prison sentence on anybody who imputes that Poland is in any way responsible for Nazi or Stalinist crimes. Hungary fast-tracked a legislative amendment to Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education that is officially aimed at regulating the 28 international universities that function in

the country. However, as observers have noted, it specifically targets one particular international higher education institution that has been immune to traditional tools of influence: Central European University or CEU. So much so, that the law has been dubbed “Lex CEU.” CEU played a central role in rebuilding democracy in Central and Eastern Europe and forwarding the ideals of an “open society.”

Governments often treat universities akin to political opposition. Since their inception, universities have fostered critical thinking, debate, and—as a result—dissent against the status quo. Traditionally, democratic governments have perceived universities as important and worthy opponents that play a vital role in the metabolism of any healthy democracy. Nondemocratic governments have perceived them as threats and have tried to steer their activities through a variety of means (i.e., curtailing academic freedom, reducing institutional autonomy, cutting funds, closing universities). However, more recently, governments in places generally deemed democratic have started to perceive universities as threats. The recent legislative change in Hungary represents a particularly worrying example.

---

**Academic freedom is both a core value and a governing principle of higher education institutions.**

---

### RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN HUNGARY

The legislation directly threatens the existence of the university in Hungary. It requires CEU to set up a campus in the state of New York in the United States (where all its programs are registered, but where it does not operate), stops CEU from issuing US degrees to its graduates (even though all its programs are accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in the United States), imposes work permit vetting by the Hungarian government on CEU faculty from outside the European Union (they are currently exempt from these procedures), and precludes CEU from functioning under its present name.

The Hungarian government argues that the amendment is meant to regulate cross-border higher education programs in order to ensure quality. However, considering that the legislation disproportionately targets CEU—a university that ranks 39th in the category of top universities worldwide founded less than 50 years ago (according to the *Times Higher Education* ranking)—this justification is inapplicable. These are not quality assurance measures, but

administrative measures intended to give the government direct control over international education, which it previously could not influence through traditional methods (i.e., by cutting public subsidies).

#### CONTINUOUS ATTACKS ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

This legislative amendment is the most recent policy initiative targeting academic freedom in the country. Previously, the Hungarian government has employed similar tactics in order to diminish the influence of public universities in the country. In 2014, another amendment to the national higher education law gave the prime minister the power to appoint chancellors with executive financial responsibilities at public universities. As a result, the power of rectors has been relegated solely to the academic sphere. This arrangement was reinforced by a 2015 amendment to the higher education law, which delegates strategic planning for medium- and long-term goals to university-level advisory bodies mainly comprised of representatives of the national government. The official rationale behind these amendments was to improve the efficiency of publicly funded universities. However, such policies have in fact reduced institutional autonomy and allowed the government to have direct control over university operations.

#### ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN ILLIBERAL STATES

These developments were unthinkable just a decade ago. Following the fall of the communist regime in 1989, Hungary has witnessed a relatively fast and successful transition toward democracy, being among the first Eastern Bloc countries to gain full membership to the European Union (EU). In 2014, ten years after the EU accession, Prime Minister Viktor Orban declared that in order to protect Hungary's national sovereignty, he planned to abandon liberal democracy in order to establish an "illiberal state" modeled after the realities of Russia and Turkey. According to The Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index, which measures indicators such as the quality of political participation and political culture, since 2011 Hungary has become an ever clearer "flawed democracy."

Severe assaults on academic freedom have taken place in Russia and Turkey. In Russia, the European University at St. Petersburg (EUSP) has had its educational license revoked after a complaint by politician Vitaly Milonov triggered 11 unannounced inspections from regulatory agencies that uncovered 120 licensing violations, only one of which has not been resolved. Incidentally, Vitaly Milonov is the architect of the ill-famed law banning "gay propaganda" and EUSP is home to the biggest gender studies center in the country. In Turkey, Scholars at Risk reports that almost 6,000 academic and administrative personnel have been dismissed from universities by authorities, based on sus-

picious that they were involved in the 2016 failed coup attempt.

#### CONCLUSION

Attacks on academic freedom in democratic countries are both a powerful indicator and a consequence of democratic decline. The protection of academic freedom represents an important societal tool for inclusiveness and guards against power abuses. Countries such as Hungary have witnessed firsthand the devastating effects of authoritarian regimes. Teaching freely and researching freely ensure that history is not forgotten, and that the checks and balances necessary for a working democracy are maintained. Academic freedom is important not only for the wellbeing of universities, but also for the wellbeing of the countries and regions in which they operate. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9929>

## Ukraine: Endemic Higher Education Corruption

ELENA DENISOVA-SCHMIDT AND YAROSLAV PRYTULA

*Elena Denisova-Schmidt is lecturer at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, and research fellow at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: elena.denisova-schmidt@unisg.ch. Yaroslav Prytula is dean of the Faculty of Applied Sciences at the Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv, Ukraine. E-mail: ya.prytula@ucu.edu.ua.*

Recent articles in the *Wall Street Journal* and *The Times of London* raise the alarm: international students enrolled at US and UK universities cheat more frequently than their domestic counterparts. Why does this happen? Using Ukrainian higher education as an example of an endemically corrupt academic environment, we try to answer this question by exploring some determinants of student academic misconduct, and provide insights on groups of students who are more likely to engage in either monetary or nonmonetary corruption. Our findings might help American and European universities hosting international students to adjust their policies and procedures with regard to academic integrity.

#### WHY UKRAINE?

In Ukraine, as in most post-Soviet countries, corruption in higher education is not an exception, but rather a growing



trend. According to the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index, Ukraine ranks very low among the 15 post-Soviet states on the global survey. There are no public institutions free from corruption in Ukraine. Education, healthcare, and the police are the most corrupt sectors, according to surveys conducted by the European Research Association in 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2011, and by a survey conducted by the US Agency for International Development in 2015.

#### CHEATING STUDENTS IN LVIV

In our recent representative study conducted among 600 students at public universities in Lviv—one of the least corrupt cities in the country—we found all kinds of monetary and nonmonetary forms of corruption involving students. 47.8 percent of students have experience with bribing; 94.5 percent of students admit that they cheat during exams and tests; 92.8 percent write papers by copying and pasting without acknowledging their sources; 64.2 percent download papers from internet and submit them as their own; 40.4 percent purchase papers from ghostwriters; and 37.5 percent ask faculty for preferential treatment. They do it with different frequencies—“seldom,” “sometimes,” “often,” or “systematically”—but they do it nonetheless. Why? The reasons vary. It might be the necessity of having a part-time job, which leaves no time for studying and/or attending classes (classroom attendance is obligatory at Ukrainian universities). It might be related to subjects deemed “unnecessary,” like sports. Some students confirm that they are pursuing a university degree as a mere credential, without regard to how they obtain it. Good marks are also important for receiving a state scholarship: this might be another reason for bribing a faculty member.

#### WHO CHEATS MORE?

Some groups of students are more prone than others to using various cheating techniques. One of these groups is students living in dormitories. These students are probably the best informed about possible cheating tools, and faculty members are ready to ignore and/or accept such behaviour. These students have to spend more time solving everyday problems such as shopping, cooking, and cleaning, compared to students who live with their parents; hence, they have less time for studies. Moreover, in Ukrainian dormitories, not all students can afford the privacy to live alone and study. Improving the students' living conditions to the level of, for example, the dormitories of US universities, which typically offer food on site, or creating more space for studying at the universities, might be possible remedies. Cheating students are also typically from small towns and villages with insufficient standards in secondary school education, such as not enough, and often underpaid, teachers, or less

developed infrastructure. Investing in improving schools in small towns and villages, and making secondary school teaching more attractive might be other possible tools to mitigate corruption. Recent PISA results suggest that students attending schools where teachers are motivated and supportive, have better morale and achieve better results in certain subjects, even after accounting for socioeconomic characteristics.

The second group that is more likely to use various cheating techniques are students who do not complete their homework. Some need to have a job in order to pay for their living expenses, because the support they receive from their family and/or from the state is not sufficient. If they were to receive additional financial support, this would probably reduce corruption. Often, students who do not invest personal effort into their studies by engaging in their homework and additional reading compensate for this by cheating their way through the system. Fostering a culture of academic engagement might also contribute to mitigating corruption.

