Is the Public Good Role of Higher Education Under Attack?

Ellen Hazelkorn

Ellen Hazelkorn is professor emerita and former director of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU), Ireland, and international coinvestigator, ESRC/HEFCE-funded Centre for Global Higher Education, London, UK. E-mail: ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie.

Higher education is usually seen as serving the public good, especially when it is funded directly by the state, and because its benefits extend to the individual and society. It is the source of human capital, innovation, and entrepreneurship to fuel and sustain personal, social, and economic ambitions and development that society and citizens require while underpinning civil society. As such, there is an implicit social contract that balances public support, through taxation and public policy, in return for institutional autonomy.

Civic and land grant universities, in the United Kingdom and the United States and other regions and countries, are a good example of this balance. Universities were established to deliver "publically articulated purposes," while the academy retained a strong role in determining and asserting quality and value. There has been an underlying assumption that by representing and promoting the public good through teaching, research, and service/engagement, the actions and outcomes of (public) universities were *ipso facto* in the public interest.

Today, many assumptions that have underpinned public support for higher education investment have not held true. At a time when higher education is in growing demand, more people feel left behind—struggling to live up to societal and personal expectations. Unequal distribution of societal goods has been accompanied by a perception that the rest of the world is doing better. Economic and research, development, and innovation (RDI) benefit is insufficiently impactful beyond the metropoles. Moreover, we are competing with cities and countries that most of us never knew of or previously considered.

UK and US based surveys suggest that universities and faculty are regarded as too self-serving and insufficiently interested in student learning or outcomes. While the university community is gripped by its position in global rankings, fewer than 1 percent of US students attend highly selective universities such as Harvard and Yale, and only 9 percent of UK students attend Oxbridge or Russell Group universities.

These contrasting world visions are evidenced in recent election results in the United Kingdom, the United States, and France, and rising social tensions elsewhere. They show a widening gap between universities and people living in global-facing towns and cities, and locally focused communities and regions.

Tensions between Higher Education and Society

Across Europe, and elsewhere, higher education is under pressure.

- In the United States, accreditation has traditionally been the shared responsibility of a "triad" comprised of the federal government, regional accrediting agencies, and state governments, with the critical support of the academy. The federal government's role has been relatively minor. However, over the years, there has been growing concern about student completion and employability, especially when seen in the context of rising university prices and student debt. The Obama administration created the College Scorecard "to hold colleges accountable for cost, value, and quality" and open up higher education performance to public scrutiny. In addition, there are several actions at the congressional level aimed at tightening up accreditation practices and the practices of accreditors.

- In the United Kingdom, the first version of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) has been published. Its purpose is to provide students with better information about the quality of degree programs and to raise the profile of teaching. To some extent, the TEF supplants the previous practice of quality assurance (QA), which produced lengthy reports for institutions and was accordingly unsuitable for measuring and comparing student performance and outcomes. QA has often been criticised for being too bureaucratic and a box-ticking exercise. These developments have contributed to a breakdown in trust and a gap that rankings have filled. The TEF speaks to a range of needs and interests, including a more sceptical political system and public, and a diverse educational market.

- In Ireland, the government set out its vision for higher education in the *National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030* (2011). Shaped by an expert group following lengthy consultation, it promoted the concept of the "system-as-a-whole," in contrast to the view frequently promulgated by university rankings, which elevates the performance of indi-

vidual institutions. The strategy also acknowledged the constraints of the country's size and budget. The government seeks to hold institutions to account through a negotiated process called "Strategic Dialogue," to ensure better alignment between institutional mission and performance and overall national policy objectives. A research prioritization strategy has also been adopted, linking funding to key industrial sectors.

> **Today, many assumptions that have underpinned public support for higher education investment have not held true.**

- In the Netherlands, a series of events led, over recent decades, to greater government involvement with the intention to make universities more productive and efficient, and to introduce the principle of long-range scientific planning. This followed concerns around institutional differentiation and student performance, especially poor retention and the inability of the system to meet the varied needs of students and labour markets. Universities and universities of applied sciences have both signed collective strategic agreements with the relevant government ministries through their associations, which have provided the framework for these agreements. The agreements, made by individual higher education institutions, include statements and targets around system structure, institutional profiles, and programs, and are linked to funding.

Time for a New Social Contract?

These examples illustrate just some ways in which growing tensions between higher education and society, often described in terms of (social) accountability vs. (institutional) autonomy, are becoming both more visible and, at times, contentious. Recent events and decisions in Hungary, India, and Turkey worryingly expose a different set of fissures. However, collectively, all these instances raise questions about higher education's role in society today, and how the "public good" is determined in practice by universities, governments, and the public.

Government "incursions" into domains traditionally associated with academic self-governance, such as focusing on performance and outcomes, is often presented as evidence of neoliberal new public management (NPM). More recently, nationalist and nativist thinking and policies have put higher education at odds with governments, which have campaigned to restrict foreigners, stem multiculturalism, and question liberal social values. These "ideological" developments have enabled the academic community to brush aside genuine criticism, thus feeding public concerns about higher education's arrogance and isolationism.

Ireland is again an interesting case in point. Failure by one university to respond to legitimate allegations of financial irregularities by whistle-blowers has led to the entire sector coming under public scrutiny. In turn, universities have argued that declining public funding has transformed public institutions into private ones, thus altering the governance model. However, in doing so, the universities have effectively recast their "public good" role as a transactional relationship—opening up a can of worms.

Over recent decades, we have witnessed a significant shift in governance arrangements, from strict regulation to steering-at-a-distance, to signs of a new social contract. The latter model involves higher education institutions and governments coming together to form a common vision with agreed outcomes. Such practices are underway in, inter alia, Australia, Hong Kong, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and Ontario. The process shows the potential that different goals need not be mutually exclusive, and that being responsive to society can give the academy's own goals legitimacy in a wider sense.

Whereas the state historically provided for the needs of universities, today—in the age of globalization and near-universal higher education—higher education institutions provide for the needs of society. In this new environment, higher education can choose to engage meaningfully in helping to construct the new social contract or the state will step in—taking full responsibility to itself. ■

"Free Speech" and "Offensive" Speech on Campus

Peter Scott

Peter Scott is professor of higher education studies at the University College London Institute of Education, UK. He is also the Commissioner for Fair Access for Scotland. E-mail: p.scott@ioe.ac.uk.

Threats to free speech and academic freedom are legion—from authoritarian regimes in China, Hungary, Russia, and Turkey, and Middle-East states beleaguered by religious fundamentalism, to right-wing populists who believe their cultures and communities are under attack (and

often see universities as bastions of liberalism and cosmopolitanism).

But liberals too have got in on the act. Students at Yale University and Princeton University have campaigned for campus buildings to be renamed, one of their targets being President Woodrow Wilson, the author of the "Fourteen Points," the impeccably liberal principles that ended the First World War. Following the success of students in Cape Town, students at the University of Oxford have attempted to replicate the "Rhodes must fall" campaign, although the offending Oxford statue of the late-Victorian imperialist Cecil Rhodes is a more modest affair high on the wall of Oriel College.

> **The final and most important change is that the student base of twenty-first century mass higher education systems is much more heterogeneous than that of the elite university systems they replaced.**

Confused Political Responses

Even in democracies, political responses have been confused. For example, in the United Kingdom, the government legislated requiring university leaders to guarantee free speech for unpopular (right-wing?) speakers and resist "no-platform" campaigns that seek to exclude them. But, at the same time, it insisted that the same university leaders ban the efforts of Islamic fundamentalists to radicalize students, even inventing new categories previously unknown in democratic thought, like "nonviolent extremism."

The truth is that "free speech" and "political correctness" are best seen not as opposing principles, but as part of a spectrum. No sensible person argues that free speech is absolute: first, because no one has the right to call "fire" in a crowded movie theatre (or use racist language on a multicultural campus?); and secondly, because free speech has always been exercised within a regime of laws. Indeed, some of its most avid advocates argue that it is precisely the rule of law that guarantees free speech.

A Changing Context

Rather than attempting to establish some absolute principles, it may be more helpful to identify some trends that impact on this debate. The first is that there are, and always have been, legitimate debates about the (absolute) beneficence of science. In the past, the objection was not

so much to science itself but to the uses to which it might be put. Now, some go further. Stem cell research and human genomics certainly, and arguably artificial intelligence and (some aspects of) cognitive science, are seen as raising questions about the autonomy, and even sanctity, of human existence.

A second shift has been toward a more confused, fractured, volatile, and ideologically diverse global environment. The heady days of post-1989 triumphalism, when Francis Fukuyama pronounced the "end of history," are a distant memory. Ideological struggles have revived with the rise of so-called "populism"—the election of Donald Trump as US President, the UK's decision to leave the European Union, the rise to political dominance of Putin, Erdogan, and others. Inevitably, these new discomforts are reflected on campus, and provoke sharper contests about "free speech" and "political correctness."

These are linked to a third big change, the rise of so-called "identity" politics. Traditional markers of social identity such as nationality, religion, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic class have been joined by new identifiers, some of which are (fairly) fixed, such as sexual orientation, while others are more fluid, associated with lifestyle preferences and cultural habits. The campus is often an arena in which these new more fluid, and even experimental, social markers are most pronounced. Those with nonstandard social, cultural, or even sexual preferences are no longer content to resist discrimination.

The final and most important change is that the student base of twenty-first century mass higher education systems is much more heterogeneous than that of the elite university systems they replaced. For all their faults, higher education systems, in most advanced countries, have become "rainbow" systems that reflect the diversity of the societies in which they are embedded.

This diversity has had important implications for debates about "free speech" and "political correctness." For the first time, the disadvantaged, with most to gain from a recalibration of the language permitted in these debates, are now present on campus—and often in strength. Classic liberal values, once accepted as universal and absolute, are more likely to be regarded by the former as partial and partisan. The exercise of free speech that appears to threaten their identity or culture and even their still precarious foothold in higher education can easily be interpreted as intolerable.

Responsibilities of Universities

Two conclusions can be drawn from the impact of these changes on the tone of the debate about "free speech" and "political correctness." The first is that there are no absolutes. No society has ever granted its citizens unrestricted

freedom of speech. No campus—although the university should offer a space where this freedom is exercised up to (and even a little beyond) these legally imposed and socially mandated limits—can agree that "anything goes." On the other hand, although sensitivities and vulnerabilities should be respected, there are clearly limits of the extent to which they can be indulged if free and vigorous intellectual enquiry is in danger of being seriously inhibited. We have just to be pragmatic and try to strike the right balance, which will be different in different places and in different times.

The second is that universities are, or should be, exceptionally well placed to strike these shifting balances. Free expression, in the shape of critical enquiry, is a core value in the academy. A university education designed to produce not simply technical experts but also critical citizens depends upon it. So too do a progressive science and enlightened scholarship. But moderation in language, and mutual respect within an academic community, are also core components of a college and university experience—although they should not be invoked too often to protect the thin-skinned or accidentally promote those bent on censorship.

Postsecondary Systems, Massification, and the Research University

Philip G. Altbach

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.

The expansion of both student numbers and increasingly diverse functions of postsecondary education worldwide in the past seventy years has been unprecedented, representing a true revolution in postsecondary education. Just in the past decade or so, global enrollments have doubled. In few countries, however, has there been any comprehensive effort to create clearly defined and differentiated academic systems to serve new academic functions, to ensure that quality is maintained, or that the wide range of needs of an increasingly diverse student population are met.

As economies have become more sophisticated and globally intertwined, ever-higher levels of skills are needed to sustain them, and postsecondary education has been called on to prepare a qualified labor force. A postsecondary qualification has become a prerequisite for social mobility and entry into the skilled job market almost everywhere. The growing diversity of postsecondary institutions has responded to popular demand for access, but while the landscape has diversified, it has not been coherently differentiated.

> **The research university, as the apex academic institution, is central to the global knowledge economy.**

At the same time, the traditional research universities around the world have come under increased pressure to educate academic staff for the expanding higher education sector, undertake research, and engage in the global knowledge networks, while also preparing professionals for leadership positions in society. Before massification, these traditional universities dominated the postsecondary sector. Now, they are typically a small minority in most countries. Yet, they are of central importance as the leading academic institutions but are under unprecedented budgetary pressures, increased demands for accountability, and global competition to be "world class." The rest of the postsecondary sector looks to these prestigious universities for leadership, but for the most part the research universities have kept to their traditional roles. They have by and large not recognized that they are an integral part of a broader postsecondary ecosystem and that they have a responsibility to provide some leadership to the broader academic community.

There is a clear need to coordinate the confused array of postsecondary institutions that have emerged everywhere. In many countries, a considerable number of new institutions are in the private sector and a growing proportion of these are for-profit. Ensuring that private postsecondary institutions work in the broader public interest and at an acceptable level of quality is of great importance.

The generally unhindered diversification that has emerged in response to market demand needs to be replaced by a deliberate effort to develop differentiated academic systems to serve the complex set of social purposes that have emerged in the past half-century. Such a system should recognize the specific roles and responsibilities of different types of institutions and ensure effective coordination and recognition of the importance of each type of school.

While research universities sit at the top of any academic system, they must recognize that they are an integral part

of a multifaceted system. Research universities are only a small segment of large and complex systems—it is important that these singular institutions do not overexpand and that the rest of the system does not seek to emulate the research universities.

These challenges were recently discussed in Hamburg, Germany, by the Körber Foundation, the University of Hamburg, and the German Rector's Conference (HRK), during their biannual Hamburg Transnational University Leaders Conference on the theme of diversified and differentiated academic systems. Fifty university leaders from around the world discussed this topic, and issued the following statement reflecting their perspectives.

The Hamburg Declaration: Organizing Higher Education for the 21st Century

The role of the research university
- The research university, as the apex academic institution, is central to the global knowledge economy. It educates leaders, scientists, and scholars who serve society, academe, industry, and the broader economy. It conducts research, and is the window to international science.
- Research universities are central to the success of higher education, and contribute to the common good.
- The research university functions in an increasingly complex and diverse academic ecosystem, consisting of large numbers of institutions serving varied populations and needs. To be effective in contemporary society, research universities must maintain their essential roles of teaching, research, personality development, and service to society, but must also constructively engage with, and by example provide leadership to, the other institutions in the postsecondary sector.

