INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

For weekly global higher education news and comment see our partner

University World News

universityworldnews.com

BOSTON COLLEGE
Lynch School of Education and Human Development

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

DUZ medienhaus

2

twitter.com/BC_CIHE

facebook.com/Center.for. International.Higher.Education

Fighting for Funding and against Inequality post COVID-19

Hans de Wit and Philip G. Altbach

Abstract
The COVID-19 pandemic has opened a Pandora's box about the future role of higher education. Online education was acceptable for a short period, but made clear that institutions of higher education are also a living community of faculty and students. The pandemic has put a spotlight on the importance of international research collaboration. But because of severe economic downturns, the pandemic has dramatically worsened inequalities within the higher education and research sector.

The COVID-19 pandemic has opened a Pandora's box of options for and predictions about the future role of higher education. On the one side are those who predict that nothing will change and that things will return to "business as usual" after the crisis. These conservative views seem currently more realistic than those, on the other side, who foresee a revolution through which higher education will be radically transformed. Numerous articles in *University World News* and elsewhere have argued that radical change is both desirable and inevitable—and that reimagining postsecondary education is an urgent necessity.

This is not the first call for revolutionary change in one of the two oldest institutions in the world (the other being the Roman Catholic Church). Not long ago, many argued that MOOCs would transform higher education—this, of course, did not happen. As Henry Mance writes in the *Financial Times* ("The Future of the University in the Age of Covid," September 18, 2020), "In fact the pandemic has underlined the demand for what universities do." At the opening of the academic year in Europe and North America, governments and institutional leaders have been calling for reopening campuses, so too have some faculty and many students. Online education was acceptable for a short period to tackle the first wave of the pandemic. But it has become manifest that institutions of higher education are more than education providers. They are living communities of faculty and students, inside, but even more outside of the classrooms. "Students are unlikely to commit large amounts of time and money to consume online content. Students go to universities to meet great people, have inspiring conversations with faculty, collaborate with researchers in the laboratory and experience the social life on campus," the E*ducation at a Glance* report of the OECD writes correctly. And while there were concerns that student numbers, both locally and internationally, would drastically drop, the reality at the start of the academic year is that they seem to have gone up, including for international students, although countries and postsecondary institutions have been affected differently. This is not surprising, since in times of unemployment education becomes an alternative. The coming years will tell if this continues to be the case, especially with respect to international students.

That returning to "normal" has a price, is certain. Where universities have opened for on-campus or hybrid instruction, student enthusiasm has led to flouting rules and little attention to safety, thus to a significant uptick of COVID-19 infections. Further, the revival of campus life is noticeable mainly at top universities in high-income countries, contributing to increased inequality and exclusion. Universities everywhere are under severe financial constraints, due to the additional costs of COVID-19 management, loss of revenue, and, increasingly, budget cuts. For these reasons, although revolutionary changes are unlikely, there is no going back to the prepandemic status quo. Changes will happen, reforms will be implemented, but gradually and with active steering and attention to the voices of students, faculty, and the outside world.

The Future of Research
Although only a small minority of the world's 20,000 or more universities have a significant research mission, research done in universities is of central importance for both the research university sector and for society. Universities around the world are currently engaged in COVID-19 research, and the large majority of public health experts appearing in the global media are university professors. Universities are in general protected from the politicization of science that is evident in some countries, and are being recognized

as key contributors to solving the most dramatic global health crisis in modern times. The pandemic has put a spotlight on the importance of research and research collaboration. "Global research collaboration is a good news story in a difficult time," writes Simon Marginson (*International Higher Education* #104). If one looks at the approximately 30 initiatives currently working on a vaccine, all depend on international partnerships of researchers—located in multinational companies, research institutes, and universities that all need access to the best minds, sophisticated equipment, and testing opportunities in different parts of the world. The effort is truly global and illustrates the necessity of the globalization of science and scholarship.

The COVID-19 crisis also shows that solving the problem is fundamentally interdisciplinary and that universities are the only institutions capable of easily marshalling expertise from both the hard and social sciences. Further, most research-oriented public health scholars are based in universities, and academic public health institutes have been at the forefront of understanding the various aspects of COVID-19. Social scientists from a range of fields, including economics, sociology, anthropology, and others, provide needed expertise.

Challenges

But there are also concerns. The OECD has warned that if the number and quality of international doctoral students and postdocs decreases post COVID-19, research will be significantly weakened since they constitute a significant proportion of laboratory staff. The funding boon predicted by David Matthews in his September 14, 2020 article in *Times Higher Education* ("European universities are set for a stimulus funding bonanza") is relative. The research budget of the European Commission for 2021–2027 is likely to be cut back from EUR 94 to 86 billion, as a result of an agreement on recovery funds between European leaders. There are also concerns about nationalist actions limiting international research collaboration. The most dramatic examples are manifested in the tensions between the United States and China and between Australia and China, and in the efforts by some governments to avoid equitable vaccine distribution.

Because of severe economic downturns as a result of the pandemic, research funding will probably shrink further in lower- and middle-income countries, where it is already limited. An exception may be China, and primarily in the hard sciences, as a result of recent massive investments in research universities and early signs of economic recovery—but ongoing constraints on academic freedom in the social sciences and humanities put interdisciplinary research at risk.

The pandemic has dramatically worsened inequalities within the higher education and research sector—among students, faculty, and institutions—and between countries. Addressing this negative trend "will require a long-term vision, structural changes, and collective commitment from all academics, stakeholders, institutions, and countries around the world" (Xin Xu, "The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Global Research," *International Higher Education* #104). ◢

Because of severe economic downturns as a result of the pandemic, research funding will probably shrink further in lower- and middle-income countries, where it is already limited.

Hans de Wit is professor emeritus and distinguished fellow, Center for International Higher Education at Boston College (CIHE), US. Email: dewitj@bc.edu. Philip G. Altbach is research professor and distinguished fellow, CIHE. Email: altbach@bc.edu.

Impact of COVID-19 on Higher Education from an Equity Perspective

Jamil Salmi

Abstract
While the disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic are affecting both rich and poor countries, students from underrepresented groups have faced greater challenges. In countries with limited internet deployment and low broadband capacity, opportunities for online learning have been drastically constrained. Colleges and universities in low-income nations have struggled to put in place quality distance education programs for a lack of experienced academics and adequate resources.

5

While the disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic are affecting both rich and poor countries, students from underrepresented groups have faced greater challenges. In countries with limited internet deployment and low broadband capacity, opportunities for online learning have been drastically constrained. Colleges and universities in low-income nations have struggled to put in place quality distance education programs for a lack of experienced academics and adequate resources.

Short-Term Effects and Reactions

- Closures and transition to online education: The degree of readiness was highly unequal across countries and institutions. Universities and colleges in developing countries have faced serious IT infrastructure and internet access difficulties.
- Impact on students: The commotion brought about by the abrupt closure of campuses and the rapid switch to online education have disrupted the lives of students all over the world. Students from underrepresented groups have been hit especially hard, suffering economic hardship, connection difficulties, and emotional distress.
- Assessment and exams in transition: Many higher education institutions have struggled with difficult choices about online assessment and the risk of increased cheating.
- Universities rising to the COVID-19 challenge: A positive development has been the generous responses of universities worldwide in contributing their scientific knowledge and resources to fight the pandemic. Universities developed a faster and cheaper COVID-19 test, donated surplus equipment to help hospitals, and produced medical supplies, sanitizing equipment, and medicines.

Longer-Term Effects

- Reopening in the fall: In countries where the pandemic is still raging, decisions about reopening have been heavily influenced by political and economic considerations. In the United Kingdom and the United States, COVID-19 denial and the threat of economic difficulties have led many higher education institutions to take chances with the health of their students.
- Diminished learning and increased student failure: Many students will have an incomplete learning experience during the 2019–2020 academic year. Besides the adverse impact on the quality of the educational experience during COVID-19, mental health problems among students have risen.
- Reduced resources, shifting demand, closures, and restructuring: The crisis has revealed structural weaknesses in the existing financing models of many higher education systems and institutions. For private higher education institutions fully dependent on tuition fees and/or on international students, financial survival will be seriously tested. Large numbers of students with limited resources could drop out of higher education altogether. In many low-income nations that have traditionally allocated insufficient public funding to higher education, usually less than 0.5 percent of GDP, consequences could be dire.
- Impact on research: The closure of labs and travel restrictions mean that researchers are unable to continue their experiments or field investigations, except when remote lab work and collaborations are possible. A growing concern for all research universities is the likelihood of reduced funding in the coming years, except for programs directly related to COVID-19. Data on research production have revealed that women

academics have been affected more seriously than men, reflecting the skewed division of labor within households.

National Mitigation Policies

- Financial support: A number of high-income countries have rapidly approved economic rescue packages for colleges, universities, and/or students. But few low-income nations have been able to provide a sizeable support package.
- Capacity building for connectivity and online education: Many countries have tried to increase connectivity for higher education institutions and their students. Governments in sub-Saharan Africa have strengthened broadband capacity through national research and education networks (NRENs).
- Flexibility in quality assurance and assessment: The third type of national-level intervention has been efforts to bring greater flexibility to the application of quality assurance criteria and assessment methods.

Institutional Mitigation Policies

- Innovative educational approaches: The first step to ease the transition to online education has been to offer crash courses in the use of digital platforms and application of effective techniques for online teaching and learning. Institutions with fully functional teaching and learning services have found themselves better prepared to support their academic community. At the core of a successful online education experience is the alignment of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment. Also important is the recognition that teaching online is not about recording a traditional lecture and posting it on the institutional website, but adopting pedagogical methods that engage the students in a stimulating educational experience. Finally, many institutions have found it indispensable to strengthen their academic and psychological support systems for students who have been personally impacted by the health and economic crisis and have struggled to adjust to online education.
- Governance beyond the pandemic: The crisis has tested the leadership skills of college and university presidents in an unprecedented way, forcing them to make quick and vital decisions to protect the health of the academic community and maintain business continuity. A lesson of the crisis has been the importance of effective and frequent communication to explain, in an honest and transparent manner, the challenges and the unknowns brought about by COVID-19.
- Inventing new economic models: New opportunities may arise from the postpandemic period. Higher education institutions could become serious about embracing adult learners as a legitimate segment of their target student population. Adopting lifelong learning stresses the primacy of the learner, recognizes competencies acquired on the job, and addresses the training needs of a more diverse clientele. Higher education institutions can also explore alliances to offer joint degrees, teach courses collectively, and conduct research collaboratively, combining their talent and financial resources more effectively.
- Equity-focused responses: One of the priority tasks for many higher education institutions, immediately after the closure of on-campus activities, has been to alleviate the hardships experienced by students from low-income families and other vulnerable groups. Financial help has come in the form of additional grants, interest-free loans, and access to food banks. To reduce the digital divide, many institutions have donated devices to students and offered internet bundles to provide online access.

> *The crisis has tested the leadership skills of college and university presidents in an unprecedented way.*

Conclusion

Never before has the strength of colleges and universities been tested as painstakingly as during the current pandemic. The health crisis has revealed that the digital gap and economic inequalities were uncomfortable realities that influenced directly the capacity of students to cope with the COVID-19 crisis.

While the world's top universities are unlikely to suffer adverse long-term consequences, for many higher education institutions financial survival will be a serious challenge. Millions of students with limited resources could drop out of higher education altogether.

Since the pandemic has exposed the extent of the digital divide and the socioeconomic inequalities that perpetuate glaring gaps among nations, higher education institutions, and the students themselves, it is essential to consider measures, at the national and institutional levels, that focus on achieving fairness in higher learning for students from low-income families, female students, and racial and ethnic minorities. ◣

Jamil Salmi is a global tertiary education expert and research fellow at Boston College's Center for International Higher Education, US. Email: jsalmi@ tertiaryeducation.org.

"Futurology" and Higher Education in the Post-COVID-19 Environment

William Locke

7

There is nothing like a good crisis to excite ideas about different futures and new beginnings. At the very least, right now we are told that there will be a "new normal" and no return to the way things were before COVID-19. However, even before the pandemic, there were plenty of futurologists—especially in English-speaking nations—declaring a series of cataclysmic scenarios for higher education in which various factors combine to challenge and disrupt traditional academic conventions, business models, and working practices in public universities. Some speculate that these transformations may come to threaten the very foundations of higher education, its economic value, and its role in society.

These scenarios usually feature some combination of the following so-called "disruptors": the transformation of graduate employment; raised student expectations; a technology revolution including the widespread use of online learning, data analytics, and artificial intelligence; expansion and public financing constraints; policy turbulence; and growing global competition, particularly from private for-profit institutions and universities from emerging nations. To this mix, the cutting edge futurologist now adds the accelerating impact of COVID-19 and summons up its anxieties.

Abstract

Even before COVID-19, futurologists maintained that a number of disruptions to higher education were combining to create cataclysmic scenarios for universities. These claims inform an increasingly dominant policy and management discourse about the need for rapid and radical transformations in academic conventions, business models, and working practices. However, what is needed are evidence-based and iterative approaches to imagining the future, drawing on universities' own experiments with new forms of higher education.

The Futurologists' Discourse

Futurologists—often management consultants, "thought leaders," and journalists—predict that the future will bring rapid and continuous change, challenge, and uncertainty for those who manage and work in universities. In response, these managers and staff will need to fundamentally transform themselves in order to adapt to these new conditions and demands. In particular, the academic "workforce" of the future will have to be more "agile" and "flexible," more "professionalized," and subject to greater "specialization." One scenario from Ernst and Young even predicts that academics will largely become freelance workers operating across several higher education institutions (HEIs) and knowledge businesses.

So, it is argued, the conservativism, "silo mentality," resistance to interdisciplinarity and practical knowledge, sentimentality about "low-value" courses and, of course, the inherently glacial pace of change in public universities must be overcome. The legacy higher education "workforce" will have to be dismantled. Fortuitously, so the argument goes, amid the global pandemic and its upending of lives, communities, and institutions, these essential transformations will be expedited.