---

**In Ukraine, as in most post-Soviet countries, corruption in higher education is not an exception, but rather a growing trend.**

---

The third group are students with a low academic performance before entering the university, as well as students who are underachievers during their university studies. Such students often consider university studies to be a path for getting a formal credential rather than an education—one of the logical consequences of the massification of higher education. Developing the system of vocational training and making it attractive—for instance on the model of the German system of vocational training, which combines school attendance and employment—might be one option to mitigate corruption.

We did not find statistically significant relationships between participation in NGOs (our measure of social activism), types of educational funding (state stipend or self-financing) or students' (family) wealth, and types of academic dishonesty. However, our enquiry on the effects of anticorruption interventions among students showed that those campaigns might have opposite outcomes than intended, promoting corruption and academic dishonesty by convincing young people that cheating is widespread, and/

or introducing them to new cheating techniques. Learning about the dissemination of corruption might augment its acceptance.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE?

While it is almost impossible to eliminate corruption in endemically corrupt environments, corruption can be mitigated. Anticorruption policies should, however, be smart enough not to make things worse. Anticorruption policies stipulating zero tolerance of corruption, targeting the needs of specific groups, and showing the negative results of academic dishonesty over a long-term perspective—such as the direct and indirect damage to human lives—are likely to have more success. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9745>

## The Vicious Circle of Quality in Ethiopian Higher Education

AYENACHEW A. WOLDEGIYORGIS

*Ayenachew A. Woldegiyorgis is a doctoral student and graduate assistant at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: woldegiy@bc.edu.*

#### CONTEXT

The Ethiopian higher education sector has been undergoing rapid expansion in the last 15 years. Over this period, the number of public universities has grown from just two to 35 (among which two are universities of science and technology), compared to three private ones, and the number of undergraduate students has surged from a little over thirty thousand to 729,028 (in the 2014–2015 academic year), putting the gross enrollment ratio at 10.2 percent. The government of Ethiopia is now building 11 new public universities during the second phase of the country's Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II). This is a massive undertaking with many implications, in particular an urgent need for qualified teaching staff.

In order to have sufficient numbers of qualified teaching staff for the planned universities, the ministry of education invited students graduating from bachelor's programs to sit for a qualifying examination at the end of the 2014–2015 academic year. Those successfully passing the examination—which was tailored to each major—could be hired as university teachers at the rank of graduate assistants in

their respective fields.

While this procedure is an improvement over the practice in previous years of hiring graduate assistants solely based on grades and English language proficiency, the results were less than ideal: a sweeping majority of the candidates failed the test. These results indicate the seriousness of the challenge Ethiopia faces in the coming period: to simultaneously expand access to higher education and improve the quality of the education delivered.

#### WHAT NUMBERS TELL US

A quick look at some of the data from this exercise yields some striking results and worrying observations. Close to 10,000 students graduating from 32 universities across the country took the centrally prepared examination, which was offered in 14 fields of study. Eligibility was based on expressed interest and minimum requirements of a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 2.75 for men and 2.5 for women. Ultimately, 716 candidates were selected and offered a job, among which 30 percent were women—conceivably in line with the objective of increasing the share of female academic staff to 25 percent by the end of the Fifth Education Sector Development Program (ESDP V), in 2020.

While the maximum possible score was 100, only one person scored more than 80 (81, to be exact), followed by 28 candidates who scored between 70 and 79. The overall average score was 57.8, with no significant gender difference (59.3 for men and 54.3 for women).

A score of 57.8 in one's major must be viewed at best as a mediocre result. Disturbingly, 127 of the selected candidates (or close to one-fifth) scored a failing result (less than 50 percent score means failure according to the education policy of the country). Here, there is a considerable gender gap: 12.9 percent for men as opposed to 29.7 percent for women. Of course, it is also important to note that this is a result from a small sample of the highest scorers in the respective fields, representing just about 7 percent of those who took the examination. One can imagine the results of the remaining 93 percent of those who sat for the examination, or even worse, for those who reach the cutoff point to qualify for the examination in the first place.

These are deeply distressing numbers. Not only is the average result of the new generation of university teachers unquestionably mediocre, but a sizable proportion actually failed the qualifying examination in their own major subject. This has grave implications for their skills as teachers and their standing as role models for their students.

#### THE QUALITY CRISIS

Low caliber university teachers are one major input in the vicious circle of feeble quality in Ethiopian higher educa-

tion. Simultaneously, because of the low quality of primary and secondary education in Ethiopia, students are unprepared for university-level education. The country's Fifth Education Sector Development Program (ESDP V) reported that "many students joined higher education institutions with results below the 50 percent threshold in the higher education entrance examinations." ESDP V further notes that the combination of low-quality instruction and unprepared students could be the cause for low graduation rates among undergraduate students. For the government, on the one hand, to make such an assessment, and, on the other hand, to hire university teachers with such poor levels of academic performance appears to be utterly self-defeating.

The problem is even more serious in certain fields. For example, the average score for test takers in the fields of mathematics and physics were 48.3 and 50.5, respectively. Such low scores in these fields are particularly worrisome, since these subjects are considered fundamental to the country's priority academic areas of engineering, science, and technology.

There are also implications for research capacity. Since 2011–2012, research has accounted for only 1 percent of the total budget of all universities, and much of the research is conducted predominantly by graduate students. Given the quality of graduates, and of those admitted into graduate programs, the research capacity of Ethiopian universities is in serious jeopardy.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE?

The overall poor quality of Ethiopian university education, its graduates, and its research infrastructure represents a real danger to the national economy and the country's development agenda. Immediate responses are needed to address these concerns.

As a quick fix, there is a need to create arrangements for competent professionals from industry to take part in teaching, perhaps partnering with freshly graduated assistant recruits; establishing a mentorship program where senior staff could train and empower their novice colleagues; creating better pay and benefits packages that attract more qualified professionals to the teaching profession; better utilizing Ethiopian professionals in the diaspora; and, in spite of all its drawbacks, using expatriates in certain important fields.

The long-term solution is, however, to slow down expansion and focus on strengthening existing institutions, with particular emphasis on creating differentiation across the system. Specifically, by reducing the rate at which new universities are established, selected senior institutions must be elevated to research universities and resourced accordingly. These institutions can engage in high level academic and research work, which provides two key benefits.

First, they will serve as hubs for knowledge generation and transfer, and for scientific and technological advancement. This provides the critically needed knowledge supply for the development of key sectors, such as agriculture and industry. Second, as epicenters of academic advancement, they will have the capacity to strategically produce highly trained and qualified academic staff for the new universities to be established, and strengthen the existing ones.

It is high time to take the issue of quality in Ethiopian higher education more seriously and come up with practical solutions to avert the looming crisis. Otherwise, Ethiopia's grand plan to expand access to higher education will result in universities of poorer quality than those already in business. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9737>

## Unusual in Growth and Composition: Ethiopian Private Higher Education

WONDWOSEN TAMRAT AND DANIEL LEVY

*PROPHE (Program for Research on Private Higher Education) has a regular column in IHE. Wondwosen Tamrat is associate professor and founder-president of St. Mary's University, Ethiopia. E-mail: [preswond@smuc.edu.et](mailto:preswond@smuc.edu.et). Daniel Levy is SUNY Distinguished Professor, Department of Educational Policy & Leadership, University at Albany, US. E-mail: [dlevy@albany.edu](mailto:dlevy@albany.edu).*

#### CONTEXT

With more than 110,000 students (2016), Ethiopia's private higher education (PHE) is the largest or second largest in sub-Saharan Africa. This large private presence exists despite Ethiopia being rather late to start PHE and despite some stiffly restrictive regulation.

It is common for expert and public opinion in a given country, partly for lack of knowledge of other countries, to hold an exaggerated view of how atypical their systems are. But a reasonable conclusion from scrutinizing Ethiopian PHE is that in fundamental ways it is indeed significantly atypical for sub-Saharan Africa. After acknowledging several not insignificant commonalities, we will hone in on the more striking differences.