Requirements for effective differentiation
For differentiation processes of the global higher education landscape to take place in a scientifically designed and value-oriented way, the following steps are necessary:
- *Clear-cut differentiation*: The mission of each type of postsecondary institution should be clearly defined and protected. Controls should seek to maintain appropriate academic differentiation. We note that global academic rankings often distort differentiation by promoting homogeneity.
- *Autonomy:* Postsecondary institutions should be given the authority to manage resources necessary to their mission.
- *Funding:* Predictable funding streams, adequate to the mission of each type of postsecondary institution, must be established.
- *Quality*: Quality assurance systems, designed and executed by academic professionals, must be an essential feature of all postsecondary institutions.
- *Permeability*: There should be articulation mechanisms that permit students equitable access to postsecondary education, allowing them to easily move between different types of institutions without loss of academic standing.
- *Coherence:* Private higher education, the fastest growing part of postsecondary education globally, requires careful integration into an effective postsecondary education system.

The *Hamburg Declaration* reflects the concerns of the fifty rectors participating as well as the sponsoring organizations. Massification has meant not only dramatically increased numbers of students and academic institutions, but also greatly increased complexity and diversity. A central challenge, so far unmet in most of the world, is to ensure rationality in postsecondary education. Further, an increasingly diverse student population and the complex globalized economy need to be adequately served as well.

Note: The report that informed the deliberations in Hamburg is available from the Körber Foundation without cost. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/Korber%20bk%20PDF.pdf. The report is also published as a book. Philip G. Altbach, Liz Reisberg, and Hans deWit, eds., *Responding to Massification: Differentiation in Postsecondary Education Worldwide* (Rotterdam, Netherland: Sense Publishers, 2017).

Armenia: Cross-Border Higher Education

Tatevik Gharibyan

Tatevik Gharibyan is a senior higher education policy specialist at the ministry of education and science of the Republic of Armenia, a 2016–2017 Hubert H. Humphrey Fellow at Pennsylvania State University, and a visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: tatevikgharibyan@gmail.com.

After Armenia regained its independence in 1991 following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the higher education sector started to reshape itself autonomously. A

large number of private and cross-border higher education institutions were established, calling themselves universities—there was no regulation in place at the time determining the right to use the term "university." The government reduced their number by applying licensing and accreditation mechanisms, and there is an ongoing merging policy in place, but the number of higher education institutions (HEIs) in Armenia remains relatively high.

Armenia has around 3 million inhabitants. The gross enrollment ratio in tertiary education is 44.31 percent. There are 65 public and private HEIs: 23 public nonprofit, 31 private for-profit, four "interstate" institutions, and seven institutions that are branches of foreign HEIs. Interstate HEIs are institutions established following an interstate agreement between the Republic of Armenia (or with state participation) and a foreign government. Their activities are regulated by the laws of both countries, and they receive their license and accreditation from both states.

Cross-Border Education as an Incentive for Internationalization

On the one hand, cross-border higher education has posed many challenges to Armenia, due to its weak national regulatory framework and the lack of quality assurance standards and criteria to monitor partnerships appropriately. At the same time, the establishment of cross-border institutions has reinforced the internationalization trend in Armenian higher education and heightened competition between the HEIs. The Armenian government gave strategic support to the development of interstate institutions by exempting them from a number of binding regulatory statutes, with the objective of, at a minimum, attracting the Armenian diaspora, which is comparatively large (around 8 million worldwide).

By joining the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in 2005, Armenia had the opportunity to participate in TEMPUS and Erasmus+ capacity building projects, which gave a solid base to Armenian HEIs developing partnerships with European institutions. Currently, Armenian institutions are using these opportunities to set up joint/double degree programs with European partners and to internationalize their programs.

Transnational Higher Education in Armenia

There are several kinds of transnational education providers in Armenia: interstate institutions, franchises, joint/double degree providers, branch campuses, independent institutions, and virtual education programs.

According to Armenian legislation, all educational institutions and programs have to be licensed by the ministry of education and science (MoES). Although universities delivering joint programs and double degrees are licensed,

the procedures and criteria to develop and deliver joint programs and to monitor relationships between institutions are not regulated by Armenian legislation. Recently, changes have been made to the draft of the new Higher Education Law; appropriate provisions for joint and double degree programs have been added, but these changes have not yet been implemented.

For institutional or program accreditation, HEIs can choose between the National Center for Professional Education Quality Assurance Foundation (ANQA), any quality assurance agency registered with the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR), or an agency that is a full member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). Institutions implementing education programs jointly with HEIs (or branches of HEIs) from countries outside the EHEA can choose the ANQA or any other recognized quality assurance agency from a list of agencies approved by the MoES. Notably, there are no standards and guidelines for quality assurance for joint programs, which is an issue for almost all Bologna member states.

After Armenia regained its independence in 1991 following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the higher education sector started to reshape itself autonomously.

Who Are the Cross-Border Educational Providers in Armenia?

The main providers are:

- The American University of Armenia (AUA), initiated with the support of the Armenian and the US governments (via USAID allocations), the Armenian General Benevolent Union, and the University of California. AUA operates today as an independent, private, nonprofit HEI, awards US qualifications, and holds accreditation from the WASC Senior College and University Commission. AUA offers graduate and undergraduate degree programs as well as preparatory and continuing education courses. It hosts research centers that address critical national and international issues. AUA is very attractive for Armenian learners and attracts the best students.
- The Russian–Armenian University (RAU), a public for-profit university, established on the basis of an interstate agreement between the two govern-

ments. As such, RAU awards double qualifications and has 31 departments within five schools. The university delivers several joint graduate-level programs with partner universities in Russia and Europe. It also has several research clusters.

- The French University in Armenia (UFAR), established on the basis of an interstate agreement between the two governments and collaborating with Jean Moulin Lyon 3 University via a franchising agreement. UFAR is a private nonprofit foundation awarding double qualifications.
- The European Regional Educational Academy of Armenia (EREA), another interstate, nonprofit, public foundation. The Academy was created by decision of the Armenian government and on the basis of franchising agreements signed with a number of educational institutions from various European countries. The institution awards Armenian qualifications.

According to the national ranking system, two of these universities, AUA and RAU, are competitive in the Armenian education system and ranked as second and third respectively.

Meanwhile, there are seven branches of Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian universities active in Armenia. These campuses award the qualifications of their parent institutions. Given that there is no publicly available information on these institutions, the number of graduates from these branches is not clear, nor is it possible to say much about the quality of the education they offer.

The Yerevan Branch of Lomonosov Moscow State University (MSU) is quite new in the Armenian higher education landscape. It was launched in 2015 and has not graduated any students as yet. MSU offers undergraduate programs in seven disciplinary areas; most of them overlap with areas offered by RAU, which raises the question of whether these two universities will compete for the same student population. On the other hand, the arrival of MSU on the market might add value to the growing internationalization of the sector by attracting more students from the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries.

What Does the Future Hold?

Although the number of private institutions in Armenia is large, the majority of students (about 87 percent) still choose to enroll in public and interstate institutions, even though they are costly. Approximately 15 percent of learners choose cross-border institutions, and this percentage is growing steadily. These figures, together with the evaluation results of national rankings—where private universities occupy lower positions—tell us that the quality of private institutions in Armenia is low, and that they are not yet strong competitors.

In contrast, transnational education institutions are becoming more attractive because they offer students the opportunity to study in a language other than Armenian. Given that legislation hinders national HEIs from delivering their programs in foreign languages, unequal conditions for transnational and national institutions exist and contribute to growing complaints from national universities.

In light of these various factors, the popularity of cross-border education in Armenia will likely increase, driving national institutions to pursue stronger internationalization policies in order to compete.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.91.10041

Higher Education in Mauritius: Challenges and Perspectives of Internationalization

Shaheen Motala Timol and Kevin Kinser

Shaheen Motala Timol is quality assurance and accreditation officer at the Tertiary Education Commission, a 2016–2017 Hubert H. Humphrey Fellow at Pennsylvania State University, and a visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: sam776@psu.edu. Kevin Kinser is professor and head of the Department of Education Policy Studies at Pennsylvania State University, US, and codirector of the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT). E-mail: kpk9@psu.edu.

In an effort to align itself with global trends in higher education, Mauritius has since the late 1990s identified internationalization as a key strategy to achieve knowledge hub status and become a regional center of excellence. In 2000, the government brought forward this vision in its New Economic Agenda. The island has specific advantages supporting its aspiration to achieve this goal, from its strategic location in the Indian Ocean to its historical relationship with Europe and its bilingual educational system. Since its independence in 1968, Mauritius has already proven that it is a global player in several sectors by being innovative in its approach to economic growth and diversifying from traditional sectors to service sectors. This article discusses Mauritius' approach to establish higher education as a major pillar of its economy through internationalization, and the challenges it has faced.

The Development of a Knowledge-Based Economy

The 2000 Agenda to develop Mauritius into a knowledge hub served to catalyze the existing internationalization activities in the higher education sector. In fact, since the late 1990s, public and private institutions in Mauritius had already been engaged in internationalization through cross-border education, mostly in collaboration with universities from developed countries. Private institutions offered programs through franchise partnerships and some also enrolled students on overseas distance education programs. Public universities were collaborating with foreign universities to offer joint degrees in fields where there was a lack of local expertise. Appointment of foreign external examiners by public institutions also brought an international dimension to programs and curricula, ensuring they aligned with international standards.

The Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), a regulatory body for higher education, was established in 1988 to oversee the sector. In 2007, TEC was invested with additional powers when the existing regulatory framework was consolidated. In 2010, new momentum was given to the vision to transform Mauritius into a knowledge-based economy with the establishment of a separate ministry for tertiary education. TEC defined and implemented measures to reach the objectives of the government. As opposed to the gradual, incremental approach adopted previously, a bolder strategy was chosen. Locally, the goal was to democratize higher education in order to have one graduate per family. The internationalization goals were to attract 100,000 international students and at least one world-class institution by 2020. The ministry created a "one-stop bureau," Study Mauritius, to cater to the needs of foreign students. Private institutions already experienced in cross-border education were encouraged to expand access to their programs and to partner with renowned universities. Administrative procedures for international student visas were expedited. The Board of Investment organized student fairs and investment promotion strategies in the region, in collaboration with TEC and higher education institutions.

The Hurdles of Internationalization

Implementing and piloting the new measures was not without risks or unintended consequences. Opening access to higher education by lowering the entry threshold or offering alternative routes undeniably impacted the quality of recruitment, and consequently, the quality of education and employability. The government introduced different training schemes for unemployed youth and graduates, the latest one being the Graduate Training for Employment scheme of 2015, which aims to equip unemployed graduates with relevant skills to enhance their employability. Enrollments in public universities, which stood at around

9,000 in 2000, grew to 22,800 in 2014. Public universities were unprepared to service more students without additional resources. Although they were engaged in internationalization activities, they had no formal internationalization policies. Their market remained limited to local students, except in cases where they affiliated with private medical schools. Strengthening the University of Mauritius, the oldest and premier university in the country, would have been the wisest decision in the effort to become a knowledge hub. A foreign vice-chancellor was appointed in 2010 to bring international perspective to the university leadership, but he resigned in 2012. Meanwhile, two new universities were created in 2012. One was dedicated to distance education. The other was the result of a merger between two polytechnics.

In the period from 2000 to 2014, enrollments in private institutions rose from 5,250 to 18,000, but these were not yet attractive to international students. Out of 50 private institutions, only few had campus facilities, a factor that international students consider when choosing an institution. Courses on offer at private institutions were also costlier, which represented a financial barrier for full-time students. Some private institutions took advantage of the new government policies to attract international students and went on

> The government of Mauritius is presently engaged in a process of consolidation of its legislation impacting the higher education sector.

student recruiting sprees in countries such as Bangladesh, highlighting programs that had no formal entry requirement. Some international students came to Mauritius to work rather than study, and in the process paid large fees to overseas recruiting agencies. Regulating these ad hoc issues, as well as ensuring that private institutions were more accountable for their international marketing strategies, was beyond the purview of TEC.

Branch campuses are important elements in the internationalization of higher education in this context. Middlesex University and Wolverhampton University in the United Kingdom and EIILM University in India established branches in Mauritius prior to 2014. Following public communiqués in 2013 by the University Grants Commission in India, which did not authorize Indian universities to establish offshore campuses abroad, the operation of EIILM University (Mauritius Branch Campus) came to an end. The Wolverhampton University branch campus closed its doors

in 2015, probably due to low student enrollments. Another UK institution, Coventry University, was unsuccessful in sustaining its collaborative venture in Mauritius.

Although the number of international students tripled from 2010 to 2015 from around 500 to 1,500 students (with enrollments from Africa steadily growing), the critical mass of international students needed for Mauritius to establish itself as a knowledge hub was far from being reached. In addition, the regulations of the TEC, unchanged since 2007, were not revised to provide sufficient incentives for world-class universities to risk setting up branch campuses in Mauritius.

By the end of 2014, TEC was juggling many new challenges. Increasing the number of international students had created a demand for additional services beyond education. Several ministries had to revise their policies on health, labor, housing, and immigration to support internationalization, and had to make concerted efforts to resolve issues related to the arrival of new international students.

Where Do We Stand Now?

With the election of a new government in December 2014, the ministry of tertiary education was closed down and tertiary education was again integrated under the umbrella of the ministry of education. Since then, TEC has adopted a cautious stance in its quality assurance activities. The government of Mauritius is presently engaged in a process of consolidation of its legislation impacting the higher education sector.

Some lessons on implementing internationalization are evident from the case of Mauritius. First, internationalization has to be planned sustainably and include all stakeholders. Second, goals can be achieved with robust regulatory measures to encourage innovative ventures and to prevent abuse. Third, public universities need strong leadership that drives internationalization. Fourth, a tailored strategy has to be devised for private institutions, which have different agendas. Fifth, high-quality foreign universities need both a supportive infrastructure and appropriate incentives to be attracted to a new country. And sixth, cross-border higher education needs to be scaffolded by mutually beneficial interregulatory agreements.

These last years have been turbulent times but have offered a rich learning experience for the country to better plan and pursue the internationalization of its higher education ecosystem. Mauritius needs to leverage its unique contextual advantages and design a culturally informed regulatory framework, to align with its dynamic higher education sector.

Higher Education Internationalization in Ukraine: Concerns and Hope

Irina Sikorskaya

Irina Sikorskaya is senior researcher at the Institute of Higher Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences, Kiev, Ukraine. E-mail: irinasikorskaya0207@gmail.com.