There is nothing like a good crisis to excite ideas about different futures and new beginnings.

A Flawed Methodology

These self-appointed experts on higher education largely draw on interviews and surveys of university heads, senior policy makers, and key stakeholders such as business leaders and graduate employers. They rarely seek the views of staff or students working and studying in HEIs, let alone consult the existing academic research on developments and trends within higher education systems throughout the world. Nevertheless, this futurology circulates among influential networks and begins to inform current strategy making within institutions and policy making at state, national, and global levels. So, it should not simply be dismissed as speculative marketing, but evaluated as a discourse with influence and material impact on behavior and decision-making.

Cataclysmic futurology caricatures existing models of public higher education. Universities are said to be traditional, "twentieth-century" institutions that are academic-orientated rather than student- or customer-focused. They are also characterized as too similar to each other and dominated by an ageing academic workforce that is reluctant to change. The futurologists almost exclusively cite previous management consultancy reports, policy documents, and newspaper articles. They recycle myths and folklore that have become all too familiar as a result, but frankly, do not stand up to empirical scrutiny.

Academic Work by Evidence

One area in which evidence is mostly lacking concerns the actual work that people do inside universities. Futurologists ignore much of the existing research evidence about academic work. For example, they assume the academic profession is still largely homogenous and the vast majority of academics are in permanent positions, undertaking both teaching and research. The evidence suggests otherwise. There is burgeoning research literature on the diversification of the academic "profession," the wide range of entrants (including from other professions), the different career paths that they take, and the erosion of the linear academic career. Further, part-time, fixed-term, contingent, teaching-only, and nontenure track faculty have grown significantly in the United Kingdom, Australia, and United States in recent years.

An Evidence-Based Approach to Looking Ahead

In contrast to these accounts, we should start with an accurate analysis of the present, based on the best current research evidence and analysis of trends in the recent, mid-, and long-term past. This must include rigorous analysis of existing examples of effective and successful practice that could offer embryonic illustrations of developments for the future. The European Union-sponsored "Universities of the Future" program and the University of Lincoln's 21st Century Lab are two examples.

More evidence-based and iterative approaches to imagining the future can ensure that we evaluate the full range of factors influencing current trends, including sociocultural, political, and environmental (and even quasilegal) factors, as well as economic and technological factors. We can then avoid reductionist approaches that privilege particular activities and deterministic assumptions that prioritize specific outcomes.

Is the Pandemic the Ultimate Disrupter?

So, is the pandemic the ultimate disrupter? It is certainly providing plenty of grist for the futurologists' mill. We are told that "these are unprecedented times" and, indeed, it is rare for the higher education sector as a whole to contract, and for so many individual universities to be downsizing. However, there have been disruptions before—wars, including civil wars, nationalist movements, invasions, mass migrations, all of which have seriously impacted on universities in various parts of the world. There have been retrenchments in the past: Following the financial crisis of 2008–2009, there was contraction in many national HE systems, with staff moving to shorter working weeks and taking pay cuts, and voluntary and compulsory redundancy schemes, in exchange for the job security of the majority who remained.

We are also told that "there will be no return to the old normal," but most universities are currently concerned with short- to medium-term survival and not altering their business models and *modus operandi* too much, for fear of collapse. A crisis is not a good time to start making a new strategy, even though the old strategy is probably in

tatters. When universities had the money to innovate, they felt that they did not need to; but now when they do need to renew their activities, they do not have the funds to invest in managing the necessary change.

None of this is good for management consultants, of course, who will suffer as a result of the contraction in universities' finances. So, maybe it is time for universities to take charge of their own futures. ◂

William Locke is professor and director of the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne, Australia. Email: william.locke@unimelb.edu.au.

Developing System-Wide Approaches to Teaching Excellence

Paul Ashwin

Abstract
This article discusses the challenges of developing system-wide approaches to teaching excellence and offers three principles that can support the development of more effective approaches.

There are two approaches to promoting system-wide teaching excellence: "exemplar" and "mapping" approaches. Exemplar approaches focus on identifying particular cases of individual teachers or centers of teaching excellence at a national level, and have operated, for example, in Finland, Germany, Norway, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. Mapping approaches seek to assess teaching across the whole system, which can be national or international in scope. The two main examples of mapping approaches are the OECD's unsuccessful piloting of the AHELO (Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes) and the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) in England.

This article assesses existing exemplar and mapping approaches in relation to three questions: How is teaching excellence defined? How is teaching excellence measured? How does the teaching excellence scheme lead to the enhancement of teaching and learning? Based on this, principles are identified for developing more effective approaches to system-wide teaching excellence.

How Is Teaching Excellence Defined?

Under exemplar approaches, teaching excellence is defined by those who are applying to be awarded the status of "excellence." The logic of such approaches is that applicants develop an evidence-based account of the ways in which they are excellent. This allows space for a variety of different definitions of teaching excellence to flourish.

In contrast, mapping approaches identify the expected outcomes of excellent teaching and assess these across the system. For example, in the TEF, universities were assessed on a series of metrics based on students' views of teaching, student dropout rates, and employment outcomes. Assessors initially assessed institutions' performance on the metrics before considering an institutional submission outlining their claim to excellence, with performance on the metrics being the most important contributor to institutions' TEF outcome.

Neither approach offers an explicit definition of teaching excellence, which highlights a central contradiction. How can system-wide schemes claim to have identified incidences of teaching excellence if they do not know what teaching excellence is? The answer is that they are based on implicit views of what constitutes teaching excellence, which are not subject to public scrutiny. Approaches would be more effective if they developed explicit definitions of teaching excellence, explicitly aligned with the educational purposes of higher education, and showed how teaching contributes to the successful education of students. This suggests that the first principle for system-wide teaching excellence

10

Overall, a range of separate measures of teaching excellence are needed that focus on both the processes and outcomes of high quality teaching.

Paul Ashwin is professor of higher education and head of the Department of Educational Research at Lancaster University, UK. Email: paul. ashwin@lancaster.ac.uk.

schemes is defined as: *System-wide schemes of teaching excellence need to offer a definition of teaching excellence that reflects the educational purposes of higher education.*

How Is Teaching Excellence Measured?

Under exemplar approaches, applicants develop their own accounts of teaching excellence and provide evidence to support these accounts. There may be particular types of evidence that are requested, such as the outcomes of student evaluations of teaching, but these tend to be tailored to the account of the applicant who selects which measures to focus on and explains the ways in which they are significant.

Mapping approaches tend to focus on common measures of student outcomes, whether these are the ones selected in the TEF or students' performance in common tests such as in AHELO. The problem that these schemes face is encapsulated in Goodhart's law that once a measure becomes a performance indicator, it ceases to be a good measure. Though a measure may have covaried with quality in the past, as institutions seek to maximize their performance, its relationship to quality is lost. This can be addressed by focusing on measures of processes as well as outcomes, because this creates a situation where the simplest way to "fix" the system is to actually engage in processes that will enhance the quality of teaching and learning. This is not to argue that outcome measures should not be included, but rather that they need to be underpinned by measures that provide evidence about how these outcomes have been achieved.

Overall, a range of separate measures of teaching excellence are needed that focus on both the processes and outcomes of high quality teaching. Given principle 1, these need to offer evidence about the extent to which the definition of teaching excellence has been achieved. Thus the definition of the second principle is: *Measures of system-wide teaching excellence need to be aligned to the definition of teaching excellence and focus on educational processes as well as educational outcomes.*

How Does Teaching Excellence Lead to Enhancement?

Exemplar and mapping approaches are based on different views of how they lead to the enhancement of teaching. Exemplar approaches are based on a contagion model of change, which assumes that if the best individuals, departments, or institutions can be identified and rewarded, then they will share their excellent practices and help to encourage others to become excellent. While these schemes can play a role in signaling the importance of teaching and provide significant benefits to individuals and departments, they do not enhance every day teaching and learning across the whole system.

Mapping approaches are based on a competition model of change, in which the best institutions are rewarded and the others will improve their practices or lose students and cease to offer degree programs. The problem with such an approach is that for enhancement to occur, it relies both on the measures of teaching excellence being valid, precise, and accurate; and on applicants using these measures to inform their choice of degree program. Neither of these appear to be the case. The problems with measurements of teaching excellence were examined in the previous section, and studies consistently show that students tend not to use information in this way to make their choices.

This suggests that both exemplar and mapping approaches are based on flawed theories of change. An alternative approach can be developed based on Goodhart's law. If we include in our measures of teaching excellence an indication of the extent to which institutions are engaged in practices that research has shown support high quality teaching and learning, then this is likely to lead to institutions improving their practices. Based on this review of how system-wide teaching excellence can lead to enhancement, the definition of the third principle is: *Improving performance on measures of teaching excellence should only be possible due to improvements in teaching practices.* ◄

Information and Markets in Higher Education

Janja Komljenovic

Higher education is increasingly marketized around the world. Yet, for higher education markets to work, it is not enough to change a law or introduce tuition fees. In my recent chapter published in the book *Changing Higher Education for a Changing World*, I examine the role of market devices. While this is a broad category and includes anything from price tags to shopping carts, from computer screens to data analytics, from formulae to rankings, and much more, I examined market information tools in higher education. Through four illuminating vignettes, I trace how these tools *do* market making work.

The Four Vignettes
The market information tools that were examined include Unistats (now Discover Uni), a British webpage providing information on study programs to prospective students. Unistats had a user-facing visualization to highlight particular traits of programs and universities, while making other information hard to find, or not available. The second examined vignette illuminates Coursera's marketing messages to its corporate clients. The numbers and messages that Coursera communicates to its clients frame a particular kind of reality in which quality is determined by university brands and their reputation, and the value of MOOC courses by the monetized calculation of acquired skills. The third vignette tackles the brokers of international student recruitment agents. Events organized by these brokers act as market information signalling reliability that universities can trust. Finally, LinkedIn's data and analytics on labor and skills are examined. Linkedin's algorithms, based on network effects, present the value of particular skills, match candidates with jobs, and enable various learning and working opportunities. While various devices showcased in the four vignettes are each distinctive in the way they work, they also have more in common than one might think at first glance.

Market Devices Make Actors Calculate
Market information tools equip market actors with ready information expressed in a particular form. Devices themselves are calculating and comparing, and provide individuals with ready solutions. For example, think of LinkedIn's data and suggestions on people, their skills, courses for training, employment suggestions, all based on its algorithms. The very nature and logic of these devices become essential for the nature of higher education markets because they intervene in individuals' rationalities, meaning making, and decision-making. We are not born as *homo economicus*, but we are made one with the help of such tools. Even more, we are made a particular kind of *homo economicus*, the kind calculating with information and solutions offered by market devices.

Market Devices Are Opaque
While market information tools are meant to bring transparency into the system, and they do to some extent, they are at the same time opaque. They rely on multiple steps of classification before publishing certain information. For example, university rankings and league tables rely on compound, multifaceted measures. In the end, they are promoted as being objective and reliable in representing the world, but in reality, they are also interpreting, classifying, and structuring the world. While, on the one hand, market information tools are serving the function of informing market actors and enabling their calculative choice, they are, on the other hand, also devices for scoring and classifying individuals and institutions.

Abstract
Higher education marketization needs a supportive state and friendly legislation. However, more is needed for markets to work. Markets need market actors, who calculate and behave in line with the economic logic. Market devices help turn students, staff, employers, and others, into such actors. In this article, I look at the case of market information tools that make us calculate in economic terms, organize what we consider valuable, and construct social futures.

11

While market information tools are meant to bring transparency into the system, and they do to some extent, they are at the same time opaque.

Janja Komljenovic is lecturer of higher education at Lancaster University, UK. Email: j.komljenovic@lancaster.ac.uk.

Market Devices Interact and Structure New Criteria for Value

Each in their own way, market information tools determine and structure new criteria for value. For example, with their criteria, university rankings and league tables determine what we understand as university quality. Or another example, Coursera, offers a monetized view on the value of its MOOC courses for its corporate clients. This way, the economic value of its courses is foregrounded before other possible forms of value that it brings to staff who are taking its courses, such as knowledge itself or personal growth.

Market devices found in higher education around the world often interact to some extent, or may be shared across, markets' settings. For example, Coursera's and LinkedIn's infrastructures interact by Coursera, enabling its course attendees to put earned and paid certificates on their LinkedIn profiles with a click of a button. Another example is where recruitment agents use the Discover Uni webpage in advising students on where to study. As market information tools often have a global reach, the power struggles between different framings and logics of these devices become global too. Collectively, it seems that the higher education market tools picture the value of higher education in ways that are individualized, flexible, unbundled, measurable, and utilitarian.

Market Devices Construct Social Future

Market information tools portray a particular future. As they aid individuals in their calculations and decisions, they contribute to the materialization of this imagined future. For example, Unistats offers information on graduate salaries for particular study programs at specific universities. While this will have been information from the past for future graduates, it might still be understood as illuminating the actual future in the present. Each market information tool portrays a future of its own. But the kind of future that is proposed collectively seems to be increasingly competitive, digital, quantified, and networked.

Where Next?

Higher education market information tools are expanding in size (more issues that they cover), scope (the elements that are covered are broadened), span (different tools drawing from the same datasets but doing different combinations of the data as well as adding some of their own), and temporality (historical and into the future). Therefore, it is vital that policy makers, stakeholders, and other users understand how these tools work, as they are contributing to creating the higher education sector in its marketized forms. It matters which classifier is used in a list, or which formula is used for a calculation. These are not apolitical choices. As different devices have different consequences, critically scrutinizing their nature and effects enables us to discuss how higher education markets can promote or worsen social equality and social justice more generally. ◢

China–Global Relations: A Higher Education Cold War?