Though large in absolute private enrollment, Ethiopia's 14–17 percent private *share* is typical of sub-Saharan Africa. Furthermore, the types of Ethiopian PHE are those found throughout the region. By far the largest chunk is nonelite,

which is some mix of demand-absorbing and more effective job-market oriented. Semielite and religious institutions are visible as well. The few semielite universities compete with the good public universities, especially in teaching and some other fields, and benefit from disorder in their public counterparts. Also, as seen elsewhere in the region, PHE's overwhelming majority of fields of study are market-oriented, but with some recent diversification into other fields. Women account for a larger share of the private than public sector. Myriad forms of community engagement are apparent. And both in Ethiopia and the region, while total enrollment growth has been very rapid in the private sector, it has been very rapid in the public sector as well, so that the private share has recently even slipped a bit.

Notwithstanding such similarities, atypical characteristics are more remarkable. One set of unusual characteristics concerns growth and regulation; another concerns the private sector's internal composition.

---

**Though large in absolute private enrollment, Ethiopia's 14–17 percent private share is typical of sub-Saharan Africa.**

---

#### ATYPICAL GROWTH AND REGULATION

As African PHE emerges comparatively late in terms of global PHE and from low gross enrollment ratio (GER), so Ethiopian PHE is late (1998) for even the African context and started from an atypically low 0.8 GER. Much of the reason for Ethiopia's late entry into PHE lay in the decades of repressive Marxist rule that followed the end of the long reign of Emperor Haile Selassie in 1974 and banned all forms of private ownership. Yet today only Uganda may match Ethiopia in private enrollment. Meanwhile, Eritrea (which broke away from Ethiopia in 1991) remains one of the few countries in Africa or the world with no PHE.

Compared to most of the region, where the unplanned emergence and rapid growth of PHE caught governments by surprise, establishment with fast growth of PHE was rather planned and promoted by Ethiopia's post-Marxist government. Indeed the regulatory framework preceded the private education sectors emergence—and was mostly enabling (as opposed to restrictive) regulation.

Though it is common for African countries to promulgate “delayed regulation” when they see the academic and other weaknesses of easily proliferating private institutions, and common to impose some rules on the private sector not imposed on the public sector, in notable ways Ethiopia has gone to a regulatory extreme. Without legal war-

rant, the government blocks private programs in law and teacher education. After PHE had played a pioneering role in Ethiopian distance education, it was temporarily banned from that realm, too. And while religious institutions often start within African private sectors and then thrive there, in Ethiopia the religious degrees offered by religious PHE are accepted only within religious society. They are not recognized by the state, a restrictive policy with job-market ramifications; to gain wider acceptance, programs would have to be secular and gain national accreditation.

#### ATYPICAL COMPOSITION OF SUBSECTORS

It is not by chance, then, that the religious subsector holds a markedly lower share of PHE than it does in most of the continent. Nor is it by chance that Ethiopia's religious subsector is mostly nonelite. Much of it was not created afresh but, rather, rose from preexisting schools at lower levels. In contrast, in many African countries religious institutions are among the strongest academic forces. Many former colonies had strong Catholic or Protestant roots to build upon in higher education, whereas Ethiopia was never colonized.

So if religious PHE is unusually small in Ethiopian PHE, what is unusually large? The answer is for-profit PHE. It accounts for the overwhelming majority of PHE. This is not just a difference between Ethiopian and most African PHE. It is a stunning difference. Not all African countries allow a for-profit presence and often the appearance of profit relates to legally nonprofit institutions finding ways to skirt regulatory restrictions. Moreover, in those countries with legal for-profits, the for-profits sit alongside an array of nonprofits. Not so in Ethiopia. It appears that the only nonprofit Ethiopian higher education institutions outside the (small) religious subsector are a few PHE institutions owned by NGOs. Among the for-profits, the bulk are private limited corporations, mostly family-owned. For-profits are allowed at all tertiary education levels.

#### CONTINUITY VS. CHANGE GOING FORWARD

Thus, in the face of a huge growth in demand for higher education in Ethiopia, a mix of enabling and restrictive policy has let PHE play a major role that is, however, limited in key respects. How will policy evolve as the country now faces not only continued growth, but a projected acceleration of it? If, as predicted, the total enrollment will nearly double over the next five years, with the private sector expected to receive an increasing share of this growth, policy choices about how supportively or restrictively to handle PHE will assume increasing importance. The private sector, bolstered by its relative success despite restrictive regulation, is confident that it could perform a larger role into the future, for a greater share of Ethiopia's enrollment, were government to provide stable and less antagonistic policy.

Not all government policymakers share that view. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9791>

## Uganda: Higher Education Modernization Needed

MUKWANASON A. HYUHA

*Mukwanason A. Hyuha is emeritus professor of economics and consultant at Budembe Enterprises. E-mail: hyuhama@gmail.com.*

In terms of quality, Uganda's education sector, modelled on the basis of the British system, was one of the best in Africa until the early 1990s. Thereafter, both the academic and physical infrastructures experienced serious declines in quality. Like in many other African countries, the higher education subsector in Uganda is currently facing various challenges—including, *inter alia*, underfunding across the board, inadequate academic staff at all levels, an acute shortage of senior staff, low remuneration packages for academic staff, inadequate facilities for graduate training, serious governance problems, low research output, scarcity of student scholarships, and suboptimal supervision of the sector by the mandated authorities. The main challenge is, however, underfunding.

Institutions of higher learning comprise 36 universities, four other degree-awarding institutions, and various certificate- and diploma-awarding institutions. The student population in these higher education institutions is just over 200,000, of which 45 percent are women. These students represent about 2 percent of the entire population of learners in primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions in the country. In general, access to higher education by the poor is very problematic. Most of the students in these institutions come from well-to-do backgrounds. This is in contrast to access to primary and secondary education, which is broad and attainable by both rich and poor in general, in view of the ongoing universal primary and secondary education (UPE and USE) programs, implemented following the UN Declaration of September 2000. Further, many citizens of Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Tanzania, and other neighboring countries study in these institutions.

### DEMAND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Since the mid-1980s, Uganda's higher education subsector has continued to register considerable growth in terms of institutions, primarily due to its high demand. Colleges of

commerce and business studies dominate the subsector (33 percent), followed by universities (16 percent) and technical colleges (4 percent). Although Makerere University was the only degree-awarding institution in Uganda until 1988, there are now 41 degree-awarding institutions in the country, of which 11 are public universities.

Overall, there is ample demand for university education, at least in the Eastern African region. This demand is far in excess of that for middle-level and technical education. This is a result of popular demand, intense advertising by universities, and the job market, which prefers degree holders to certificate and diploma holders. In addition, students who study science and technology have a better chance of being employed earlier, and more employment options, than those studying other disciplines. Consequently, most students, parents, and policy makers prefer university education to middle-level and technical education. This bias has led to a noticeable lack of middle-level technicians and workers, whom Uganda has to import. Hence, by 2016,

---

**Thereafter, both the academic and physical infrastructures experienced serious declines in quality. Like in many other African countries, the higher education subsector in Uganda is currently facing various challenges**

---

less than 10 percent of the training programs in health sciences and engineering were for diplomas. Needless to say, Uganda needs an immediate policy shift on this issue if it is to have the skilled labor needed to attract investment and propel economic growth and development.

Further, since the early 1990s, there have been improvements in women's access to higher education, computer access and use, as well as enrollments in science and technology. The upsurge in enrollments has, however, been in business and computer-related disciplines, rather than in basic, mathematical, or other technical sciences. Factors to explain this include poor teaching facilities at secondary schools and underfunding, in addition to better employment opportunities in the articulated preferred areas. Due partly to the closing of technical institutes in favor of universities in the recent past, the production of middle-level technicians from technical institutions has, unfortunately, continued to decline.