As part of a wider effort to upgrade educational services to international standards of excellence, Ukrainian higher education institutions (HEIs) have recently undertaken an increasing number of international activities. After decades of isolation, Ukrainian HEIs have gradually embraced internationalization, particularly academic mobility initiatives and double degree programs, and by encouraging more faculty and students from other countries to set up ties with HEIs in Ukraine. From 2005 onward, the Bologna Declaration guidelines have gained increasing strategic importance, and internationalization of higher education has become a topical issue in Ukraine. It is important to note that while historically, national political motives have been the key driving force behind the implementation of reforms at the institutional level, the role of the central government in the reform process today is limited to issuing educational guidelines and supervising their implementation.

Internationalization from the Institutional Perspective

Due to common social, academic, and historical context, international activities at Ukrainian HEIs have a certain degree of similarity. Currently, they rest mostly on three major pillars: the recruitment of foreign students; the organization of student and staff mobility; and participation in international projects.

To a large extent, internationalization occurs in a fragmented rather than systemic way and is not shaped by a given institution's mission, traditions, or current context. This could be attributed to a lack of leadership-level management skills across institutions in the higher education sector. However, the acknowledgement of the importance of internationalization by the senior leadership, at least in words, is an indication that the system is moving in the right direction.

In the majority of HEIs, the principal focus is on recruiting international students. Ukrainian HEIs seek to attract international students in order to earn income and gain recognition. Still, the main barriers to the admission of foreigners are language proficiency, visa requirements, bureaucracy, finding suitable accommodation, credit recog-

nition, and diploma validation problems. The integration of international students into host campuses remains a major area of concern. To overcome these challenges, a lobbying process is needed at the national level.

The level of involvement of the academic community in international education and research activities is at best average, if not limited. The inertia and lack of enthusiasm of students and staff hinder progress. Younger faculty are likely to be more supportive than many senior faculty, who are not comfortable with the changes brought by internationalization. The opponents of internationalization see it as a threat to national culture and security. Clearly, the main concerns nationwide include the brain drain of talented students and faculty, especially in the areas of science and engineering, who opt for study and academic work outside Ukraine.

In spite of the progress made in international student admissions, mobility is still out of reach for the majority of Ukrainian students. Most nonmobile young people can learn about cultural diversity through interaction with international students and scholars on campus. Here, educators with teaching and research involvement abroad can help mitigate the problem of the students' lack of international experience.

Another area of concern is the limited amount of research collaboration of Ukrainian scholars with international partners. Numerous reasons for this situation include poor research facilities of most HEIs, shortage of staff capable of performing international research tasks, lack of familiarity with international academic and research traditions, and a lack of advanced language proficiency, which results in a low level of publication in international journals. The few exceptional cases of existing research collaboration have been, as a rule, initiated by individual faculty members. Only a handful of universities, mostly technical, have managed to devise schemes to overcome these obstacles. A shift toward prioritizing international research collaboration is needed, as well as strategically coordinating all efforts at the national level.

International double degree programs are not common practice. Unclear national legislation is one of the main barriers for such initiatives. The current few double degree programs were introduced and financed by the Tempus program (Erasmus+ since 2014). Mechanisms to provide additional financing to joint programs must be elaborated.

Another financing issue can be identified at the institutional level: public institutions currently function with decreased state funding and increased operational costs. No substantial funds have been proposed or allocated by national authorities to stimulate internationalization in higher education.

An additional ailment that many Ukrainian universi-ties have to deal with is corruption of all kinds: favoritism, plagiarism, nepotism, and other unproductive practices including bribing for university entry, for exam marks, and for grading theses. International activities are not spared by corruption. In some cases, participation in international projects or exchange programs among students and academic staff has turned into rigid incentive schemes whereby "favorites" may supplement their modest salaries, compromising the access, quality, and equity of international activities.

Lately, Ukrainian universities have seen their reputation diminished among several Arab countries, where governments refuse to recognize diplomas of graduates from Ukraine. Numerous cases of international students paying bribes to get their diplomas have become a significant concern for the ministry of education and science of Ukraine. However, the media do indeed keep the public openly informed about recent developments in higher education, including issues of quality of educational programs and corruption.

> **Internationalization occurs in a fragmented rather than systemic way and is not shaped by a given institution's mission, traditions, or current context.**

Nevertheless, there are positive signs regarding the internationalization of higher education in Ukraine. Today, most Ukrainian HEIs show a positive shift toward increasing student mobility abroad, and faculty are increasingly willing to engage in activities that promote internationalization. More efforts are made to reinforce the international culture on campus by attracting foreign students and lecturers. The participation of Ukrainian academics in joint international projects has increased significantly. Thus, despite many obstacles and the socioeconomic reality, Ukrainian universities expect that their internationalization efforts will soon pay off.

CONCLUSION

Ukrainian HEIs face a number of challenges in their attempts to internationalize. Their efforts are restricted by a lack of funding and a lack of strategic vision from the government. In most cases, the process is driven by individuals participating in international activities. Moving forward, education programs set up as a result of international partnerships will need consolidation and innovation.

The internationalization of Ukrainian HEIs has been triggered by a number of national reforms, but the responsibility for implementation and quality assurance rests with the institutions. In order to adapt to changing local and global needs and strengthen the quality of research and teaching, Ukrainian universities must make a robust effort to promote internationalization.

Free Higher Education: Mistaking Equality and Equity

Ariane de Gayardon

Ariane de Gayardon was awarded her PhD from Boston College in 2017, where she served as a doctoral research assistant at the Center for International Higher Education. She is now a researcher at the Institute of Education Centre for Global Higher Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: a.gayardon@ucl.ac.uk.

The free-tuition movement has been spreading around the world: from the Chilean student movement of 2013, to the South African #FeesMustFall movement of 2016, and the 2017 decision to abolish tuition fees in the Philippines. The general population, particularly demonstrating students and their families, seems to believe that eliminating tuition fees would improve access to higher education, including (and more specifically) for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. However, there is no evidence that free-tuition higher education leads to improved access and success for students, or to better equity.

Unequal Free-Tuition Systems

Close to 40 percent of higher education systems in the world today consider themselves "free." However, the realities hidden behind the label "free higher education" are very diverse, and few countries provide a degree that is free of charge to all who enter. Indeed, even countries that are considered fully "free" restrict subsidized education to the public sector. In these countries, any student graduating from high school is guaranteed a place in the free public higher education sector. Such countries include Argentina, Cuba, Finland, and Norway. Others, namely Denmark and Sweden, added a restriction by recently introducing tuition fees for international students.

Other countries have increased nominal fees, which are supposed to cover administrative costs, while keeping tuition fees at zero. This is the case in Ireland, where current nominal fees are higher than the tuition fees that were abolished nearly ten years ago.

However, the most common way, globally, to reduce the public economic burden while keeping higher education free has been to limit the number of places subsidized by the government. These measures are particularly important, because they go against the very reasoning behind the call for free higher education: they restrict access, often penalizing the most disadvantaged groups. Some countries, like Brazil and Ecuador, have established standardized entrance exams for access to public institutions. Others, mostly ex-Soviet countries and nations in East Africa, implement dual-track systems, where the government only finances a certain number of places in the public sector, while other places can be accessed by paying tuition fees. Effectively, these two systems, where individuals accessing the free places are chosen on merit, create the same kind of inequity, by favoring students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds.

Overall, the concept of free-tuition higher education is a complex one that includes many realities. How free a country's higher education system really is depends on many factors but rarely guarantees universal access.

Access and Success: A Latin American Case Study

To illustrate the link between access and tuition fee policies, particularly free-tuition policies, this article looks at a specific set of countries in Latin America. Argentina and Brazil both have free public higher education, although the Argentinean public system is open to all, while the Brazilian one is restricted in size through a standardized entry exam. Before 2016, Chile had expensive tuition fees in the public and private sectors, making it one of the world's most expensive systems when adjusted for GDP per capita. Comparing these three countries is an edifying exercise, as their approach to financing higher education is radically different despite shared historical, geographical, and cultural circumstances.

In 2013, the gross enrollment ratios (GER) for these countries were 84 percent in Chile, 80 percent in Argentina, and 46 percent in Brazil. Chile had the highest GER and outperformed Brazil by nearly 40 percentage points. Thus, tuition fee policies in themselves do not necessarily deter participation, and close to universal access can be achieved in systems that have tuition fees.

But enrollment is not a good enough measure for higher education access. Success has recently become an integral part of the research on access in higher education, and a system's access performance has to include graduation rates. In 2015, graduation rates were estimated at 60 percent for Chile, 31 percent for Argentina, and 51 percent for Brazil. On this measure also, Chile ranked first among the three countries, with a graduation rate twice as high as

Argentina's. Like access, success in higher education does not seem to be defined by tuition fee policies, and countries with free tuition can do very poorly.

What these examples show is that higher education access and success are not defined by tuition fee policies, and that countries sustaining free-tuition systems could be struggling in these areas, while countries with high fees shine. Additionally, an analysis of these three countries' socioeconomic surveys shows that access to, and success in, higher education are independent of an individual's economic background in Chile and Argentina, while access is highly dependent on this variable in Brazil. All countries, however, suffer from pronounced inequity based on individuals' cultural capital. This suggests that cost is not the only or even the main barrier to access and that implementing free higher education will not necessarily lead to improved access, thus defeating the main argument of its advocates.

The free-tuition movement has been spreading around the world: from the Chilean student movement of 2013, to the South African #FeesMustFall movement of 2016, and the 2017 decision to abolish tuition fees in the Philippines.

Implementing Free Tuition

Beyond impact, the realities behind the implementation of free tuition are essential to look at when considering such a policy move. Countries that recently decided to implement free tuition are facing critical issues. In Chile, the government is struggling to find the funds to implement its policy of free higher education for all in the public and private sectors. As a result, restrictions placed on who could get free tuition led to less than 18 percent of the student body getting free-tuition higher education in 2016. At the same time, the free-tuition law recently passed in the Philippines is already under criticism by the very same individuals who advocated for free tuition, as they argue that it will, in its current format, deepen inequity. Similarly, the government of Ecuador introduced an entrance exam when it abolished tuition and is now blamed for preventing the democratization of higher education. However, eliminating the entrance exam could create quality issues for a system that is not ready to absorb additional demand.

Implementing free-tuition policies is far from easy and these recent examples show that the limitations observed in

Brazil and Argentina, two countries that have been sustaining free public higher education for decades, can become realities soon after the change is implemented. Beyond mere implementation, these policies need to be considered in the long-term since they are extremely hard to turn around, as embodied by Germany, which scrapped tuition fees in 2014 less than ten years after having introduced them, because of popular pressure.

The situation in countries that recently introduced tuition free policies should therefore be monitored to see how it evolves and if free-tuition approaches are successful. As of now, indicators seem to show otherwise.

Conclusion

Free-tuition higher education is a complex reality. To policy makers, it may seem like an easy move, since it is, after all, simply a budget decision, and definitely a strong political act. However, implementing free-tuition higher education is not only expensive and convoluted, but also does not guarantee improving access or success. This is mostly because free higher education is not a targeted policy; it impacts all individuals independently of whether they need it or not. While this policy is egalitarian, it can, and often does, create inequity.

Examples of free systems with equity issues abound globally, but politicians continue to push for free tuition as a miracle social policy. However, what are the chances that a policy will work in one system if it does not elsewhere? Should we not spend more energy setting up equitable ways to help students pay for higher education, rather than negate its cost?

The Emergence (and Perils) of Income-Targeted Free Tuition

Alex Usher

Alex Usher is president, Higher Education Strategy Associates, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: ausher@higheredstrategy.com.

There once were two broad streams of thought about tuition in public higher education. The first was simple enough: make it free. No charge at the point of service, no charge ever, just a universal benefit... for those lucky enough to be allowed in (on the whole, countries with "free" tuition tend to have fewer students because there is

less money to accommodate them). The second stream of thought was to charge fees but provide a mix of loans and grants to those who needed help paying the bill, thus creating beneficial price discrimination: rich families pay more than poor families.

The problem with the latter approach to tuition is that it is complicated. Students and families see that there is a sticker price, but do not always know about, or understand, the offsetting subsidies. Sometimes these are very large. In Canada, for instance, the total value of bursaries and scholarships more or less equals the amount of tuition taken in from domestic students, yet many are still under the impression that tuition represents a major financial barrier. Free tuition may be wasteful in that it provides subsidies to those who would likely attend regardless, but it is much simpler to communicate.

> **Free tuition may be wasteful in that it provides subsidies to those who would likely attend regardless, but it is much simpler to communicate.**

A New Approach

But now, a "third way" on tuition is emerging across the Western hemisphere: call it "income-targeted free tuition." This takes the clarity of the free tuition pitch but makes it income tested. It first appeared in the United Kingdom in the late 1990s, when tuition fees there were briefly income tested (from 1998 to 2005, students from families earning less than £20,000 paid no fees, while those earning from £20,000 to £30,000 paid half-fees). It is an approach that is now appearing in places as far away as Fredericton, New Brunswick and Santiago, Chile.

In Chile, this approach was accidental. President Bachelet came to office in 2012 promising free tuition for all Chilean university students, but the tax reform that was supposed to pay for it ended up yielding far less money than expected (falling copper prices played a role, too). In the end, there was only enough money to pay for "gratuidad" for students coming from the bottom six income deciles, or about a third of all students.

In Canada, it has been more deliberate. In early 2016, the government of Ontario, building on an improvement to the federal government's system of grants (in Canada, aid is provided by both levels of government working mostly in tandem), decided to "rejig" its own somewhat complicated system of loan forgiveness and tax credits into a "free tu-

ition" guarantee for low- and middle-income undergraduate students. Institutions were not actually barred from charging tuition, which for most programs is around C$6,500; rather, the government committed to paying grants equal to average tuition in the province for everyone with family income under (roughly) C$50,000. Above that line, students still get grants but on a sliding scale, but they decline to about C$1,800 somewhere around C$100,000 and then disappear altogether at C$160,000. The government of New Brunswick has since followed suit with similar programs; it would not be a surprise in this year's round of provincial budgets to see others follow the same path.