Lizhou Wang and Wen Wen

There are signs that we are at an inflection point in China's academic and scientific relations with much of the rest of the world. This article presents key aspects of current developments. While international exchanges and collaboration between students, scholars, and researchers have contributed significantly to cross-cultural understanding, global knowledge production, and research and publications, at the time of writing, relations are at a more precarious stage.

Excluding Chinese "Influence" from US Campuses

President Trump's administration has been imposing restrictions on international education and exchanges, advancing the agenda on anti-immigration and foreign espionage. During the pandemic, the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement put forth a new immigration policy that subjected international students to deportation if they did not show up for class on campus, though it was rescinded after higher education institutions and the attorneys general of 20 states sued. The US Department of Homeland Security is planning a four-year limit for international students in the United States, to prevent foreign adversaries from exploiting the country's education environment.

More actions were targeted at Chinese scholars and researchers on the grounds that some may have acquired sensitive US technology, data, and intellectual property. In May, President Donald Trump signed a proclamation to bar Chinese graduate students and researchers who have ties to the People's Liberation Army from entering the United States, affecting about 3,000 to 4,000 students. Soon after, the United States revoked the visas of more than 1,000 Chinese students and researchers who were deemed to be a security risk. Additionally, students receiving funding from the China Scholarship Council (CSC, a government agency responsible for international exchanges of students and scholars) were increasingly scrutinized at US airports. After the fall semester started, the University of Northern Texas terminated an exchange program with 15 CSC-funded researchers and asked them to leave the country within 30 days. Furthermore, federal officials have ended the Fulbright exchange program in Hong Kong and Mainland China and forbidden Chinese diplomats from visiting college campuses without US government permission.

Universities, seen as important battlegrounds by many Trump administration officials, are under inspection because their laboratories develop crucial tools for future internet technology, medicine, warfare, and the economy. The US Department of Education is already investigating over a dozen universities, including Stanford University and Fordham University, on their foreign gifts and contracts, particularly from China. These institutions need to submit documentation of all foreign gifts and contracts from the past decade; contact information for all visiting Chinese researchers and scholars over that time; and information about any links that visitors have had to the Chinese government or military—something that the government, not universities, screens for in the visa process.

Around the World

The Australian government has reportedly launched a broad-ranging probe into foreign interference in the education sector. Universities' links with China—which channel billions of dollars to Australia's higher education sector, mainly through tuition fees from almost 150,000 students—are coming under unprecedented scrutiny. In Canada, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service warned that China's Thousand Talents Program used "corrosive tactics, which are done to advance the economic and strategic

Abstract

In 2020, as the discourse and initiatives of "decoupling" or "the new Cold War" deteriorated between the United States and China, higher education has invariably come under fire owing to its international nature. Higher education is premised on the existence of open and free global movements and exchanges to enable institutions and individuals to generate scientific production. How higher education holds its ground during these times of geopolitical turmoil is a question vital to its future.

13

objectives of hostile states," expressing concern about Canadian professors participating in the program.

The Confucius Institute, the most important venue for Chinese language and cultural exchange and export, is experiencing closures worldwide. The US Congress has blocked colleges that host Confucius Institutes from receiving certain Defense Department grants, a bipartisan strategy that led many of the institutes to close. Universities and public schools in Belgium, Germany, and New South Wales in Australia are also ending ties with Confucius Institutes. Sweden has closed all Confucius Institutes and Classrooms.

In Europe, the European Commission's director-general for research and innovation raised concern on the unbalanced relationship between the European Union and China, including open data, research collaboration, and academic mobility. While stressing the importance of continued collaboration, Brussels is now creating a common framework that will more clearly define how European universities and research organizations should partner with China, considering security and intellectual property rights issues.

Brussels is now creating a common framework that will more clearly define how European universities and research organizations should partner with China, considering security and intellectual property rights issues.

Meanwhile, In China

Over the four decades since its opening up, China's higher education has prospered through international collaboration and communication. China's top research universities are leading in global rankings. Chinese scientists, particularly in the STEM fields, are producing high-impact research and publications. With nearly 500,000 international students, China has become Asia's largest study-abroad destination.

At the same time, recent global geopolitical turmoil and domestic political sensitivity have been affecting Chinese universities. The obvious barrier for Chinese researchers and scholars seeking international scientific production and communication is access to information. While everyone joins the virtual world of Zoom meetings, this platform and other popular research, communication, and social media platforms such as Google Scholar and YouTube, are not easily accessible in Mainland China.

Since 2016, seeking to improve its overall soft power and academic quality, China has been constructing "a philosophy and social science system with Chinese characteristics." China's Research Evaluation Reform, announced in the spring 2020, is projected to cease the adulation of the Scientific Citation Index and encourage scholars to address China's concerns within its own context in the Chinese language. Meanwhile, scholars are encouraged to "tell China's story well" to the outside world, by using academic discourse with Chinese characteristics rather than "addressing Chinese issues wearing American lenses." This initiative might challenge the English-dominated academic knowledge system and impact international collaboration.

Many Western scholars predict that the heightened role of Party leadership in universities, especially on talent team construction, research, and the curriculum, is likely to negatively impact China's scientific disciplinary development. Meanwhile, some Chinese scholars believe that this is the most salient and dominating feature of a Chinese university, making it a "Chinese idea or model of university," if there is one.

Ramifications

This new Cold War has a clear spillover effect on higher education, impacting individuals and institutions worldwide. China has long been the world's top-sending country. In the United States alone, there were over 360,000 Chinese international students in 2018, with as many as 133,400 in graduate programs. Nine in 10 stay in the country after earning their doctorates, becoming a key source of top scientists, researchers, and professors, specifically in STEM fields. In the midst of an increasingly deteriorating Sino–US relationship, survey data shows that Chinese students have lower willingness and confidence to study in the United States. Many STEM departments are already observing a decline in the number of international applicants to their doctoral programs.

As tensions rise, many students would prefer studying, and later, working in countries with friendlier attitudes and policies, such as Canada, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere in Europe. A recent analysis by Georgetown University found a 75 percent increase in successful applications from US residents to Canada's main skilled-immigration program since 2017. All of the growth was due to noncitizen applicants, many of them US educated.

On the institutions' and scholars' side, cumbersome procedures on submitting documents and reporting foreign influences might prevent them from initiating and inviting international collaboration.

The Obscure Future

The United States and China are the largest and most influential countries in terms of knowledge production. Collaboration between these two countries propels global science and higher education forward. Though cooperation with China is framed as being zero-sum, international scientific collaboration generates a positive-sum outcome. Regardless of the external political and economic environment, higher education institutions should hold on to the fundamental values of free and critical thinking and the pursuit of truth. ◢

Lizhou Wang is research assistant and doctoral student at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. Email: wangliz@bc.edu. Wen Wen is associate professor of higher education at the Institute of Education and vice director of the Asian Studies Center, Tsinghua University, China. Email: wenwen@tsinghua.edu.cn.

Challenging Times for Sino–Foreign Sci–Tech Relations

Anthony Welch

Abstract
US actions to restrict research collaboration with China in key high-tech science and technology fields is increasingly recognized as part of a tech war, if not an ideological war. Australia, Europe, and Japan, among others, are also instituting measures to limit collaboration in sensitive high-tech areas, citing security concerns and loss of intellectual property. If insufficiently nuanced, such measures pose risks and will potentially weaken well-established and important research networks with China.

The US decision to revoke 1,000 Chinese graduate students' and researchers' visas is a recent example of increased restrictions being placed on Sino-US science and technology research relations. Earlier actions include the arrest of several Chinese scientists who failed to acknowledge receiving Chinese research funds, including from one of China's major "foreign talent" schemes.

But such actions, including prosecuting Chinese researchers who failed to acknowledge military ties, have been criticized by some US researchers. They raised instances of Chinese medical researchers being placed under suspicion by default, simply because the major Chinese hospital where they worked had some affiliation with the military. Contested claims regarding industrial espionage, and concerns of research having military applications, followed earlier US actions to deny visas to Chinese researchers in STEM fields, particularly those related to China's Made in China 2025 policy, which prioritized key high-tech areas: IT, robotics, aerospace technology, new materials, and biotechnology. (The issues relating to social science and humanities research are rather different, including language, different epistemological and interpretive frames, as well as censorship and China's "Great Firewall"). In response to the visa cancellations, some Chinese students posted an online spreadsheet claiming to show only nominal links to the Chinese military.

Restrictions Spread

The US actions are part of the so-called US-China trade war, now increasingly recognized as a tech war, and perhaps even an ideological cold war. References to research in the White House's "Strategic Approach" document of 2020 list misappropriation of technology, intellectual property theft, breaches of confidentiality, and failure to disclose foreign interests. But moves to limit international research collaboration are spreading. The European Union's substantial and longstanding collaboration with Chinese researchers was recently challenged by the European Commission's director-general for research and innovation, Jean-Eric Pacquet, who warned that Beijing lacked transparency regarding its scientific data, and restricted collaboration in several of its strongest scientific areas. According to Pacquet, the European Union no longer believes that

The US actions are part of the so-called US-China trade war, now increasingly recognized as a tech war, and perhaps even an ideological cold war.

scientific links with China are reciprocal. He argues that, while access to Europe is free and open, access to China is "cumbersome and sometimes formally limited." Such concerns, including about forced technology transfer, presage a forthcoming framework to more clearly define European universities' and research organizations' partnerships with China, including issues such as national security and intellectual property rights. As with the United States, the changed stance on research collaboration is part of a wider transformation by the European Union: from viewing China as a strategic partner, to naming it a systemic rival in March 2019.

Japan, too, is mulling tighter control over Chinese researchers and scientists, in an effort to stem leakage of high-tech research in areas such as quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and semiconductor manufacturing. Proposed guidelines would tighten vetting of visas and require Japanese universities and research establishments to declare all foreign research income. But, while in 2017, 6,313 international researchers were Chinese (of a total 39,473), it is unclear how many of them specialized in sensitive, high-tech areas. In addition, some Japanese scientists voiced concerns that measures to protect sensitive research and strengthen research integrity should not restrict open science and innovation, or Japan's national research effort.

Amid claims about rising foreign interference, Australia proposed a parliamentary inquiry into foreign influence. It specifically included its universities and listed concerns about research collaboration. While no country was mentioned specifically, China was clearly the target. The fact that two eminent Chinese researchers credited with expanding Australian studies in China were initial targets and had their visas cancelled, did not inspire confidence that a sophisticated strategy was being applied. With funding from the US State Department's Global Engagement Centre, the Australian Strategic Policy Institute developed a Defence Universities Tracker in 2019: a database of Chinese institutions engaged in military or security-related science and technology research. The website includes individual entries on almost 100 civilian universities, 50 People's Liberation Army institutions, three ministry of state security institutions, and 12 state-owned defence industry conglomerates.

Different from the United States: The European Union and Asia

The United States is pressuring all its allies to follow its lead in containing China, including within research collaboration. Japan may well follow. But China remains keen to cooperate internationally and there is little evidence that either Europe or much of Asia wishes to limit their options so strictly. To take sides, for example, would be very much at odds with ASEAN's long standing desire to hedge, maximizing the room to maneuver between two increasingly rivalrous, rancorous superpowers. There are no signs among ASEAN member states of wanting to restrict research collaboration with China, which is in fact a major knowledge partner of many ASEAN research systems. Even Vietnam, for example, with a long and complex history of China relations, shows no sign of wanting to curtail research relations with its often-troublesome giant neighbor. In addition, several ASEAN systems are repositories of significant numbers of high-skilled members of the Chinese knowledge diaspora, working in universities and research establishments.

Risks

The examples above tend to show national security concerns dominating decisions about international research collaboration. But there are associated risks. The first is that the baby may get thrown out with the bathwater. What is clearly needed is greater sophistication in distinguishing sensitive high-tech projects from many others that pose no national security risk. As Denis Simon, a specialist on China's scientific rise and former senior executive at Duke Kunshan University in Suzhou, put it recently, "To assume a comprehensive conspiracy is too far from the reality."

The second risk of too blunt an approach is that many gifted Chinese researchers may decide not to travel to the United States or to other systems with similar restrictions. Or they may leave the United States: There is already troubling evidence that some researchers of Chinese descent are departing. Others are reorienting their research collaboration toward Japan, the United Kingdom (which, however, recently unveiled its Academic

Approval Technology Scheme of selective bans), or Europe. The effect may represent a win for China, but a net loss for US research, as a number of US researchers have warned.

The final risk is arguably the most troubling: the rise of nationalism and nativism in a number of systems around the world. The associated elevation of national security above diplomatic and academic concerns may undermine the well-established web of bilateral and international research networks, which increasingly sustain much global research output. When one in three of all publications worldwide now results from the collaboration of researchers from at least two countries, and when China and the United States are each other's largest collaborators in coauthored published papers, how sensible is it to exclude so many contributions from China, now one of the world's scientific superpowers? ◢

Anthony Welch is professor of education, School of Education & Social Work, University of Sydney, Australia. Email: anthony.welch@sydney.edu.au.

17

Chinese Students Halt Plans to Study in the United States

Xiaofeng Wan

Abstract
The United States has seen a dramatic rise in the number of Chinese students studying on its campuses over the past ten years. However, the ravaging pandemic across the United States, hostile visa policies toward Chinese students, and the constant xenophobic rhetoric of the Trump administration may soon reverse this trend significantly. The interest in an American education among Chinese families is still there, but impacts may be long lasting.

The United States has seen a dramatic rise in the number of Chinese students studying on its campuses over the past ten years. Approximately 370,000 Chinese students studied in the United States in the 2018–2019 academic year, accounting for a third of all international students in the country, according to the Institute of International Education (IIE). They contributed nearly $15 billion dollars into the US economy in 2018, according to the Department of Commerce, and created thousands of jobs. But this may soon take an unexpected turn.

In a June study of ChinaICAC, the China Institute of College Admission Counseling, 36 percent of Chinese high school students responded saying that they had foregone their plans of studying in the United States completely. Among their many concerns, 85 percent pinpointed their primary concern to the potential health risks of being in the United States. Nearly half of them also cited uncertain visa policies and anti-Asian racism as their main concerns.