The closing of lower-level tertiary training institutions was a retrogressive step, since middle-level technicians and artisans are indispensable in all construction and mainte-

nance. Most of the growth of higher education institutions is in the commerce and business studies areas, rather than in the science and technical college fields.

Overall, the private sector owns 72 percent and the public sector 28 percent of the tertiary institutions. The overwhelming majority of students at the public universities are sponsored by private sources, not by government. In fact, apart from providing the required funding and other resources to the private tertiary education institutions, the private sector also plays a big role as a source of funding for the public tertiary institutions. Thus, the private sector plays a vital, complementary role in the provision of tertiary education in Uganda.

#### QUALITY UP TO THE 1990s

As noted, Uganda's quality of education at all levels used to be the best in Eastern Africa. The sound quality of education was sustained by a highly qualified team of instructors, well-equipped and well-funded institutions, adequate supporting services and staff, and good governance at all institutions. Despite political turbulence following the Idi Amin coup d'état of 1971, the quality remained reasonably high for at least two decades. Unlike today, it should also be noted that, at that time, there was hardly any corruption in the country, and student and teacher discipline and morale were very high. Unfortunately, corruption is now widespread in the country.

As noted earlier, many foreign students flocked to Uganda's secondary schools in search of quality education. Following admission of nongovernment sponsored students in 1992–1993, accompanied by the establishment of private universities since 1988, many non-Ugandans also flocked to the country to benefit from sound quality university education. The fact that tertiary education in Uganda is generally cheaper than in neighboring countries also helped increase the demand, and, therefore, the number of foreign student inflows into the country.

After that, the situation changed for the worse—mainly due to serious underfunding. Currently, most higher education institutions are known for, inter alia, insufficient funding, overcrowded lecture halls, insufficient (and sometimes inexperienced and underqualified) instructors, inadequate teaching and learning materials, suboptimal numbers of senior academics, meagre or non-existent research output, and shortcomings in administration and other aspects of governance. In fact, all the universities are currently “bottom-heavy,” with a serious lack of senior staff, particularly at the professorial levels. As for research, basically, only Makerere University can boast of reasonable annual research output; the other universities are essentially teaching universities with minimal research output. The situation at most institutions in terms of physical and edu-

cational infrastructure and academic standards leaves a lot to be desired, just as in primary and secondary schools.

#### THE WAY FORWARD

Uganda needs to immediately modernize higher education—including rehabilitation and growth in the face of changing needs and technologies. Ultimately, this involves reshaping higher education in order to give it new life and a new relevance, including transforming institutions to meet changing social needs. This revitalization should culminate in improvements in its quality and quantity, strengthening existing systems and structures, filling existing gaps, diagnosing and dealing with deficiencies, and, consequently, enhancing sustainable development.

The higher education sector definitely needs overhauling. Annual government budget allocation to the entire education sector needs to be raised from its current low level (less than 10 percent of the budget) to at least 15 percent. Hence, increased funding, close supervision, and serious attention to solving the other challenges are essential in overcoming the multifaceted problems afflicting the sub-sector. Policy should target these variables. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9787>

## The Challenges of Creating a Ranking: A Colombian Example

FELIPE MONTES, DAVID FORERO, RICARDO SALAS, AND ROBERTO ZARAMA

*Felipe Montes is a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Industrial Engineering, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia. E-mail: felmont@uniandes.edu.co. David Forero is lecturer, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Universidad Nacional de Colombia. E-mail: davidfforerot@gmail.com. Ricardo Salas is manager at the Quality Assurance for Higher Education Office, ministry of education of Colombia. E-mail: jssalas@gmail.com. Roberto Zarama is full professor at the Industrial Engineering Department, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia. E-mail: rzarama@uniandes.edu.co.*

Colombia is a country with a population of 48 million and 2.3 million students enrolled in higher education (49 percent access rate). For almost two decades, the Colombian government used a voluntary accreditation system to provide information to the population on the quality of higher education institutions. Even if accreditation has

been a recognized tool to grant public trust in educational quality, it does not provide enough information for decision-making, as the public only knows whether a higher education institution is accredited or not. The public does not know the extent to which the quality of an institution is close to, or far away from accreditation standards. In addition, only 14 percent of higher education institutions are accredited, and most of the remaining 86 percent have opted out. Therefore, the community has limited information on the quality of the nonaccredited institutions, which represent the majority. The main source of information consulted by the community is in the international rankings. However, the most comprehensive academic ranking in the region so far, QS Latin America, includes only 50 of the 289 Colombian higher education institutions (17 percent).

As members and advisors of the ministry of education of Colombia, we developed a ranking with a multidimensional approach: the Model of Higher Education Performance Indicators (MIDE by its acronym in Spanish). Our goal was to provide information enabling the community to compare the performance of the country's public and private higher education institutions and inform their decisions on higher education,

This article addresses the five main challenges encountered during the design, implementation, and disclosure of MIDE, which was launched on July 15, 2015 by the minister of education. We also present the methodology used to overcome these challenges.

#### **CHALLENGE 1: INFORMATION SOURCES AND RELIABILITY**

The most challenging restriction for the construction of an academic ranking relies on the availability and robustness of information. We built MIDE based only on already existing data provided by public information systems; we did not use indicators stemming from surveys and reputational measures, as we considered them prone to be self-referential and self-perpetuating. Although Colombian data sources are public and free, they are rather difficult to access and interpret by the population. Therefore, MIDE was designed to provide a simple mechanism to read and interpret data resulting from these information tools.

The information systems that we used have been developed by the government since the early 2000s to measure the performance of higher education institutions in terms of quality and pertinence. These systems use mainly information reported by higher education institutions. They include demographic and financial variables of institutions; dropout rates based on socioeconomic indicators; alumni employability and salaries in the job market; research indicators; and results of higher education standardized national tests.

#### **CHALLENGE 2: DIVERSITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**

One major challenge in the construction of the MIDE model was to compare the performance of diverse higher education institutions with common metrics. In order to partition a complex higher education system, we adapted the concept used by the Carnegie Classification of Higher Education Institutions in the United States. We aggregated both public and private institutions in four groups (Doctoral, Master, Bachelor, and Specialized institutions), according to the number of graduates or programs offered per education level and the number of disciplines offered in undergraduate programs. This classification allowed us to produce, in addition to a general ranking, a ranking for each group.

---

**For almost two decades, the Colombian government used a voluntary accreditation system to provide information to the population on the quality of higher education institutions.**

---

#### **CHALLENGE 3: CHOICE OF VARIABLES AND INDICATORS**

The MIDE structure is based on the review of different elements of global rankings such as the Academic Rankings of World Universities (Shanghai) principles, the QS weights system, and the multidimensional approach of U-Multirank. MIDE is composed of 18 variables grouped in six dimensions that are aggregated in three main categories: students, professors, and institutions. We considered both input and output variables. Input variables serve as indicators of resources available to the institution, and output variables serve as indicators of learning outcomes and success on the labor market. We selected indicators in which a progression would result in an improvement for the higher education institutions, both in international rankings and in the domestic process of accreditation.

MIDE is different from other rankings, in that it incorporates objective measures of learning outcomes using the results of the Colombian state examination SABER PRO. Since 2003, this examination evaluates annually all higher education graduates in five basic areas of competence, including quantitative reasoning, critical reading, writing, English comprehension, and a module with discipline-specific questions.

#### **CHALLENGE 4: RANKING METHODOLOGY**

The main role of rankings is to serve as a systematic or-

ganization structure that allows summarizing a series of variables in one single score. To rank the institutions, we designed a methodology called “Ranking of Rankings,” as a technique that guaranteed every variable to have the same scale and distribution. The methodology consisted of using the ordinal place of the higher education institution in each indicator, then averaging the positions to get a final score by using a weight for each variable. This led to the challenge of defining weights for each variable. Although we considered the option of allowing users the freedom of assigning the weights so they could create their own ranking, for the ministry it was crucial to promote improvement in certain key indicators. Therefore, we fixed weights for each variable according to the robustness and reliability of data sources, and to the importance of the indicator in the higher education goals of the National Development Plan.