American Initiatives

In the United States, too, the idea is catching on. During the 2016 election campaign, Hillary Clinton proposed a Chilean-like system, wherein the federal government would provide funds to state higher education systems if they agree to stop charging tuition fees to students from families below $125,000 in income (or, roughly, 80 percent of the student population). That idea was always a little bit "pie in the sky" from a federalism point of view: as many pointed out, it was never entirely clear how a set of federal subsidies could guarantee certain tuition levels when these are controlled by state government. But though Clinton's proposal died the moment Pennsylvania declared for Trump on November 8th, the idea continues to resonate at the state level, most importantly in New York, where Governor Cuomo has proposed a form of "free tuition" for anyone attending the City University of New York (CUNY) or the State University of New York (SUNY), and whose family earns less than $125,000.

Governor Cuomo's offer is not quite the same as Secretary Clinton's—it resembles the Ontario plan more than the Santiago plan. Basically, he is going to offer students from families below the $125,000 threshold whatever amount of grants it takes to equal the amount they pay in tuition. This payment, to be known as an "Excelsior Scholarship," will thus be equivalent to tuition minus any grants the student is already receiving from the federal or state governments via the Pell grant system.

While all of these initiatives have a common thread, their distributional consequences are quite dissimilar. In the Canadian cases, the gains accrue to students from families under $60,000; families making over $100,000 are somewhat worse off because of the elimination of tax credits used to pay for the increase in grants. Similarly, in Chile, the benefits accrue nearly entirely to students from below-average income (though, here too, it is not a 100 percent gain because there are offsetting losses from reduced bursary funding). But, in New York, the benefits of the additional funding go almost entirely to families between $80,000

and $125,000 in family income, because below that tuition is already to some degree covered through grants. So the majority of the funding goes to an income class which has never had a great deal of trouble affording higher education (at public institutions, anyway) in the first place.

POLICY LESSONS

The key to making income-targeted free tuition both effective and efficient is not to make the threshold too high. Even the Chilean government, once very keen on "gratuidad" for all, has belatedly come around to this realization. For budgetary reasons, the government was forced to limit its recent introduction of "free" tuition to students from families in the bottom six deciles of income. This summer, the Chilean Treasury Department published cost estimates for expansion of the program. In its present state, the cost of the fully phased program will be 607 billion pesos (about US$950M). Adding the next four deciles raises the price by about 350 billion, or 58 percent for each decile. That is to say, free tuition for everyone would cost over 2 trillion pesos, or over three times as much as it costs for the bottom six deciles. This difference is equal to 1.5 percent of GDP. And for what? The very fact that it costs so much is a reflection of the reality that participation from these groups is already so high that they do not need government help.

In short, while targeted free tuition makes lots of sense, it really does need to be targeted. If targeting weakens, the program becomes more expensive and less effective. New York's plan, clearly, suffers from insufficient targeting. The Canadian and—unintentionally—the Chilean plans have it mostly right. As more jurisdictions experiment with targeted free tuition, it will be important to grasp these lessons.

Public Universities and Budget Cuts in Malaysia

DORIA ABDULLAH

Doria Abdullah is senior lecturer at UTM School of Professional and Continuing Education (UTMSPACE), Malaysia, and associate at the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE). E-mail: doria@utmspace.edu.my or Doria.Abdullah@obhe.org.

Malaysia invests heavily in education. The tertiary sector commands the largest share of the education budget. Public funding is directly disbursed to 20 public universities in the country. In 2007, 90 percent of the universities' operating budgets came from the government, while the remaining 10 percent was derived from tuition fees and other self-generated income. Public funds were also allocated indirectly through scholarships, student loans, and annual stipends for individual students to purchase books, reference materials, and broadband subscriptions.

Since 2007, the Malaysian government has reduced funding for higher education. The allocation to public universities is at present reduced to 70 percent, with 30 percent of the budget covered through self-generated income. The cuts have been particularly drastic the past two years: in 2017, public universities received a total allocation of RM 6.12 billion, which represents a 19.23 percent drop from the RM 7.57 billion allocation received in 2016.

These massive cuts have not been well received among Malaysia's academic community. Multiple calls were made for the government to reconsider the budget cuts, not only by vice-chancellors of public universities, but also by the public, which is concerned with the quality of higher education delivered in an environment with limited resources.

RATIONALES

It is rather convenient to use economic volatility as a justification for the current austerity measures. Fluctuating oil prices and the depreciation of the local currency, the ringgit, have reduced overall revenues and taxes, shrinking the amount of public funds available to the sector. It should be noted here that other sectors have not been spared: the healthcare sector, for example, has also experienced reduced funding in recent years.

The gradual reduction of public funding to higher education is necessary. Malaysia ranks 11th out of 50 countries for resources allocated for higher education, under the Universitas 21 ranking of national higher education systems. However, the country is 39th in terms of output and impact on research, institutional excellence, and graduate employability. For a sector that receives significant public funding, returns do not meet expectations. Citing outcome-based budgeting, the government rationalizes its funding allocation to public universities, prompting them to be more efficient in their operations.

The fact remains that the Malaysian higher education sector has expanded immensely. In 2012, there were 1.2 million students undertaking postsecondary studies, and this figure is expected to increase to 2.5 million by 2025. With a twofold expansion anticipated in the next decade, increasing public funding to support the sector is not a sustainable solution. The budget cuts come at a critical and timely moment, and public universities have to adjust to the new norm.

ADJUSTMENTS

Before the budget cuts, public universities were in a com-

fortable financial situation, with no pressure to generate income through their core work. The funding reduction has necessitated swift changes across all functions. It started with short-term cost–cutting measures in administrative functions, travel reimbursements, and events management. Next, the institutions cut down on international faculty recruitment, academic staff mobility, and infrastructure development. This was followed by rentals and leasing of on-campus assets, increasing public consultancy services, and a push for commercialisation of R&D together with industry.

A hike in tuition fees might be a quick way out of the financial conundrum. However, the minister of higher education has given his personal reassurance that tuition fees for domestic students will not be raised. The universities are negotiating a solution by calling for a tuition fee review, which should enable them to gradually increase fees over time, or adjusting tuition charges to a student's socioeconomic background. International students enrolled at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels pay full tuition fees, which has encouraged universities to intensify international student enrollments.

Budget cuts will become a permanent fixture in the Malaysian higher education landscape.

Universities are revisiting the functions of their alumni engagement offices, and initiating plans to better connect with their alumni networks. Contributions from the public to higher education are encouraged through endowments and *waqf*, donations of assets and cash contributions in accordance with Islamic principles. Universities have also set up private entities that offer market rate, full-time academic programs and a variety of professional programs to the general public. These initiatives, which are common elsewhere, are becoming integral components of Malaysian public universities.

The Ministry's Agenda

The ministry of higher education is using budget cuts to push for two transformation agendas.

The first agenda relates to governance. The board of directors, once a ceremonial and dormant structure in each public university, is now given the specific role of expediting decision-making processes. The board also performs annual assessments to evaluate their effectiveness. The

five research universities—Universiti Malaya; Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia; Universiti Putra Malaysia; Universiti Sains Malaysia; and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia—were the first group of universities that were granted financial autonomy, enabling them greater decision-making power over student enrollments, academic management, human resources, and income generation.

The second agenda relates to performance indicators and specific functions that support the financial sustainability of the universities. The performance contracts of vice-chancellors include targets on revenue generation, which affect the disbursement of future funding allocations and overall performance evaluation. Other strategic functions include the deputy vice-chancellor for development, who works with the business development unit to unlock funding opportunities for the institution, and the deputy vice-chancellor for industry and community affairs, tasked to strategically engage with external players from the industry and from communities for academic and research collaborations.

Unaddressed Gaps

Public universities are on a steep learning curve. Faculty and administrators are finding it hard to adapt. It will take a while to change mindsets and behaviors; many understand the need to be more efficient and innovative in generating revenue, but balk at the thought of actual implementation. Indeed, they may not have the fundamental entrepreneurial competencies to do so. Faculties and departments are risk adverse, preferring to maintain current initiatives rather than discovering new ways of doing things.

Of great concern are changes in regulatory frameworks, which do not reflect the autonomy status granted. In order to generate greater income, universities must operate more like business entities. However, public universities were established under the University and University Colleges Act of 1971 (amended in 2009), and are therefore still tied to traditional structures and investments. Universities also have to navigate layers of approvals and paperwork required by the ministry of higher education, the ministry of finance, and the Economic Planning Unit concerning budget allocations, procurements, and other financial matters.

Budget cuts will become a permanent fixture in the Malaysian higher education landscape. The country could well take advantage of the current financial situation as an opportunity to transform public universities, which have to get used to leaner and more efficient operations, while maintaining or increasing existing allocations for academic and research activities. Additionally, the time is ripe for public universities to explore the uncharted territory of transnational education (TNE), working with private and foreign institutions to expand access to academic programs

through innovative TNE models.

Another Missed Opportunity? Underfunding Australian Higher Education

Anthony Welch

Anthony Welch is professor of education at the University of Sydney, Australia, and "Haiwai Mingshi" and PhD supervisor at Tianjin University, China. E-mail: anthony.welch@sydney.edu.au.

The recent set of budget reforms proposed by the Australian federal government will only compound the existing funding problems experienced by the higher education sector. Some of the worst cuts proposed by a previous minister have now been abandoned, an acknowledgement that they would never gain the approval of parliament. But it is hard to disagree with the conclusion of the vice-chancellor of a major Australian university that, while that particular crisis has been averted, the current set of proposals represent another missed opportunity to adequately fund higher education.

Government funding to the sector in Australia has fallen by 4 percent over the decade 1996-2006, while OECD data reveal that funding for higher education across member countries has risen by an average of 49 percent over the same period. There was an expectation within the higher education sector that the new prime minister, a supposed reformer whose campaign centerpiece was the need for the nation to prioritize science and innovation, would substantially raise funding for higher education and research. With at least two Nobel prizes in medicine in recent times, and internationally leading achievements in diverse fields such as solar cell technology, biotechnology, and quantum computing, it could reasonably be expected that government would reverse previous funding cuts, adequately fund the sector, and fulfil earlier promises to support the full cost of research. The leading, research-intensive "Group of Eight" universities, for example, which consistently win the lion's share of research funding, had long complained that successive governments' failure to fund the full costs of research meant an increasing pressure on their research budgets.

The Proposed Reforms

Despite such reasonable expectations, the sector was to be sadly disappointed at proposed measures that, rather than redressing past failures, arguably compounded them. A key reform was to reset the balance between public and private debt proportions that supported the longstanding national income-contingent loans scheme. Under existing arrangements, students are liable for 42 percent of the cost of their degree, an amount that is triggered only if the students meet specific conditions: graduating, gaining a job, and earning an amount above an annual income threshold. Once all these conditions are met, graduates pay an additional modest amount of income tax until the debt is cleared. Under the new arrangements, students would pay more, contributing an additional 1.82 percent each year between 2018 and 2021 for an ultimate total of 7.5 percent. This means that from 2021, students would be paying 46 percent, instead of 42 percent, of the costs of their degree.

It remains to be seen if the proposed shift of the cost burden toward students deters some from enrolling, particularly those from the more vulnerable groups in society. Could the proposed reforms make higher education less attractive, and perhaps even prohibitive, for some groups of students, particularly those studying part-time? The architect of the original funding scheme estimated that it should not have a great impact on student debt, adding only about a year to the time it takes students to repay their loans. Much more significant is the substantial reduction in the income threshold at which loan repayments begin—from $55,000 to $42,000—although cuts to the rate of collection of the debt from 4 percent to 1 percent would mean that the effects on most students will be relatively small.

Beyond changes to the student loans scheme, universities would be hit with a direct cut of almost AU$400 million—AU$384.2 million over two years—in the form of an "efficiency dividend" to the Commonwealth Grant Scheme. This so-called efficiency measure is a convenient euphemism for reduced funding, and adds to the ongoing failure by government to fund the full costs of research. If implemented, the proposed cuts would represent an overall decline in government funds of 2.5 percent in 2018 and a further reduction of 2.5 percent in 2019. The full package, it has been estimated, would reduce public funds to the sector by almost AU$2.0 billion over five years from 2016–2017. When combined with changes to the way that university grants would be indexed, it is clear that the intention is that universities would receive a smaller amount of funding per student, and would thus need to do more with less. Clearly, this is no solution to the funding problem; in fact, it would only aggravate a condition under which universities have been languishing for some time.

The Nonreforms

Abandoned in the current set of proposals were the worst elements of the earlier, deregulatory budget for higher edu-

cation of 2014–15. Among these former proposals, there were to be cuts of around 20 percent to the sector overall, as well as the introduction of a real rate of interest on student debts (currently tied only to the inflation rate). Universities would also have been free to charge any fee they chose for high-demand courses. Some vice-chancellors (largely from the wealthiest institutions) who supported the proposed flexibility to charge higher fees for some courses, may have been privately disappointed. But the large majority of the sector breathed a sigh of relief that these earlier measures, which would have seriously weakened higher education and the national research effort, were abandoned. Even if dropping such measures was only an admission that they were doomed to failure—since the national parliament had consistently refused to accede to their implementation, a potential major funding crisis was averted.

> It remains to be seen if the proposed shift of the cost burden toward students deters some from enrolling, particularly those from the more vulnerable groups in society.

The Problems of Success
But while the worst effects of earlier proposals were averted, the new budget measures have again failed to address the problem of inadequate funding. The problem is that Australian universities have been too successful, and are being punished for it. By transforming themselves into major engines of export earnings, now earning a collective AU$20 billion annually from international student fees, universities have come to be seen by government as cash cows to be milked at will. Further "efficiency dividends" and a continued failure to fund the full cost of research will only drive universities further in the direction of earning more from international students, to make up for declining government funds. At least one vice-chancellor responded by raising the prospect that enrolling more international students could displace domestic students. This argument has not been raised as part of the national debate over higher education in the past. But the fact that one in four higher education enrollments (one in three at some of the leading universities) is international—the highest rate of any major system worldwide—could, for the first time, be met with popular resistance. While averting the worst elements of earlier proposals, the current set of proposed "efficiency dividends" transfers of more of the financial burden for loans from the state to students themselves. Further, chang-

es to grant funding mechanisms do nothing to address this prospect and only add to the longstanding failure to fund the sector adequately.

Tempest in the Rankings Teapot: An African Perspective

Damtew Teferra

Damtew Teferra is professor of higher education, leader of Higher Education and Training Development, and founding director of the International Network for Higher Education in Africa, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Email: teferra@ukzn.ac.za and teferra@bc.edu.