On May 29, President Trump signed a proclamation barring Chinese graduate students and researchers who have ties with the People's Liberation Army from entering the United States, citing fears of intellectual property and technology theft. As of September 8, 2020, the State Department has revoked more than 1,000 visas of Chinese nationals who were found to be ineligible for a visa, based on the proclamation. These moves have worsened fears among Chinese students that they would face tougher visa scrutiny should they choose to major in a STEM field, potentially upending years of preparation to study in the United States. As Sino-US relations continue on a deep, downward spiral, concerns about more hostile policies against Chinese students and using them as political pawns further unsettle Chinese families.

Then, there is the raging pandemic across the United States and surging anti-Asian racist attacks, verbal and physical, fanned by the country's very own president who repeatedly calls COVID-19 the "China Virus." These are deeply disturbing factors for Chinese parents when they weigh the pros and cons of sending their children, many of whom were born under the one-child policy, halfway across the globe for school.

In a June study of ChinaICAC, the China Institute of College Admission Counseling, 36 percent of Chinese high school students responded saying that they had foregone their plans of studying in the United States completely.

Rock Bottom? Not Yet.

"Winter is coming," said Frances Zhang, dean of college counseling at WLSA Shanghai Academy, commenting on potential implications of the current trend to US colleges' recruitment of Chinese students. "There will be a delayed impact to the number of Chinese students applying to US colleges. The real decline will manifest itself in two to three years when current 9th and 10th graders enter the college process," she added.

Recent data shows a 20 percent increase in the number of *zhongkao* (high school entrance exam) students in Beijing compared to 2019, and a 15 percent increase in Shanghai. However, many international programs at both public and private high schools across the country have reportedly failed to meet their enrollment targets far past the traditional recruitment season.

At the recent Amherst, Williams, and Yale seminar with Chinese high school principals, the principal of a prestigious public high school in Xi'an, a metropolis in western China's Shaanxi Province, lamented that their international program only managed to meet 40 percent of its enrollment goal. To retain those already enrolled, the school had to add additional *gaokao* courses to the curriculum, so students would still be qualified for Chinese university admissions, an unprecedented move for the school. Parents had threatened to pull their children out if otherwise.

A recent <u>white paper</u> published in China shows that the United Kingdom has surpassed the United States for the first time as the primary overseas destination for Chinese students. However, even for schools that offer an exclusive A-Level curriculum and send most of their graduates to the United Kingdom, widespread declines in enrollments are also common. A branch campus of a selective English independent school in southern China's Jiangsu Province saw a 50 percent drop in its high school enrollment this year.

Does the United States Still Welcome International Students?

One of the underlying concerns of Chinese families is that the United States as a whole is no longer a welcoming place for them. Political and cultural differences may be in play here, as many Chinese families associate the Trump administration's xenophobic rhetoric with public opinion, including higher education institutions.

<u>The recent lawsuit</u> against the new rule of the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement barring international students from taking only online classes in the United States, championed by Harvard and MIT, showed Chinese families that the US government did not have full control over higher education institutions' attitude toward international students. The lawsuit itself and the subsequent victory were in stark contrast to what their system allows.

Additionally, widespread misinformation on Chinese social media, including on WeChat and Weibo, around college admissions and the future of Sino–US relations, has generated anxieties among Chinese families about the wisdom of selecting the United States as a study destination. "We hope that there's more direct communication between US colleges and Chinese families. So our families know that US colleges still welcome them, and that they are not easily agitated by misleading information on the Chinese web," said the principal of one of the most prestigious public high schools in Beijing, at the recent principals' seminar.

A Future Outlook

One thing is for sure, Chinese families still see value in sending their children to study in the United States for the many beacon-like ideals and opportunities that US higher education embodies and provides. Although the impact of the current political and health crises seems dire and will undoubtedly be long lasting, the wish of Chinese families to provide their children with the best education possible is not going to change.

That said, recruiting Chinese students in the next couple of years may present more challenges than ever before. How well the United States puts the pandemic under control is key to rebuilding their confidence to enter in the country. In the absence of national leadership to control the spread of the virus and embrace talent from abroad, higher education may need to take on more of the work. Families will not care about how many resources we provide, until they know how much we care about the wellbeing of their children, especially during a global pandemic. As the first point of contact, admission

officers have a critical role in voicing our welcoming stance and our commitment to support international students directly, to avoid filtered information and to clear any doubts and misconceptions about studying in the United States—so that Chinese students will not only want to come to the United States again, which I believe they will, but thrive on our campuses and beyond with dignity and support. ◄

Xiaofeng Wan is associate dean of admission and coordinator of international recruitment at Amherst College, Amherst, US. Email: xwan@amherst.edu.

Hong Kong Higher Education: A Turning Point?

Philip G. Altbach and Gerard A. Postiglione

Abstract

Hong Kong's universities have faced unprecedented challenges in the past year. Continuing social unrest concerning Hong Kong's future culminated in the imposition by Mainland China of a security law curtailing much of the territory's autonomy, profoundly shaking the universities as well as society. While it is too early to fully analyze the implications, Hong Kong's universities might lose some of their international attractiveness and internal autonomy. Academic freedom is also called into question.

19

The past year has been one of unprecedented crises for Hong Kong. Protracted and sometimes violent protests, with active student participation, concerning the extradition bill, the future of democracy, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the central government's new national security law have created concern and uncertainty about the future of higher education. After months of disruption on several university campuses, many in the academic community, both in Hong Kong and around the world, have questions. The population is suffering yet another wave of COVID-19 and is apprehensive about the implementation of the new security law, which for some is an ominous sign of things to come. It is, of course, too early to accurately assess what it will mean in practice, but it may be worthwhile to place higher education in context—and to consider the potential risks.

Hong Kong's Traditional Higher Education Strengths

In 2012, we wrote an article entitled "Hong Kong's Academic Advantage" (*International Higher Education*, #66, Winter 2012). The article was translated into Chinese and also published in a prominent Mainland China education journal. We reflected on reasons why Hong Kong, despite its small size, has a very high proportion of universities included in the global rankings (three in the top 100; five in the top 200), and overall a high-quality postsecondary system.

We pointed to several key factors. Among these are academic freedom for faculty and students and the ability to speak out on public affairs. Scientists, scholars, and students have unfettered access to information and can report the results of scientific research without restriction. There is a combination of strong government support and overall guidance for higher education policy, and at the same time, a high degree of institutional autonomy and self-governance. English is the predominant language of teaching and research in most universities. Hong Kong selects its university presidents on the basis of their prominence as internationally renowned scientists and scholars, and its universities have been uniquely internationalized with recruitment of top notch academic staff from all over the world. Students come from all continents, and there are strong links with universities worldwide. Not only are Hong Kong's academics international, they are highly productive, publishing prominent research and obtaining major research grants from local, national, and international sources. They contribute to global science as well as to the territory's vibrant economy and civil society. Hong Kong's academic success is quite remarkable: A population of 7 million compares favorably with Mainland China's 1.4 billion population in the number of globally ranked universities.

In our 2012 article, we pointed out some of the reasons why we thought that Hong Kong's academic arrangements give it a unique edge over those of Mainland China. Since then, the progress made by universities in the Chinese mainland has been impressive,

especially the top tier institutions. But the realities of entrenched bureaucracy with an overlay of political control, low average salaries, limited academic freedom and restricted access to information in some areas, and a certain insularity have somewhat limited progress. In the past few years, there have been, without doubt, increased restrictions and more politicization.

An Inflection Point for Hong Kong

The imposition of the new security law by the authorities has created a new sense of reality—for society and for higher education. How this affects Hong Kong's attractiveness to international students is as yet unclear. From a policy and security perspective, many students from the Chinese mainland who had planned to study in the United States now see Europe, Hong Kong, and Singapore as preferable. On the other hand, if Hong Kong becomes "just another large Chinese city," it would lose its distinctiveness in higher education. Until stability became an issue, the central government's plan was for Hong Kong's universities to be pivotal in the new Greater Bay Area Initiative (Hong Kong, Macao, and seven cities in Guangdong Province), which aims to build a Chinese-style Silicon Valley. The situation may lead to a substantial investment by the central government in creating more top tier universities in adjacent Guangdong, including the special economic zones of Shenzhen and Zhuhai.

Possible Higher Education Implications of the New Law

It is too early to fully assess the implications of the new law for Hong Kong's universities, but there are a few ambiguous signs. Five of eight public university presidents issued a statement supporting the national security legislation, while also stating that their universities will continue to stand fast in upholding the principles of academic freedom and institutional autonomy. Will there be new complications in adhering to these commitments in practice?

The academic senate of a premier university decided to retain an academic who was jailed for his role in a protest event that turned disorderly. The government has removed several books from public libraries for investigation to see if they are in breach of the new security law, but if pulled, they would remain available on the World Wide Web—unless there was an unprecedented action by the government to block internet sites. After the promulgation of the new security law, a half million Hong Kong residents registered to vote in the primary election of the opposition political party, which the authorities say is in breach of the new law. Liberal studies is a required subject in secondary school aiming to foster critical thinking, and is aligned with what universities do in their common core curricula: The government will announce this year how to handle this controversial subject, which critics blame for contributing to Hong Kong's months-long social unrest.

The new law does not include travel restrictions in either direction for students or academics. Yet after it was promulgated, one prominent international scholar issued a warning to "be very careful collaborating with Chinese colleagues or Hong Kong academic colleagues now," and a major international academic association sent a statement to its members noting that the new "legislation's vague working and expansive categories of offense make it impossible to know what speech and actions will result in severe legal consequences."

These contradictions do not yet confirm a significant change to academic life, but they may give pause to scientists and scholars from the global academic community who are considering an academic career in Hong Kong or academic collaboration with Hong Kong's universities.

Conclusion

Hong Kong's essential attraction in higher education, and for its broader society and economy as well, has traditionally been its openness, internationalization, and cosmopolitanism. "One country, two systems" has served Hong Kong's higher education well. If it loses what made that possible, then its distinctiveness in higher education may be lost and its advantages and international prestige could disappear. ◢

> *The imposition of the new security law by the authorities has created a new sense of reality—for society and for higher education.*

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and distinguished fellow, Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. Email: altbach@bc.edu. Gerard A. Postiglione is professor emeritus, honorary professor, and coordinator of the Consortium on Higher Education Research in Asia, Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong. Email: gerry@hku.hk.

Future-Proofing German–Chinese Partnerships in Higher Education

Marijke Wahlers

Abstract
Building on solid, long-term cooperation, it is now time to future-proof German–Chinese university collaboration. Taking a nuanced view of the specific parameters, objectives, and content of individual partnerships is key. Open dialogue on opportunities and challenges—both within one's own university and with partner institutions—will help clarify matters and identify development pathways. The German Rectors' Conference's guiding questions on university partnerships with China are intended to support and enhance this dialogue.

21

The development of cross-border collaboration and academic exchange between German and Chinese universities in the past thirty years can truly be called a success story. Due to overall political conditions at the time, the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) recorded less than 100 partnership agreements between German and Chinese universities during the 1980s. Just two decades later, in the 2000s, the number had already tripled. Today, after another two decades, there are approximately 1,400 partnership agreements involving more than 200 German and almost 400 Chinese universities. As a result, we can confidently speak of a stable bridge between German and Chinese academia. While partnerships were at first often based on bilateral agreements between individual academic persons, they now cover the entire range of collaborative activities, from individual student and researcher mobility, joint study programs, and doctoral projects to joint research and innovation initiatives and transnational education offerings. As Chinese partners recognized the great potential of German universities of applied sciences early on, engagement on the German side extends fairly evenly across all institutional types.

Balancing Interests

A closer look, however, reveals a few cracks—some smaller, some larger—in the jointly built bridge. In terms of subjects, for example, partnership activities have always focused rather one-sidedly on certain fields, i.e., the natural and technical sciences, economics, and law. To this day, the other social sciences and the humanities are underrepresented in these alliances. A clear imbalance is also evident regarding the mobility of students and researchers. The pronounced research strength of Chinese universities and research institutions in numerous fields has not (yet) led to a noticeable increase of German students and academics bound for China.

Furthermore, there are some indications that, at least in the early stages, the institutional arrangements that governed collaborations did not adequately consider the concerns of German universities or the benefits they reaped. Far-sighted strategies, on an institutional as well as a systemic level, were needed to counteract this imbalance. As early as 2005, the HRK had already emphasized in recommendations for joint German–Chinese study programs that partnerships should create added value for all parties and that joint study programs should be designed with a view to addressing the needs of students in both countries. Given the increasing differentiation within the sector and German universities' enhanced efforts to create distinct institutional profiles, these aspects have come into greater focus. The internationalization approach employed by German universities has since changed markedly, moving away from one of seizing opportunities as they arise (instead of systematically seeking them out) toward a truly strategic approach to internationalization that links the activities of individual university members in a holistic fashion. Despite these trends, a 2018 study commissioned by the federal ministry of education and research and the federal foreign office concluded that although German universities have begun to place greater emphasis on exploring and thinking about China as a key global player, knowledge about, and expertise on, China among students, teachers, and researchers still need to be significantly expanded.

As a result, we can confidently speak of a stable bridge between German and Chinese academia.

22

Founding Partnerships on Solid Value Systems

Global geopolitical developments and political changes in Germany and China have also left their mark on institutional collaboration between both countries. As a result, we are currently witnessing a confluence of different currents: While the partnering process has been an overwhelmingly positive experience, and while joint projects continue to operate successfully in some areas, cooperation in other areas has been significantly affected.

In recent years, many German partner universities have faced an increase in legal requirements and organizational hurdles on the Chinese side. Moreover, growing state influence on curricula and processes at Chinese universities and the expanding curtailment of academic freedom are straining partnerships, even bringing them to a complete standstill in some cases.