#### CHALLENGE 5: DISCLOSURE

Normally, ranking models are developed by third parties. Although the model was created by the ministry of education itself with the goal of increasing quality and improving decision-making, this presented a challenge because the ministry is responsible for providing resources to higher education institutions and thus, in part, responsible for their quality. Therefore, the ministry could be seen as both judge and jury in this process. However, the result of culling available information produced a useful tool for the public and a wake-up call for the institutions. In that way, we reassured the community that 1) the ranking was not going to be used for other purposes, such as informing resource allocation or setting quality standards for the accreditation process; 2) the model indicators were balanced in order to be representative of the complexity of the higher education system; 3) the ranking was designed with relevant existing objective measures to be transparent, and thus replicable.

#### OUTLOOK

After facing these different challenges and publishing MIDE in July 2015, the ministry managed to establish a common language around higher education quality that was heavily discussed in the following months. Even if the model may need time to achieve a certain degree of maturity, it has certainly provided relevant and reliable information for higher education institutions on how to improve in quality, and for parents and families to make informed decisions on higher education. Throughout 2016, an updated version of the ranking (MIDE 2.0) was developed and increasingly accepted by higher education institutions. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9776>

## Private Higher Education in Brazil: Fueling Economic Growth

JOSÉ JANGUIÊ BEZERRA, CELSO NISKIER, AND LIoudmila BATOURINA

*José Janguê Bezerra is president of Associação Brasileira de Mantenedoras de Ensino Superior (ABMES) and of Grupo Ser Educacional, Brazil. E-mail: janguie@sereducacional.com. Celso Niskier is vice-president of ABMES and rector of Centro Universitário Carioca, Brazil. E-mail: cniskier@unicarioca.edu.br. Lioudmila Batourina is International Partnership consultant at ABMES. E-mail: lioudmila@abmes.org.br.*

The Brazilian private education sector is one of the largest in the world. The demand for education in the country is so high that with relevant support from the government, private universities keep expanding. In the traditional higher education community, most think of private education in terms of business rather than of a national plan, with a critical focus on their quality. With nonprofit institutions also engaged in creating profits by means of various courses and projects, there is no end to the discussion about for-profit and nonprofit education. In Brazil, meanwhile, the national test of graduates (ENADE) reveals a wide range of quality in both the public and private sectors, where the great motivation of students from for-profits makes them show strong results. Private universities, as a part of the National Program, often undergo rigid quality checks. In the majority of cases, the teaching staff of these universities are employed at federal and state institutions, while the students, mainly from the low-income social strata, have a high motivation to study.

#### A FORCE TO BE RECKONED WITH

Since 1996, the private higher education sector in Brazil has been consolidating each year, as shown in the latest census data: out of 2,364 higher education institutions (HEIs) in Brazil, 87.5 percent are private. This includes 2,069 universities, university centers, and colleges distributed throughout Brazil, giving Brazilian citizens the possibility to complete a degree (undergraduate, master’s, and doctorate) and to change their own circumstances and the circumstances of their families.

The strength of this private segment is proved by national statistics: today, there are more than 6 million students enrolled in private higher education institutions, which represents more than 75 percent of all university students. There is a certain social twist in the educational sys-



tem of Brazil; in short, young women and men who study in expensive private high schools, after their final examination win the competition for the very limited number of free study places in federal or state universities. On the other hand, students from public schools with good but lower scores have to apply for grants to pay for their education in the private sector. Basically, this means that the private sector has the responsibility—for which it receives much criticism—of bringing these students to the necessary level of knowledge and education for service to the country.

The private sector in Brazil comprises many small and medium HEIs, as well as large institutions. About 36 percent of the students are enrolled at the 12 largest educational groups. Regardless of their size, all HEIs face multiple challenges: sustaining quality standards, attracting the best staff, remaining flexible, passing rigid audits for accreditation, constantly adapting to numerous changes in regulations, and many others, including funding.

Traditionally, Brazilian private HEIs are better known for courses in the less technological fields, though the difference, over time, is being erased, leaving fundamental science and the most technologically demanding specialties to public universities. Among a wide range of courses offered by private HEIs, law education is traditionally the most popular among students, with the highest enrollments (14 percent), followed by administration (9 percent), civil engineering (6 percent), and finally medical school, pedagogy, and HR management. Private universities supply the country with qualified middle-class workers, most needed on the Brazilian labor market and fueling the economic growth.

#### GROWTH CURVE

Brazilian higher education started expanding in 1996. Before that, enrollments remained limited and could not meet the demands of society. The turning point was the introduction of a fund allowing young people to take out students loans. Thus, the growth of the private education sector in Brazil should not be mistaken for a result of the development of the private business in general, as it is the natural outcome of the National Education Plan (PNE). In fact, this is the core characteristic that differentiates private education in Brazil from, for instance, private education in European countries. Brazilian private universities are an inseparable part, tool, and provider of the PNE. They serve as a joint innovative solution by the country's leaders and highly educated businesspersons, to tackle the problem of the insufficient quantity of higher education institutions and of social inclusion in the country.

The second dramatic jump happened in 2002, when the first technological undergraduate courses were introduced. These courses were of shorter duration, and facilitated the admission to higher education of students from

the low-income social classes, or classes “C” and “D,” which represented more than half of the Brazilian student population. The courses were accepted on the market as higher education and were open to adult learners who came to universities not right after high school, but after some years of work.

The next peak of growth was in 2005, when the ProUni fund was created. It offered scholarships at private HEIs for students from less privileged families. The scholarships were awarded to students from families receiving a maximum of 1.5 minimum salary.

The reformulation of the loans of the Student Financing Fund (FIES) in 2010, with a reduction of interest rates and an increase of the amortization period, caused an exponential increase in new enrollments from 76,000 in 2010 to 732,000 in 2014.

---

**The demand for education in the country is so high that with relevant support from the government, private universities keep expanding.**

---

The economic and political crisis of 2015 forced the Brazilian government to reduce FIES loans drastically, and most students from “C” and “D” classes were again excluded from entering higher education. Currently, the net enrollment rate in higher education for the 18–24 age class is just over 17 percent, while, according to the PNE, 33 percent of young people should be enrolled by 2024. From 1996 to 2014, FIES reached almost 40 percent of the goal, but after the sharp reduction of 2015, it accounted for less than 15 percent of the students in 2016.

Such a deviation from the PNE arouses the strongest reaction from the association of private universities (ABMES—*Associação Brasileira de Mantenedoras de Ensino Superior*), which stands for the legitimate interests of private HEIs and their students, and for the education plan as a whole. The argument that scholarships have taken a heavy toll on society turned out to be no more than a polemic cliché: the cost of students at private institutions (87.5 percent of the HE sector) to the country is less than that of students at public institutions, while their immediate impact on the national economy is massive. Therefore, in support of the challenge to reach PNE goals by 2024, ABMES strategically focuses on pushing the government to keep investing in the scholarships. At the same time, in light of the current economic crisis, the association is working with the authorities to find alternative funding mechanisms, e.g., possible new

regulations allowing private banks to join the financing market for prospective students.

Experiencing the direct impact of the economic crisis, the private education sector is the best and most active partner of the government in searching ways to provide society with access opportunities to higher education, and to sustain economic growth. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9933>

## Higher Education Regionalization in East Asia

EDWARD W. CHOI

*Edward W. Choi is a doctoral student at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: [edward.choi.2@bc.edu](mailto:edward.choi.2@bc.edu).*

Three prominent organizations have emerged as drivers of regional higher education (HE) cooperation in East Asia: the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO), and a recently formed trilateral grouping between the governments of China, Japan, and South Korea (hereafter referred to as Korea). While these regional actors share some history of collaboration, in part driven by a desire to create a common East Asian HE space, they implement regionalization schemes largely based on different needs, goals, timetables, and customs. This phenomenon has resulted in a fragmented landscape of East Asian HE regionalization. In considering this state of affairs, several questions emerge. Why are there multiple regionalization schemes in East Asia? For nations with multiple regional memberships, is it possible that some regionalization schemes have priority over others? If yes, are there any adverse implications for East Asian regionalization schemes, both as separate initiatives and, more broadly, as schemes working toward a common East Asian HE space?