It is that season when ranking entities announce their "findings" on the comparative stature of the world's universities. As usual, the "premier" universities remain at the top and the rest are relegated to the bottom—African universities in particular. The "rankers" go about their business, some with audacity, but too often without sufficient concern for veracity, authenticity or integrity in their methodologies and, especially in the case of Africa, without sufficient data.

Facts vs. Perceptions
For the last three years, the University of Kwazulu-Natal in South Africa has been the first in the country in academic productivity, as measured by the Department of Higher Education and Training. The Department undertakes the task of ranking using parameters that meticulously measure research and academic outputs. Yet, according to the newly released QS ranking—which allocates 60 percent of the criteria to academic reputation—the University of Kwazulu-Natal now stands below six other South African universities. This points to a glaring tension between data and dubious assessment based on reputation.

Building Reputation: Unpacking the Numbers
The QS ranking is a mix of survey responses and data across six indicators, compiled and weighted to formulate a final score. It claims that over 70,000 academics and 30,000 employers contribute to the rankings through the QS global surveys. QS states that it analyzes 99 million citations from 10.3 million papers before 950 institutions are ranked.

The *Times Higher Education (THE)* states that their

methodology is a unique piece of research that involves "questionnaires [that] ask over 10,500 scholars from 137 countries about the universities they perceive to be best for teaching and research." It claims that the Academic Reputation Survey "uses United Nations data as a guide to ensure that the response coverage is as representative of world scholarship as possible." *THE* goes on to state that where countries were over- or underrepresented, the responses were weighted to "more closely reflect the actual geographical distribution of scholars," throwing more uncertainty on the changing parameters of the rankings.

There appears to be a conflation between "world of scholarship" and "geographical distribution of scholars," without any clear definition of "scholar" or "scholarship." China, India, and Brazil may have the largest number of "scholars" and by that account more scholarship, yet they barely make it to the top in the rankings.

According to *THE,* only 2 percent of the survey participants are Africans, presumably located on the continent. As about 50 percent of research in Africa is undertaken in South Africa, one may presume that the number of survey participants in the rest of Africa tapers off to 1 percent. Around 100 academics in Africa, then, outside of South Africa, participated in the reputation index "evenly spread across academic disciplines." Thus, for the 11 disciplines considered in the *THE* rankings, that would mean about 10 responses per discipline from Africa. A similar problem is presented in the Latin American and Middle Eastern contexts, which see survey representation of 5 percent and 3 percent, respectively.

Rankings Indices

Indeed, rankings are largely about reputation. According to QS, reputation is a calculation with 40 percent derived from the responses of academics and 20 percent from employers. An institution improves its position in the rankings if it scores big in these two indices based on perception. The *THE* reputation index is entirely based on a perception survey which requests subjects "to name no more than 15 universities that they believe are the best."

The reasons why the world, especially Africa, would be well served to ignore these rankings are numerous. Let us consider the QS ranking, which puts considerable weight on student–faculty ratio. Without exception, the African higher education sector is expanding massively, as is the case in many other areas of the world. This has resulted in high student–staff ratios, which may force institutions to face difficult choices if improving their standing in the rankings is important to them—either freezing expansion or raising the number of academics. Increasing the number of academics would require massive investments, creative policies, and long-term commitments that few institutions

are positioned to contemplate.

Another parameter used in the rankings is international faculty ratio and international student ratio. In sub-Saharan Africa, South Africa and Botswana, and to some extent Namibia, are the only countries that attract international faculty, mostly from elsewhere on the continent. This remains a dream for the rest of Africa. The same could be said about most developing countries.

Likewise, improving the percentage of international students is another ranking criterion used by QS and others. The number of African countries that attract international students is very small and includes South Africa, Ghana, Kenya, and Uganda. Virtually all of these international students come from other African countries, with the exception of South Africa. Even when students enroll from overseas, it is only for a semester or two.

Some enterprising entities, calling themselves data analysts, are already emerging to "help" African institutions do better in the rankings.

The nature of these rankings is such that the institutions at the top are mostly from the United States, year in and year out. In reviewing the ranking published by *THE,* the same could be said about those in the middle and at the lower end on the global list, where some may have moved up a notch and others moved down a notch. Emphasizing reputation-based criteria does not affect the standing of those established at the top. These institutions tend to be immune from strikes, financial strain, internal strife, or other critical challenges faced by institutions in the developing world.

Manipulating the Rankings

Some enterprising entities, calling themselves data analysts, are already emerging to "help" African institutions do better in the rankings. One flagship university in East Africa is suspected of pursuing that approach, for which it is reported to have paid a hefty service fee. The rankers themselves have now started selling their expertise to institutions, claiming to provide a "branding" service for a fee. This emerging development adds another twist to this already flawed exercise—conflict of interest.

The aggressive positioning of these entities masquerading as service providers—often at major events, where senior institutional administrators meet—is nothing more than a swindle. Institutions should use their limited re-

sources effectively, rather than pursue shortcuts to improve their rankings.

The Quest for Quality Regimes

The global market place for higher education is exploding with a plethora of new and old, bona fide and dubious players and providers. Accordingly, the scope, mode, platform, and practices of educational delivery have diversified tremendously, increasingly necessitating the need for a reliable—and trustworthy—quality regimes.

As a consequence, numerous quality agencies are being established at the national and regional levels. For instance, more than half of the African countries now have national authorities regulating higher education quality—with various levels of effectiveness. As the higher education sector continues to diversify, there is a great need for such entities at the global level. The ranking agencies are supposed to be these gate keepers of quality at the global level; but they have so far not lived up to that expectation.

Over a year ago, I received a phone call from a vice-chancellor at a university in South Africa who suggested coordinating a withdrawal from the rankings by the country's institutions. The proposal was to encourage all universities in the country to refuse to participate and instead to dedicate all their resources, energy, and time to more relevant concerns. Rhoades, one of the premier universities in South Africa, already refuses to participate in the rankings, so a precedent exists.

An international roundtable on rankings, supported by the Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies at the University of British Columbia, took place in May 2017 in Vancouver. The roundtable deliberated on the scope and significance of university rankings and proposed concrete actions and interventions on the issue in the future.

Conclusion

According to *THE*, "the reputation league table is based on nothing more than subjective judgment." QS also states that 60 percent of its scores are dependent on reputation, and are thus subjective. What is depressingly astonishing, however, is how seriously the world of higher education (and beyond) takes these self-serving businesses, which use defective and flawed instruments year in and year out.

Rankings will not be disappearing anytime soon. In fact, as additional rankings join the fray, they are more likely to generate more buzz to insure their survival and influence. But it is not inconceivable that the proliferation of these rankers may be the beginning of the end of their huge influence—as institutions pick and choose particular rankers which presents them in a favorable manner. In the end, institutions at the very top and the massive bottom of the rankings will continue to watch the ritual from the sidelines, while the tempest continues undeterred in the rankings teapot.

Research: The "Lost Mission" of African Universities

Harris Andoh

Harris Andoh is research policy expert at the Centre for Research on Evaluation, Science and Technology (CREST), Stellenbosch University, South Africa. E-mail: andoharris@gmail.com.

The first universities in Africa were established with the triple mission of teaching, research, and community engagement. However, between the early 1970s and 2000, teaching became the only de facto mission of many of these African universities. Yet, many university leaders hold the mistaken notion that their universities have always been research universities. It is only over the last decade that the research mission has emerged again as a key vision of African universities.

In colonial times, the British government set up several commissions to explore the need for higher education in British colonial Africa. Among eight well known commissions and advisory bodies established during the colonial era (from the Madden Commission in 1841 to the Asquith Commission in 1945), it is worth noting that the Channon Commission (1943) was the first to mention the need for future universities in the British colonies to include research as a core function. Thus, research became part of the mission of universities that were later established by the colonial and national governments.

Since the establishment of universities in British colonial Africa in the late 1940s, several conferences have been held to discuss the notion of the African university and its mission. These meetings brought together key stakeholders in higher education across Africa and assessed the role and relevance of universities at each period of their history. Of the four main conferences held before 2000 (Addis Ababa Conference, 1961; Tananarive Conference, 1962; Accra Workshop, 1972, and Tananarive Conference, 1980), it was only the 1962 conference that strongly emphasized research as a key mission of African universities.

Years after these national universities were founded, most governments in their respective countries were overthrown. Military governments interfered with the administration of universities by appointing their political affili-

ates to positions of authority, and in some cases instructing heads of universities on how the universities should be managed. Although universities had the desire to carry out research, they lacked the necessary funding, a critical mass of researchers, and infrastructure to carry out research.

When Research Became a "Lost Mission"

When African universities were established, they were expected to know what research was about and to make their findings available to the government and society, helping to tackle societal and development problems. However, the years after independence saw a lot of government involvement in the management of the universities. Those governments did not pursue the research agenda of the universities, but rather furthered their nationalistic views of how universities should be run. In that period, the research mission of these universities became "lost": many African universities and their governments did not see research as a priority, which resulted in a very low research output. Postgraduate research was virtually nonexistent. Universities only carried out their mandate of developing human resources for the country. Between 1960 and 2000—the period of the "lost research mission"—African universities were labelled, among others, "teaching," "vocational," and then "developmental." During that period, they were never known as "research universities."

Evidence of this "lost research mission" period can be found in the low research output of the continent during that period. Data from the Thomson Reuters WoS-Science citation index (SCI) shows that Africa, excluding South Africa, produced 1,646 publications between 1985 and 2000 and 5,534 publications between 2000 and 2015 within the sciences. These numbers fall well below the total global scientific output for the same period, of 44,963,737 (mostly from Europe and the United States). In addition, during the period of the "lost research mission," the ratio of gross domestic expenditure on research and development (GERD) to gross domestic product (GDP) of all African countries excluding South Africa was less than 0.2 percent—and nonexistent in most African countries.

During this "lost research mission" phase, many African universities were mandated by their national governments to train skilled workers including health assistants, secretaries, and both engineering technicians and engineers. In addition, researchers were mostly interested in research that would facilitate their promotion within the university—with fewer publications needed to be promoted. Outcomes of research carried out at the universities were hardly disseminated to the public and, in some cases, were kept confidential. Anecdotal evidence suggests that universities were also under siege from dictatorial governments that did not like researchers publishing anything contrary to the official standpoint. This authoritarian tendency forced universities to focus on knowledge for its own sake.

Regaining the "Research Mission"

Since 2000, African universities have shifted policies and now embrace global changes in their missions. The advent of university rankings, internationalization, and the issue of massification have all prompted university administrators and national governments to reconsider the "lost" research mission. For instance, in defining its new mission, the University of Ghana (UG) stated that, "It would aspire to move closer to some of the world-renowned universities who have achieved world-class status through cutting edge research" (UG, 2012).

Since 2004, universities have begun to invest more effort into research and publishing in international journals. Postgraduate studies have also been enhanced, especially at the masters' and doctoral levels, by recruiting more professors to undertake the supervision of research graduates and by establishing laboratories.

Due to periods of military dictatorship, research at African universities lagged for four decades.

To improve their research output, most universities have also established offices of research and development and schools or faculties of research and graduate studies. Offices of R&D are very new to most universities, and mainly found at flagship universities, such as UG or the University of Ibadan in Nigeria. The belief is that these research offices will increase the focus of the university's research, improve the quality of research, and attract funding. The task of these offices is also to help foster and improve relations with other research institutions and with donors in the West.

The new research mission of African universities has forced them to develop policies to guide them through the process of improving their research effort. In addition, universities have also developed research ethics and general research guidelines for their academic and research staff.

Conclusion

Due to periods of military dictatorship, research at African universities lagged for four decades, while great progress was achieved at counterpart universities in Europe, the United States, and selected Asian countries. This has

contributed to a low classification of most African universities in international rankings. To establish themselves as research universities, African universities will need to overcome enormous challenges, including lack of funding; inadequate training of their research staff; lack of appropriate structures for research evaluation; and a need to ensure research accountability, which is presently nonexistent.

In addition, African universities need to define what university research is, and what form of research (basic and applied) they want to prioritize, in order to meet their research mission. Research findings should benefit their respective national governments and communities and contribute to development and the knowledge economy.

India: World-Class Universities?

Philip G. Altbach and Jamil Salmi

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. Jamil Salmi is a global tertiary education expert and former staff member of the World Bank. E-mail: jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org.

Not long ago, Indian President Pranab Mukherjee declared, "If we provide enough funds to 10 to 15 top institutions for the next four to five years, these institutions will certainly storm into the top 100 of global academic rankings within the next few years." Late in 2016, the ministry of human resource development issued a series of draft guidelines and regulations to create 20 World-Class Universities—10 public and 10 private. Unfortunately, this laudable goal will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve in the short or medium run. Why?

India's Higher Education Environment

India's higher education and research sectors have for decades been generally underfunded, especially in view of the tremendous growth in numbers of students. Compared to the other BRIC countries, the percentage spent on education, 4.1 percent of GDP, is second to Brazil. But in terms of research expenditures, India is at the bottom, with only 0.8 percent of GDP. And India educates at the postsecondary level the lowest percent of the relevant age group among the BRICs. Although India now has the second largest higher education system in the world, following China, the pressures for expansion to meet both public demand and the government's own targets are immense.

The higher education system is poorly organized to create world-class universities. None of India's state governments seem to have an ambitious vision for the development of world-class institutions at the state level, and none provides funding for higher education that is adequate to main high standards of quality. The central universities are better funded and do not have the immense, and globally unique, responsibility for supervising India's 36,000 colleges that the state universities have.

In the past, when India wanted to create new and innovative higher education institutions, entirely new schools were started—such as the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, the Indian Institutes of Management, and a few others. Indian planners did not want to grapple with the seemingly insurmountable governance problems of the existing universities. Indian regulations stipulate that eligible universities should have around 20,000 students. While international data shows that most world-class universities have around this number, many do not, and this guideline would eliminate the IITs—arguably the only Indian institutions with the spirit and governance that might permit rapid advancement.

Creating world-class universities requires careful thought, planning, and quite considerable funding over the long run. If recognition in the global rankings is a goal, the challenges are even greater because the rankings are a moving target, and the competition is fierce. For example, the Russian government is funding an initiative with the goal of five Russian universities entering the top 100 by 2020. More than US$400 million is being given each year to 15 top universities. Japan recently started its Super Global Universities Project. China continues to spend heavily on its top universities, two of which have made it into the top 100 of the Shanghai ranking for the first time. India is very much a latecomer to the world-class party, and will not be spending enough to make much headway. Funding will be 500 crores of rupees (around $US75 million) over a year period—or perhaps 5 crores (about US$1 million) annually for each institution if funds are uniformly distributed. These amounts are entirely inadequate to make much of a difference.

A World-Class Blueprint

We analyzed the experiences of ten new universities that have achieved considerable success in our book, *The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities* (World Bank, 2011). We found that all share some common characteristics. The following list provides necessary but perhaps not sufficient conditions for building successful top level research universities.

Among the key ingredients necessary for creating a new research-intensive university are the following: adequate financial resources to get started and sustain excellence over time; a balanced governance model that includes significant participation from, but not total control by the academics; strong leadership, not only a visionary president, but a professionally competent administrative staff able to implement the university's mission; autonomy from the interference of governmental or private authorities, but that allows for a reasonable degree of accountability to external agencies; academic freedom for teaching, research, and publication; top academic staff who are committed to the university's mission (including teaching), and who are paid adequately and provided with appropriate career ladders; highly qualified and motivated students; and a firm commitment to meritocracy at all levels.

> **None of India's state governments seem to have an ambitious vision for the development of world-class institutions at the state level.**

In our book, we also identified a number of "accelerating factors" that can play a positive role in the quest for excellence. The first factor consists in relying extensively on the diaspora when upgrading an existing university or establishing a new institution. As illustrated by the experiences of Pohang University of Science and Technology (POSTEC) in South Korea and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), bringing a large numbers of overseas scholars back to their country of origin is an effective way of rapidly building up the academic strength of an institution.

The second element is to introduce significant curriculum and pedagogical innovations. HKUST, for example, was the first US-style university in Hong Kong, a feature that made it distinct from the existing institutions operating according to the British model. The Higher School of Economics in Moscow was among the first Russian institutions offering a modern curriculum that integrates teaching and research and establishes a supportive digital library. These kinds of innovative features—part of the "latecomer advantage"—are of great consequence for new institutions that need to be attractive enough to entice students away from existing universities and to get them to risk enrolling in an unknown program.

The third factor consists in using benchmarking as a guiding methodology to orient the institution in its upgrad-ing efforts. Shanghai Jiao Tong University, for instance, anchored its strategic planning work in careful comparisons with leading Chinese universities first and then moved to include peer foreign universities in the benchmarking exercise. Concentrating on niche areas is another suitable manner of achieving a critical mass of top researchers more rapidly, as demonstrated by the examples of HKUST and POSTEC in Asia, or the Higher School of Economics in Russia. Many of the efforts to develop world-class universities have emphasized science and technology as the exclusive focus. These fields are certainly important, and they will bring dividends in the rankings because they produce many journal articles. Yet, the social sciences and humanities are increasingly relevant, and more recognized by citation counters that matter for rankings. The contemporary world needs focus on all aspects of knowledge to address our planet's big challenges (climate change, energy, food, health, etc.).

Indian Realities

India does not have a distinguished record of allowing significant autonomy from government directives and political involvement in such aspects as controlling the appointments of vice-chancellors and other senior officials. Indeed, most observers have pointed out that many aspects of higher education have been politicized, and the proposed guidelines indicate that no basic change in university governance will be possible. India's "reservation system" of linking up half of student admissions and faculty appointments to particular disadvantaged population groups may work for educational institutions focused on teaching and have many positive results, but will not permit the development of world-class research universities that seek to attract the most talented academics and students—the proposed guidelines indicate that the reservation system will remain fully in place.

India has certain advantages. The use of English as the medium of teaching and research in much of higher education puts India in the global linguistic mainstream. India has no shortage of well-trained and brilliant researchers, both at home and working abroad. A truly exciting and well-planned academic development can attract the Indian diaspora—but only if appropriate academic conditions and flexible governance arrangements are in place and if salaries are at international levels.

Current realities and past efforts suggest that the road to world-class universities in India may be extraordinarily difficult. Yet, with support from the country's president and with thoughtful planning and much creative thinking, the goal of building several world-class teaching and research universities in India may be achievable. However, the proposed levels of funding and guidelines for implementation

make success highly unlikely.

Enough Quantity: Time to Focus on Quality of Researchers in Pakistan

Muhammad Z. Ahmed

Muhammad Z. Ahmed works at the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Gainesville, US. Email: muhammad. ahmed@freshfromflorida.com.

Although many Asian countries have recently experienced financial problems, the economic downturn in Pakistan is particularly notable for numerous additional factors including increased incidence of terrorism, widespread corruption, lack of law enforcement, a hampering of private investment and foreign aid, political instability, energy shortages, and ongoing military operations. Since 2000, the gross domestic product has grown on average by 4 percent per year, which is not enough to keep pace with the fast population growth. However, despite the relatively low growth rate, Pakistani R&D funds and the number of Pakistani PhD graduates increased at a surprisingly high rate during that same period.

Is Pakistani Research Really Progressing?

To address the overall advancement of the Pakistani research sector, I performed an analysis using the database "Web of Science" to assess the research output quantitatively, by calculating the number of research articles by Pakistani authors in relation to the number of PhD graduates during the past 15 years. Articles produced by Pakistani institute affiliates increased by 687 percent between 1985 to 2015. Similarly, the number of Pakistani PhD graduates increased by 248 percent between 1947 and 2014. Further, citations of Pakistani research articles have increased by 419 percent over the last 30 years. The journal impact factor usually predicts the quality of an article and *Science* and *Nature* are among the highest impact factor journals publishing basic scientific research. Unfortunately, most research articles from Pakistan are published in low quality research journals (i.e., low impact factor journals). From 2000 to 2015, only nine articles were published by Pakistani researchers in *Science* and 11 in *Nature*. But even these relatively low figures represent an increase in periodical publication rates, compared to the period between 1985 and 1999 (350 percent in *Science* and 267 percent in *Nature*). In comparison, overall publication rates for Pakistani research articles increased by 687 percent during the same time period.

Reviewing the comparative rates of articles published per higher education institution is also instructive. In Pakistan, the publication rates per institution are 0.13 in *Science* and 0.23 in *Nature*, while the same rates in India are 0.18 in *Science* and 0.48 in *Nature*, and 4.2 in *Science* and 5.6 in *Nature* in the United States. Acknowledging this gap, Pakistan has attempted to increase the number of local impact factor journals, from two such journals in 1999 to 11 at present (with a maximum impact factor of 1). Thus, while the number of research journals has increased, the perception of their quality remains very low.

I offer three relevant suggestions for Pakistani researchers, academic institutions, and university administrations, which may help raise national research standards.

Urgent Need to Rid Pakistan of a Corrupt Education Culture

Plagiarism is a major cause of low quality academic research in Pakistan. Authors often plagiarize others' ideas by exploring easily available literature and then skillfully manipulating the idea to minimize the appearance of plagiarism. Pakistani students are learning the art of publishing papers in easily accessible journals and then manipulating the citations of their articles. One can question to what extent the students themselves are to blame. The Pakistani research environment—fashioned by incompetent faculty who are improperly trained to supervise students—is responsible for perpetuating plagiarism, as the Pakistani academic culture discourages independent thinking and forces students to be blindly obedient to their supervisors. Indeed, the pressure on students from supervisors to produce papers forces them to manipulate their work, which is then enormously difficult to publish in a high quality journal. If Pakistani researchers are spending such a huge amount of time plagiarizing papers, and are smart enough to pass through intensive review procedures utilizing their network connections, then why are they not willing to use their time and effort in the right direction? What causes students to cheat is the lack of ability of teachers to educate them on research ethics at an early stage of their academic life.

In addition, politics and favoritism are very common in Pakistan. Knowing your supervisor and examiners well will likely guarantee your graduation. Pakistan needs an organized infrastructure to enforce antiplagiarism laws and avoid politics and favoritism in science. Seminars and training workshops on ethics should be held to spread aware-

ness about plagiarism, and at least one compulsory course related to academic ethics should be offered in the early stages of bachelor and postgraduate degrees.

Recently, the Pakistani Higher Education Commission blacklisted 23 academic researchers on charges of plagiarism. However, no adequate actions have been taken against these blacklisted scholars under the plagiarism policy: all of them continue to hold positions at their universities. One of them is a well-known researcher, a former postdoctoral fellow in the United Kingdom currently working as a professor and director of a research center in Pakistan. Due to the widespread corruption in Pakistani academic culture, blacklisting does not have any impact on the reputation or career of such high-profile individuals. A portion of Pakistani R&D funds should be budgeted to enforce antiplagiarism rules, as in the budget of the National Science Foundation in the United States. An infrastructure with a team of specialized experts is urgently needed to enforce laws against plagiarism; to set an example for others, guilty parties should have their research and teaching rights revoked by universities.

Pakistan needs an organized infrastructure to enforce antiplagiarism laws and avoid politics and favoritism in science.

Revision of Faculty Selection Criteria

Research standards will only improve over the long term by dedicating resources to producing better quality researchers and hiring well-trained faculty members. At present, most faculty members hired as assistant professors in Pakistan have no postdoctoral experience. In developed countries, postdoc experience is often required before being hired in a faculty position, as postdoc positions provide additional research training in a specialized field, allowing for the acquisition of necessary skills before starting in a faculty position. Pakistan needs to revise its faculty recruitment procedure. Higher selection standards and transparency in hiring faculty are critical to save academia in Pakistan. Instead of hiring all PhD graduates as assistant professors, why not appoint them as postdocs for a few years before considering them for faculty positions? This would allow for a more effective screening process. Among those selected for a faculty role, tenure (and further promotion) should only be awarded based on research novelty and creativity, rather than on number of publications.

Engaging Pakistani Researchers Graduated Abroad

The Pakistani HEC has run overseas scholarship programs since 2003 and has given awards to 7,537 students to study around the world. This is by far the highest achievement of HEC. The aim of these scholarships is to send students abroad to get training and later return to serve the country (it is a mandatory requirement that students return after completing their PhD). However, many HEC policy makers do not understand the concept of post-PhD research. Between 300 and 400 cases are being pursued in the courts against scholars who refused to return to Pakistan after completing doctoral work. If, as seems likely, the duration of existing scholarships is insufficient for students to be fully trained, HEC must consider extending time limits. Further, if scholars choose to remain abroad, they might easily be engaged as adjunct faculty at Pakistani universities, or by distantly supervising Pakistani students, and/or serving as coprincipal investigators in HEC projects.

Overall, there is an urgent need to change the environment of Pakistani research. Although many of these changes must be implemented by universities and government organizations, some must come from the researchers themselves.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.91.9932

Student Diversity and Challenges of Inclusion in Higher Education in India

Nidhi S. Sabharwal and C. M. Malish

Nidhi S. Sabharwal is associate professor, and C. M. Malish is assistant professor at the Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration in New Delhi, India. E-mail: nidhis@nuepa.org and malishcm@nuepa.org.

The higher education sector in India has experienced an unprecedented expansion in recent decades. With an enrollment of 34 million students and a gross enrollment ratio passing 24 percent in 2016, India is in a stage of massification of higher education. This massification is accompanied by a growing diversity of the student body. A large number of students from disadvantaged and socially excluded groups, such as former "untouchables" and other lower castes from poor families and rural areas, have been entering the sector and this has changed the social composition of campuses in India. Today, a majority of higher

education teachers and administrators still come from privileged social backgrounds, while a majority of students belong to disadvantaged backgrounds. This is a source of tension and adds to the challenges of addressing the issue of growing student diversity on higher education campuses.

Understanding Diversity in Indian Higher Education

The Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE) has completed a major study on diversity and discrimination. It is based on large-scale, empirical data from a questionnaire-based survey of 3,200 students, interviews with 200 faculty members, and 70 focus group discussions with students in higher education institutions across provinces of India. This study is one of the first detailed empirical analyses on this theme in India. The study shows the need for categorizing the phenomenon into distinct, but related, stages to understand the issue of diversity and to initiate steps to develop inclusive campuses. The following sections describe the classification developed in the study.

> **Our study finds that social group identity and academic differences become a source of prejudice and discrimination on campus.**

Stage I: Social Diversity

Social diversity is the most visible form of student diversity and is quantifiable and measureable. Social diversity is reflected in terms of the relative share of enrolled students from different social groups: scheduled castes (SCs); scheduled tribes (STs); other backward classes (OBCs); and higher castes. Empirical evidence shows that the share of students from socially excluded groups (SCs, STs, and OBCs) has increased, making campuses more diverse. We argue that the change in student composition is, in large part, due to a strict implementation of reservation policies and the quota system.

These trends, however, cannot be generalized. Elite institutions—following selective admission policies based on competitive examinations—very often enroll disproportionally large numbers of students from privileged groups (higher castes). These campuses remain less diverse and continue to segregate students based on caste and ethnicity across disciplines. For example, the share of higher-caste students in institutions following competitive test-based admissions is more than 60 percent, while the share of

students belonging to lower castes, such as SCs, is as low as 9 percent. Since most of these institutions specialize in STEM subjects, the selective admissions policies also have a significant effect on choice of study programmes and on employment and earnings after graduation.

Stage II: Academic Diversity

While stage I deals with issues of diversity at the entry level, stage II reflects what happens inside the classroom and effects on academic outcomes. Due to differences in precollege academic conditions, students from disadvantaged groups are severely constrained to compete with students from privileged backgrounds. Many disadvantaged students are the first generation in their families to attend college; they come from government schools where the medium of instruction is a regional language, and have had limited access to precollege support opportunities to acquire the necessary academic level to succeed in college.

The attitudes of university level teachers are not always conducive to overcoming the difficulties faced by students from disadvantaged groups. Many faculty members tend to believe that the increase in the share of students from disadvantaged groups is a reason for the deterioration of academic quality. For them, the former "untouchables" are "unteachable" in the classroom. The resulting low teacher–student academic engagement negatively impacts the academic integration of students from disadvantaged groups. Therefore, we argue that even when students from disadvantaged groups are admitted to institutions of higher education, they fail to compete with others, unless supportive environment and learning conditions are created. In other words, even when diversity in stage I is achieved, diversity in stage II may remain a distant dream.

Stage III: Social Inclusion

The third stage of diversity reflects the extent to which campuses admitting students from disadvantaged backgrounds have a socially inclusive climate. Our study finds that social group identity and academic differences become a source of prejudice and discrimination on campus.