Anchoring universities' cross-border activities in firm and sound value systems is becoming crucial, which is why the HRK underscores that freedom of research and teaching is indispensable to the successful operation of universities. In the HRK's view, this freedom is a fundamental, nonnegotiable principle that also applies to German universities' international activities and partnerships. In light of the profound changes on the global stage, the HRK published in April of this year guidelines and standards governing international university partnerships.

Additionally, the HRK recently issued guiding questions on university cooperation with the People's Republic of China. They complement the general guidelines and standards by detailing necessary as well as optional courses of action that relate specifically to cooperating with Chinese academic partners. The guidance is meant as motivation to validate and, where needed, to recalibrate existing partnerships with Chinese universities and academic institutions. At the same time, it seeks to encourage German universities to continue to expand their academic efforts in China, and to proactively shape the collaboration with Chinese partners.

Differentiated Approach Key to Resilient Partnerships

The guiding questions are designed to provide both universities as institutions and individual university members with motivation, support, and orientation when establishing and further developing resilient partnerships with Chinese universities and academic institutions. The questions are divided into three main categories: strategy and governance; joint teaching, learning, and research; and universities as transnational spaces. They address the prerequisites, requirements, and objectives of a partnership on an equal footing. The HRK believes that the careful selection of subjects and partners is one key factor to fruitful cooperation. The added value and sustainability of international partnerships are equally rooted in the university's structures and processes. In addition, they are closely connected to how the university defines itself, its mission, profile, institutional principles, and values.

The HRK holds the view that intensifying dialogue and cooperation with Chinese partners across all fields is essential. This is a science-driven rationale, first and foremost; however, it is also in the interest of society to convince students and researchers to engage more extensively with China and, in doing so, to help build up expertise on China. Taking a nuanced view of the specific parameters, objectives, and content of individual partnerships is key here, as it will facilitate the clarification of matters with Chinese partners as needed and, at the same time, identify rewarding development pathways. In negotiating opportunities and risks, it is imperative to proactively identify areas of opportunity without jeopardizing institutional values and standards in the process. The HRK will make every effort to support its members in the upcoming development process to ensure that we continue to build academic bridges with solid foundations, both now and in the years ahead. ◢

Marijke Wahlers is head of the Department for International Affairs, German Rectors' Conference, Germany. Email: wahlers@hrk.de. URL: www.hrk.de/guidance_China_cooperation.

Doctoral Education: Global Perspectives

Victor Rudakov and Maria Yudkevich

Doctoral education worldwide is characterized by parallel trends toward diversity and, at the same time, toward unification. These trends are influenced by massification and internationalization, growing research requirements, labor market challenges, and changing purposes of doctoral education. On the one hand, there is a tendency toward increased flexibility, as illustrated by the development of professional and work-based doctorates, of distant and part-time forms of PhD programs, and variations in terms of types of PhD programs, supervision, and study processes. On the other hand, the formation of global doctoral education systems with worldwide flows of students, faculty, and graduates, and the development of world-class universities contribute to unifying the enrollment and study process of doctoral education, and lead to similar requirements for those intending to pursue careers at world-class universities. However, this process of unification affects only top universities, frequently leaving national doctoral education systems intact—which also creates institutional differentiations within countries.

The Origins of Global Differences

The patterns of doctoral education in a given country depend considerably on the model that was chosen during its emergence and the implications of subsequent reforms. During the formation of their system, countries adopted models or elements of doctoral education of other countries with mature academic systems. For instance, some countries adopted the German model, with its strong focus on research work during the doctorate. Some went for a two-step doctoral education system as in the Soviet Union and some post-Communist countries (requiring two dissertations). Later, others adopted the US model, which is more structured and includes considerable coursework.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there were several different national leaders in the sciences, and as a result doctoral education in many countries is a mix of best practices of these leading countries, adopted to fit internal realities and national institutions. In our publication *Trends and Issues in Doctoral Education: A Global Perspective* (2020), we analyze key trends in doctoral education around the world.

Scale of Labor-Market Outcomes

During the past two decades, there has been massive growth in the number of PhD holders, caused by increasing research ambitions of universities and the need for more faculty as higher education systems expand. It is frequently mentioned that there is an oversupply of PhD graduates globally. However, one must differentiate between the situation in many lower-income countries with expanding tertiary education systems, where there is a dire need for PhD graduates, and most higher-income countries, where doctoral graduates are indeed in excessive supply and face employment problems in academia. Due to a shrinking academic labor market in these countries, the employment prospects of doctorate holders, especially in the humanities and social sciences, are getting worse, which explains the spread of postdoc formats of employment and emphasizes the importance of industry as an employment destination for doctoral graduates.

Internationalization

In terms of internationalization, English-speaking countries and countries providing an option to write and defend one's thesis in English have an important competitive advantage in attracting international doctoral students. A long history of doctoral education, as in Germany, or a past as a colonizing power, as in the case of France—which provides massive flows of students from former colonies with expanding higher education

Abstract

Doctoral education worldwide is characterized by parallel trends toward diversity and, at the same time, toward unification. There is no such thing as a standard doctoral education model. The landscape of doctoral education across the world is quite diverse and there is a considerable rise in its variations and flexibility. However, doctoral education has become a global market with flows of international students, faculty, and graduates who create a demand for unification of standards and benchmarking.

23

Doctoral education worldwide is characterized by parallel trends toward diversity and, at the same time, toward unification.

systems—are other predictors of high numbers of international doctoral students. Countries like Brazil, China, and Russia are regional powers in terms of higher education and mainly attract students from neighboring countries.

Processes and Types of PhDs

There are considerable differences between doctoral program processes, namely in program length, levels, and intermediary exams, affecting PhD completion and attrition rates, as well as between types of PhDs, dissertations, and supervision. There is a stable increase of part-time and distant formats of PhD programs all over the world, which, however, raise issues of quality and learning outcomes. There is some heterogeneity in terms of program length, although in general programs last between three and five years depending on country and subject. Despite the fact that in several countries (e.g., Germany, Poland, and Russia) there are still some elements of two-step doctoral degrees, with the implementation of the Bologna reform these systems are gradually disappearing. There is a differentiation between research-based (mainly in Europe) and course-based (mainly in the Unites States) approaches to doctoral education, but most countries gradually move toward course-based PhDs. Another clear trend is a change in dissertation requirements, namely the increasing significance of research publications.

A need for new leaders in the knowledge-oriented economy, the importance of industry–university partnerships, a shrinking academic labor market, and wide criticism against a lack of attention to skills have led to a change of purpose of doctoral education. PhD programs are no longer limited to nurturing new scholars for the academic labor market. This leads to the development of professional and work-based doctorates, especially in fields like accounting, finance, law, medicine, and nursing.

Funding and Status of Students

There is a wide diversity in funding models of doctoral education: free, tuition based, supported by scholarships and loans, or paid with a salary. In China, Japan, South Korea, the United Kingdom, and the United States, tuition costs are high and financial help depends on funding from programs, research projects, or universities. Germany provides students with the necessary support during their studies, making doctoral education there an attractive option for talented youth from around the world. In Kazakhstan and Russia, some doctoral students pay tuition fees, but these are quite low. In the majority of doctoral systems, including in the United Kingdom and the United States, doctoral candidates are considered students, while in Germany, the Netherlands, and some of the Scandinavian countries, doctoral candidates have the status of university employees.

The Impact of the Pandemic

As all other students, doctoral students are affected by the current pandemic. Many are not able to work on their projects, especially where equipment is involved. Some suffer from lack of communication and support from their advisers and departments. For those who are entering the job market this year, the situation is extremely uncertain and insecure. The negative effects of the pandemic are likely to increase: Some doctoral schools at several major US universities have already announced that they will not admit PhD candidates into their programs next year in order to "concentrate resources on their work with existing doctoral students." Universities will definitely need time to return full scale to their function of preparing new academics. ◢

Victor Rudakov is a research fellow at Center for Institutional Studies, National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), Moscow, Russia. Email: vrudakov@hse.ru. Maria Yudkevich is director of the Center and vice-rector of HSE. Email: yudkevich@hse.ru.

This article gives an overview of results from the recent book Trends and Issues in Doctoral Education: A Global Perspective, *edited by M. M. Yudkevich, P. G. Altbach, and H. de Wit. Sage, 2020.*

Africa: Resource Challenges to Doctoral Education

Wondwosen Tamrat and Getnet Tizazu Fetene

Abstract

This article examines the provision of doctoral education in Ethiopia and its implications for African higher education. Despite the role given to doctoral education toward achieving economic development and improving the quality of higher education, the resources for running PhD programs are lacking in many African countries. More efforts should be directed to building institutional capacity and availing the resources needed to run successful doctoral programs.

The contribution of doctoral research to the advancement of knowledge is widely acknowledged. On the African continent, doctoral education has been especially promoted owing to its critical role and potential contribution to economic and scientific development. As a result, the link between doctoral studies and research for the development of Africa has been emphasized in public discourse, policy directions, and program expansion schemes. It is assumed that the main needs of building research capacity and enhancing economic development on the continent can be met by supporting higher education institutions that offer postgraduate programs, especially doctoral education.

While this basic assumption appears to be shared across the continent, the crucial importance of PhD programs in improving the quality of education at African universities has also been recognized. The latter has been dictated by the need to upgrade the academic qualification of faculty where there is significant deficiency at many universities across the continent. However, despite increasing interest in the expansion of PhD programs, doctoral studies in Africa and lower-income countries in general are fraught with a multitude of challenges.

In a recent study that we conducted to examine doctoral students' views about the support schemes and resources deployed to run PhD programs, the issue of funding and resources came out as the most critical area hindering the progress and success of PhD studies at Addis Ababa University—Ethiopia's flagship university and main PhD provider.

Resource Availability

The study revealed that doctoral students are dissatisfied with the poor standard and availability of resources such as IT and computer facilities, personal work or study space, library and electronic research resources and services, quality of library holdings, and availability of laboratory, clinical, or related physical facilities.

The overall rating given by doctoral students to adequacy of facilities was very low and quite worrisome. In terms of specific categories identified, availability of laboratory, clinical, studio, or other physical facilities received a mean rating of 1.65 (standard deviation [SD]=0.99) out of a possible high mean score of 5; and availability of personal work or study space was rated 1.91 (SD=1.13). There is clearly a high level of agreement among doctoral students about the lack of resources, which must be negatively affecting the success of their PhD journey.

We found our results to be consistent with earlier local studies where poor facilities and resources, shortage of laboratory and learning materials, lack of office or working space for PhD students, and related deficiencies were reported as major challenges of postgraduate programs across most Ethiopian universities. The same is true about many African countries where the expansion of doctoral education has not been accompanied by a corresponding improvement in availing facilities critically needed for running successful PhD programs.

Availability of Financial Support

The issue of funding for doctoral studies in many African countries has been repeatedly identified as a critical incentive—or barrier. In the context of the present study, doctoral students rated the financial support and related support schemes provided the university as poor. Out of a possible score of 5, doctoral students' ratings ranged from a mean score of 1.18 (SD=0.68) to 2.53 (SD=1.13). Concerning the availability of financial support to take part in conferences or workshops, which is the least rated category, over 92 percent of the respondents said the assistance that they received was poor. This should be a cause

The financial challenges faced by doctoral students appear to have been a common and outstanding feature of the system.

Wondwosen Tamrat is associate professor, founder–president of St. Mary's University, Ethiopia, and PROPHE affiliate. He coordinates the private higher education subcluster of the Africa Union's Continental Education Strategy of Africa (CESA). Email: wondwosentamrat@gmail.com or preswond@smuc.edu.et. Getnet Tizazu Fetene is assistant professor of sociology of education in the Department of Educational Planning & Management at Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. Email: getnet.fetene@gmail.com.

for concern, since this does not only constrain the success of the PhD journey but it can also limit doctoral students' opportunity to develop their research capacity and skills.

The financial challenges faced by doctoral students appear to have been a common and outstanding feature of the system. Most programs are often opened without necessary preparations and deployment of adequate resources. In terms of budget allocated to PhD research, the amount of money allocated at Addis Ababa University has until recently been ETB 25,000 (US$781.23) per student. Aware of the exorbitant costs involved in conducting PhD research, the university was forced to supplement student allocations using funds from its internal income and external funding received from international development partners.

The study further indicated that a recent increase of the research budget to ETB 45,000 (US$1406.25) for students in social studies and humanities and to ETB 60,000 (US$1,875.00) for students of science and technology, is still regarded as unsatisfactory in the eyes of doctoral students. One doctoral student decried the inadequacy of the funding scheme as follows:

"If PhD candidates should conduct studies that are useful for the country, they must have adequate financial backing. However, the present financial support is very low. If I tell you from my experience, the amount doesn't cover my transport expenses. In places where there are security problems you are expected to take airplanes. The budget doesn't even cover that. And the people concerned clearly know that it is inadequate. I think the government is aware of that. The problem is failure to give importance to the issue and improve the situation."

What is more worrying about the financial strain faced by doctoral students is the fact that the existing financial stringency is forcing them to misdirect their research focus and compromise the quality of their output. A doctoral candidate observes,

"Because they know the money they get from the university is limited, doctoral students try to fit their dissertation topic to the missions and activities of certain NGOs, with an aim of securing some grant. That means PhD students are not doing research on problems that come out of their interest nor those aimed at solving national problems. They do research to get some spillover from the research grant they secure by linking their topic to the interest of potential sponsoring organizations."

This is an indication that the financial challenges of the university are threatening the goals of increasing research productivity and enhancing economic development through doctoral education, which are regarded as the main rationales for introducing the programs. Research findings at the regional level are indicative of similar patterns. Most African countries spend little on research, innovation, and development, which has a direct impact on expanding doctoral programs and promoting quality outputs.