### ASEAN AND THE ASEAN UNIVERSITY NETWORK

Initially (roughly in the period 1967–1989), ASEAN drove cooperation on the twin premises of political stability and security. Thus, its founding members—Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand—shared a mission focused on the containment of communism in Indochina and cooperative nation-building, especially in the years following successful national independence

movements in the region. However, events of the 1990s, particularly the Asian financial crisis of 1997, prompted a shift in rationale as a wave of political discourse around economic integration swept the region. The financial crisis highlighted the need for cooperation not only among ASEAN member countries, but also among other afflicted nations—namely China, Japan, and Korea—to find economic solutions to prevent future recessions from devastating the region. This grouping of countries became known as ASEAN Plus Three.

Throughout ASEAN's evolution—from an exclusive grouping of Southeast Asian countries, to the inclusive ASEAN Plus Three configuration, and later the ASEAN Plus Six arrangement (with the addition of Australia, India, and New Zealand)—policy dialogue around HE regional cooperation materialized slowly. The conversation began with the first two ASEAN Committee on Education meetings in the 1970s; together, these meetings promoted higher education, particularly the labor potential of HE graduates, as the primary engine driving economic prosperity. The meetings also advanced a compelling argument in favor of an international pipeline to secure qualified and highly motivated students. What resulted was a subregional grouping known as the ASEAN University Network (AUN), which, assisted by the ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) framework and the ASEAN Credit Transfer System (ACTS), facilitates exchanges of faculty, staff, and students among 30 member institutions.

### SEAMEO AND THE SOUTH EAST ASIAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA

Whereas ASEAN's AUN operates on a subregional platform, the SEAMEO Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development (RIHED) seeks to achieve a higher-order objective of establishing a South East Asian Higher Education Area (SEA-HEA). To date, three primary regionalization processes have advanced this work: the Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand (M-I-T) mobility pilot project and two regional harmonizing mechanisms, the ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN) and the Southeast Asian Credit Transfer System (SEA-CTS). Assisted by the University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific Credit Transfer System (UCTS), 23 universities under M-I-T facilitated the exchange of 1,130 undergraduate students during the initiative's four-year rollout (2010–2014). M-I-T is now moving forward under a more inclusive branding, the ASEAN International Mobility for Students (AIMS), and plans to expand its remit to include four additional countries: Brunei Darussalam, Japan, the Philippines, and Vietnam. In contrast to M-I-T, AQAN and SEA-CTS activity has been difficult to measure; however, it is likely that these two regional mechanisms will

have increased visibility under AIMS.

#### **CAMPUS Asia**

The newest arrival on the scene of regional cooperation in East Asia is a trilateral student mobility scheme called the Collective Action for Mobility Program of University Students in Asia (CAMPUS Asia). Launched in 2012 as a pilot project under the direction of China, Japan, and Korea, CAMPUS Asia facilitates both undergraduate and graduate student mobility through credit exchange, dual degree, and joint degree programs, and aims to develop a pool of talented “Asian experts” through a shared resource and knowledge platform. These experts are expected to become ambassadors of an internationally competitive, knowledge-based Northeast Asian region. As perhaps a secondary objective, the mobility scheme may be regarded as a means to alleviate China and Korea’s brain drain problem (the loss of intellectual capital to popular study and work destinations such as North America and Europe), while simultaneously creating international demand for HE sectors faced with the prospect of diminishing enrollment rates (Japan and Korea).

#### **THE CONUNDRUM OF REGIONALIZATION IN EAST ASIA**

Taken separately, all the regionalization schemes described above have the potential to yield considerable benefits within their respective geographic purviews: a deepening of cross-cultural understanding; knowledge sharing; an international pipeline to skilled labor; and regional stability and peace. However, viewed as a whole, they represent a fragmented landscape of HE regionalization, comprised of mutually exclusive and, in some instances, overlapping cross- and intraregional economic and political interdependencies. These uncoordinated dynamics are bound to cause geopolitical tension, as regional networks are likely to engage in political maneuvering and other posturing behaviors, especially as programs expand into neighboring territories and endeavor to recruit member nations that are already committed to other initiatives.

For example, the trilateral Northeast Asian grouping has plans to include some ASEAN and/or SEAMEO member countries in CAMPUS Asia, while both ASEAN and SEAMEO have entertained the possibility of expanding AUN and AIMS, respectively, to the northeast, namely to China, Japan, and Korea. As the prospect of new regional partnerships opens up, countries with multiple memberships may choose to honor or devote more resources to cooperative arrangements that either yield the most benefit (e.g., in terms of prestige, political endorsement, or resources), are most feasible, or both. The maturing of spinoff ASEAN Plus One arrangements (e.g., ASEAN-Japan), perhaps at the expense of developments in the larger ASEAN Plus Three grouping,

may illustrate this point. In other cases, regional networks may find themselves fighting over resources that become “spread too thin” as member nations devote funding, manpower, and time to multiple regionalization initiatives. In sum, prioritization activities may thwart the cultivation of enduring regional cooperative ties and hamper the progress of regionalization schemes that share multiple member nations. Perhaps also at stake is the creation of an all-inclusive, single East Asian HE community.

Another challenge facing regional organizations in East Asia is the inherent difficulty of attempting to harmonize an extremely polarized geographic area of cultures, languages, standards around HE quality, and national norms and regulations, specifically around visa protocols and academic calendars. Reference tools such as AQAN, UCTS, and ACTS have mitigated the most visible differences and successfully facilitated student exchanges for elite regional groupings such as AUN and pilot international mobility projects. But a need emerges to develop more broad-sweeping harmonizing mechanisms with the aim of equalizing educational benefits across East Asia as a whole. In recognition of this

---

**This phenomenon has resulted in a fragmented landscape of East Asian HE regionalization.**

---

limitation, SEAMEO RIHED and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) have begun to develop what aims to be an all-inclusive, pan-East Asian reference tool known as the Academic Credit Transfer Framework (ACTFA). However, the question becomes whether the many regional networks that coexist in East Asia will embrace this framework, especially in light of their tendency to promote homegrown mobility schemes and harmonizing mechanisms native to their respective subregions. Currently, CAMPUS Asia seems to be exploring its own CTS and QA framework and AUN, as already mentioned, uses AUN-QA and ACTS.

Given this current state of affairs, now would likely be a good time to emphasize a greater level of interregional cooperation among regional networks in East Asia. The aim here would be to alleviate any geopolitical tension that is perhaps characteristic of East Asian regionalization today, and develop efficient ways to share knowledge and resources across regional networks to equalize HE benefits across the region. Perhaps in this way, East Asian regionalization can begin to move toward a more inclusive regionalization

agenda of creating a single, pan-East Asian HE community. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9805>

## China: A World Leader in Graduation Rates

**JULIAN MARIOULAS**

*Julian Marioulas is a PhD candidate at the Department of East Asian Studies, University of Vienna, Austria, and teaches German at the School of Foreign Languages, East China University of Science and Technology, China. E-mail: julian@marioulas.de.*

In its April 2013 edition, *The Economic Observer* posed a simple question: “Are China’s Colleges Too Easy?” Although this question may be asked of many higher education systems, the answer given by *The Economic Observer* for China is an unambiguous and resounding yes. China has one of the lowest college dropout rates in the world, with sources from the ministry of education stating that less than 1 percent of students fail to complete their degrees. Rare instances of disciplinary action against students provoke outcries from the affected individuals and their families. While East Asian higher education in general is characterized by high entry requirements and low dropout rates, the latter still hover around the 10 percent mark in South Korea and Japan, a far cry from the situation in China, where failing college remains almost unthinkable.