Prejudices and stereotypes along caste and ethnic lines are common and result in overt and covert forms of discrimination both inside and outside the classroom. Teachers give socially disadvantaged students less time in and outside the classroom to discuss academic matters and do not encourage them to organize or to participate in academic and nonacademic events. Students from disadvantaged background face humiliating experiences in their interactions with administration. Derogatory remarks such as *sarkari damad* ("special pupil of the government who gets benefit through reservation"), labelling them as "reserved

category," and making fun of them are usual discriminatory practices. Their mannerisms, accents, and dressing patterns are subject to ridicule on campus. Fear of discrimination leads SCs and STs to form identity-based peer groups, which further alienates them from the mainstream.

Although there are institutional mechanisms to promote diversity and protect students from discrimination, many of these arrangements do not function effectively. This is primarily due to a lack of sensitivity on the part of faculty members and academic administrators to issues related to diversity and discrimination. Discriminatory practices, no doubt, alienate students from disadvantaged groups and result in social exclusion. Students are left with a feeling of not being welcome and campuses remain non-inclusive. All these issues pose major challenges to realizing individual potential and achieving inclusive excellence.

Conclusion

It can be argued that there is a wide gap between policies for higher education expansion and institutional capacity to respond to increasing student diversity. The classification of diversity into different stages, and the identification of problems at each stage help specify areas of intervention and strategies to develop inclusive campuses in India. Institutional leaders and managers need to understand the dynamics of growing student diversity and recognize diversity as an asset rather than a liability to develop socially inclusive campuses in India.

The Contradictions of Private Higher Education Expansion in India

Eldho Mathews

Eldho Mathews is head, Internationalising Higher Education–South India, British Council, Chennai, India. The views expressed here are solely those of the author in his private capacity. E-mail: eldhomathews@gmail.com.

The debate on the relative merits of public and private educational institutions has a long history in India. During the last two decades, there have been many interesting parallels between the growth of these two sectors in the country.

Currently, more than 25 percent of elementary and secondary schools in India are in the private sector. Their share has been growing steadily during the last decade. For many reasons, including quality of teaching and learning, better resources, medium of instruction in English, punctuality, etc., many middle-class Indian parents prefer private schools over government schools for their children.

When it comes to college and university-level education, although various trends regarding the growth of institutions are almost identical (as stated above), there is a marked difference with regard to students' choice in securing admission to institutions. A majority of students and parents still prefer government and government-aided private institutions to their purely private/unaided counterparts.

India has an immensely complex and often confusing higher education system. There are different types of institutions such as central universities, state universities, the Open University, private universities, deemed universities (institutions that are declared by Central Government under Section 3 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956), and others that are also empowered to award degrees. In addition, there are affiliated and constituent undergraduate institutions of central and state universities, called colleges. Colleges can offer degree programs, but are not authorized to confer degrees on their own.

The Growing Role of Private Institutions and Some Faulty Generalizations

The private unaided sector has had an important role in the massive expansion of Indian higher education in terms of enrollments and institutions. According to the latest official statistics, there are 777 universities in India. Of these, around 261 are private universities. Among the 38,498 mainly undergraduate colleges, more than 77 percent are in the private sector. The massive expansion of professional higher educational institutions in India during the last two decades has also significantly contributed to this growth. Almost 20 percent of the total enrollment in higher education in India is in the professional disciplines, with engineering and technology being the most popular fields.

Since the present gross enrollment ratio (GER) in higher education in India is only 28 percent (calculated for the 18–22 age group), the demand–supply gap will increase and the role of private higher education institutions is going to be very important moving forward.

Recently, Pritam Singh, the former director of the prestigious public Indian Institute of Management–Lucknow, made an important observation about the state of private business schools in India: "While certain private institutes have managed to break away from the stereotypes attached and emerged as quality Institutes, there are still several problems plaguing the private sector today. The most important one is that owners of private colleges consider them

to be businesses rather than educational institutes. More importance is put on infrastructure rather than research work and the quality of faculty is bad. Quality faculty is not willing to take up such jobs because such institutes don't pay well or give their teachers autonomy and freedom for research."

This observation is also relevant in the context of the growth of private universities and private unaided colleges. The report of the ministry of human resource development's Tandon Committee in 2009 highlighted the following observations about many private deemed universities:

• Research was neglected;
• Additional fees for admission were collected, in violation of the norms of regulatory agencies, which had an adverse impact on access and equity;
• Family members were appointed as the head of the trust or as chancellors and vested with executive functions, which would ultimately compromise the autonomy of the institutions;
• Universities were named after a living founder/trustee, a practice contrary to all ethical and cultural norms and highly unusual.

There are notable exceptions: for instance, institutions like Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Azim Premji University, Manipal University, and a few others contribute to the quality of the Indian private higher education sector. These institutions stand out mainly because of their relevant curriculum, infrastructure, industry partnership, and the quality of their faculty.

Private institutions enjoy considerable academic and administrative autonomy compared to their public counterparts. However, it is a fact that only a few of them apply adequate importance to studies and research in the social sciences and humanities. Some prominent private universities are able to offer internationally competitive salaries to their faculty and attract the best talents from premier government institutions in the country and from abroad. Most of the prominent private institutions are far ahead of many government institutions in building and maintaining international and industrial partnerships, ensuring job placements, offering relevant curriculum, etc.

Impact on Students' Choice
Despite growing numbers of private universities and unaided colleges, students still prefer public universities and government-aided institutions to private institutions, as shown by the increase in private coaching institutions in various parts of the country, which help students secure admission into prestigious public institutions. More than 80 percent

of graduate-level research students in India are in public institutions. The main advantages of publicly funded colleges and universities are affordable tuition fees and living costs, a liberal campus atmosphere, campus diversity, and relatively strong academic programs. Since there is a huge demand–supply gap to get into prestigious public institutions such as the Indian Institutes of Technology, prominent central universities like Jawaharlal Nehru University, research institutions sponsored by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, and a few others, competition is very keen.

The main reason for the preference for public institutions is that the vast majority of private universities and unaided colleges are commercially oriented. This is clearly reflected in their course offer, mainly aimed at responding to the demands of the domestic and international labour market, and in the fees they charge. Most of these institutions invest a lot of money in marketing and advertisement to attract students. The absence of democratically elected associations in most private institutions make students and faculty vulnerable to exploitation in various forms. While both government and private institutions are affected by a shortage of quality faculty, lack of accountability to key stakeholders is a feature generally attributed to a majority of private institutions.

Private institutions enjoy considerable academic and administrative autonomy compared to their public counterparts.

Conclusion
The private higher education sector in India has explored new paths for growth and development over the last two decades. However, the sector needs more investment from generous philanthropists rather than from commercially-oriented actors who view education as a commodity. At the same time, it is also important to note that the classification of colleges and universities into categories such as *excellent, good, average, mediocre, weak* is applicable to both public and private institutions. Publicly funded colleges and universities, especially those located in second-tier cities and small towns, need to pay more attention to improving their infrastructure and to the quality of teaching and learning processes. Both public and private sector institutions have relative strengths and weaknesses and, therefore, can learn from each other in terms of affordability, faculty retention,

academic and administrative autonomy, internationalization, freedom of expression, faculty and student diversity, job placement, infrastructural facilities, and admissions processes, among other areas.

The Cultural Mission of Premier Universities in East Asia

Rui Yang

Rui Yang is professor and associate dean for cross-border and international engagement at the Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, China. E-mail: yangrui@hku.hk.

A new set of university rankings strengthens the notion that East Asia is fast becoming the next higher education superpower. With its unique traditions, East Asia attempts to indigenize the Western concept of a university that has dominated the world for centuries. Higher education systems in East Asia have arduously explored an alternative model to combine Western traditions with their own. Such an experiment has significant theoretical and practical implications. Yet, coming to terms with East Asia's higher education development has turned out to be far more difficult than previously thought. This article reports findings from a recent study supported by the Hong Kong Research Grants Council, entitled "Integrating Chinese and Western Higher Education Traditions: A Comparative Policy Analysis of the Quest for World-class Universities in Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore" (751313H).

Recent Developments and Their Assessment

East Asian higher education systems have been fast improving in both quality and quantity. A modern higher education system has been established throughout the region. East Asia has become the world's third largest zone of higher education, science, and innovation. While Japan has long been a world-class powerhouse in science and technology, the growth of research in China, Korea, and Singapore is also impressive—and Taiwan is not far behind. At the institutional level, universities are rigorously setting global quality research as their performance standard. Such developments look even more remarkable when compared with other non-Western societies.

However, when assessing future development, one may be more skeptical. To some, East Asian universities are reaching the most exciting phase of their development, leaping ahead to join the distinguished league of the world's leading universities. To others, although East Asian universities have made tremendous strides in terms of volume and quality of research output, they generally still lag behind the best universities in the West. By and large, the notion of "world-class" status in East Asia has been more imitative than creative. Financial and other resources, combined with some innovation strategies, can only bring you so far. A kind of "glass ceiling" will be reached soon.

Studies of higher education reforms have been overwhelmed by powerful economic and political influences. A cultural perspective that gives weight to the impact of traditions on contemporary development has been lacking. It is interesting to note that both optimists and pessimists have cited East Asia's traditional culture in their argumentation. It is equally interesting to note that extreme views are usually expressed by external observers: for researchers within the region, both gains and losses appear to be more real. Yet, they have also failed to theorize how their universities differ from those in Western countries. This is despite their evident pride in the idea that East Asian universities are not willing to assume that Western models define excellence.

A Narrowing Gap

Traditional higher learning in East Asia was concerned with worldly affairs. Pragmatic moral and political concerns were favored over metaphysical speculation, with a central focus on statecraft and ethics rather than logic. Ancient East Asian higher learning institutions were established to serve the rulers, in sharp contrast with medieval universities in Europe. At the turn of last century, East Asian societies started to institutionalize modern higher education based on Western experience, as part of their wider social transformations in a context of national "salvation" and eastward movement of Western learning. From the outset, fundamental differences between East Asian and Western values have led to continous conflicts and laid out troubles for the future.

East Asia's unique cultural roots and heritages have greatly constrained the functioning of core Western values that underlie the concept of university. The coexistence of two powerful value systems that are not compatible with each other has proven to be the greatest challenge for East Asian higher education development. The Western concept has been adopted only for its practicality. There have been frequent attempts to indigenize the Western idea of a university and various societies have employed different approaches, but little has been achieved. This explains why achievements in science and technology are so much greater than in the social sciences and humanities. This is precisely the bottleneck of East Asia's higher education de-

velopment.

However, East Asia's century-long hard and bitter work has begun to bear fruit. Defining the values of the university is gradually taking root throughout the region, most evidently at the individual level. An overwhelming majority of participants in my research acknowledged growing autonomy granted to their institutions. Even those who were concerned about the negative role of traditional culture and called for "seeking truth and freedom," agreed that much progress has been made. Such progress contributes to the narrowing the conventional gap between Western and East Asian ideas of a university. It interrogates mainstream views that predict an impasse of East Asia's higher education development due to a complete lack of academic freedom and institutional autonomy.

Cultural Experiment

As a latecomer, East Asia's modernization involves a response to Western challenges. The desire to catch up with the West has always been fervent. All participants mentioned major global universities frequently and, without exception, those were Western institutions. It was common to hear them refer to Western universities when talking

---

East Asian higher education systems have been fast improving in both quality and quantity.

---

about their international networks, strategic partners, and positions in global rankings. The fact that all participants showed a rich understanding of Western society in their talks has to be understood in a context of a contemporary East Asian society and culture that have been profoundly influenced by the West. Western learning has become part of East Asia's knowledge system. It is already impossible for East Asians to talk about education without mentioning the West.

East Asia's higher education elites and scholars believe that the conflicts between traditional and Western values can be resolved. This confidence was repeatedly confirmed during my fieldwork. East Asia's intellectual tradition has its strength, and good potential to contribute to the idea of a university. After painstakingly learning from the West during more than a century, East Asians are now well positioned to get the mix right. Their flexible and open perspective allows them to appreciate opposing poles as a driving force and see opportunities in contradictions. Their prag-

matic approach to life enables them to use whatever helpful means are available to solve problems. They do not have to choose between the East Asian and the Western university models: they can use both simultaneously and flexibly.

Both traditions are deeply incorporated into the daily operations of elite East Asian universities. East Asia is making a cultural experiment with emerging signs of hope. East Asian universities appear increasingly able to turn scars into stars. Unlike their prestigious cousins in the West, who have a poor knowledge of other parts of the world, East Asian academic elites know the West as well as their own societies. While Western universities operate in a largely monocultural environment, East Asia's flagship universities work in a combined culture that includes at least East Asia and the West. Such a combination is globally significant and historically unprecedented.

Conclusion

With enormous progress in spite of serious challenges, growing evidence shows that East Asia is likely to reach further by integrating Western and traditional cultural values. Premier universities in East Asia are exploring an alternative path to a future development with global implications. Their experiment has demonstrated the possibility of striking a balance between East Asian and Western ideas of a university that are conventionally perceived as mutually exclusive. While it is too early to predict East Asia's success, the process is certainly full of promise.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.91.10038

The Slow Path to General Education in Chinese Universities

Bie Dunrong

Bie Dunrong is professor and director of the Center for Higher Education Development Research, and deputy dean of the Institute of Education, Xiamen University, China. E-mail: yy241504@foxmail.com.

General education is an important theme in the context of current university-level education reform in China. The main purpose of this reform is to broaden students' general knowledge, extend their vision of the world, and strengthen their capacity to solve complex problems. Many universities have launched their own general education programs, while others have taken steps to improve general

education programs already in operation.

General education has a long history in Chinese higher education. Prior to 1949, university education was mainly regarded as general education, since economic and social development until that point had been constrained, and the need to employ a high-level, specialized work force was limited. After 1949, China entered a phase of large-scale economic development, with a pressing need to increase the numbers of professional specialists and technicians. As a result, universities established a model of professional education, in order to produce a specialized work force. This model has made a deep impact on Chinese universities, and is to this day the main education model.

General education has a long history in Chinese higher education.

It has become an increasingly important task for universities in China to reform their overly specialized education model, with its rigid structure consisting of (mainly) compulsory courses. This rigid model was established in accordance with the planned economy system. But given the current reform movement, leading to a nascent market economy, higher education needs to become more flexible. Early attempts to reform higher education date back to the late 1970s, when some universities adopted elective and credit systems that opened the door to the development of general education. In the early 1990s, some Chinese universities, notably Huazhong University of Science and Technology, began to offer courses or lectures on cultural quality (*wenhua suzhi*). The main content of these courses or lectures emphasized traditional Chinese culture, social sciences, a basic knowledge of natural sciences, and the latest cultural developments, with a particular emphasis on Chinese classics.

First-Class Comprehensive Universities as Pioneers of General Education

At the turn of the twenty-first century, some first-class comprehensive universities began to develop cohesive general education models. For example, in 1998, Nanjing University set up a special undergraduate college focused on general education, initially named College of Basic Subjects Education, then renamed Kuang Yaming College in 2006, in honor of a former president. In 2001, Peking University launched the "Yuanpei Program" (also named after a former president), providing general education to a very small number of freshmen in their first two years of college edu-

cation, regardless of their major. Beginning in 2002, Tsinghua University sought to expand its high-caliber professional education across disciplines, and in 2014 established Xinya College, a residential liberal arts college, to explore comprehensive education reform based on general education principles in addition to formative education. Lastly, in 2005, Fudan University set up "Fudan College" to develop general education for undergraduate students. Yet other universities launched their own general education programs. There is no evidence to prove that their attempts drew on experiences from the historical general education practice in China. Contemporary general education curricula have been developed in the context of new challenges faced by China's higher education system, including sustainable development, social equity, reconstruction of social value and morality, internationalization and globalization, etc.

Rethinking General Education

Increasingly, various types and levels of Chinese universities recognize the value of general education and are exploring models that are suitable to their particular profile. According to a study on the "985 Project" universities, the four main areas of development of general education are as follows:

- *Defining objectives*: As an example, Fudan University has defined the purpose of general education as, in particular, breaking down barriers between academic disciplines; developing the common foundation of intellectual exploration and knowledge; and facilitating student development with a comprehensive understanding of different cultures and ways of thinking. At Xiamen University, the aim of general education is to promote the comprehensive development of students in the humanities, arts, science, morality, and other areas.
- *Developing a core curriculum*: Peking University, for instance, introduced 30 core courses in general education through 2015, promoting classical reading and teaching through discussion. Fudan University has built up six modules of general education core curriculum, with a total of nearly 180 core courses.
- *Exploring teaching methods*: Beijing Normal University has established freshman seminars in general education to create a comprehensive course of study including literature reviews, cooperative discussions, and group presentations. Tsinghua University has actively explored "small class" teaching in general education, aiming to increase sustained and in-depth communication among faculty and students.
- *Setting up mechanisms for general education:* Universities typically offer general education programs at special

colleges or centers, but Fudan University has established a General Education Board to design and plan the core curriculum.

Early Developments, with a Long Road Ahead

Although general education is under development at first-class universities, the majority of Chinese universities are only now beginning to establish a relevant framework. They still face a number of problems and challenges, including, first, recognizing the value of general education. A widely held view among many university staff and students, as well as among the general public, is that liberal education is useless, while professional education is considered valuable. Second, the disciplinary foundation of general education is problematic. Many Chinese universities have developed from specialized colleges with a relatively weak basis of expertise in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Third, the pedagogy has to be improved, as many teachers are accustomed to transferring knowledge on various topics to students, with lectures as their main method of instruction. Fourth, the number of academic hours and credits dedicated to general education is limited; the curricula of general education programs need to be revised, allocating more academic hours and credits to general education.

These problems will not be easily solved. Chinese universities need to increase curriculum resources allocated to general education, to improve the capacity of faculty and to reform the professional education model. The road ahead for general education in China remains long.

New "Startups" in a Rigid Higher Education System: China's Young Elite Institutions

Hantian Wu

Hantian Wu is a doctoral candidate at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: hantian.wu@mail.utoronto.ca.

In the past decade, several elite institutions have been established in Mainland China with ambitious visions of becoming world-class, small-scale research universities.

Typical examples include Southern University of Science and Technology (SUSTech) opened in 2011, Shanghai-Tech University (ShanghaiTech), established in 2013, and Westlake Institute for Advanced Study (WIAS), founded in 2016 to prepare for the establishment of Westlake University. With limited intervention and zero financial support from the central government—as opposed to China's other existing universities—these three young elite institutions have unique development strategies, funding models, and admissions policies. They were started primarily with the purpose of establishing world-class Chinese universities based on alternative models. Adequate funding is primarily provided by the local municipal governments or the private sector. Admission policies tend to be more flexible, with some degree of independence from the existing system based on the national college entrance examination (*gaokao*). The establishment of such institutions can be regarded as a bottom-up innovation in China's higher education development. However, considering the respective institutional visions and science-focused strategies, it might also be the result of a new utilitarian direction chosen by stakeholders—including local municipal governments and higher education practitioners—probably driven by global university rankings.

Three Young Elite Institutions

SUSTech is a public, small-scale research university located in Shenzhen, originally founded by the local municipal government in 2011. In 2012, its establishment was endorsed by the Chinese ministry of education and the university was acknowledged as a platform for "experimenting with, and catalyzing, Chinese higher education reform." In 2011, without permission from the central government, SUSTech recruited its first cohort of 45 undergraduate students based on its own standards. In 2016, it recruited its first cohort of graduate students. Presently, SUSTech has 260 faculty members and 3,228 undergraduate students in 14 academic units (i.e., departments and schools), mainly concentrating on science and engineering disciplines such as physics, chemistry, biology, and electronic engineering.

ShanghaiTech is a small-scale, public research university in Shanghai, established jointly by the municipal government and the Chinese Academy of Sciences in 2013. In 2014, ShanghaiTech recruited its first cohort of 207 undergraduate students from nine provinces, based on its own admissions criteria. ShanghaiTech has four academic schools (physical science and technology; information science and technology; life science and technology; and entrepreneurship and management) and two research institutes (Advanced Immunochemical Studies and iHuman Institute). It now has 849 undergraduate students and 1,272 graduate

students, including 202 doctoral students. ShanghaiTech plans to build up a faculty of 1,000 professors, including 500 tenure-track/tenured professors recruited from world-class institutions.

WIAS is a nonprofit, private research institute located in Hangzhou, focusing on science and engineering disciplines. It was founded in December 2016 by the municipal government and Hangzhou Westlake Education Foundation, a private foundation initiated by a group of top Chinese scientists. One of its cofounders, a famous biologist from Tsinghua University, serves as the president of the institute. WIAS currently has four research institutes focusing on the fields of biology, basic medical sciences, natural sciences, and advanced technology. The main purpose of founding this institution was to prepare for the establishment of a new world-class, private, small-scale, elite research university, Westlake University. The municipal government provides financial and policy supports, and has set up a special unit to "promote its development" (*tuijin xiangmu jianshe*).

Similarities and Differences

According to the missions and visions of these new institutions, there are three main similarities among them in terms of development strategies. First, they all plan to develop into world-class, small-scale research universities, mainly concentrating on the disciplines of science and engineering. Second, they all chose leading American research universities as models or examples. For instance, WIAS acknowledges that it draws lessons from both Caltech and the educational philosophy of Stanford University in its continuing evolution to Westlake University. In 2016, the president of SUSTech stated that the university aimed to become a "Chinese Stanford." However, compared to American private research universities, local governments have played more active roles, in line with China's political system. Third, all three institutions attempt to explore alternative models to educate students and run schools. But for SUSTech and ShanghaiTech, this may be constrained by the fact that they are publicly funded: during the past five years, SUSTech has become increasingly similar to other Chinese universities in terms of admission policies.

As mentioned above, SUSTech and ShanghaiTech are mainly funded by the local municipal governments. The governments of Shenzhen and Shanghai, the two richest cities in China, are able to provide sufficient and sustainable funding to their respective institutions. WIAS and the future Westlake University are very different. As a private institution, WIAS is mainly funded by the private Hangzhou Westlake Education Foundation. Its contributors include several famous Chinese entrepreneurs. The municipal government of Hangzhou provided part of the startup funding. It can be expected that as a mainly privately funded university, Westlake University may have a greater autonomy compared to SUSTech and ShanghaiTech.

To some extent, admission criteria reflect this degree of autonomy. SUSTech is no longer unique. Although it still has its own test (which weighs for 30 percent in the decision to admit a candidate) and considers applicants' high school grades (10 percent), *gaokao* scores are the main criterion (60 percent). ShanghaiTech has more diversified admission standards. Applicants' personal statements, reference letters, high school grades, and *gaokao* scores are all considered. "Comprehensive interviews" are used to examine their "overall quality (*zonghe suzhi*)." Although the *gaokao* score weighs the most, the admission criteria of both SUSTech and ShanghaiTech are much less rigid than at other Chinese universities, where in most cases the *gaokao* score is the only criterion. As a private, small-scale university, Westlake University may in the future have even more flexible admission policies.

> **The establishment of such institutions can be regarded as a bottom-up innovation in China's higher education development.**

Bottom-up Innovation or Utilitarian Choice?

As mentioned, such new "startups" can be regarded as significant bottom-up innovations in the Chinese higher education sector. As opposed to existing Chinese universities where the Soviet influence is still felt in spite of three decades of reforms, these young institutions have followed Western models from the outset, although the intervention of local governments is significant, in line with China's political system.

However, the primary motivations of both scholar-practitioners and local governments may be utilitarian, and probably driven by world university rankings. The research focus of these institutions, as well as their strategies of following the models of American top research universities and recruiting famous scientists, meet to a great extent the evaluation criteria of mainstream rankings. For local officials, establishing top-ranked universities is an eye-catching "vanity project" (*zhengji gongcheng*), which adds points for promotion. Therefore, one of the potential problems is that essential tasks, such as improving the quality of education and enhancing the research capacity of young scholars, might be ignored to some extent. Moreover, although cen-

tral government intervention is relatively limited, excessive local government intervention may also hinder institutional innovation. Since the municipal government plays a lesser role in the management of WIAS, it will be interesting to see how Westlake University develops. In other words, these young "startups" require the test of time.

NEW PUBLICATIONS FROM CIHE

Elena Denisova-Schmidt. *The Challenges of Academic Integrity in Higher Education: Current Trends and Prospects,* published in 2017. CIHE Perspectives 5 addresses the issue of ethics and values in international higher education, an increasing concern in an area of massification, privatization, and globalization in higher education. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pubs/CIHE%20Perspective/Perspectives%20No%205%20June%2013%2C%202017%20No%20cropsFINAL.pdf.

Ayenachew A. Woldegiyorgis, Laura E. Rumbley, and Hans de Wit, eds. *The Boston College Center for International Higher Education, Year in Review, 2016-2017*, published in July, 2017. CIHE Perspectives 6 presents a collection of articles—new or recently published—from the Center's graduate students, research fellows, visiting scholars, and faculty. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/Perspectives%20No%206%20Yearbook%207-27.pdf.

Georgiana Mihut, Philip G. Altbach, and Hans de Wit, eds. *Understanding Global Higher Education, Insights from Key Global Publications*, published in 2017. This issue of the Global Perspectives on Higher Education series is the first book from a collaboration between CIHE's *IHE* and *University World News*, bringing together some of the most relevant articles over the past five years on topics of lasting interest. https://www.sensepublishers.com/catalogs/bookseries/global-perspectives-on-higher-education/understanding-global-higher-education. The second book by the same editors is: *Understanding Higher Education Internationalization, Insights from Key Global Publications*, https://www.sensepublishers.com/catalogs/bookseries/global-perspectives-on-higher-education/understanding-higher-education-internationalization.

Philip G. Altbach, Liz Reisberg, and Hans de Wit, eds. *Responding to Massification, Differentiation in Postsecondary Education Worldwide*, published in 2017. Having first appeared as a report published by the Körber Foundation, the exploration of how postsecondary education can be organized coherently to meet society's needs is presented in this issue of the Global Perspectives on Higher Education series. https://www.sensepublishers.com/catalogs/bookseries/global-perspectives-on-higher-education/responding-to-massification/.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

(Editor's note: *IHE* no longer publishes short book summaries, but rather provides 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.)

Attebery, Brian, John Gribas, and Mark K. McBeth, eds. *Narrative, Identity, and Academic Community in Higher Education.* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, 2017. 218 pp. $160 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com.

Banks, James A., ed. *Citizenship Education and Global Migration, Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association, 2017. 572 pp. $90 (hb). Website: www.aera.net/publications.

Deardorff, Darla K., and Lily A. Arasaratnam-Smith, eds. *Intercultural Competence in Higher Education—International Approaches, Assessment, and Application.* Abington, UK: Routledge, 2017. 312 pp. $38.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com.

Kumar, C. Raj, ed. *The Future of Indian Universities: Comparative and International Perspectives.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2017. 482 pp. INR 1,495 (hb). Website: global.oup.com.

McMahon, Walter W. *Higher Learning, Greater Good: The Private and Social Benefits of Higher Education.* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016. 415 pp. $22.95 (pb). Website: jhupbookspress.jhu.edu.

Ndlovu, Musawenkosi W. *#Feesmustfall and Youth Mobilisation in South Africa: Reform or Revolution?* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, 2017. 164 pp. $140 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com.

Paige, Susan Mary, et al. *The Learning Community Experience in Higher Education: High-Impact Practice for Student Retention.* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, 2017. 132 pp. $149.95 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com.

Preece, Julia. *University Community Engagement and Lifelong Learning: The Porous University.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. 214 pp. € 96.29 (hb). Website: www.palgrave.com.

Robertson, Susan L., Kris Olds, Roger Dale, and Que Anh Dang, eds. *Global Regionalisms and Higher Education Projects, Processes, Politics.* Chelten-

ham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2016. 336 pp. $130.50 (hb). Website: www.e-elgar.com.

Teferra, D., ed. *Flagship Universities in Africa.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. 535 pp. € 109,99 (hb). Website: www.springer.com.

Troschitz, Robert. *Higher Education and the Student: From Welfare State to Neoliberalism.* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, 2017. 236 pp. $150 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com.

Whitchurch, Celia, and George Gordon. *Reconstructing Relationships in Higher Education: Challenging Agendas.* Abington, UK: Routledge, 2017. 192 pp. $48.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com.

Yeravdekar, Vidya Rajiv and Gauri Tiwari. *Internationalization of Higher Education in India.* New Delhi: Sage, 2016. 284 pp. $60 (hb). Website: www.us.sagepub.com.

Zwaan, Bert. *Higher Education in 2014. A Global Approach.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2017. 256 pp. € 19.95 (hb). Website: en.aup.nl.

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 Internationalisation (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