Conclusion

Given the circumstances, it can be anticipated that neither the process of doctoral education nor the quality of the research output in Ethiopia will help achieve the aims of PhD programs, unless significant improvements are made in terms of overhauling both national directives and resources and support mechanisms. The same holds true for the many higher education systems on the continent where, despite encouraging efforts to expand doctoral education, little attention is given to fulfilling the requirements needed to run successful PhD programs. Future efforts should focus on addressing existing constraints, rather than on opening new PhD programs without proper financial planning. ◢

Japan: Decline of Doctoral Applicants—Crisis for Innovation?

Yukiko Shimmi

Abstract
For a number of reasons, while the number of doctoral graduates has been increasing in leading countries, in Japan the number of new entrants to doctoral programs has been decreasing. In order to bring innovation to society and industry, Japan needs to enhance the attractiveness of its doctoral programs with stable and long-term support.

Doctoral degree holders are seen as an engine for innovation, and their number has been increasing in leading countries. OECD data shows that, between 2010 and 2017, the number of graduates from doctoral programs or equivalent levels increased from 57,407 to 71,042 in the United States and from 18,756 to 28,143 in the United Kingdom. However, it slightly decreased from 15,867 to 15,674 in Japan. More significantly, in Japan, the number of new entrants to doctoral programs has been decreasing from its peak of 18,232 in 2003 to 14,976 in 2019, according to the annual survey by the ministry of education, culture, sports, science, and technology (MEXT). The number of international doctoral students, many from Asian countries and especially from China, was about the same level at 2,643 and 2,664 in these two years, and their percentage increased from 14.5 percent to 17.8 percent. While the presence of international doctoral students has been increasing at Japanese universities, so far institutions do not seem to be able to compensate for the overall decline in number of Japanese doctoral students.

Background and Potential Reasons

One of the reasons why doctoral programs are not so popular among young Japanese is that a doctoral degree is not perceived as helpful to enhance employability at Japanese companies. Moreover, the average salary of doctoral degree holders is not necessarily higher than that of master degree holders. To give some context, in Japan, until the early 1990s, the primary purpose of doctoral programs was to train future faculty and researchers to work in academia. After 1991, the capacity of graduate schools was extended by about 2.5 times to educate highly skilled professionals. However, owing to the long tradition that doctoral programs were to train graduates to pursue academic jobs, there is a mismatch between the skills developed during the programs and those expected by Japanese companies. In a survey by the National Institute of Science and Technology Policy (NISTEP) in 2012, many Japanese companies reported that although doctoral recipients have specialized knowledge, it is challenging for them to apply their knowledge and skills immediately to the companies' needs. This problem is also applicable to international doctoral students who look for jobs at Japanese companies.

Additionally, young Japanese are discouraged from pursuing doctoral degrees because the academic career of graduates has become unstable. This situation became apparent with the budget cuts that Japanese national universities suffered in 2003. According to NISTEP, among doctoral recipients in 2012, roughly 60 percent found jobs at universities or public research institutes. However, more than 60 percent among them held nontenure track positions, with 70 percent among those on contracts shorter than three years. The salaries of nontenured employees tend to be lower than that of staff with tenured positions or working at private companies. Also, the brevity of contracts makes it difficult for young researchers to select and work on research topics requiring a long-term commitment. This issue also affects international doctoral students. According to the same report, international doctoral students tend to look for academic positions. After graduation, more than half go back to their home countries to work.

Another reason why young Japanese do not pursue doctoral degrees is that financial support is quite limited. In contrast, some international doctoral students receive MEXT scholarships for their studies in Japan, and many other privately funded international students receive tuition exemptions. According to MEXT's report of 2014, nearly 50 percent of doctoral degree recipients received no financial support for their doctoral studies.

One of the reasons why doctoral programs are not so popular among young Japanese is that a doctoral degree is not perceived as helpful to enhance employability at Japanese companies.

27

Yukiko Shimmi is senior lecturer, Global Learning Center, Institute for Excellence in Higher Education, Tohoku University, Japan. Email: shimmi@tohoku.ac.jp.

The most extensive research fellowship program, by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), provides JPY 200,000 per month to doctoral students, which is about US$1,900; however, this fellowship is awarded to less than 5 percent of new entrants to doctoral programs. Also, earnings from research assistantships and teaching assistantships at Japanese universities are not sufficient to make a decent living. This is comparable to the situation in the United States, where nearly 80 percent of students primarily fund their doctoral study with either research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowships, or scholarships, according to the Survey of Earned Doctorates in 2019.

The Government's Response

As one way to enhance the attractiveness of doctoral programs in Japan, MEXT conducted a project called "Leading Program for Doctoral Education" from 2011 to 2019. In this project, 62 five-year PhD programs at 33 universities received competitive grants to develop a doctoral program to educate leaders equipped with both specializations and broad perspectives to work globally in academia or outside of it. In many of these programs, professionals from private companies taught some courses, and students were encouraged to do internships in companies as well as to do research abroad. MEXT reports that, as of March 2018, 96.5 percent of 1,846 students in these programs found jobs after graduating. This was higher than the percentage of all doctoral recipients that year (72.1 percent of a total of 15,658 graduates). Moreover, 42.6 percent of graduates of the MEXT project pursued nonacademic careers, for example in companies or government organizations, which is also higher than the overall percentage (25.1 percent).

Though the Leading Program seemed to be successful in increasing the link between doctoral programs and nonacademic careers, one of the main problems of recent governmental projects is that they tend to be limited to a fixed term. By the time the Leading Program project ended in 2019, a similar project, "Excellence Graduate School," had started in 2018. However, it is also a fixed-term project, basically lasting seven years. At the end of January 2020, the Council for Science, Technology, and Innovation discussed new goals to enhance the attractiveness of doctoral programs, including an increase of financial support for doctoral students. In December 2020, it was reported that MEXT provides up to JPY 2,900,000 (about US$28,000) for about 7,000 doctoral students (about 10 percent of all doctoral students in Japan), although the details of this support have not been announced yet. It is also reported that this support will be a stable one, which is what Japan needs to enhance the attractiveness of its doctoral programs and bring innovation to society and industry. ◢

Can Academic Corruption Be Eradicated?

Liz Reisberg

Abstract
Corruption is pervasive in higher education worldwide, the result of a confluence of circumstances that make it attractive due to potential rewards and limited consequences. Many higher education systems unintentionally support perverse incentives for the proliferation of corruption. This article cites examples of corruption highlighted in a recently published volume, *Corruption in Higher Education – Global Challenges and Responses*.

29

Corruption exists in nearly every public and private enterprise in every country worldwide. Where there are private benefits to be acquired, it seems inevitable that there will be individuals who exploit opportunities for personal advantage by cheating, undermining the integrity of the systems that they are abusing by their actions. Higher education is not immune. The 2020 report of the Russian Academy of Sciences documenting the retraction of 800 journal papers submitted by Russian scholars is a shocking example of just how serious and ubiquitous the problem is.

In *Corruption in Higher Education – Global Challenges and Responses*, edited by Elena Denisova-Schmidt, scholars in countries throughout the world suggest that corruption in higher education results from poorly designed systems; students and professors who do not fully understand what constitutes unethical behavior; a lack of consequences; individuals who find themselves in difficult situations where "shortcuts" seem to be the only solution; and individuals tempted by an easier path to personal advancement. The lack of clarity over the boundary between ethical and unethical, or of recognition of the circumstances that encourage corruption in different contexts complicate the effectiveness of any policy or procedure designed to protect against academic corruption.

Clearly, not enough is being done in many countries or at many institutions to orient students and faculty to accepted international standards of academic integrity or explain why these standards are important. In some cases, transgressions are committed innocently, or because corrupt behaviors are observed in others without consequence and subsequently "normalized." While some behaviors are clearly wrong, they cannot be addressed without a better understanding of why they occur. Incentives to cheat are often great, while the consequences of cheating are few.

Shortcuts and Perverse Incentives
Perhaps one of the most important conclusions to be drawn from the book is that corruption will not be eradicated simply by punishing individuals who are found guilty of unethical practice. Many systems present perverse structural incentives to cheat or overlook cheating. Such is the case in Armenia, Lithuania, Russia, and Ukraine, where instructors find themselves facing the dilemma of either ignoring cheating or dismissing students whose fees sustain the university where they are employed.

Massification has certainly contributed to the problem. The result of expanded access has meant that more students enter higher education underprepared. Where academic support services are lacking, there is an incentive to cheat in order to succeed. Contract cheating, when students purchase essays to turn in as their own, is one of the consequences. In some cases, students resort to this due to pressure to work. Papers for purchase are easily found online. Agencies that sell papers and essays often do so blatantly, sometimes located close to a campus. "Essay mills" serve not only the needs of students who purchase them, but the authors who write them. In Kenya, for example, university graduates often resort to selling essays online as a result of limited legitimate employment opportunities in Kenya's weak economy. The government of Kenya would confront a greater problem of unemployment if there was any concerted effort to crack down on the "academic writing" industry.

The growing number of university graduates has to some extent devalued the qualification. In many countries, a university degree has become a baseline qualification even for a position that does not require higher-level skills. The result is a market segment servicing people interested in acquiring the credential without investing the time or effort to earn it. For these individuals, it is tempting to purchase a degree from a degree

30

mill that will provide credentials for any degree, at any level, for a fraction of the cost of study and virtually no commitment of time. Despite the efforts of UNESCO and other organizations, it has proven impossible to create a complete database of enterprises contributing to this type of fraud.

Commercial Ventures Address a Need

When academic employment and promotion depend on number of publications, individuals will inevitably resort to predatory journals.

When academic employment and promotion depend on number of publications, individuals will inevitably resort to predatory journals. The proliferation of predatory journals responds to this need but has also complicated the task of distinguishing predatory from legitimate publications. Attempts to develop "blacklists" are stymied by the lack of resources necessary to review a multitude of existing journals.

Predatory conferences represent a similar challenge. Organizers have found a receptive audience, particularly among young scholars who need to build their CV or others who are flattered by an invitation to present. There is also the appeal of obtaining university funds to travel, with the result that even scholars from elite institutions participate. Unfortunately, all manner of institutions host these events, valuing them as a source of revenue.

Finally, resourceful "third parties" act as intermediaries to place prospective students at universities abroad (most often in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States). While this practice treads a fine ethical line depending on whose interests are paramount, the incentives to all parties are powerful—for the student and student's family, it cuts short a complicated process of sorting through the overabundance of international options; for universities, it brings in full-paying students with little recruitment effort; for the agents who act as intermediaries, the arrangement is profitable.

Remedies

Eliminating corruption in higher education will require efforts on multiple fronts. Perhaps most important is the need to orient teachers and students about what constitutes academic corruption and to address the underlying issues that encourage unethical behavior. Where students do not have the luxury of dedicating themselves to full-time study, mechanisms are needed to relieve financial pressure. When students struggle to balance time for study and the need to hold a job, there is a temptation to make efficient use of time by cheating. Additionally, the line between the financial, professional, or academic interests of individuals who hold public office or otherwise influence public policy is often blurred. Unless conflicts of interest can be identified and prevented, corruption will flourish.

A critical issue that is only partially addressed in the book is the problem created by the way success is measured. As long as progress to degree is measured predominantly by exams and papers, cheat sheets, impersonations, technology, and essay mills will offer an appealing path to needed results. Alternative mechanisms to measure student learning could eliminate many of these shortcuts to graduation. Likewise, if success for faculty is measured quantitatively, then illicit options will remain attractive. There are fewer opportunities for corruption when excellence in teaching and service to the institution are valued more.

Conclusion

Higher education is fundamental to the creation of the highly qualified human capital needed in today's knowledge-based economies. Citizens in nations at all stages of development need to trust universities to protect the integrity and quality of their "output."

One cannot read this book without being impressed by the degree of innovation that has produced so many forms of academic corruption. If only these creative efforts could be employed more ethically, how much greater the achievement of the world's universities would be!

Liz Reisberg is a consultant in international higher education and a research fellow at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. Email: reisberg@gmail.com.

To Buy or Not to Buy? Investing in a Dissertation in Ukraine

Ararat L. Osipian

Abstract
In addition to widespread and globalized academic essay mills, doctoral degree fraud is becoming an issue. In Ukraine, dozens of firms offer ghostwritten dissertations for sale. Aspirant doctorate holders face the dilemma: to buy, or not to buy, a ghostwritten dissertation. Despite the mounting costs of a doctorate, it is a union card that brings job security and snowballing benefits in large increments to those who decide to invest in a ghostwritten dissertation.

31

Many lower-middle-income nations, including Communist and post-Communist regimes, have been undergoing market transition for decades. In many instances, despite the lengthy period of transformation, the market reforms undertaken by different political regimes can hardly be called successful. Largely monopolized, semifeudal, to a significant extent illicit, and highly corrupt national economies do not feature well-developed and competitive markets. Nevertheless, there is one market that is a clear exception because of the unusual product—doctoral dissertations. Those who use this product undermine national economies due to a lack of developed skills. Available for sale, doctoral degrees no longer signal expertise. On the international market, it is not clear what the degree holders are worth. The problem of ghostwritten dissertations has become a global concern.

Ukraine Advances in Ghostwritten Dissertations
My decade-old study, "Economics of Corruption in Doctoral Education: The Dissertations Market," published by *Economics of Education Review*, found 169 firms in Russia that produce ghostwritten dissertations. Ukraine had only 16 such firms at the time. My more recent study, "Let Me Write a Dissertation for You: The micro-level cost-benefit approach to doctoral degree fraud," which appeared in *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, found 46 firms that offer ghostwritten dissertations for sale in Ukraine. In addition, there are numerous individual scholars—freelancers of a kind—eager to write a dissertation for a reasonable fee. These firms and individuals represent the supply side of the dissertations-for-sale market. One can order a dissertation in any field on the topic of one's choice. The demand for these services comes largely from aspiring doctoral candidates, faculty members, and administrators already employed at colleges and universities, practicing physicians, civil servants, politicians, and businessmen. While businessmen are interested in doctorates for prestige and reputation, other potential clients have clearly economic reasons.