### THE NUMBERS

As part of my data collection for this article, using the “Quality Reports on Undergraduate Education” published by higher education institutions on the Mainland, I cataloged 187 universities and their four-year graduation rates, as well as the bestowal rate of bachelor degrees upon graduation. The mix of universities in the list is diverse, encompassing twelve provinces, rural and urban communities, and institutions of all qualities and sizes. Their average four-year graduation rate in 2013 stood at 97.3 percent. Five institutions allowed 100 percent of students to graduate, while the lowest percentage stood at 84. The rate of bachelor degrees bestowed during that same year stood at 96 percent, lower than the total graduation percentage. Usually, the Certificate of Graduation requires a passing grade in all mandatory courses plus a statutory number of total credit points, while a certain GPA might be required for the

bachelor degree.

The quality and ranking of a college do not seem to make a difference, as the graduation percentages for national key universities of the “211 project,” which have higher entry requirements compared with provincial ones, fall just less than half a standard deviation below the average. What does make a small difference seems to be geographical location, with Hebei—where a substantial proportion of colleges were upgraded to university status in recent years—reaching an average graduation rate of 98.8 percent, while for Shanghai it drops to a lower 95.9 percent. Several universities have departments that are jointly run with foreign partner institutions, and these tend to be harder to graduate from, averaging slightly above 90 percent.

### ENSURING GRADUATION

Writing for the Chinese magazine *Time Education*, two lecturers from Jiangsu University of Technology, a provincial college with comparatively low entry requirements, touched upon several measures to facilitate timely graduation: lowering the difficulty of makeup exams, coupled with the possibility to retake exams in later semesters or even shortly before the projected graduation date. Another contributing factor is the general lack of competency within the ranks of faculty, together with their unwillingness to accept a greater workload if students were not to pass. The effect on students enrolled at less competitive institutions can be detrimental. In class, many of them play on their phones, read novels, or just sleep. While study outside of class is concentrated around exam weeks and materials relevant toward passing the course exams, even this is neglected if the students are aware that failing multiple exams does not carry sanctions.

Similar concerns were echoed by the authors of the only study on the subject of graduation rates in recent years. Li Zifeng and colleagues from Yanshan University in Hebei province observed that most universities have graduation rates close to 100 percent, with students not being reprimanded for cheating, and teachers choosing to avoid trouble by simply letting everybody pass. Students are not being “cultivated” to perform the functions that are theoretically demanded of them. The authors contrast these facts with Western universities, where requirements are more flexible, yet also more demanding, hypothesizing that these contribute to a higher quality of graduates.

A 2013 article in the *Workers’ Daily* reported the case of a university in Hainan, in which the faculty was instructed to let all bachelor students graduate, whether or not they had failed any classes. This also applied to master students, all of whom were allowed to graduate as long as their theses passed a run through plagiarism software. Academic administrators had opted to keep graduation rates high across

the board in order to maintain a positive image and secure future funding, as well as to prevent low-performing departments from being phased out. In such a case, it seems likely that an arrangement to pass everybody would be welcomed by the faculty.

#### SOME DELIBERATIONS

The expansion of higher education in China has allowed a record number of people to enroll in college, and has brought benefits to society as a whole. Investments undertaken by the central government have raised the quality and international recognition of educational institutions on the Mainland. I would, however, argue that graduation being almost guaranteed is acting as an impediment to their further development.

As it stands, elite universities enroll the bulk of their students through the *gaokao* (the university entrance exam) and Independent Recruitment. Although the latter method allows universities a more flexible approach to their student intake, not relying on one single determining score, it is also prone to corruption. The most notable case in recent years is that of Cai Rongsheng. During his eight-year tenure as head of the admissions office at Renmin University of China, he took in more than RMB 23 million (US\$34 million) in bribes for enrolling particular students. According to the *Beijing Morning Post*, places at renowned universities can be priced as high as RMB 1 million (US\$150,000). Independent Recruitment has become a channel for unqualified high school graduates with strong official connections to get into good universities, where they will graduate regardless of their efforts. Under such circumstances, assessment systems designed to weed out low-performing students during the course of their four-year degrees are unlikely to be implemented.

In the case of Renmin University at least, Independent Recruitment has been scaled down considerably since the days of Cai Rongsheng. As numbers from the admissions office show, 192 students were admitted through that process in 2016 (out of 2,797 freshmen in total), which is considerably less than in 2012, when that number stood at 550, around 20 percent of newly enrolled students at the time.

Given the huge pool of qualified candidates, it seems quite imaginable that these universities could achieve graduation rates at the current level, without the need for any particular accommodation toward that end. This would presuppose a transparent, merit-based admission process free of corruption.

As far as provincial universities and colleges are concerned, I am of the opinion that they would benefit from strict graduation requirements to an even greater extent. As of now, the impetus towards numerical growth in enrollment and majors coincides with a mandate to keep gradu-

ation rates high as well, independent of actual student performance. A paradigm shift instituted at a number of provincial universities, placing strict value on the quality of graduates instead of their quantity, would help to raise the value of their degrees and alleviate the hierarchical nature which characterizes Chinese higher education.

It is worth noting that a handful of newly established universities that break with established patterns in student recruitment and curricular requirements do in fact exist, among them ShanghaiTech University and Southern University of Science and Technology. It remains to be seen if their graduation practice will differ from, or fall in line with, the vast majority. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9746>

## Politics and the Universities in Postrevolutionary Iran

SAEID GOLKAR

*Saeid Golkar is lecturer in the Middle East and North Africa Program, Northwestern University, Evanston, US. E-mail: saeid.golkar@northwestern.edu.*

The trajectory of Iranian higher education after the 1979 revolution can be divided into three phases. First, under the revolutionary era (1979–1987), Iranian higher education underwent a first wave of Islamization with the onset of the Cultural Revolution and the Iran–Iraq War (1980–1988). Next, followed a period of reconstruction and political development between 1998 and 2004. During that period, the regime released universities from ideological pressures, allowing them to grow more independent from the state. The third period, the “hard-liner era” (2005–2012), saw another round of Islamization and recentralization of the universities.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION DURING REVOLUTION AND WAR

Iranian universities enjoyed a brief moment of autonomy as the Pahlavi monarchy came to an end, but their role as political hotspots during the revolution quickly led the government to assert control. Immediately following the 1979 Iranian Revolution, government officials implemented policies intended to regulate and “purify” universities, to cleanse them of any trace of the Pahlavi regime.

University autonomy eroded under the Cultural Revolution Plan. All universities closed for three years until 1982, in order to be “cleansed” of both political and reli-

gious opposition. During that time, the Cultural Revolution headquarters was the main body managing and directing the Islamization project. The council emphasized two stages in Islamizing universities. First, it installed a pro-Islam curriculum by purging institutions of any Western or Eastern influence. During the second stage, it dealt with the physical construction of the newly Islamized universities: all aspects of the institutions were to be modified to mirror Islamic principles and criteria. A variety of organizations such as the Supreme Council of the Cultural Revolution (SCCR) were set up in order to oversee and govern the Islamization project of universities and expand it to the entire Iranian culture.

#### **THE CONSTRUCTION AND REFORM ERA (1989–2004)**

The technocratic government under Hashemi Rafsanjani, who took power after the Iran–Iraq War, perceived universities as the primary resource to train officials for the state bureaucracy. The Rafsanjani administration emphasized *takhasoos* (technical expertise) over *taahhod* (ideological commitment), which had dominated after the first Cultural Revolution. Rafsanjani’s pragmatism resulted in the dramatic expansion of higher education in Iran. During that era, many private universities were established around the country. Enrollment in state universities increased from 407,693 in 1988 to 1,192,329 in 1996.

This trend continued under Khatami’s reformist administration (1997–2004), which saw an increase in university autonomy and a relaxation of their political atmosphere. Khatami’s government tried to restructure the higher education system and increase its independence from government. In 2000, the ministry of culture and higher education was changed to “ministry of science, research, and technology” (MSRT), emphasizing its reach over research as well as education. The following year, universities were given more independence in the preparation of curricula and syllabi. In addition, in 2002, they were allowed to hire professors as opposed to accepting state appointments. Finally, universities were permitted to choose their administrations, including deans of faculties and presidents, through an election process.

As in the Rafsanjani era, under Khatami student enrollment expanded rapidly, increasing from 1,404,880 in 2000 to 2,117,471 in 2004. The number of female students in universities also increased steadily. Backed by the students themselves, reformists opened up the political debate in universities and encouraged the political participation of students, a policy that was attacked by conservatives. This expansion of political freedom among students led to their strong democratic desire to challenge the unelected bodies of the political regime, as shown by the student uprisings

in 1999 and 2003, suppressed by the militia and other vigilante groups.

Although the state bureaucracy strove to implement reformist policies, it was met with relentless opposition by Iran’s supreme leader and the conservative wing, who tried to block reformist programs, thwart student movements, and continue to Islamize universities. In 1997, the SCCR—dominated by conservatives and appointed by the Supreme leader—supported the establishment of a new Council for Islamizing Educational Institutes (CIEI). The CIEI ratified many regulations, including a doctrine entitled “Principles of Islamic Universities,” in December 1998. According to this document, the Islamization of universities would be achieved through six different channels: professors, students, curriculum and syllabi, cultural programming, educational programming, and school management. The policies, which were rejected by reformists, were implemented under the following hard-liner administration.

#### **HARD-LINER ERA (2005–2012)**

An authoritarian populist, Ahmadinejad simultaneously expanded higher education and political control over universities. The number of students reached to 4 million by 2013. At the same time, his government revoked the relative autonomy of universities, recentralized the higher education system, and brought universities under political control. During that period, the government’s efforts to control universities intensified dramatically. The MSRT, dominated by hard-liner scholars, implemented all the CIEI regulations that had been proposed to further the Islamization of universities.

The recentralization of the higher education system occurred at several levels. At the administrative level, the MSRT, not the faculties, selected university presidents. The Ahmadinejad government replaced many esteemed academic staff with fundamentalists who believed deeply in university Islamization. The MSRT also replaced university management regulations that had been in place for 18 years with the mandate that university presidents would select deputies and heads of faculties who would implement university Islamization. A gender segregation policy was aggressively implemented; universities were also required to expand the implementation of moral policing and to create mosques and Islamic seminaries. In 2007, to enroll pro-regime loyalists, the government removed the autonomy of the universities in the hiring process and recruited ideologically driven lecturers. During the Ahmadinejad administration, student admissions were similarly centralized and the admission of doctoral students came under the control of the MSRT. This control helped the government prevent politically active students from continuing their education and

facilitated the access of pro-regime students to postgraduate studies. Universities also lost their autonomy to design and prepare their curricula. The Committee on Promotion of Human Sciences Textbooks was established to “purify” university textbooks. Many observers interpreted these efforts as a second Cultural Revolution, which has eroded the quality of higher education in Iran.

#### CONCLUSION

Controlling and Islamizing universities has been one of the primary concerns of the Islamic republic since its inception. This has culminated in two Cultural Revolutions that occurred in the 1980s and 2000s respectively. These policies paved the way for a massive brain drain and undermined the quality of education, notably in the humanities

and social sciences. Despite these efforts, the state was not successful in creating an Islamic university. The expansion of universities and student numbers, the growth of information technologies, and the fragmentation and deideologization of part of the political elites are among the reasons why the project of islamization of Iranian universities has been a relative failure. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9930>

#### NEW PUBLICATIONS

(Editor's note: *IHE* is no longer publishing short book summaries, but rather is providing a more comprehensive listing of new books that will be of interest to a higher education audience. We welcome suggestions from readers for books on higher education published especially outside of the United States and United Kingdom. This list was compiled by Edward Choi, graduate assistant at the Center.)

Arar, Khalid, and Kussai Haj-Yehian. *Higher Education and the Palestinian Arab Minority in Israel*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 213 pp. \$100 (hb). Website: [www.palgrave.com](http://www.palgrave.com).

Bader, John. *Dean's List: 10 Strategies for College Success*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017. 216 pp. \$24.95 (pb). Website: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

Barrett, Beverly. *Globalization and Change in Higher Education—The Political Economy of Policy Reform in Europe*. New

York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. 314 pp. \$99.99 (hb). Website: <http://www.palgrave.com>.

Cramer, Sharon F. *Shared Governance in Higher Education: Demands, Transitions, Transformations*, Volume 1. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2017. 273 pp. \$85 (hb). Website: [www.sunypress.edu](http://www.sunypress.edu).

Cochrane, Sharlene Voogd, Meenakshi Chhabra, Marjorie A. Jones, and Deborah Spragg, Eds. *Culturally Responsive Teaching and Reflection in Higher Education: Promising Practices from the Cultural Literacy Curriculum Institute*. Abington, UK: Routledge, 2017. 126 pp. £44.00 (hb). Website: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

Cottom, Tressie McMillan. *Lower Ed: The Troubling Rise of For-Profit Colleges in the New Economy*. The New Press, 2017. 240 pp. \$26.95 (hc). Website: <http://thenewpress.com>.

Diner, Steven J. *Universities and Their Cities: Urban Higher Education in America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins

University Press, 2017. 192 pp. \$44.95 (hb). Website: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

Farrugia, Christine A. *Open Doors 2015: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York, NY: Institute Of International Education, 2016. \$79.95. Website: <http://www.iie-books.org/opdoreonined.html>.

Kim, Eunyoung, and Katherine C. Aquino, Eds. *Disability as Diversity in Higher Education—Policies and Practices to Enhance Student Success*. Abington, UK: Routledge, 2017. 244 pp. £29.59 (pb). Website: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

Knight, Jane, and Emnet Tadesse Woldegiorgis, Eds. *Regionalization of African Higher Education: Progress and Prospects*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2017. 269 pp. \$54.00 (pb). Website: <https://www.sensepublishers.com>.

Larsen, Marianne A. *Internationalization of Higher Education: An Analysis through Spatial, Network, and Mobilities Theories*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmil-

lan, 2016. 196 pp. £100.00 (hb). Website: <http://www.palgrave.com>.

Marber, Peter, and Daniel Araya, Eds. *The Evolution of Liberal Arts in the Global Age*. Abington, UK: Routledge, 2017. 242 pp. £25.59 (pb). Website: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

Musselin, Christine. *La Grande Course des Universités*. Paris, FR: Presses de Sciences Po, 2017. 304 pp. 19 (pb). Website: <http://www.pressesdesciencespo.fr>.

Shek, Daniel T. L., and Robert Hollister, Eds. *University Social Responsibility and Quality of Life*. Singapore: Springer, 2017. 283 pp. \$119 (hb). Website: [www.springer.com](http://www.springer.com).



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

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

#### 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 CIHE Web site provide detailed information about the work of the Center, along with links to news and relevant resources in the field of interest to scholars, professionals, and students of higher education. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the Web site provides easy access to details about current and past CIHE projects, initiatives, and resources; information about our key partners; and links to our many publications. Prospective graduate students and visiting scholars can also find extensive information about how to seek connections with us in support of

their studies and research.

#### 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. Specializations are offered in international higher education, administration, and student affairs. For additional information, see: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/departments/eahe/graduate.html/>.

#### SPECIAL SECTION ON INTERNATIONALIZATION

The section on internationalization is made possible through a cooperative arrangement between CIHE and the Centre for Higher Education Internationalization (CHEI) of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. Fiona Hunter, Associate Director of CHEI, is editorial advisor for this section.

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

Learn more about  
CIHE's new MA in  
International Higher  
Education:  
<http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe/graduate-studies.html>

**EDITOR**  
Philip G. Altbach

**ASSOCIATE EDITORS**  
Laura E. Rumbley  
Hans de Wit

**PUBLICATIONS EDITOR**  
Hélène Bernot Ullerö

**EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS**  
Salina Kopellas  
Lisa Unangst

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

**Tel:** (617) 552-4236

**Fax:** (617) 552-8422

**E-mail:** [highered@bc.edu](mailto:highered@bc.edu)

<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>

*We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports.*

*If you would like to subscribe,*

*please send an e-mail to:*

*[highered@bc.edu](mailto:highered@bc.edu), including*

*your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policy-maker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a digital subscription; a fee of \$35/year applies to a subscrip-*

*tion to the print version*

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)

©Center for International Higher Education