Moral and Ethical Considerations Aside
Results of my fieldwork conducted in Ukraine show that ethical considerations and matters of professional conduct play little, if any, role in such decisions. To the contrary, monetary matters dominate decision-making. Buying a dissertation as a long-term investment is attractive to potential clients aspiring to a doctorate. They have to consider the opportunity costs of being involved in teaching and research in academia to earn a doctorate legitimately, even though a doctoral degree produces some benefits in the long-term. Unless one works for a higher education or research institution, is a medical professional or a civil servant, occupies a public office, serves in the military or in a law enforcement agency, or plans a career as a politician, any benefit from holding a doctorate is doubtful. The private sector, including large, medium, and small businesses, does not give much weight to the doctoral degrees of its employees and business owners. Thus, doctoral degree fraud is closely tied to the public sector.

The Mounting Costs of a Doctorate
Ukraine still has a two-tier system of doctoral degrees, with a first level, *kandidat nauk*, and a higher level, *doktor nauk*. Although the former was recently renamed "PhD" in reference to the Western degree, in essence the system remains virtually intact. Arriving at a doctorate requires producing and defending a dissertation. Preparation and publication of scholarly works is required as well. All of these requirements are available for

Available for sale, doctoral degrees no longer signal expertise.

sale. The total cost of dissertation, scholarly works, and positive references and reviews for a *kandidat nauk* would cost around US$5,000. This is based on averages of minimum (basic) prices posted by the firms. The maximum price for this package is around US$19,000, almost four times the average basic price. For a *doktor nauk* degree, prices are much higher. The total cost of dissertation, scholarly works, and positive references and reviews would cost around US$25,000. The maximum price reaches US$82,000. Since *kandidat nauk* is a necessary prerequisite for *doktor nauk* degree, the latter results in a maximum price of over US$100,000. These high prices are both unaffordable for most and unreasonable. Indeed, who would want to spend a minimum of US$5,000 for a *kandidat nauk* degree in an academic system where an associate professor at a typical public university has to survive on a meager US$300 a month or even less? Nevertheless, the significant increase in the number of providers—from 16 to 46—may be an indication of increased demand for doctorates.

In addition to the costs listed above, there are other costs, including those that are sometimes referred to as the direct costs of corruption. It is not unusual for doctoral candidates, especially those buying ghostwritten dissertations, to bribe members of their doctoral committee in exchange for admission to the defense and positive votes. In addition, lavish banquets and gifts are considered as natural parts of this corrupt tradition. Finally, costs also include paperwork. In anticipation of the dissertation defense and conferral of a doctoral degree, a required set of documents must be submitted to the ministry of education and science. These documents can also be prepared for a fee by specialists closely affiliated to those who offer ghostwritten dissertations for sale. In addition, there are numerous other, less significant, expenses. These expenses drive the cost of the degree even higher than the average price used in the initial cost-benefit analysis.

It Pays Back to Have a Doctorate
Still, benefits can justify the costs. Holders of doctoral degrees are entitled to a significantly higher pay, in both public and private colleges and universities as well as in public offices. Benefits also include higher positions in academic or bureaucratic hierarchies and receiving higher retirement pay. Job security is also a consideration. To put it bluntly, a doctorate is a union card that offers security and snowballing benefits in large increments. Furthermore, in a corrupt country such as Ukraine, faculty and state bureaucrats generate illicit income in the form of bribes to supplement their legal pay. Quite frequently, this illicit income may exceed formal pay. The seniority that results from a doctorate may also promise a higher level of illicit income and expand opportunities for corruption. ◢

Ararat L. Osipian is a fellow of the Institute of International Education and of the New University in Exile Consortium, US. Email: araratos@yahoo.com.

False Institutional Affiliations and Gaming University Metrics

Vivienne C. Bachelet

Abstract
Publications are used by ranking houses to build their indicators on university quality. Many universities worldwide pay their academics and scientists cash rewards for publishing in high-impact or indexed journals, as a way of increasing their productivity. However, universities may be using other mechanisms to increase the numbers of publications that are credited to their account, gaming the metrics used to rank universities.

33

Last year, the Sixth World Conference on Research Integrity was held in Hong Kong in the first days of June, just before the 9 June 2019 mass demonstrations. The conference was hosted by the University of Hong Kong and gathered academics, researchers, advocates, journalists, editors, university research integrity officers, government officials, and so on, from all around the world. There was a sizable participation of Chinese delegates, as well as keynote talks by top representatives of the People's Republic of China.

One of the main plenary sessions was devoted to the role that funding agencies play in shaping responsible research practices. One of the speakers was Qikun Xue from Tsinghua University, who gave an overview of the research integrity policies and practices of her institution, ranked number one in China and Asia by the *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings. After her talk, a delegate very bluntly questioned her on the Chinese university policy of paying researchers for papers published in high-impact journals. His tone was hostile, and underlying his question was the assumption that paying scientists a fee for papers published is contrary to research integrity. Qikun Xue laconically replied that her university has not been paying scientists for academic publications for over a decade.

Monetary Rewards for Papers Published

Is there a problem with paying academics or scientists a monetary incentive for each paper published in a high-impact journal or for papers published in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science (WoS)? This practice, very extensive in China until recently, when it was banned, occurs not only there—it is, in effect, pervasive in many countries. In Chile, nearly all universities pay monetary rewards for papers published, and cash incentives are scaled according to the ranking of the journal or the indexing service (WoS-indexed articles are paid more than Scopus articles).

The driver behind this policy is to incentivize academics who only teach to begin conducting research and publishing. In many emerging countries with higher education systems that are still struggling to consolidate a research culture, this seems an easy way to raise their productivity and, accordingly, to gain positions in university ranking systems, most of which rely heavily on outputs as informed by WoS or Scopus. While this practice seems to be frowned upon by Western science culture—and some may consider it a breach of research integrity, others see this widespread policy as a way of driving up the productivity of their scientists, and, consequently, the prestige and reputation of the institution. Whatever the take on this reward system, the underlying objective component is the *reporting of the institutional affiliation*.

Are Universities Purchasing Publications?

Cash rewards to stimulate a research culture could have mutated into a different way of gaming the system for those universities that are interested in advancing their positions in the international ranking systems. A lot is to be gained by improving a university's standing, as a higher rank may lead to more student enrollments and revenues.

Universities in Chile are using many mechanisms to game the system, such as encouraging naïve authors to include the university affiliation in the author byline of a manuscript submission, without having contributed to the research or to the academic's salary. There are cases of Chilean private, for-profit universities that reach out to foreign researchers, offering cash incentives to include the university affiliation in their next submission to a high-impact journal, even when these authors have no connection at all with that university. Cash incentives offered by universities can also attract interest

34

Apart from our study, there seems to be little or no interest in the research integrity and publication ethics community to see the elephant in the room.

Vivienne C. Bachelet is associate professor at the School of Medicine, Universidad de Santiago de Chile (USACH), Chile. Email: vivienne.bachelet@usach.cl.

of independent clinical researchers in, say, teaching hospitals. While the real affiliation of the author is the hospital where he or she works, an institutional affiliation may pop up in the publication of the results as a result of the cash offer. Likewise, casual tutors who teach courses in numerous universities might shop around for the highest fee-for-paper or, better yet, collect them all; at submission, this author will appear as having multiple institutional affiliations. In other parts of the world, universities offer honorary positions to prestigious academics from Western universities, sometimes on a contractual basis, with the expectation that these academics' publications will include the institutions as affiliations as well.

Impact on Rankings

Hence, much is riding on affiliations, but much more is at stake on *institutional affiliations*. Ranking and quality accreditation systems and competition between universities have led to a rank-or-wither culture. Many of the indicators used by ranking houses (e.g., Nobel prizes) are not easy to tweak within a short timeframe, while productivity (output) is. Multiple affiliations are becoming increasingly common—one might even say, standard—due to the internationalization of universities and the growth of collaborative research projects.

It is no surprise, therefore, that most papers, especially in the biomedical field, have many authors, and a proportion of them may report multiple institutional affiliations. When a corresponding author submits a manuscript for publication, all the affiliations in the author byline are self-reported. Astonishingly, there are no known recommendations for correctly reporting affiliations, and authors rely on their own best judgment to include one, or more, affiliations, depending on what is at stake. However, do we know that the reported affiliations are real? To what extent do stakeholders verify whether affiliations are correct? In a study examining and verifying the affiliations of authors who report multiple affiliations, with at least one of them belonging to a Chilean higher education institution, we were unable to validate 38 percent of the reported affiliations using publicly available means.

When metrics become the driving force underpinning many important higher education policy definitions, the validity of the data used to build these metrics is essential. Apart from our study, there seems to be little or no interest in the research integrity and publication ethics community to see the elephant in the room. If the global higher education system is to continue using academic publications as a way of gauging institutional quality, it must ensure that gaming is not going on. The implications are far-reaching, and the solutions must engage many stakeholders, including universities, ranking houses, journals, funders, and research integrity and publication ethics organizations.

The Tragedies of Brazilian Higher Education

Marcelo Knobel and Fernanda Leal

In previous articles, we summarized critical policy changes in Brazilian higher education since President Jair Bolsonaro took office in January 2019. Essentially, we referred to uncertainties, controversies, and pushbacks to which the sector has been subjected: budget constraints imposed on science and public higher education institutions (HEIs); the president's ideological bias against the humanities; and the "Future-se" program, a proposal from the ministry of education with a neoliberal perspective, intended to increase the financial autonomy of federal public HEIs—while intensifying mechanisms to control them.

In this article, we continue this reflection, presenting what we call "a chronology of tragedies," a review of events that have taken place in Brazilian higher education since September 2019. These events reveal the ways in which federal policies have continued to threaten university autonomy, even though the public higher education sector has proved to be fundamental to fighting the current COVID-19 pandemic.

More Uncertainties, Controversies, and Pushbacks

One of the notable effects of Bolsonaro's policies on higher education has been the sector's instability. Many of his measures were imposed without any dialogue with universities and representative associations, resulting in strong resistance and initiatives being canceled or postponed.

The third minister of education since the start of his presidency was replaced in July 2020. Abraham Weintraub's administration was the second and longest (from April 2019 to June 2020) and left a very negative legacy. Due to his ideological positions and hostility toward public universities and academics, Weintraub had to leave office. He went so far with his controversial attitudes that the president could no longer justify keeping him in his post. Perhaps one of the more egregious moments was when Weintraub showed up at a small progovernment demonstration in June 2020—in the middle of one of the worst public health catastrophes in modern history—without a mask. He greeted demonstrators and proclaimed: "I don't want more sociologists or anthropologists. I don't want more philosophers with my money."

Economist Carlos Alberto Decotelli was nominated to follow Weintraub. However, due to several inconsistencies in his academic qualifications, including inaccurate information and accusations of plagiarism, he was not appointed. In July, Presbyterian priest Milton Ribeiro assumed the ministry, provoking new concerns following statements such as suggesting that being homosexual is a matter of education and values. In general, the minister has adopted an extremely low profile, but, unfortunately, the situation for higher education and science is not improving at all.

More Budget Constraints

Budget cuts constraining public universities and science funding have continued and are expected to reach greater levels in 2021. At the beginning of 2020, the federal agency Capes announced a new model for granting research scholarships to graduate students, prioritizing technological areas. Similarly, the federal agency CNPq excluded humanities and social sciences from priority research projects to be funded from 2020 to 2023. This was justified in the interest of "accelerating the country's economic and social development."

Capes and CNPq are the main funding agencies of research scholarships in Brazil. Capes is also responsible for assessing and accrediting graduate programs, so that the

Abstract

Continuing our reflection on critical policy changes in Brazilian higher education since President Bolsonaro assumed office in January 2019, this article presents what we call "a chronology of tragedies," a review of events that have taken place since September 2019. These events reveal the ways in which federal policies continue to threaten university autonomy, even though the public higher education sector has proved to be fundamental to fighting the current COVID-19 pandemic.

35

restriction of research funding to a few "priority fields" potentially puts the development of many areas and academic freedom at risk, with serious consequences for critical thinking.

Successive budget constraints will be magnified, as federal HEIs are expected to face an additional 18 percent cut (corresponding to approximately US$185 million) in 2021 on discretionary expenses (payments, investments, and student assistance). This situation will be worsened by the approval of a project that reallocates approximately the equivalent of US$260 million from the ministry of education to the ministries of infrastructure and of regional development in November. This, the associations of federal HEIs argue, will harm teaching, research, and extension/outreach activities, with a direct impact on Brazilian society.

More Threats to Administrative Autonomy

After the rejection of the "Future-se Program" by the vast majority of federal HEIs, the government searched for new ways to interfere with their administration. Last June, the president published a provisional measure according to which, when a rector's four-year term ends during the COVID-19 pandemic, the ministry of education designates his or her successor, deviating from the long and well-established tradition of election of university leaders by faculty, administrative staff, and students. Since the federal government has shown very little concern with the COVID-19 pandemic, this measure appeared to be a means of interfering with their autonomy. Indeed, the assertion that it would not be possible to vote for new rectors during the pandemic is absurd, as most activities have continued remotely and current technology makes distance voting possible and safe. Fortunately, the senate overturned the decision, as it deviated from the Brazilian constitution.

According to the constitution, the process starts with an internal institutional vote. The university council then sends the president a list highlighting the top three nominees. Since the country's return to democracy, the practice has been that the president nominates the first candidate on the list, respecting the choice of the university community. Since 2019, Bolsonaro has nominated rectors following 27 university elections, but in 10 of them he disregarded the choice of the institutions. In one of the cases, the president's designated candidate was not even on the list. Even though there is no obligation, accepting the academic community's preference is an important expression of respect for the autonomy and legitimacy of institutions that suffered from a lack of democracy during the military dictatorship. The management of a complex university by an individual who was not chosen by a majority of the community only exacerbates tensions within the academic environment.

Another concern is the federal government's intention to permanently expand distance learning at federal HEIs. In October, the president established two working groups to present strategies in this regard. The COVID-19 pandemic has led HEIs to find ways to provide remote learning as an emergency measure. However, issues such as quality and student access to technology need to be addressed and broadly discussed by HEIs and representative institutions. As public HEIs have broadened access over recent years, more students from low-income families have enrolled. Risks of digital inequality as a result of permanently expanded distance learning cannot be disregarded. Before attempting such a major shift, HEIs must be given the possibility to assess and mitigate its potential impact in terms of access and quality.

Paradoxically, despite all the tragedies that the public higher education system has suffered, the current moment might be considered an opportunity for HEIs to reinforce their value to society by getting closer to the communities that surround them. After years of relentless attacks, with the pandemic the media have been giving more space to faculty members to be heard and emphasize the importance of research to address critical public issues such as fighting the virus. Public HEIs are responsible for 95 percent of the country's research and their combined voices are an essential counterpoint to the denial of the seriousness of the virus and to the suggestion that "science is fiction," propagated by the Bolsonaro administration. Attempts to silence academics and control universities put democracy, development, and social well-being at risk across the country and damage the achievements that arise from university autonomy and academic freedom worldwide. ◢

Their combined voices are an essential counterpoint to the denial of the seriousness of the virus and to the suggestion that "science is fiction," propagated by the Bolsonaro administration.

Marcelo Knobel is rector of Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp) and full professor at the Gleb Wataghin Physics Institute, Unicamp, Brazil. Email: knobel@ifi.unicamp. br. Fernanda Leal is executive assistant for the provost of people development and management at Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Brazil, and a former visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), Boston College, US. Email: fernanda.leal@ufsc.br.

Emerging from the Mist: French Universities and Global Rankings

Ludovic Highman

France's higher education system can be described as *sui generis* and has been categorized as fragmented, stratified, and multitype. From the early twenty-first century, France has been rationalizing its higher education system, following disappointment in the lacklustre performance of its institutions in global university rankings. To remedy this, government-initiated reform processes have sought to bridge the divide between *grandes écoles* and universities and encourage the reemergence of historic universities. To understand why the creation of strong French universities was challenging and, for a long time, an almost alien concept to French policy makers and academics alike, a brief historical overview is necessary.

From a Republic of Faculties to a Republic of Universities?

Following the French Revolution, all existing universities were abolished, many of which had originally been founded by papal bull (Montpellier in 1289, Grenoble in 1339, etc.) They were replaced in 1806 by a single, nationwide institution named alternatively the Imperial University, University of France, or simply *l'Université*. The latter was placed under the authority of a Grand Master, or minister responsible for faculties, with considerable powers over the recreated faculties (i.e., theology, law, medicine, humanities, and the sciences). These faculties developed independently from one another and with no institutional attachment beyond that of being under the aegis of *l'Université*.

In parallel, the *grandes écoles* were created with a vocational aim, that of providing the nation with engineering and military manpower. This created a new type of institution that would educate much of France's elites, outside of the university sector and unlike other European countries. The founding of the University of Berlin in 1810 had little effect on importing the Humboldtian model to France, and it was not until 1896 that separate faculties located in a same city were placed under a common institutional identity. However, the damage was done, allowing powerful faculty dynamics led by deans to override any centralized university-driven initiatives, leading to a so-called "Republic of Faculties."

Inspired by French academics looking toward the American model, the *loi Faure* of 1968 initially attempted to create autonomous and multidisciplinary research universities, responsible for their own administration, budget, and educational offer. However, the legacy of the "Republic of Faculties" proved too strong to curb, although some modest results were gained with the creation of multidisciplinary universities in small to middle-sized towns. Elsewhere, disciplinary and political alliances in large cities and in the capital proved too strong to reverse, leading to the creation of "universities" around one or two broad fields of related subjects, in other words, the previous faculties.

The Impetus for Reform

The first global ranking of universities in 2003, namely the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), also known as Shanghai ranking, created what has domestically been referred to as the "Shanghai shock." There was much consternation at the relatively disappointing performance of French institutions. The poor standing of the prestigious *grandes écoles*, which in many cases ranked lower than French universities, was particularly devastating to the elites that it produced. This was perceived as a barrier to the attractiveness of French higher education and as hampering the competitiveness of France's knowledge-based economy.

It was not obvious to the powers that be what specialized universities could gain from merging into multidisciplinary institutions, so deeply enshrined were the disciplinary

Abstract

The French higher education landscape has been considerably altered in the early twenty-first century. In order to enhance the competitiveness of the sector at the global level, the French government has steered the system through structural policy processes aimed at consolidating it and overcoming the traditional divide between universities and *grandes écoles*, while providing incentive schemes rewarding mergers.

37

boundaries in academic (and student) minds. This was coupled with a general lack of interest from political elites, for a large part educated in *grandes écoles*. However, university rankings and the rise of the Emerging Global Model (EGM) of the research university put an end to this political apathy, challenging the mindset of French academics and university administrators.

Investing in the "Best": Initiatives for Excellence

The Initiatives for Excellence (IDEX) scheme, launched in 2010 with the goal of developing five to 10 world-class universities, created profound structural change, far more effectively than previous incentive schemes (e.g., Plan Campus), if only because of the sheer magnitude of the allocated funding and the deliberate aim to implement a policy of differentiation within the university sector. This meant a significant departure from previous policy, which did not recognize any difference in status or quality between universities, or within any formal category of institutions. The relatively "flat" structure of the French university sector was about to become significantly vertically differentiated. The prestigious IDEX label has been awarded to 10 universities or consortia of institutions located in Aix-Marseille, Bordeaux, Grenoble, Lyon, Nice, Paris, and Strasbourg, allowing institutions to present themselves, with the government's stamp of approval, as France's leading research universities.

The IDEX scheme sought to provide necessary incentives to finalize the ongoing structural consolidation of the sector (first in 2007 through the *pôles de recherche et d'enseignement supérieur* [PRES], or research and higher education hubs, replaced in 2013 by the *communautés d'universités et établissements*, or communities of universities and higher education institutions [COMUE]). It rewards large-scale, multidisciplinary institutions with a strong research mission, either through the merging of *grandes écoles* with universities, or by merging specialized universities within the same city. One of the latest mergers finalized in 2019, Paris-Saclay University, now ranks 14th globally, in a ranking that sees both Paris Sciences et Lettres (PSL) University and Sorbonne University breaking into the top 40, while the University of Paris and Grenoble-Alpes University appear in the top 100 (ARWU, 2020).

Conclusion

With such a traumatic history, it is unsurprising French universities have had a hard time finding their feet. The French higher education system has suffered from its parochialism and a self-imposed division between, on the one hand, large open-access universities catering for the majority of students, and on the other a professional elite training provided by small and selective *grandes écoles*, preparing students for senior executive positions in the civil service or the private sector.

It is no surprise that the most highly ranked universities are those that managed to overcome the fragmented nature of French higher education, and include the best of both worlds, namely the *grandes écoles* and the university sectors. The quality of French institutions has not suddenly exponentially improved, it was always there. However, successive governments have managed to harness that quality and reform the higher education landscape to allow it to translate and conform to globally accepted norms and concepts surrounding "world-class" universities and the increasingly dominant model of the EGM.

The consequences of this stratification on the vertical dimension remain to be seen, in particular the implications for access and student choice. By rehabilitating the university as the dominant medium of publicly funded instruction and research in France, policy makers and senior management in institutions have accepted global university templates provided by the Humboldtian model and the EGM. ◢

One of the latest mergers finalized in 2019, Paris-Saclay University, now ranks 14th globally.

Ludovic Highman is associate professor in higher education management, International Centre for Higher Education Management, School of Management, University of Bath, and research centre associate, Department of Education, University of Oxford, UK. Email: lah26@bath.ac.uk.

Not Yet Nirvana: International Higher Education Implications of the US Election

Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit

Abstract

The departure of Donald Trump as president of the United States will bring some immediate and positive changes to the US and international higher education landscape. But the kind of populism and nationalism that Trump exemplified remains part of the US reality—and of the realities of many other countries. At best, one can say that international higher education will be in a less deplorable state under Biden, and that is something to be pleased about.

Much of the higher education world, in the United States and beyond, is overjoyed that Donald Trump will soon be leaving power. His departure will bring immediate and positive changes that will affect the US and the international higher education landscape. But Trumpism is far from gone. The kind of populism and nationalism that Trump exemplifies remains part of American reality—and of the realities of many other countries. The divide between anti-international and anti-immigration advocates and climate change deniers on the one hand, and those in favor of international collaboration to help address key challenges locally and globally, is fiercer than ever, in the United States and in the rest of the world.

Quick Changes
Of course, during the Trump presidency, the US higher education community continued to engage internationally, but the policies and the rhetoric of the Trump administration had a severe impact.

Policies that are likely to be quickly reversed are visa restrictions, elements of the "Muslim ban" that may still be in practice, time restrictions on student visas, tight regulations on Optional Practical Training (OPT) and H-1B visa, and others. Regulations concerning postdoctoral appointments will revert to traditional practice. Procedures for foreign graduates to obtain a green card will become easier. And the DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) program, which does not directly affect international higher education but provides protection to 643,000 immigrants, will be reinstated. Existing exchange programs such as Fulbright, which were under threat and suffered budget cuts, will be safe. Hopefully, the partisan politicization of international initiatives will end.

In general, US governmental policies relating to international higher education will most probably revert to pre-Trump norms. But with the continuing COVID-19 crisis and ensuing fiscal and economic disruptions, new initiatives are very unlikely. Given the strong determination of incoming vice-president Kamala Harris, important issues of racism and inequality in higher education, in particular in study abroad and international student policies, will receive renewed attention. But given their systemic presence in the sector, they will not be easy to overcome.

Broader Trends
Overall, the transition to a Biden presidency in the United States will imply a substantive shift in tone toward increased international collaboration in research and in education and the revision of a number of draconian measures that have affected international students, faculty, and partnerships. But one can wonder if it will be possible to correct the enormous damage inflicted to the country's international reputation in the past four years. At best, one can say that international higher education will be in a less deplorable state under Biden than under Trump, and this, in itself, is something to rejoice about. ◀

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and distinguished fellow, Center for International Higher Education at Boston College (CIHE), US. Email: altbach@bc.edu. Hans de Wit is professor emeritus and distinguished fellow, CIHE. Email: dewitj@bc.edu.

CIHE UPDATES

As of November 1, 2020, the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at the Lynch School of Education and Human Development, Boston College, has undergone a change in its leadership and their titles. The center will be led by Academic Director Gerardo Blanco, also associate professor, and by Managing Director Rebecca Schendel, also assistant professor. Hans de Wit, Director of the Center from 2015 to 2020, will become Distinguished Fellow of CIHE and Professor Emeritus, and Founding Director Philip Altbach will combine his position of Research Professor with the title of Distinguished Fellow of CIHE.

They form the team in charge of the center's activities in the area of teaching and training, research, and publication, with the support of CIHE's current graduate assistants: Tessa DeLaquil, Lizhou (Jo) Wang, Maia Gelashvili, and Mathew Rombalski, and of Administrative Assistant Salina Kopellas.

CIHE Conference

On October 23–24, 2021, CIHE will organize its first International Higher Education Conference, an event originally planned for October 2020 to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the center and its flagship publication *International Higher Education*. The conference will have two tracks: International Higher Education and Internationalization of Higher Education. We invite you to send us a proposal for a paper, with a title, an abstract of maximum 500 words, and a short bio of 175 words. Submissions should be sent to internationalhighered@bc.edu by **May 15, 2021**. Please explicitly label your e-mail "Conference submission."

WES–CIHE Summer Institute

Assuming that it will be possible to gather in person by June 2021, we have launched the call for proposals for the 2021 WES-CIHE Summer Institute, scheduled to be held at Boston College from June 9 to 11, 2021. All graduate students and early-career professionals are now invited to submit a proposal on the theme of "Innovative and Inclusive Internationalization in Higher Education."

CIHE PUBLICATIONS

In its series *CIHE Perspectives*, the center published "Catholic Higher Education Institutes in Francophone West Africa: Challenges, Promises, and Networking Commitments," by Jean Baptiste Diatta (CIHE Perspectives No. 17) and
"Innovative and Inclusive Internationalization: Proceedings of the WES-CIHE Summer Institute 2020," edited by Hans de Wit and Tessa DeLaquil (CIHE Perspectives No. 18).

Internationalisation of Higher Education

Policy and Practice

⊘ **4 issues per year**
in English
with 5–7 articles per issue

⊘ **Unlimited access**
to the publication's website

⊘ **€268**
annual billing + shipping

⊘ **€241,20 (Online-only)**
annual billing

⊘ **Campus licences**
also available

Internationalisation of Higher Education – Policy and Practice is a publication for practitioners and policymakers in higher education. It examines internationalisation policies, processes and activities, addressing key issues in the internationalisation of higher education, and placing them in the context of global developments.

DUZ medienhaus

Inaugural Conference on International Higher Education

Marking the 25th anniversary of the Center for International Higher Education

OCTOBER 22–23
2021

BOSTON COLLEGE
Lynch School of Education and Human Development
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Including
Keynote presentations
Panel discussions
Individual paper presentations

Interested in presenting?
Submit an abstract by May 15, 2021
» BC.EDU/CIHE

Are you a graduate student or early career professional? Join us at the next WES-CIHE Summer Institute on

INNOVATIVE AND INCLUSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Boston College | June 9–11, 2021

To learn more and submit a proposal, visit:
wes.org/2021-wes-cihe

WES
WORLD EDUCATION SERVICES

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION
BOSTON COLLEGE

IHE Advisory Board

International Higher Education has an advisory board of distinguished higher education experts to provide insights, suggest topics, and increase the visibility of the publication.

The Editorial Advisory Board is comprised of the following members:

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

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perpective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through International Higher Education, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide.