

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

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

The newest non-English editions of *IHE*—in French and Vietnamese—are made possible thanks to partnerships with the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie and FPT University, respectively.



Subscribe to *IHE*
[http://ejournals.
 bc.edu/ojs/index.php/
 ihe/user/register](http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/user/register)

Learn more about
 CIHE's new MA in
 International Higher
 Education:
[http://www.bc.edu/re-
 search/cihe/graduate-
 studies.html](http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe/graduate-studies.html)

European Crises

- 2 Brexit and the European Shape of Things to Come
Fiona Hunter and Hans de Wit
- 3 European Universities in the Aftermath of the Economic Crisis
Jo Ritzen

Integrity and Corruption

- 4 The Global Challenge of Academic Integrity
Elena Denisova-Schmidt
- 6 Analyzing Corruption in Indian Higher Education
William G. Tierney and Nidhi S. Sabharwal

Branch Campuses and Transnational Education

- 7 How Much Autonomy Do Branch Campuses Really Have?
Megan Clifford and Kevin Kinser
- 9 Singapore's "Global Schoolhouse" Aspirations
Jason Tan
- 11 How International Branch Campuses Stand Out from the Crowd
Rachael Merola
- 12 Transnational Education in Chinese Secondary Education
Fion Choon Boey Lim

Aspects of Internationalization

- 14 International Advisory Councils: A New Aspect of Internationalization
Philip G. Altbach, Georgiana Mihut, and Jamil Salmi
- 15 Internationalization of the Curriculum in Israeli Colleges
Amit Marantz-Gal

World-Class Universities

- 17 Excellence Initiatives to Create World-Class Universities
Jamil Salmi
- 18 Funding World-Class Universities
Alex Usher
- 20 Two Central Obstacles to Russian Academic Excellence
Philip G. Altbach

Private Higher Education

- 22 Vietnam: Governance and Policy in Private Higher Education
Dao T. H. Nguyen
- 24 Private Higher Education in Latin America
Dante J. Salto

Countries and Regions

- 25 Revenue Diversification and Reform in Ethiopia
Kibrome Mengistu Feleke
- 27 The Western Balkans: Recent Trends and Challenges
Lucia Brajkovic

Departments

- 29 New Publications
- 30 News of the Center

Brexit and the European Shape of Things to Come

FIONA HUNTER AND HANS DE WIT

Fiona Hunter is associate director, Center for Higher Education Internationalization (CHEI), Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy. E-mail: fionajanehunter@gmail.com. Hans de Wit is director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: dewit@bc.edu.

Brexit has happened and UK universities, along with the world of European higher education, are still reeling from a state of shock and disbelief. Academic communities—both staff and students—were fervent supporters of Remain, with their cities also coming out strongly in favor of staying, many well over 70 percent. A key question raised is whether the British exit from the European Union (EU) will also lead to a brain exit from the United Kingdom. Currently, around 5 percent of students in the United Kingdom are from the EU; and collectively they make up the largest international student group, not only bringing diversity to the universities but also generating around £3.7 billion in income for the UK economy. However, uncertainties around visa requirements and fee levels may lead to a fall in EU applications. Fifteen percent of the UK academic workforce is composed of EU citizens, who now seek reassurance of their positions and prospects. Worrisome reports of incidents of racism on the rise, even in the favorable Remain environments of UK universities, may discourage many from an academic career in the United Kingdom. Given the strong anti-immigrant tone of the Leave supporters, it is likely that academics and students from non-EU countries will become more sceptical about a future in the United Kingdom. This was an ugly campaign, and while the Leave voters did not have higher education in mind when crossing the box on their ballot sheet, the consequences are, and will be, far-reaching for universities, both in the United Kingdom and elsewhere in Europe.

At this moment of flux, all universities can do is seek to minimise disruption by offering reassurance to students and staff, albeit in the short term, around the rights of study and work, but there are many unanswered questions. Concern about research funding runs high, given that UK universities perform disproportionately well in EU programs, and some UK universities are practically reliant on EU research money. The future of access to Erasmus+ is equally uncertain. Perhaps a solution will be found along the Swiss and Norwegian models of participation, paid out of own national resources, but for the moment nothing is certain, also given the state of the UK economy in comparison to

the other two countries.

These concerns link to the bigger issues of academic exchange, collaboration, and sharing; of the free movement of talent; and of participation in international networks. A European Higher Education Area without the United Kingdom changes the game for everyone.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

This outcome would have appeared unthinkable at the beginning of the century, when Europe seemed to be emerging as a stronger and more integrated reality. The European Union had expanded from 15 to the current 28 countries, the euro had been adopted by 19 as a single currency, and the Schengen area had opened borders in 20 EU and six non-EU countries (although the United Kingdom opted out of both.) As the European project made headway, strong internal and external forces started to weaken its foundations. At the global level, the attack on the Twin Towers in New York in 2001 generated instability and fear of terrorism, and a more united Europe was perceived by some as a solution, but by others as problematic. Dutch and French voters rejected the European Constitution in 2005, and the economic crisis that began in 2008 generated new tensions and fears. With Europe in the grips of an economic and political crisis, and a refugee emergency unfolding within its borders on an unprecedented scale, the integration process began to fall apart. The issues are now bigger, the climate more tense. The spirit of cooperation has diminished and lack of confidence in Europe has grown, as its institutions have not been able to present credible solutions to the problems faced. Anti-EU sentiment is spreading among the member states, with Brexit as its most dramatic outcome so far.

BREXIT AND THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA

The emergence of the European Higher Education Area in the first decade of the century told a different story. Building on the successful experience of Erasmus cooperation, the Bologna Process rapidly gained momentum from four countries in 1999 to 48 countries, 5,600 universities, and 31 million students by 2010. It focused initially on putting the European house in order through greater commonality in degree structures, credit systems, and quality assurance, but it quickly acquired an external dimension. Convergence of structures and tools was aimed not only at increasing cooperation within Europe, but also at making the continent a more competitive and attractive destination to the rest of the world. This was the period in which European universities began to feel the winds of change, as globalization and the emergence of the knowledge economy required them to develop a more competitive approach, engage in the glob-

al search for talent, and position themselves beyond their own borders. The Bologna Process offered a framework for shared solutions to shared problems.

While it was hailed as a landmark reform, achieving in only 10 years what many national governments had failed to achieve in several decades, the Bologna Process did not evolve along equal paths in the different countries and institutions, and there was significant variation in the pace of change and degree of success in implementation of the action lines. These trends were magnified by the even faster pace of globalization that was creating previously unknown levels of instability and volatility in the economic and political environments of the different EU member states, even though the universities themselves were firm believers in—and strong benefiterers of—European cooperation.

A key question raised is whether the British exit from the European Union (EU) will also lead to a brain exit from the United Kingdom.

HOW DO WE MOVE FORWARD?

There is a clear message in Brexit that no matter how international or European universities seek or claim to be, they operate in a national context that will define and, at times, constrain their mission, scope, and activities. This political outcome has the potential to impact negatively on internationalization for the universities, but, at the same time, it raises awareness of the importance in going beyond the rhetoric and purposefully reconnecting internationalization to academic values.

Greater intentionality and integration of internationalization into institutional mission and sense of purpose can enable universities to demonstrate the value and impact of an international community of students and scholars, firstly to themselves, and secondly to the government in the upcoming negotiations. British universities are currently issuing statements around the importance of diversity and how vital it is to their success, but they will need to articulate clearly what it means to have international research collaborations and an international classroom and campus, and how that benefits all members of the university.

They will need to find a way to express internationalization in other terms than for the purposes of prestige and income generation, and demonstrate the importance of a genuinely inclusive approach, as expressed in the statements they are currently making. UK universities are fine examples of institutions that thrive on European cooperation, and are more robust and more able to fulfill their mis-

sions as a result of it. The road ahead is an arduous one, but a European Higher Education Area without the United Kingdom would be everybody's loss. ■

European Universities in the Aftermath of the Economic Crisis

JO RITZEN

Jo Ritzen is professor of international economics of science, technology, and higher education, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands. E-mail: j.ritzen@maastrichtuniversity.nl.

After a seven-year period, the economic crisis seemed to be over in 2015: economic growth was picking up again in most European Union (EU) countries. During the crisis, economic growth fell, fewer taxes were collected, banks were rescued with public money, government debt levels rose and (youth) unemployment increased. Governments cut budgets in order to satisfy the “Maastricht criteria” of budget deficits and of the government debt-to-GDP (Gross Domestic Product) ratio. This has impacted universities, both through the reduction of direct per-student expenditures and (much less) through the reduction of student aid (loans and grants). Except in the United Kingdom, EU governments barely allowed universities to compensate for the loss of public funding of direct costs through increased tuition fees, although several countries—such as Denmark, the Netherlands, and Sweden—introduced full cost tuition fees for international students outside of the EU.

The financial and economic crisis hit Europe harder than the United States in terms of bailout costs of banks and decline in GDP. This was felt by universities and students alike. More than half of the 22 European countries and regions for which the European University Association collected data, cut government expenditures for university education (including student aid) during the crisis, with the greatest cuts in Greece and Hungary (more than 40 percent). Universities located in the group of countries that had to seek refuge under the umbrella of the European Emergency Fund (Cyprus, Greece, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain) were hard hit in terms of funding direct costs, student aid, and research.

EUROPE'S COMPETIVENESS REDUCED

In 2000, the EU launched the Lisbon Strategy, aimed at

increasing regional competitiveness through economic innovation by means of higher education and research. The economic crisis slowed down and, for some countries, reversed the process. In many countries, there will still be a need in the near future to further reduce government debt, undercutting the space for government outlays for higher education and research.

The financial and economic crisis hit Europe harder than the United States in terms of bailout costs of banks and decline in GDP. This was felt by universities and students alike.

The EU program for student exchange, Erasmus, has been beneficial to maintain and even increase student mobility during the crisis. However, intra-EU student mobility (4 percent of the total university enrollment) is relatively low compared to student mobility within the United States. The mobility of well-off students from countries with serious funding deficits (mostly in the south) to Western Europe is likely to increase, even though language differences in Europe continue to present a major barrier to mobility.

The EU is now relatively homogeneous in terms of university degree structure, with the levels of bachelor, master, and PhD, thanks to the process initiated with the Bologna agreement in 1999. However, the organizational structures of universities differ substantially across the EU, due to substantial differences in legislation. In some countries, universities are still highly controlled by government and enjoy little autonomy, be it financial, organizational, pedagogical, and where curriculum and even staffing are concerned. During the crisis, university reforms virtually came to a standstill, perhaps because the climate for change was not beneficial in the face of all the other uncertainties.

The competencies of university graduates are related to university funding and organization. The impact of the crisis has reduced the innovative power of EU economies, in so far as they depend on the competencies of graduates. Research productivity continued to increase, but likely as a result of pre-crisis investments. The future will show the extent to which research has been hurt by the crisis, in particular in countries (mostly in the south) with a deep recession during the crisis period. The EU Framework Program has compensated to some extent for research cuts at the national level, and encouraged convergence, while “excellency programs”—like the one in Germany, with substantial extra investments—will give rise to divergence.

Universities in the northwest of Europe and in central and eastern European countries seem to have been more resilient to the crisis, compared to those in the south. A further widening of the competencies gap between the north and south of Europe is to be expected.

There is little or no evidence to support the notion that the crisis has encouraged innovation at European universities, whether in learning content or methods, or in research.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY SAFEGUARDED

Equality of access to higher education in Europe has not suffered, if measured by the availability of financial aid to students, compared to total public expenditures on higher education. During the crisis, European countries mostly abstained from raising the private (direct) costs of higher education, as a way to compensate for cuts in public expenditures. The European tradition of guaranteeing equality of access, with low or no tuition fees and ample student grants, is heavily criticized for benefiting the upper and upper-middle classes (the children of the richer part of the population, who are more likely to go to university.) From this perspective, the alternative of higher private costs and social loans (the system now in place in the United Kingdom) would be fairer. However, this alternative does not seem to fit in the political traditions of continental Europe.

Still, in comparison to the United States, Europe may not have fared too badly during the crisis in terms of preserving equality of access. The United States, with substantially higher tuition fees, may have lost its edge in promoting intergenerational mobility through higher education. It is likely that the crisis made it more difficult for youngsters from low and middle-income groups to participate in higher education, compared to Europe (with similar levels of student aid in relation to GDP). ■

The Global Challenge of Academic Integrity

ELENA DENISOVA-SCHMIDT

Elena Denisova-Schmidt is a lecturer at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, and research fellow at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: elena.denisova-schmidt@unisg.ch.

The *Wall Street Journal* raises the alarm: international students enrolled at US universities typically cheat more frequently than their domestic counterparts. Accord-

ing to the newspaper, US public universities recorded about five cases of alleged cheating for every 100 foreign students, and only one for every 100 domestic students, in the 2014–2015 academic year. *The Times* of London revealed that almost 50,000 university students were caught cheating in the period between 2012 and 2015. Students from overseas—from outside the European Union—are more than four times as likely to cheat, according to the newspaper. In the same academic year, the Department of Immigration in Australia cancelled the visas of more than 9,000 international students over academic misconduct.

Why does this happen, and what does academic misconduct mean? Academic misconduct with the students' involvement includes various types cheating, such as attending classes or sitting for exams on another student's behalf, plagiarism, as well as services, gifts, informal agreements, or payments in exchange for admission, grades, advance copies of exams and tests, preferential treatment, graduation, and sham degrees.

Students from overseas—from outside the European Union—are more than four times as likely to cheat, according to the newspaper.

WHY ARE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS MORE LIKELY TO CHEAT?

Many of these cheating students come from countries with endemic corruption. One study conducted at several public universities in Russia—a country and an educational system with a high level of corruption—shows that the students' acceptance of the use of various cheating techniques increases significantly over the course of their university studies: “using unauthorized materials during exams” increases by 12 percent; “copying off during exams or tests,” by 25 percent; “downloading term papers (or other papers) from the internet”, by 15 percent; “purchasing term papers (or other papers) from special agencies or from other students,” by 12.5 percent; and “giving a professor fraudulent or misleading excuses for poor academic performance,” by 11 percent. The results of the same study suggest that advanced students are significantly more aware of bribes at universities than freshmen—the difference is 52 percent. Russian students often justify their activities by pointing out the necessity to learn a great deal of material by rote and to write a lot of papers for what they consider “unnecessary” classes.

Sdaxue.com, an education website, has been moni-

toring diploma mills in China since 2013. Currently, the platform has over 400 phony colleges on its list. The fake universities often try to attract students with low *gaokao* (national entrance exam) scores or inexperienced young people from small villages and towns. Those schools often choose names that sound almost identical to well-known existing Chinese universities, like, for example, the Beijing Institute of Civil Engineering and Architecture, which presents itself by using pictures from the 80-year-old Beijing University of Civil Engineering and Architecture, or the Beijing Tongji University of Medical Science, a bogus college that offers degrees only for 300 yuan (about US\$45), which was most likely inspired by the Tongji Medical College, a top medical school in China. When these fake Chinese institutions are exposed, they often just change their domain names and continue to provide their “educational” services. The *New York Times* discovered a company named Aexact offering fake online degrees all around the world in 2015. The company, with headquarters located in the Pakistani city of Karachi, used to make tens of millions of dollars in estimated revenue each year.

Differences in academic culture might be an additional reason for why international students cheat. In many countries, students are expected to repeat information from their teachers without questioning and reflecting on it; all other opinions might be considered “wrong.” Hence, some international students might experience challenges in integrating into Western “academic freedom” and need some time to realize how to work. Research papers in other countries and in other languages might be structured differently from papers written in the United States or the United Kingdom. Moreover, academic writing might be not a substantial part of the curriculum of a secondary school education in many countries. Insufficient command of the language of instruction might be a further reason for cheating.

WHAT CAN UNIVERSITIES DO?

One longitudinal observation conducted between 2004 and 2014 among students at Australian universities shows that text-matching software and educational interventions focusing on raising awareness of academic integrity might be successful remedy tools. However, this might cover only some types of cheating, which can be taught and detected, such as simply copying and pasting without attribution. The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), in cooperation with the German Embassy in Beijing, established the *Akademische Prüfstelle* (APS) in 2001. This agency is responsible for validating all certificates earned in China and conducting interviews with interested students in a discipline they used to study in their home country. This double check, together with language tests, is often a requirement

for Chinese students to enroll at German, Austrian, Belgian, and Swiss universities. In addition to various anti-plagiarism policies and procedures integrating the use of anti-plagiarism software programs like Turnitin or Unplag, faculty should present their assignments and expectations more clearly to the students, stipulating their cultural and educational backgrounds. This might be difficult to expect and demand from faculty, however: tenure-track faculty are under pressure to publish, and teaching seems to be less important for promotion; non-tenure-track faculty are under pressure to extend their contracts; and the administration is not likely to lose international students, who contribute an important part of the university's budget. Moreover, not everyone is ready to talk about such misconduct openly, because it might be perceived as racism. These improper dependencies might have dramatic consequences: It may be possible for less qualified people, or people with falsified diplomas, to get positions of responsibility, where their incompetence might lead to dangerous mistakes involving human lives. Universities should acknowledge this problem and allocate all necessary resources to mitigate academic misconduct involving students. ■

Analyzing the Culture of Corruption in Indian Higher Education

WILLIAM G. TIERNEY AND NIDHI S. SABHARWAL

William G. Tierney is university professor, Wilbur-Kieffer professor of higher education, and codirector of the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California, US. He recently completed a Fulbright Fellowship to India. E-mail: wgtiern@usc.edu. Nidhi S. Sabharwal is associate professor in the Center for Policy Research in Higher Education at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration in New Delhi, India. E-mail: nidhis@nuepa.org.

All universities have individuals who commit unacceptable acts. A student cheats on an exam. A professor fakes data in an experiment. A college president enriches himself by fraud. Although singular acts of corruption are unacceptable and must be condemned, they are individual errors of judgment that differ from systemic corruption. Systemic corruption occurs when the entire system is mired in schemes that are unethical and perpetrated at institutional and systemwide levels.

Many worry that India's postsecondary system is a post-

er child for systemic corruption. India garnered worldwide attention when a cheating scandal, involving thousands of individuals who took medical examinations on behalf of students, was exposed. Answers for entrance tests to professional courses continue to be regularly leaked. Images of family members scaling walls to help their children cheat are etched in the nation's memory.

The problems are structural. Over a generation ago, the Indian government faced a dilemma: it wanted to dramatically increase the number of students attending postsecondary institutions, but it lacked adequate funding. Con-

India garnered worldwide attention when a cheating scandal, involving thousands of individuals who took medical examinations on behalf of students, was exposed.

sequently, private, nonprofit colleges became prominent. According to the Ministry of Human Resource Development, India has 35,357 higher-education institutions and 32.3 million students. 22,100 of the institutions are private colleges. Over 60 percent of private and public colleges have less than 500 students, and 20 percent have less than 100 students. Although many say that the system is riddled with corruption, most are troubled by the 22,100 private colleges. The majority of news reports pertain to those with less than 500 students.

No one claims that all private institutions are corrupt; but large-scale surveys also will not yield data about dishonest practices. Who would admit on a survey that they engage in corruption? However, the sorts of activities that we discuss below are commonly acknowledged by those involved in higher education in India. Private institutions are, by law, nonprofit. Yet, the manner in which they are managed has enabled profit through "black money," or bribery. Private colleges enable multiple actors to generate incomes for themselves and others.

DRIVERS OF CORRUPTION

Agents: Students frequently do not approach a college directly, but go through "agents," or middlemen. Colleges also depend on agents so they can admit adequate numbers of students. The agents charge the students a commission for facilitating the admission process and negotiating a discount with the college principal. Agents also charge the col-

lege a commission for supplying bulk admissions.

Students: Students pay for, and expect to earn a degree, but do not expect to attend classes. They often refer to themselves as “nonattending students.” The institutions honor, so to speak, that expectation. The reasons for their non-attendance vary. The college may be located far from students’ hometowns, or students may have work obligations. Students may appear when exams are given or do what is minimally required. Teachers, for example, e-mail lessons to students. Sometimes students come to the college if they are able, according to their own convenience. They take notes, show their work, take work home, and try to understand the lessons. The teachers then give them a final grade that will enable them to take the university examinations. The pass percentage in the college is mostly 100 percent.

Institutional Leaders: Institutional leaders often manipulate the system to maximize their financial gain. One strategy involves keeping teachers and the college principal “on paper” to meet the staffing norms set by the regulating authorities. Thus, teachers may be listed as full-time employees, but are actually not. A teacher gets a full salary on paper, but returns a substantial amount to the college. The institution’s books appear to have a full complement of teachers, and the teachers receive an income for doing virtually nothing.

In addition, teachers and/or college principals may be involved in the university recruitment process, which creates revenue for the college and the recruiters. The “*jaan-pehchaan*” (social network) system allows institutional leaders to access levers of opportunity and sustains their business interests. The principal may act like an agent by supplying students, taking a commission from students, and, in return, negotiating a lower admission fee and proxy-attendance.

Visiting Committees: College management works hard to ensure that their institution complies with a plethora of regulations concerning daily management. When government-specified committees visit to rate, review, or rank the college, management rolls out the red carpet. Site-visit committees are paid an official amount. However, on visits to weak (or entirely nonexistent) institutions, members of the site committee might solicit more than ten times the official amount of the “*shraddha*” (a gratuity based on trust).

Colleges that do not exist are those without any buildings or that have a building, but it is empty. At times, inspection teams are taken to an entirely different building so they do not see an empty space. These colleges are able to function because of an exchange of money. That is, the institutions pay a significant amount of money to the authorities to gain the license to operate. Once they receive their initial permits, they then turn to paying visiting teams in order to provide a positive report.

CONCLUSION

The challenge in India, or for any country facing systemic corruption, is that a cultural ethos pervades individual actions. If a student cheats on an exam and the institution condemns cheating, the process of rectifying aberrant behavior is clear. However, reform is more difficult in a culture where “everyone does it.” If black money is the norm rather than the exception, there is little incentive to change. The casual use of phrases such as “nonattending student” underscores a system that is rigged so that individuals can pay for degrees. When individuals get paid for no work—or receive payment for providing a particular score on a site visit or exam—corruption is endemic.

The first step in systemic reform is recognizing that a problem exists. India has a storied history of excellence in higher education. The world’s first residential university was an Indian institution—Nalanda in the fifth century. India has generated eight Nobel Prize winners and a literary tradition that extends over thousands of years. To overcome the corruption that impairs confidence and quality, India’s epic history should serve as an archetype for a postsecondary system that promotes research and workforce development. At the moment, the ethical base underpinning India’s educational system is being eroded, undermining the very basis of mutual trust and educational standards. ■

How Much Autonomy Do International Branch Campuses Really Have?

MEGAN CLIFFORD AND KEVIN KINSER

Megan Clifford is an independent consultant based in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, US. E-mail: megan.e.clifford@gmail.com. Kevin Kinser is professor and head of the Department of Education Policy Studies at Pennsylvania State University, and codirector of the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT), US. E-mail: kpk9@psu.edu.

IHE regularly publishes contributions from C-BERT. See <http://www.cbert.org>.

In the past two decades, the governments of several developing nations including Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, and China have used public funds to support the establishment and on-going operation of international branch campuses (IBCs). They are not sponsoring IBCs to support a foreign institution’s interest in internationalization, or to

boost its international rankings. These governments justify the use of public funds because of the contributions IBCs make to their human capital and economic development. In particular, IBCs help host nations increase higher educational attainment, meet the demands of local labor markets, and decrease brain drain. It is about what makes sense for the host nation. The goals of the home campus are secondary.

Because these IBCs are expected to serve the objectives of their host nations, there are often specific requirements and regulations that the campuses must meet. Malaysia, for example, has required IBCs to offer specific academic programs and work with local partners, and has restricted their use of profits. While the parent institutions may negotiate these terms, some of the IBC's most fundamental financial, academic, and governance decisions are determined, or heavily influenced, by the host nation. Parent institutions pursuing IBCs therefore rarely have full autonomy in making core decisions that at the home campus would usually be under their full control.

The restrictions on autonomy start with how the opportunity to establish an IBC is constructed. Partnership requirements bring the interests of another entity into the mix. Financial autonomy is constrained and academic autonomy, despite assurances, always needs to reflect the host country's agenda.

Because these IBCs are expected to serve the objectives of their host nations, there are often specific requirements and regulations that the campuses must meet.

OPPORTUNITY IDENTIFICATION

The process by which most institutions identify IBC opportunities establishes a dynamic that limits independent decision-making from the beginning. Countries seeking to host an IBC typically offer resources, such as land, operating expenses, or facilities to institutions willing to meet their objectives and requirements. South Korea, for example, built a full campus with the capacity to serve 20,000 students to host several branch campuses. Parent institutions were expected to accept the terms and conditions of the campus, including its location two hours outside of Seoul. While the parent institution actively negotiates to protect its own interests, and may walk away from a bad deal, what the host country brings to the table in the early stages of the process restricts the IBC's autonomy from the start.

PARTNERSHIPS

Moreover, if the parent institution chooses to pursue a given opportunity to establish an IBC, it rarely does so without local academic, government, or private partners. In countries such as China, local partnerships are even legally required. These partners help parent institutions navigate the complex academic, legal, business, and cultural landscapes of the host countries. But they also ensure the host country's interests in the venture are maintained. Accordingly, the success of the IBC is often contingent upon the ability of their partner to uphold the terms of the agreement and provide continued guidance. Institutional autonomy is therefore further tempered by the IBC's necessary reliance on a local partner.

FINANCIAL AUTONOMY

Restrictions on financial matters also support the notion that IBCs are not fully autonomous. Some host countries set limitations on how much tuition IBCs can charge or how profits can be used or repatriated. These financial matters are key elements of financial autonomy and are important to promoting the quality and sustainability of the institution.

The financial support host governments and partners provide, moreover, also has both explicit and implicit effects on the institution's autonomy. Explicitly, the agreement may outline specific requirements and regulations in exchange for funding. Implicitly, funding can encourage complacency that might impact the IBCs choices. In Qatar, for example, the government provides such generous financial support that IBCs do not have to worry about protecting themselves from potential financial losses. Such situations may create disincentives for IBCs to think independently and proactively identify ways to enhance the quality and sustainability of the IBC.

ACADEMIC AUTONOMY

Perhaps one of the most concerning areas of limited decision-making capacity pertains to the IBCs' academic affairs. This is particularly the case when host countries solicit parent institutions to establish IBCs in specific fields of study. The Qatar Foundation, for instance, invited Georgetown University, Texas A&M University, and Virginia Commonwealth University to offer programs in foreign service, engineering, and the arts, respectively. The Qatar government—not the parent institutions—drove the selection of academic programs.

In other cases, host countries restrict the IBC's ability to offer new academic programs or have an independent admissions process. China treats many of the branches it hosts as a division of an existing university, and allows that institution to determine the programs and students that

enroll. Under such scenarios, IBCs have only limited opportunity for curriculum development and can never become full-fledged universities. This limits their growth and makes them more vulnerable to changes in the academic and labor landscape.

CONCLUSION

The restrictions highlighted in this essay violate several key forms of autonomy that academics have come to expect at a world-class institution. IBCs will continue to have difficulty attracting and retaining high-quality faculty and administrators if they are perceived as being lesser institutions. Because of this, the IBC will struggle to achieve quality at par with its parent institution.

Restrictions on autonomy may pose problems for the host country's goals as well. While host countries are focused on promoting quality and ensuring alignment with their objectives, they may find potential partners declining to open a branch campus because of a lack of sufficient autonomy. This could actually threaten the success of the host country's overall vision.

Most notably, diminished autonomy threatens the sustainability and quality of IBCs. Limiting their flexibility to make operational or academic changes in response to the needs of their students and the local economy may increase their susceptibility to failure.

Given these challenges, IBC leaders should consider an approach that emphasizes a shared set of goals, with flexibility in how to achieve these goals. Otherwise IBCs may become mere providers of education, dependent on their hosts, rather than institutions of higher education capable of setting their own path. ■

Singapore's "Global Schoolhouse" Aspirations

JASON TAN

Jason Tan is associate professor, policy & leadership studies, National Institute of Education, Singapore. E-mail: engthye.tan@nie.edu.sg. This article also appears in Higher Education in Southeast Asia and Beyond.

The "global schoolhouse" vision was outlined by Singapore's ministry of trade and industry in a 2002 report. One of the sections in the report focused on the education industry. The ministry claimed that Singapore was well placed to gain a piece of the estimated US\$2.2 trillion world

education market. An ambitious target of 150,000 international full-fee paying students was set for the year 2015, up from the then estimated figure of 50,000.

Several economic advantages for pursuing this vision were outlined. For instance, the increase in institutional spending and the spending of the foreign students would fuel economic growth and create high-paying jobs. Secondly, the influx of foreign students would contribute human capital to knowledge-based activities such as research and development, patent generation, and enterprise development. Next, an increase in the number of educational institutions as well as a greater diversity of courses would help stem the outflow of domestic students to overseas universities. Lastly, foreign students would boost Singapore's pool of talented individuals and form a network of international alumni around the world.

The report recommended a three-tiered system of universities form the core of the global schoolhouse. At the apex would be so-called "world-class universities." These universities would focus primarily on postgraduate education, and would be "niche centers of excellence" contributing to research and development. The second tier would be the three preexisting, publicly funded universities—the National University of Singapore (NUS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU), and the Singapore Management University—the so-called "bedrock" universities, which would carry out research and development activities, supply the bulk of domestic university-educated manpower to meet national needs, attract regional students through scholarships, and fulfil the concept of education as a public good. Forming the base of the pyramid would be "additional private universities." These universities would focus on teaching and applied research, and cater to the bulk of the additional 100,000 foreign students envisioned in the global schoolhouse.

SOCIAL CONTEXT

The global schoolhouse vision was the latest in a string of policy initiatives that trumpeted the key role played by education in supporting national economic competitiveness. It also represented a move towards the marketization and commodification of education. In 1996, the then prime minister announced the government's intention to turn Singapore into the "Boston of the East," with Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology serving as role models for NUS and NTU to develop into world-class institutions. Next, the state-affiliated Economic Development Board (EDB) announced in 1998 its intention to attract at least 10 so-called world-class universities to Singapore within the next decade. This initiative managed to attract prestigious institutions such as Johns Hopkins University, the University of Chicago, and INSEAD, a French

graduate business school. The global schoolhouse project fitted in well with the longstanding policy of welcoming foreign students.

OBSTACLES

Right from its inception, the global schoolhouse initiative was plagued with various difficulties. First, there were a few rather embarrassing high-profile cases of foreign universities withdrawing their campuses and programs, or being asked to terminate their Singapore operations after a few years.

For instance, the state-funded Agency for Science, Technology and Research announced in July 2006 that it would be closing Johns Hopkins University's biomedical research facility due to the latter's failure to recruit the anticipated number of doctoral students. In addition, despite having received more than US\$50 million in EDB funding since 1998, the research facility had failed to meet eight out of its 13 performance benchmarks. In another debacle, four months after the opening of the University of New South Wales (UNSW)-Asia campus in February 2007, the home campus in Sydney announced that UNSW-Asia would close in June that year because of insufficient student numbers and worries over financial viability.

The report recommended a three-tiered system of universities form the core of the global schoolhouse.

In the last few years, Singapore's global schoolhouse has suffered further setbacks with the announcement of yet another three campus closures. In 2012, the Tisch School of the Arts Asia decided to end its Master's courses in film, animation, media production, and dramatic writing. The School had been suffering financial deficits for all five years of its existence despite having received about US\$17 million in financial subsidies from EDB and additional funds from New York University.

In 2013, the University of Chicago Booth School of Business said it would move its executive education program from Singapore to Hong Kong in order to be nearer the thriving People's Republic of China economy. At the same time, the University of Nevada at Las Vegas announced the closure of its Bachelor's program in hospitality management, citing financial viability as a reason. Yet another controversy involved the Yale-National University of Singapore College. Established in 2011 as a collaborative

venture between the two universities, it was criticized by some Yale faculty and human rights advocates, who doubted whether a liberal arts education dedicated to free inquiry could thrive within an authoritarian state with heavy restrictions on free speech and assembly.

Besides these high-profile controversies, a second difficulty facing the global schoolhouse initiative was quality assurance. The first two decades of this century witnessed several cases of fraud involving private for-profit schools shutting down suddenly and leaving their students without any recourse to financial or academic redress. It took seven years from the initial announcement of the initiative before Parliament passed the Private Education Act to regulate all private educational institutions awarding degrees, diplomas, or certificates.

A third, more recent, challenge has been increasingly acrimonious public debate over the sustainability of a liberal immigration policy. The ruling party has bowed to pressure in the last few years by tightening the reins on immigration. This change in immigration policy direction will have inevitable consequences for Singapore's hopes of becoming an education hub.

Fourteen years after the announcement of the global schoolhouse vision, the attainment of the target of 150,000 international students remains elusive. A press report in 2014 claimed that foreign student numbers fell from 97,000 in 2008 to 84,000 in 2012 and 75,000 in 2014. A Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation survey, published that same year, revealed foreign students' growing concerns over employment prospects and living costs in Singapore. Two years earlier, the trade and industry minister had told Parliament that the global schoolhouse initiative would emphasize quality of education and economic relevance rather than student numbers or GDP share. His statement was an implicit acknowledgement that the original target of 150,000 international full-fee paying students was nowhere in sight. ■



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

How International Branch Campuses Stand Out from the Crowd

RACHAEL MEROLA

Rachael Merola is senior researcher at the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE). This article originally appeared on the OBHE website: www.obhe.ac.uk. E-mail: rachael.merola@obhe.org.

Transnational education (TNE) is an unwieldy beast. Its many forms are difficult to capture in description, and its constant evolution makes arriving at a concrete definition a daring endeavor. International branch campuses (IBCs), in particular, have evolved and diversified greatly in their 150 year history in terms of size, scope, ownership, and support framework. But in all the variety of TNE around the world, what exactly distinguishes an IBC?

WHAT IS (AND IS NOT) AN IBC?

The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE), along with the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at SUNY Albany, describe an international branch campus as “an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; and provides access to an entire academic program, substantially on site, leading to a degree awarded by the foreign education provider.”

There are currently around 250 higher education providers worldwide that fit this description, and many others that fulfill some, but not all the requirements to be considered IBCs. Of these, certain common characteristics emerge, making it possible to identify several common types of foreign higher education outposts that are not IBCs.

For example, campuses that are home to degree programs that are only partly administered on site, with a substantial portion taking place at another campus, are not considered IBCs. This describes a number of campuses that are used as study abroad centers for undergraduate study abroad, or EMBA/MBA programs that have an international study component. Because a substantial portion of the degree is completed elsewhere, these models are not considered IBCs.

In another example, campuses that do not require students to be physically present to undertake their studies are also excluded from the definition of branch campuses. This eliminates the numerous distance learning programs offered at many universities at both undergraduate and graduate levels, in which the foreign outpost of the university is used for recruiting, enrollment, testing, or other non-learning purposes, but engages in little or no face-to-face

teaching.

A third common model of non-IBC TNE occurs when the degree at the foreign campus is awarded by an entity that is not the home university, for example, twinning programs in India, or Yale-NUS, the liberal arts college in Singapore operated in collaboration with the National University of Singapore. These are excluded from the definition of branch campuses since the control of the venture rests with the foreign partner.

CHARACTERISTICS OF IBCS

According to the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education's latest count, more than 60 IBCs have opened in the past five years. Examining these branches reveals several notable characteristics. In particular, many branch campuses begin with a limited portfolio of programs, following a strategy of deliberate expansion and careful response to market demands. At current count, 21 IBCs opened in the last five years currently offer more than five academic degree programs, and only nine offer more than 10 programs. Whether these small branches will grow to the size and scale of their home institutions, or remain niche endeavors, depends on the strategy of the institution as well as the success of the endeavor.

There are currently around 250 higher education providers worldwide that fit this description, and many others that fulfill some, but not all the requirements to be considered IBCs.

Another notable characteristic of branch campuses is that they cover a number of ownership and governance models. In some countries—many of which are hosts to numerous IBCs such as the United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Qatar, and Malaysia—a top-down model, sometimes controlled by the government, is often utilized, in contrast to the autonomous governing models seen in the United States, Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom—major players in education export. These cross-cultural dynamics require sensitivity and awareness to navigate when setting up the governance of an IBC.

Some universities see IBCs as a way to provide education under the model of their home country's education system rather than that of the host country. In particular in countries where academic freedom is limited, IBC plans and operations have stalled and/or encountered opposition from faculty and other stakeholders. Such has been the

case at New York University in Abu Dhabi, Duke University-Kunshan in China, and the University of Nottingham in Malaysia, among others. All three have persisted despite opposition, but have required significant communication from leadership regarding how the campus fits into the university's strategic plan.

While some IBCs are wholly owned by the home campus, the majority receive some sort of support, whether financial, logistical, or infrastructural, from the host country. An arrangement frequent in certain countries—especially those with education hubs—entails partnership with the host government in which the local or national government subsidizes the cost of the local campus for at least some period of time. In turn, the government has the right to rescind its support at any time. The Incheon Global Campus in Korea follows this model, and has so far attracted four foreign institutions to open branches. The NYU Abu Dhabi campus construction and operational costs were entirely covered by the Abu Dhabi government. Likewise, the city of Kunshan provided the land and building for the physical campus of Duke Kunshan University.

Another characteristic of international branch campuses is that they are clearly identifiable as belonging to the home institution by their name. While much TNE exists through franchising and creation of entirely new institutions (i.e. Torrens University Australia, operated by the for-profit American provider Laureate), nearly all branch campuses retain the name of the home institution in their own name. For example, all campuses of the *Ecole supérieure des arts et techniques de la mode* (ESMOD) contain the name “ESMOD,” though the rest of the name is tailored to fit the local context. Likewise, Penang Medical College displays its affiliation with the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland—its parent institution—in its logo.

CONCLUSION

By narrowing the definition of what is, and is not, an international branch campus, a picture of the full landscape of TNE emerges. From this, we see a broad vista of the international branch campuses in existence, which reveals a wide range of international activity, ownership models, name representation, and size and scope of academic offering, all under the umbrella of the IBC definition. An updated look at these campuses will be revealed in the upcoming IBC report, to be released by the Observatory and C-BERT at SUNY Albany in November 2016. ■

Transnational Education in Chinese Secondary Education

FION CHOON BOEY LIM

Fion Choon Boey Lim is educational quality coordinator at Victoria University College, Australia. E-mail: fion.lim@vu.edu.au.

Transnational education (TNE) in China has received much attention in the last decade. However, literature in this area has traditionally focused on the degree level, with increasing attention given to dual degree collaboration. There has been less attention given to the increasing transnational activities at secondary school level in China.

In China, the first three years of secondary school education are compulsory. The second part consists of three years of non-compulsory study (senior secondary). At the end of the three years, students sit for the National College Entrance Examination—the infamous *gaokao*. Parents and students are well known for their anxiety over the outcomes of this examination. However, in recent years, the increasing wealth of many middle-income parents and the liberalization of secondary school policy that permits foreign collaboration, have allowed more transnational activities at this level. A growing trend in Sino-foreign collaboration can be observed, where foreign curricula, usually western, are offered in collaboration with a Chinese public or private school, usually as a guaranteed pathway to a foreign degree. To date, there has been little research, discussion, or debate on this transnational secondary education activity. Given its growth rate, however, changes in the forms of control by the Chinese government can be expected.

GROWTH OF FOREIGN SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Foreign secondary school curricula are not completely new in China. The International Baccalaureate (IB) has been offered in China since 1991. While the 1990s were a boom time when modern China opened up its markets to foreign trade, foreign education, particularly at the secondary school level, has been tightly controlled and considered relatively hard to penetrate. In recent times, however, a new trend in Sino-foreign secondary school collaboration has been observed. A number of Chinese secondary schools have partnered with foreign schools to offer preuniversity programs. The Cambridge International Examination of GCE “O” and “A” levels, the Australian VCE curriculum, and a variety of other foundation programs have since flourished.

Many students who graduate from foreign secondary school programs find themselves with comparatively easy

entry to a foreign degree program, within China or abroad, which is essentially what these foreign programs are designed to prepare them for. Since 2000, the IB has been offered by more than 100 schools in China in collaboration with the IB foundation, and 72 percent of the IB diploma program graduates between 2002 and 2012 have achieved admission to one of the top 500 universities in the world. At least 50 Chinese schools have been listed on the Cambridge International Examination website offering students an alternative pathway to universities in the United Kingdom and other tertiary institutions around the world that recognized GCE results. A large number of Chinese students have also found their way to universities in the state of Victoria in Australia via the Haileybury International School in China. Haileybury is an independent school in Melbourne and one of the early movers in this area. In China, the school was set up as a private international school, offering Year 7 to VCE programs, and it claims many of its graduates have secured admission to top universities in Australia.

A growing trend in Sino-foreign collaboration can be observed, where foreign curricula, usually western, are offered in collaboration with a Chinese public or private school, usually as a guaranteed pathway to a foreign degree.

The growth of transnational activity in the secondary school sector in China can be attributed to a few factors, one of which being that gaining approval from the Chinese ministry of education to offer a foreign high school curriculum appears to be relatively easy, compared to gaining approval to offer a Sino-foreign collaborative degree. There is no quota system involved, and Pricing Bureau involvement in this area is nonexistent. In fact, approval from the provincial or municipal government is usually all it takes to start a foreign secondary school program. Growth is also further facilitated by the increasing trade links established by different governments with China.

MANAGING GROWTH AND QUALITY: PROVIDERS BEWARE

To date, it may be correct to claim that transnational activities in the Chinese secondary school sector have prospered in a commercially driven environment, where demand, pricing, and growth are all driven by competition. However, how far and how fast can the pace of growth go in this Sino-foreign collaboration on secondary school programs in China?

Most of these Sino-foreign collaborations are concentrated in Tier 1 and Tier 2 cities, which is understandable given the comparatively larger number of middle-income families in these cities. However, the affordability of foreign secondary school programs, particularly preuniversity programs, compared to local senior secondary schools is one possible deterrent to the growth. An IB diploma program offered in Shanghai could cost up to RMB 280,000 (US\$43,000) annually. Such fees are still considered high by many parents.

Growth is probably further hindered by the reluctance of parents to allow their children to give up the right to sit for the *gaokao* entrance examination. Many well-to-do parents have chosen to send their children to foreign school programs, which is less stressful, provides a better pathway to overseas universities, and, in many ways, better prepares them for foreign degree study. However, the majority of Chinese parents continue to choose a less risky approach—putting their children through a heavier study load of two curricula—one offered by the foreign provider and one by the Chinese secondary school.

OUTLOOK FOR TNE IN CHINESE SECONDARY EDUCATION

History suggests that where education is concerned, rapid growth without robust oversight of quality is a recipe for disaster. Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and China have tightened their assessment and approval processes for transnational degrees and private education providers at different periods of time, particularly when growth outpaced quality control. The argument that universities have well developed quality assurance mechanisms has not been successful in convincing quality assurance agencies, nor proven effective in preventing delivery of dubious quality programs as reported in these countries. It is thus not unreasonable to predict that the rapid growth of foreign curriculum in secondary school is likely to reach a turning point in the not too distant future, with the introduction of tighter quality assurance systems by the Chinese government. At that point, one would question what the likely impact on transnational education in China will be: will it trigger a further downward shift of transnational activities in the “supply-chain,” with the growth shifting to primary schools and then further to preschools? ■

International Advisory Councils: A New Aspect of Internationalization

PHILIP G. ALTBACH, GEORGIANA MIHUT, AND JAMIL SALMI

Philip G. Altbach is founding director and research professor at the Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Georgiana Mihut is a research assistant at CIHE. E-mail: georgiana.g.mihut@gmail.com. Jamil Salmi is a global tertiary education expert. E-mail: jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org. This article is based on Altbach, P. G., Mihut, G., Salmi, J. (2016): Sage Advice: International Advisory Councils at Tertiary Education Institutions. Available at http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pubs/CIHE%20Perspective/CIHE_Perspectives_No1.pdf.

The latest accoutrement of world-class universities, or those aspiring to world-class status, is an international advisory council (IAC). Heidelberg University, in Germany, has one headed by a former Oxford vice chancellor; the Higher School of Economics committee, in Moscow, is chaired by a Nobel Prize-winning American economist; and several prominent Saudi Arabian universities have committees composed of top-ranking academics and a few business executives. The launch of national excellence initiatives in various parts of the world—China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, Spain, and South Korea, to mention only a few—has often been associated with the creation of such advisory boards at the institutional level. Indeed, some countries have mandated that the universities benefiting from added funds appoint such councils.

We define international advisory councils as advisory bodies formed primarily or exclusively by international members, external to the institutions, serving the upper levels of the administration and governance.

Globalization has created an environment where international expertise and linkages have become *de rigueur* for universities aspiring to world-class status. The idea is that universities must pursue the highest standards of research and, in some cases, teaching, and that international experience and expertise are very helpful to achieve these goals. IACs are seen as a way of obtaining relevant global knowledge about how to best organize and build top research-intensive universities. An IAC shows that the university has a cosmopolitan outlook, that it receives advice from top university leaders and scholars from world-class institutions, and that it can “benchmark” itself with the best international practices. Some feel that they need an IAC because their peer universities have them. Most want to take advantage of the prestige of the IAC members, and hope that those members will be informal ambassadors for their universi-

ties internationally.

IACS: WHAT THEY ARE AND HOW THEY WORK

Research we recently conducted sheds light on international advisory councils. IACs can be seen as a contribution to the internationalization of academic governance, although in no case do councils have actually decision-making roles. Our research found most IACs with a membership between six and fourteen members. In order of frequency, IAC members are current or former high-level administrators (usually presidents, rectors, or vice-chancellors), higher education researchers or scholars in areas relevant to the university appointing them, individuals with a policy background, or industry representatives. The IAC landscape seems to be heavily dominated by men, from Western countries, and in general affiliated to prestigious institutions. Both open and fixed terms are prevalent among IACs. Some IAC members have had some relationship with the university before they are appointed—through social networks, having spoken at the institution, or other contacts.

Members agree to join IACs out of a sense of service and a desire to be helpful. They are sometimes attracted by the specific institution and their relationship to it, the country in which the university is located, or a specific field of specialization that interests them. Relating to their participation, members identified several themes they found valuable: learning opportunities, academic service, the chance to influence policy, and the relationships with other members of the council and colleagues at the university—among others.

Most IACs meet once or twice a year, sometimes with additional virtual meetings. Meetings usually are from one to three days in length—although at least one council meets for a week and asks members to give lectures on campus. Some councils pay members an honorarium, but most seem not to, paying only all travel expenses of council members.

Meetings typically include the senior leadership group of the sponsoring university working with the IAC members. In some cases, additional faculty and sometimes students are invited to participate. Meetings are generally chaired by the university president, sometimes in collaboration with the IAC chair. Topics include reports on the progress of the university and questions about which the university leadership team would like consult the IAC.

WHAT THEY DO

As perceived by both IAC members and university sponsors, the main function of IACs is to provide external advice on the design and implementation of the university's overall strategy. Sometimes, the IAC provides additional services, such as interpreting university initiatives to exter-

nal constituencies or even to university faculty or others on campus. Everyone participating in our research project emphasized the key role of IACs in providing a global perspective and a sense of best practice from respected academic leaders and distinguished scholars. IAC members are much more than consultants—they are senior colleagues who have some inside knowledge of the university, and a commitment to its goals, values, and plans.

There was widespread agreement among the study participants that IACs are effective—if they are well organized, have clearly targeted agenda, and are taken seriously by the academic community—and if the university follows advice from the IAC.

The latest accoutrement of world-class universities, or those aspiring to world-class status, is an international advisory council (IAC).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of our research, we suggest that tertiary education institutions interested in establishing effective international advisory councils consider the following key questions in order to benefit fully from such an initiative:

- Do you value lessons from international experience to inform strategic decisions about the future of your university?

- What is your actual purpose in setting up an IAC? Have you defined the actual goals that you seek to achieve by establishing an IAC and working with its members?

- Does the composition of the proposed IAC reflect a healthy diversity in terms of voices and experience (gender, academic profile and disciplines, geographic distribution, balance between practitioners and researchers, etc.)?

- Do the IAC members have a clear notion of the specific inputs that are expected from them?

- What are the learning and decision-making objectives of each IAC meeting from the viewpoint of your institution? Is the meeting agenda sufficiently focused to achieve these objectives?

- Are you willing/able to objectively share the challenges that your institution faces and listen to constructive guidance with an open mind?

- Do you have a mechanism to ensure systematic follow-up after IAC deliberations and monitor the results of

these actions on a regular basis?

- Do you have clear rules to replace IAC members and bring new ones on board in line with your evolving agenda?

- In what ways are you able to obtain useful contributions from IAC members, beyond their inputs during the regular meetings, when you seek additional advice on key decisions that your university needs to consider?

- Are you able to efficiently organize IAC meetings, providing sufficient advance notice to members, and help with logistics?

Finally, while IACs have so far been mainly limited to universities interested in strengthening their international profile and level of peer recognition, there is no reason why other types of tertiary education institutions could not benefit from IACs in their search for excellence in the areas that correspond to their specific mission and characteristics. Indeed, the institutions on which this article is based are all research-intensive universities—but other kinds of tertiary education institutions can draw the same benefits from the expertise and international perspectives of an IAC. ■

Internationalization of the Curriculum in Israeli Colleges

AMIT MARANTZ-GAL

Amit Marantz-Gal is a lecturer in English for academic purposes, Sapir College, Israel. E-mail: amitm@mail.sapir.ac.il.

The foundations for the higher education system in Israel were laid in the mid-1920s during the period of the British mandate, and until the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, there were only two academic institutions (the Technion and the Hebrew University). The rest of the universities were established by the mid-1970s. An important legislative change in the 1990s enabled the opening of academic colleges (general, technical, and professional), a milestone which marked the transition to a conceptually new academic landscape.

Today, Israel is home to a total of 63 higher education institutions: seven research universities, one Open University and 55 colleges. At the opening of the present academic year, 306,370 students were expected to enroll in all academic institutions for bachelor's, master's, PhD, and diploma training. Out 190,400 bachelor's students (excluding those enrolled at the Open University), 66 percent enrolled

in colleges (data source: Israeli Council for Higher Education). Colleges in Israel nowadays constitute a central role in undergraduate education.

Despite the lack of a national policy governing and directing the internationalization of higher education in Israel, there is great commitment to the principles of the Bologna Process, expressed through the establishment of a National Erasmus Office, a Bologna Training Center, and the fostering of an Israeli group of higher education reform experts (HEREs).

Internationalization is increasingly identified by colleges as a strategic element, which can promote research opportunities and enhance qualitative aspects of curriculum development. Quite a few are taking their first steps to address the issue on a practical level. They are growing increasingly involved in EU-funded internationalization projects focusing on mobility, capacity building, curriculum design, and research. Because they are younger and smaller than universities, colleges may seem to have less capacity to embrace the complexities and challenges of internationalization, but they may just as well have some unique advantage points. The present paper outlines a few potential enablers Israeli colleges may benefit from as they attempt to internationalize, with a particular focus on internationalizing the curriculum.

Despite the lack of a national policy governing and directing the internationalization of higher education in Israel, there is great commitment to the principles of the Bologna Process.

AN INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND DIVERSITY

Responding to change and adapting to the needs of a diverse population of students is central to the nature of Israeli colleges. From their moment of inception, Israeli colleges were identified with the academic objective of teaching and training, while research remained mostly the academic purpose of universities. Nowadays, however, college faculty members are also evaluated by the scope and level of their research, just like university faculty. As a result, many colleges are busy updating and redefining their institutional strategies, attempting to incorporate and encourage research in their institutional culture. This research focus seems to make them more receptive to embrace internationalization.

Compared with the universities, colleges cater to a

more diversified population of students with respect to academic, sociodemographic, and ethnic backgrounds. Colleges are younger, smaller, and often rurally located. They are also more dynamic and open to change, and senior management—academics and administrators alike—is usually quite experienced at “dreaming the impossible.” This entrepreneurial culture is one of the dominant values at many college campuses, cascading successfully to the different layers of campus populations (faculty members, students, and administrators).

Israeli colleges are also committed to the idea of making academia accessible to all populations of Israeli society, with a particular emphasis on the immediate surrounding community. Minority populations such as Arabs and Jews from the periphery, Bedouins, Ethiopian, and Russian immigrants, who were hitherto generally excluded from elite higher education offered by the universities, can enroll in colleges. As a result, these institutions are more experienced in the practice of adapting dynamically to different community needs and addressing diversity issues, in the curriculum and with their administration. Because of the constant political tension around the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the inclusion of Israeli Arabs as equal citizens in Israeli society, special attention is paid to these sensitivities. It would be easy to argue that Israeli colleges are already implementing the principles of internationalization at home.

So what may initially seem like built-in constraints of an institution’s capacity to respond to the emerging need for internationalization, may just as well lead the way to a more creative and entrepreneurial institutional approach, which will eventually serve to expedite, not impede, internationalization.

CURRICULUM CHANGES AND THE POWER OF “NEUTRALITY”

Israeli society is made up of an intricate mosaic of cultures, ethnicities, and religions. The diverse student population in colleges reflects this mosaic, and often academics and administrators find themselves deviating from the standard academic program to address sensitivities, learning difficulties, and tensions both inside and outside the classroom. Several colleges in Israel that participated in an EU-funded TEMPUS project have identified the vast potential internationalization of the curriculum can have in introducing curriculum change, contributing to the modernization of academic programs, and resolving existing tensions.

The term “internationalization” has been perceived by colleges as rather “neutral,” free from local-social sensitivities such as those characterizing tensions between Jewish/Arab, secular/religious, industry/academia, and centre/periphery. They readily admitted that when this term was attached to their activities, these had a greater potential to

be embraced by both faculty and students. Through the process of incorporating an international and intercultural dimension into curriculum content, colleges therefore expect greater collaboration from academic faculty, a crucial component for a successful process.

At one of the colleges, for example, internationalizing the curriculum was identified with the purpose of curriculum modernization, alignment with the ECTS framework, and using English as medium of instruction in order to promote student and staff mobility, with careful attention on maintaining a “neutral” approach. Communicating this internationalization initiative throughout the campus yielded higher response rates from faculty members than expected.

Israeli colleges embarking on the process of internationalization in general, and internationalization of the curriculum in particular, may greatly benefit from paying attention to several factors. First, the existing institutional culture of entrepreneurship can be leveraged to successfully embrace internationalization, as the latter goes hand in hand with the former. Second, it may be worthwhile engaging all institutional knowledge on how to cope with diversity issues on campus. Finally, how internationalization is depicted and understood throughout their campus needs to be well captured. In the European context, internationalization may sometimes be charged with negative associations, such as the fear of losing an institution’s national identity, or the reluctance to adopt a non-native language of instruction. This does not seem to apply in the Israeli context. “Neutrality” may prove to be a powerful driver for internationalization. From practical experience gathered so far with internationalizing the curriculum at the colleges, it seems to be particularly effective in addressing Jewish-Arab tensions. ■

Excellence Initiatives to Create World-Class Universities: Do They Work?

JAMIL SALMI

Jamil Salmi is a global tertiary education expert. E-mail: jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org. This article is adapted from a chapter in Hazelkorn, E. ed. (2016). Global Rankings and the Geopolitics of Higher Education. London: Routledge (2016).

In order to accelerate the transformation process towards building “world-class” universities, a few governments—

in China, Denmark, France, Germany, Japan, Russia, South Korea, and Spain, for example—have launched so-called “excellence initiatives,” consisting of large injections of additional funding to boost the performance of their university sector. While many of these programs are fairly young, having started in the past decade or even more recently, they have begun to impact the participating universities in a significant way. This makes it imperative to assess how effective these excellence initiatives have been and draw lessons from recent and ongoing experiences.

It is indeed unlikely that the scientific production of beneficiary universities would increase significantly within the first few years immediately after the beginning of an excellence initiative.

While the first excellence initiatives, especially in East Asia and the Nordic countries, reflected a long-term national policy to strengthen the contribution of tertiary education to economic development, the most recent wave seems to have been primarily stimulated by the global rankings. This was definitely the case with the 2012 French initiative that has encouraged mergers and alliances to give more visibility to the top universities in the country, or the 2013 Academic Excellence Project in Russia, which explicitly aims to place five universities in the top 100 globally by 2020. As a result, most of the excellence initiatives have sought to promote internationalization as a mechanism for attracting top academic talent, thus strengthening the research capacity of leading universities and reducing inbreeding

CHALLENGE OF EVALUATING EXCELLENCE INITIATIVES

Measuring the effectiveness and impact of excellence initiatives on the beneficiary universities is not an easy task for at least two reasons: time and attribution. First, upgrading a university takes many years, eight to ten at the very minimum. Since many excellence initiatives are fairly recent, attempts at measuring success could be premature in most cases. It is indeed unlikely that the scientific production of beneficiary universities would increase significantly within the first few years immediately after the beginning of an excellence initiative. A thorough analysis would therefore require looking at a reasonably large sample of institutions for comparison purposes, either within a given country or across countries, over many years. The second challenge is related to attribution. Even if a statistical correlation could be identified on the basis of a large sample of institutions,

establishing how the excellence initiatives actually caused the positive changes would require an in-depth evaluation.

In the absence of impact analyses of the recent excellence initiatives, comparing the results of the top universities in the Academic Ranking of World Universities (Shanghai Ranking) over the past decade (2004–2015) offers a few insights. The four countries that have made most progress are China (24 additional universities in the top 500), Australia (five additional universities), Saudi Arabia and Taiwan (four additional universities each). All four countries have had one or more excellence initiatives, which have facilitated sustained investment in support of their top universities.

At the bottom of the list, the main “losers” are Japan and the United States, which place, respectively, 15 and 24 universities fewer among the top 500 in 2014, compared to ten years earlier. In the case of the United States, it is interesting to note the relatively higher proportion of public universities that dropped out of the ranking, which tends to confirm the adverse impact of the significant reduction in public subsidies since the 2007 financial crisis.

At the institutional level, the five universities that have climbed most significantly in the ranking over the past decade—Shanghai Jiao Tao University and Fudan University in China, King Saud University in Saudi Arabia, the University of Aix-Marseille in France, and the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology—have all received funding from their respective national excellence initiative.

WHAT POSITIVE CHANGES CAN BE OBSERVED?

Besides supporting entire universities in their improvement efforts, many excellence initiatives have offered funding to build critical mass by establishing new centers of excellence or strengthening existing ones, oftentimes with a focus on multidisciplinary approaches. A recent OECD review of excellence initiatives found that one of their major benefits has been to provide funding for high-impact/high-risk basic research, as well as for interdisciplinary and cooperative research endeavors.

Excellence initiatives often mark a momentous philosophical shift in the funding policies of the participating countries, notably in Europe. In France, Germany, Russia, and Spain, for instance, where all public universities had traditionally been considered to be equally good in terms of performance, the excellence initiatives have brought a move away from the principle of uniform budget entitlements towards a substantial element of competitive, performance-based funding.

Indeed, the selection process to choose the beneficiary universities and/or centers of excellence is perhaps the most noteworthy element of excellence initiatives. In the majority of cases, the government’s approach has involved a competition among eligible universities with a thorough

peer review process to select the best proposals. The peer review process usually relies on the work of expert evaluation teams including a mix of national and international experts.

As competition for funding among universities gets fiercer, the importance of cooperation should not be overlooked. Evidence shows that researchers are most effective when they participate in collaborative projects, nationally or internationally. The Canadian program of chairs of excellence, for example, has brought about unexpected synergies resulting from multiple collaborations across universities.

One of the other positive outcomes of excellence initiatives is that they have allowed a new generation of university leaders to emerge. The successful transformation and upgrading of universities, which is what excellence initiatives pursue, requires indeed a bold vision and the capacity to change the mindset of the academic community in the search of academic excellence.

RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH EXCELLENCE INITIATIVES

At the same time, excellence initiatives may engender negative behaviors and carry adverse consequences. Policy makers and university leaders must keep in mind the risk of harmful effects on teaching and learning quality because of the research emphasis of most excellence initiatives; reduced equality of opportunities for students from underprivileged groups as universities become more selective; and diminished institutional diversity as all institutions aspire to become world-class universities. Another challenge faced by several excellence initiatives is that, in the absence of an appropriate governance reform to free them from civil service regulations and limitations, beneficiary universities tend to create parallel tracks to provide a positive environment for their star researchers, with state-of-the-art laboratories and US-style doctoral schools operating in isolation from the rest of the university, which may remain untouched by the changes financed through the excellence initiative. ■

Funding World-Class Universities

ALEX USHER

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

Governments always face a choice between access and excellence: should resources be spent narrowly on a

few institutions in order to make them more “world-class,” or should they be spread more widely in order to build capacity and increase access? During hard times, these choices become more acute. In the United States, for instance, the 1970s were a time when persistent federal budget deficits, combined with a period of slow growth, caused governments to slash their higher education budgets. Institutions often had to choose between their access function and their research function, and the latter did not always win.

In many senses, the world since 2008 has been in a similar situation; a combination of slow growth and fiscal deficits are forcing choices between widening access and increasing research-intensity (which is of course the basis of “world-classness”). The question is: what choices are in practice being made in different countries?

For this exercise, I assembled data on real institutional expenditures per student in higher education, in ten countries: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. These ten countries collectively house 91 of the top 100 universities in the Academic Rankings of World Universities (ARWU, also known as the “Shanghai Rankings”) and so can give us a relatively strong picture about what is happening at the world’s very best research institutions. Expenditures are preferred to income as a measure of financial capacity because the latter is inconsistent and prone to sudden swings (especially where endowment returns are concerned), which detracts from the longer-term trend analysis. Insofar as is possible, and in order to reduce the potential impact of different reporting methods and definitions of classes of expenditure, I use the most encompassing definition of expenditures, given the available data.

The availability of institutional data across countries is uneven. Reasonably consistent annual data at the institutional level can be obtained in Australia, Canada, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States; however, institutional-level data is spotty in Germany, Japan, and the Netherlands, and in France no real institutional data is available. For the first six countries, comparisons between the finances of “top” universities (i.e., those in the top 100 of ARWU) and other universities is possible; for the other four, only general comments at the national level can be made.

An examination of this data reveals a number of important findings:

1) Since 2008, total per-student expenditures across the sector as a whole have risen in only three countries: Japan, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, student numbers have risen, but institutional expenditures have increased even more, thanks to the influx of money from the massive new tuition fees introduced in 2012. This

is equally true at top universities and across the sector as a whole; in both cases, per-student increases are about 8 percent in real terms since 2008. In Japan, universities have received a very slight increase in funding (just over 3 percent) but student enrollments have been flat. In Sweden, there have been small but steady increases in institutional income/expenditures, but the real news is that enrollments have been decreasing rapidly as part of what appears to be a policy of trying to maintain quality; as a result, sectorwide, per-student expenditures have risen roughly 15 percent since 2008. The surprise here perhaps is that per-student expenditures in Germany is no different than in 2008 despite the federal-länder “higher education pact.” Partly, that is because of the choice of base year (if 2007 were chosen instead, we would see a significant rise), but also because one of the intended outcomes of the pact—greater access to university studies—has in fact come true, thus diluting the new money.

2) Only in Canada, Switzerland, and the United States are “top” universities doing better than the rest of the pack. In the United States, ARWU-100 universities have seen per-student income climb 10 percent since 2008, while the rest of the system has stood still or declined a bit. This has mainly been due to their ability to charge increased tuition and expand their research funding, especially at the major private universities. In Switzerland, expenditures are up across all institutions, but student growth has been slower at “top” universities than elsewhere, so per-student expenditures growth has been higher among the elite schools (10 percent since 2008) than the rest of the sector, where it has fallen slightly. In Canada, per-student funding at top universities has stayed constant, but this is better than at other institutions, where per-student funding has fallen somewhat.

3) Overall, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States are the only countries where “top” universities are continuing to increase their per-student revenues in the wake of the economic crisis. These three countries already monopolize the top twenty positions in the ARWU rankings; in theory at least, this should solidify their standing at the top.

4) In Australia and Sweden, “top” universities are doing worse than the rest of the system. In Sweden, the sector as a whole has seen per-student incomes increase by 15 percent, but because the top universities have been attracting more students, they have had no increase at all in per-student income. In Australia, the entire sector is seeing a fall in per-student income, but it is worse in the “top” universities (15 percent) than in the sector as a whole (10 percent).

What does this mean for the future of world-class universities? Strikingly, while money is an important ingredient, the success of universities does not rest solely upon it. Certainly, money does not seem to have much of a material short-run effect on ARWU rankings: if it did, Australia's universities would be doing much worse than they are. Clearly, institutional strategy, hiring practices, and the quality of university management matter as well.

But it is equally plain that money makes a lot of other challenges in higher education much easier. If present trends continue, it seems likely that private American universities will keep their positions at the top of international rankings tables and perhaps even widen their lead. Top American public flagships, along with British and Swiss universities, will find it easier to cope than most.

Elsewhere, the problem seems to be in part that new money often only follows new students. That is, universities who want more money to pursue a more research-intensive path must first admit more students, mainly undergraduate ones. Governments may think they are offering universities a good bargain this way, but frankly this is not always helpful. Much of the new money simply gets spent educating the students themselves and there is very little

Governments who wish their universities to pursue world-class status quite simply need to find ways to decouple revenue growth from enrollment growth. That could mean relinquishing control over tuition fees, or increasing the size of excellence programs, or some other measure.

“extra” to devote to excellence. Governments who wish their universities to pursue world-class status quite simply need to find ways to decouple revenue growth from enrollment growth. That could mean relinquishing control over tuition fees, or increasing the size of excellence programs, or some other measure.

The alternative to raising more money in order to pursue world-class university status is to make universities more efficient and find more “margins” within the institutions that can be reinvested in research. It seems clear that Australian ARWU-universities have been doing exactly this for some years now, and governments around the world may want to look at the ways in which institutions there have found success. Given the overall fiscal difficulty

many governments are currently experiencing, this may be a more productive way for institutions to continue pushing for world-class status than waiting for further infusions of public money.

As Ernest Rutherford is reputed to have once said: “Gentlemen, we have run out of money. It is time to start thinking.” ■

Two Central Obstacles to Russian Academic Excellence

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

For the past several years, the Russian government has been investing significant funds to upgrade 15 of the best universities to compete with the world's best research universities and join the top ranks of the global rankings as part of the Russian Academic Excellence Project, known as the 5-100 Project. At a recent meeting in Moscow, the top seven of these universities were each awarded 0.9 billion rubles (about US\$15 million) for 2016, and the others somewhat less. Most of the universities have made significant progress since the inception of this Excellence Initiative in 2013—reforming governance, streamlining administration, stimulating interdisciplinary studies, and especially improving research output.

Although Russia has a distinguished academic tradition, many talented academics, and government backing to join the top ranks of global research universities, there are two fundamental structural barriers to success—created by the traditional separation of “academic science” and “medical research” from the universities and placing them in specialized academies. There are many other challenges as well—but these two structural realities are deeply embedded in the Russian academic structure, and without changing them it will be impossible for Russian universities to be fully internationally competitive.

KEY STRUCTURAL CHALLENGES

The first and most fundamental impediment is the “academy of science” system that traditionally has located research in a large number of separate institutes belonging to the Russian Academy of Sciences. Universities have traditionally been tasked with teaching and have had only mod-

est research budgets: public appropriations to universities for research differ from what is allocated to the academies by a factor of three. The other basic structural impediment is the separation of responsibility for medical education and research from the universities. The ministry of health of the Russian Federation (not the ministry of education and science, which oversees the majority of universities) controls both the health care system, specialized universities that train medical personnel, and most medical-related research.

Change, however, may be on the way. Dmitri Livanov, the minister for education and science, has drafted a new federal law that will replace existing regulations, emphasizing the role of university-based science and R&D—in relation to the role of the Russian Academic Sciences—and reducing the bureaucracy governing science policy and implementation, currently a very serious problem for the higher education sector. Minister Livanov has, with some success, attempted reforms that would limit the power of the Academy of Science. No doubt this new initiative will meet with opposition from entrenched interests.

THE ACADEMY SYSTEM

Although the Russian Academy of Science was founded by Peter the Great in 1724, it was shaped into its current form after the Russian Revolution. Today, the so-called system of academy institutes, which after the reform of 2013 is now supervised by the Federal Agency of Scientific Organizations of the Russian Federation, has around 700 institutes and research centers and 51,000 scientific workers. During Soviet times, these institutes focused on specific areas of knowledge, and there was little opportunity for interdisciplinary research. The most talented researchers were hired by the academies, where they enjoyed higher salaries and few responsibilities beyond research. They generally were not required to write applications for competitive research grants like their colleagues in other countries or their counterparts in Russian universities, since funds were allocated to them automatically by the government. The institutes had few teaching responsibilities and few links to the universities, although many sponsored research-only doctoral degree programs. This basic structure continues to the present.

In the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union, the academies, as well as the universities, were starved of funds, and standards of research in some fields declined significantly—the social sciences and humanities, which were never very strong and were dominated by Soviet ideology, suffered most, while standards were better in the hard sciences. Many scientists and scholars (up to 70,000 during the decade of the 1990s, according to some estimates) left the country. Others went into other areas such as education

or business. Infrastructure fell into disrepair, or in some cases was rented out to businesses. Buttressed by their high prestige and legal independence, there was little incentive for the academy institutes to change, and many commentators have pointed to serious declines in productivity. In some cases, academicians have joint appointments in universities—but often such positions do not imply much collaboration. For the most part, the separation of the two key parts of the Russian “knowledge system” remains.

Currently, the universities are much more effective in securing additional funding on a competitive basis than the Academy of Science institutes. For example, while most academy funding comes directly from the government, only 37 percent of university research expenditures come from government sources—the rest coming from industry, foundations, and others.

The first and most fundamental impediment is the “academy of science” system that traditionally has located research in a large number of separate institutes belonging to the Russian Academy of Sciences.

MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Medical education and research in Russia is traditionally a responsibility of the Ministry of Health, and there are 46 medical schools that are free standing specialized institutions with few, if any, links to either universities or to the Russian Academy of Science—the Russian Academy of Medical Science was a separate entity before the reform of the academies in 2013. Historically, medical universities retained the same separation of teaching and research, with the medical academy serving as the main provider of research in the health sciences. In other words, medical universities are primarily teaching institutions, although a few of the top schools have a significant research profile.

At the same time, some universities and academies have developed expertise in research that relates to health sciences, in such growing fields as biomedicine, physics, and other areas—indeed, this is a growing trend. There seems to be little coordination or cooperation between the medical universities and the rest of the higher education or research systems in Russia. Science and higher education, dating back to Soviet times, have been organized in silos, with small and highly specialized institutions attached to specific ministries. The medical field is a prime example of such a legacy.

The current arrangement hampers interdisciplinary medical research in fields such as biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, and others that would benefit from the work going on in relevant faculties in the universities and academies. This slows the innovation process in Russia. Many of Russia's 46 medical universities and schools could be merged, or at least cooperate with universities, in ways that could encourage cutting-edge research and interdisciplinary work. Indeed, research, especially focusing on new developments in biotechnology and related fields, is needed in much of medical education.

CONCLUSION

The damage to Russia's scientific system continues to be significant. Current arrangements deprive the universities of funds for research, inhibit interdisciplinary work, and separate the two key dimensions of advanced knowledge creation and transmission—teaching and research. An additional concern is that the aging academy has cut itself off from the younger generation of scientists by their distance from universities. Of special importance is interdisciplinarity. The future of scientific R&D in many fields depends on an interdisciplinary approach. The academies, for structural and human reasons, tend to remain in their specialized areas, while at least some of the top universities allow for more flexible boundaries between areas of study.

However, merely merging existing institutions with quite different traditions and organizational patterns will not work well. New and creative thinking concerning how to link different kinds of institutions and varying approaches to science and research are needed. Russia's ambition to join the top of the global rankings on higher education will not be fulfilled without solving these key organizational and related challenges. ■

Private Higher Education in Vietnam: Issues of Governance and Policy

DAO T. H. NGUYEN

Dao T. H. Nguyen is researcher and operations manager of Institute for Research for Educational Development (IRED), Vietnam. E-mail: nth.dao@IRED.edu.vn.

Contemporary private higher education (PHE) in Vietnam has experienced almost three decades of development featured by an impressively rapid expansion in the

number of institutions, from only one in 1988 to 22 in 2000; 77 in 2010; and 83 in 2013. The most striking increase of over 50 percent was seen in the period between 2005 and 2009 as a response to economic demand for highly educated workforce. Currently, the number of private institutions accounts for 20 percent of higher education institutions and their enrollment is around 15 percent of the total number of students. Their role is getting bigger in sharing with the public sector the provision of higher education in Vietnam, thus decreasing the state budget for higher education.

Private universities in Vietnam are generally demand absorbing. They are inferior to their public counterparts in campus size, numbers of students and faculty, and quality. They are challenged by social and institutional problems. The issues of governance and policy currently seem more pressing and put them on the edge of existence. In order to find reliable and viable solutions to deal with these problems, a qualitative multisite case study was conducted in 2015 to get insights into governance and policy issues faced by PHE in Vietnam. It was instrumented by document analysis and in-depth interviews with board members and administrators from seven private universities of various location, history, size, reputation, and programs. This sampling was typically stratified and purposive.

INTERNAL GOVERNANCE TENSION

As in private universities around the world, the top-tier organizational structure of private universities in Vietnam consists of two key constituents—the board and the president. But the authority and perspective of each constituent are different from country to country. In Vietnam, the board is legally called “Board of Directors” (BOD) (Hoi dong quan tri), sounding and functioning exactly like BODs in business. Members play roles as investors, owners, and influential shareholders of universities. They are legitimated to have a number of votes and dividends according to their financial investment. The president, appointed by the board, functions as the top manager or top administrator of the university. He or she is widely thought to represent academics, with little or no money to contribute to the university. In some cases, he or she is also a board member with votes in proportion to his or her financial contribution.

Interviews with selected board members and administrators reveal tension between the board and the president in the management of the institutions. Most board members prefer their universities to be driven by profit, to attract more investment and increase their investment returns, while the president and a few board members advocate the public good or not-for-profit purposes of their institutions.

An analysis of legal documents—Decision No. 58 of 2010, Decision No. 61 of 2009 and No. 63 of 2011 on uni-

versity regulation—reveals that current requirements of government have resulted in this tension. They favor those who support the for-profit nature of private institutions. They therefore turn all private universities in the country uniformly into for-profit institutions.

Recently, in order to solve this problem, a new decision (No. 70 of 2014) has been promulgated to replace earlier official documents. It clarifies the distinction between not-for-profit and for-profit institutions in terms of organizational structure and income use. Nevertheless, many issues still need careful consideration, particularly concerning the core nature of BODs and financial mechanism and management. The new document continues to affirm that financial contributors have the right to get financial benefits and authority like shareholders in corporations, although dividends are capped at the rate of the current government bond rates (as stipulated in Article 32 of Decision No.70 of 2014).

Currently, the number of private institutions accounts for 20 percent of higher education institutions and their enrollment is around 15 percent of the total number of students.

EXTERNAL GOVERNANCE TENSION

The first tension mentioned by interviewees is about the struggle of institutions with cumbersome, complicated, and time-consuming paperwork procedure to obtain licenses for their official establishment and operation. They also had to deal hard with unaffordable and impractical requirements for land, chartered capital, and facilities for their establishment and operation during the first 10 years.

Secondly, all the interviewees complain that the government has applied many regulations on academics, which are arbitrary and obstructive to the development of their institutions. The universities and faculty have limited autonomy and academic freedom. Some salient examples are the uniform national entrance exam applied to all universities; the rigid “floor marks” (minimum entrance exam points) applicable for student enrollments at all universities; required submission of planned programs and planned student enrollment for approval to the ministry of education and training before every academic year; and national curriculum frameworks with one sixth of the total credits forced to include communist ideologies and national defence education.

Thirdly, external governance toward institutions has fluctuated considerably—sometimes loosely and sometimes strictly, depending on office term of senior officials. One of the interviewed administrators shares that her institution’s activities (such as academic program offering and financial management) was rarely inspected by the local government of the previous term, but that lately it has been frequently controlled by the current local government.

LIMITED AND UNEQUAL POLICY

As Education Law of 2005, Higher Education Law of 2012, and sub-law documents state, it is automatically understood that private universities in Vietnam are not financially supported by the government. In 2008, however, the government implemented a policy to encourage socialization (i.e., social participation) in education, vocational training, healthcare, culture, sports, and environment. Under this policy, preferential site clearance, land right for long-term use, incentive revenue tax rates and some soft loans have been encouraged to be provided to private institutions. In practice, these privileges are not equally offered to all institutions because of different commitment and capacities of local governments. In the meantime, all public institutions are given abundant resources from state funding to build campus(es), purchase facilities, and for annual appreciation, research grants, and scholarships for faculty for professional development.

Regarding support for student access and success, only one preferential loan program is provided by the government through the system of social policy banks. Nevertheless, the loans have not helped students much because of their modest amount per student and because in many cases they have been scattered and misused.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Governance tensions and limited unequal government policy are major issues challenging the survival and development of PHE in Vietnam. They should be urgently addressed by changing current legislation and policy. To combat the internal governance tension, the concepts and criteria to distinguish between not-for-profit and for-profit institutions should be clearly informed, not only in the nature and authority of each constituent in the top-tier organizational structure, but also in financial mechanism and management. To ease external governance tension, the government should be less dominant and centralized and more supportive to private universities. For policy, fair competition should be considered in providing loans, student scholarships, research grants for faculty, and appropriations based on the merit and need of institutions. Income tax exemption or reduction should also be applied to stimulate more financial contributions to not-for-profit institutions. It

is expected that if this tax policy is launched and successful, a tradition and culture will soon be established in Vietnamese society, in which donors of not-for-profit private universities will no longer request to get financial returns on their donations. ■

The Crucial Presence of Private Higher Education in Latin America

DANTE J. SALTO

Dante J. Salto is a postdoctoral fellow at the Universidad Nacional de Cordoba (Argentina) and affiliate at the Program for Research on Private Higher Education (PROPHE), University at Albany. E-mail: dantesalto@gmail.com. (IHE regularly publishes articles from PROPHE, see <http://www.albany.edu/~prophe>.)

On March 4–7, 2016, leading Latin American higher education scholars and practitioners held a “summit” meeting to reflect on key developments and trends in their field. Private higher education (PHE) was not the sole focus of the conference, but became the topic of many meaningful discussions. This article reports on PHE and closely related issues, such as privatization and the comparison between the public and private sectors, highlighted at the summit.

A central reality, repeatedly emphasized during the conference, is that any serious and comprehensive discussion on important developments in Latin American higher education and related policy must perforce deal with PHE. This reality is not surprising, given the fact that over 40 percent of Latin American higher education enrollment is in the private sector (PROPHE data). The crucial role of PHE was shown in a variety of issues, including quality, access, expansion, equity, regulatory policy (including accreditation), new public management, academic and reputational rankings, corruption, and more.

INTEGRAL TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Many of the historical developments and trends addressed during the summit related to the expansion of the region’s higher education systems, and the resulting diversification of both public and private sectors. One keynote speaker, World Bank’s Lead Tertiary Education Specialist and Coordinator Francisco Marmolejo, pointed to challenges facing the region’s higher education based on an expanding

“demographic window,” in which working-age adults increasingly access higher education. Demand for higher education nowadays comes not just from youth reaching conventional higher education age, but also from nontraditional students—a population not given much consideration until now by public and private institutions. This nontraditional population is increasingly targeted by alternative private institutions—not necessarily university-level, or degree-granting—as well as by some recently created public institutions. Thus, the private sector plays, and will continue to play, a critical and evolving role in absorbing demand not satisfied through traditional institutions.

Diversification of higher education presents challenges to regulatory policies such as quality assurance. A recent but widespread occurrence in Latin American countries, formal quality assurance systems have usually relied on a single, “optimal” institutional model aligned on a country’s most prestigious public universities. Accommodating to the variety of new institutional missions is an ongoing challenge for quality assurance systems, a challenge exacerbated by the rise of new private forms of education.

Presentations further highlighted that diversification and privatization relate to more than just the growth of PHE. Market-friendly reforms have pushed the region’s public institutions toward increased internal privatization. Following a global trend, public institutions employ a variety of strategies to privatize. Revenue generation plays a major role and is often controversial. Public universities progressively seek external funding and establish public-private partnerships, gradually abandoning their longstanding reliance on the state as sole source of finance and responsibility. Similarly, panelists illustrated how public university adaptation of private sector governance practices, translated as public management reforms, has led to new blurriness in the public–private divide. Some speakers wondered to what extent these trends may signal that public universities are becoming entrepreneurial, as they seek to adapt to a changing environment.

TRADITIONAL VS. NEW AND EVOLVING FORMS OF PRIVATIZATION

Latin American PHE issues vary from longstanding to emerging ones, in most cases driven by contextual factors such as demographic changes or political and economic trends. Scholarship exploring historical developments and current trends emphasizes how the private sector has changed over time. Some research focuses on how public policies have overlooked, or even inhibited, the expansion of the private sector, whereas other work depicts public policy as promoting PHE. Remarkably, with borders between sectors becoming increasingly blurred, private institutions

are more boldly proclaiming their fulfillment of public purposes, such as meeting government access targets.

Of course, enrollment growth to meet access targets—a dominant topic in Latin American policy discussion for more than half a century—has for much of that same time period drawn attention to PHE, as considerable expansion has been achieved through private provision. But the summit focused on the present moment, exploring how this growth increasingly occurs in new and evolving forms of PHE. Several countries in the region now allow legally for-profit institutions. This break with tradition and traditional norms has naturally provoked controversy. The most noteworthy for-profit occurrence takes place in the region's largest higher education system (by absolute enrollment), Brazil. Brazil has not only allowed for-profits, but also financially incentivized them to provide access for needy students. Other countries participating in the for-profit trend are Peru, Bolivia, and Chile (only nonuniversity).

A central reality, repeatedly emphasized during the conference, is that any serious and comprehensive discussion on important developments in Latin American higher education and related policy must perforce deal with PHE.

Though not as dramatic as for-profit growth, various aspects of “Americanized” managerialism help reshape Latin American higher education. It has long been noted that such managerialism has thrived in the region's PHE. For example, private universities tend to hire managerial professionals rather than just asking academics to serve as managers. But, conference participants also provided examples of increased managerialism in public institutions, notably in some of the newer ones. Similarly, now even public universities are involving more external actors in their governance structures. This is portrayed as a shift toward increased accountability to various external stakeholders and perhaps the general citizenry. Such documented tendencies in the public sector further blur traditional divides between private and public higher education.

ONGOING RESEARCH ON PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

Finally, the summit took note of major efforts to study Latin America's evolving PHE and related private–public matters. Regional agencies, consortia, and research centers all play

identifiable roles. Coordinated by summit-participant José Joaquín Brunner, the Centro Interuniversitario de Desarrollo (CINDA) publishes reports on current issues in Latin American higher education incorporating sections on the role of the private sector. The Inter-American Development Bank is reediting a policy report on PHE in Latin America. The Center for International Higher Education at Boston College is involved in a project on the internationalization of Catholic universities. PROPHE continues its research on Latin American PHE in a global context.

Whatever the future knowledge generated by ongoing research efforts, the summit's scholars and policymakers grappled with knowledge already at hand. All in all, as they addressed many of the salient issues in Latin American higher education, they repeatedly noted how PHE and related privatization realities, some longstanding, some new, illustrate beyond doubt how important and integral private higher education is to those overall developments. ■

Revenue Diversification and Reform in Ethiopian Higher Education

KIBROME MENGISTU FELEKE

Kibrome Mengistu Feleke is a lecturer and researcher at the Department of Psychology, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia. He holds a Master degree in Administrative Science in Higher Education. E-mail: kbmen1973@yahoo.com.

Some twenty years ago, the Ethiopian higher education system was generally characterized as very limited in access, inequitable, poor in quality, weak in research output, and underfunded. In order to ensure access, equity, quality, relevance, and efficiency, the Ethiopian government has since 1994 introduced major reforms and policy changes to the higher education sector.

Following the reforms, the system has expanded massively within the past two decades, from only two to 36 public universities today. Private higher education has also flourished since 1997, with 98 institutions accommodating around 15 percent of the total enrollment. This rapid expansion has increased undergraduate enrollment from about 35,000 students in 1996 to 593,571 in 2014. Hence, higher education enrollment has grown from 0.8 percent in 1996 to 9.4 percent in 2014.

In general, heavy government investment on higher

education over the last two decades has resulted in massive expansion that opened up more universities, increased access, expanded program diversity, and achieved an increase of over 500 percent in total enrollment. These achievements have, therefore, been extraordinary. However, such a hugely expanded system requires continued and dependable public revenue.

FINANCING CHALLENGES

In Ethiopia, the government provides virtually all of the financing required to run the higher education system. The higher education system can sustain the current expansion only if its funding level is adequate and stable. Since 2000, therefore, government investment on education has risen as a share of the overall budget. Likewise, the higher education budget has increased in response to recent expansion, from 15 percent to about 30 percent of the total education budget.

Although the total budget devoted to higher education in Ethiopia has significantly increased over the years, the state budget has been insufficient to cover the huge expansion undertaken. As a result, universities are struggling to provide the necessary amount of resources for the continuously expanding system. The financial pressures become even more serious when we take account of the 70:30 policy shift from lower-cost studies in social science to higher-cost studies in science and technology, which demand far greater resources. (According to the 70:30 policy, 70 percent of the total undergraduate students enrolled in public universities shall go into natural science fields and the remaining 30 percent to the social science streams.) Despite this financial context, the system is still expanding, with 11 new universities to be established until 2020 to provide greater access.

In times of such financial challenges, therefore, it seems imperative for universities in Ethiopia to seek ways to expand nongovernmental revenue sources, in order to satisfy their enormous needs. Likewise, they need to raise funds from diverse sources in order to boost their financial capacity.

PRESSURES FOR REVENUE DIVERSIFICATION

The financial viability of the higher education system as a whole to accommodate enrollment pressures and maintain access, largely depends on the ability of higher education to diversify its revenue base. Revenue diversification helps sustain rapid expansion in a system where public funding is limited. The active engagement of universities in generating additional revenues helps reduce their dependence on government alone and their vulnerability to public budget fluctuations.

With the current massive expansion in Ethiopia and the limited government capacity to adequately fund this expanding system, public universities need therefore to increase and diversify their income base by generating revenues from non-governmental sources. Revenue diversification allows universities in Ethiopia to generate additional incomes, and subsequently improve educational infrastructure.

Accordingly, the higher education proclamation in Ethiopia provides public universities with the freedom to generate revenues from non-government sources in order to supplement public budget. The proclamation governs the overall policy and reform issues with regard to higher education. The policy is conducive to facilitating the development of alternative funding sources. As a result, universities are free to admit fee-paying students, offer paid educational services, accept endowments, establish commercial enterprises, and engage in other lawful activities to raise income.

In order to ensure access, equity, quality, relevance, and efficiency, the Ethiopian government has since 1994 introduced major reforms and policy changes to the higher education sector.

INSTITUTIONAL TRENDS

With the favorable policy that encourages institutions to generate new revenues, universities in Ethiopia have established various mechanisms to raise funds from nongovernmental sources. At present, almost all generate substantial income by admitting fee-paying students in different programs. Consequently, tuition revenues have now become among the major sources of income for most universities. Moreover, an increasing number of universities have been raising incomes from contracted research, training, and consultancy. There have also been substantial amounts of funds coming through donations, grants, and bilateral agreements.

The policy also allows income-generating enterprises to operate like any other business organization. Accordingly, some universities have established business-oriented enterprises to benefit from additional incomes.

Overall, a number of universities have developed educational, research, and industrial collaborations to solicit

grants and donations. As a result, revenues generated from fee-based educational services, grants, research collaborations, various commercial activities, and other sources have significantly increased in many public universities in the country.

INSTITUTIONAL DISPARITIES AND INCOME INEQUALITIES

Universities generally differ in age, geographic location, staff profile, alumni, and program diversity. As a result of such disparities, considerable inequalities exist in the capacity of institutions to generate revenues. The old, well-established universities are better able to raise funds and win grants from industries and donors, while the new ones rarely receive such funds. Besides, universities established in less developed regions have fewer opportunities to generate funds, compared to those located in highly developed regions and urban areas.

THREAT TO QUALITY

Universities that offer courses in highly demanded fields are better able to enroll more fee-paying students. In order to attract more students, therefore, many universities now offer training in market-oriented programs, even when they do not have the essential resources to support such training programs. Some universities might also tend to compromise admission criteria in order to enroll large numbers of fee-paying students as a means of increasing tuition revenue. This could lead to enroll below-standard students, which in turn compromises the quality of education.

THE WAY FORWARD

Generally speaking, public universities in Ethiopia have a significant potential to supply various services to industry and private business, thereby generating revenues. Experience at many universities illustrates their commitment towards increasing nongovernmental revenue sources essential to support their institutional operations.

Despite this promising landscape, the strategies used to generate revenues in many universities appear to be largely focused on a few, traditional streams. As a result, institutions have not adequately diversified their income base. Besides, at most institutions revenue generation activities have not been systematically and strategically supported. To conclude, the benefits of such revenues have not been capitalized to significantly contribute to institutional excellence.

In order to successfully institutionalize their strategies and diversify their income base, universities should develop appropriate administrative structures. In addition, revenues generated from various streams should be primarily used to support core university missions. To do so, universities should be given sufficient autonomy to keep additional

revenues generated: there has been external interference on individual universities. Universities should also stimulate staff to engage in income-producing activities, through various incentive mechanisms.

Overall, the increasing share of nongovernmental revenue helps to supplement public budget. Hence, revenue diversification should be seen as an essential source of supplementary income and complementary activity. While pursuing new income streams, however, universities must maintain their core values. ■

Higher Education in Western Balkans: Recent Trends and Challenges

LUCIA BRAJKOVIC

Lucia Brajkovic is senior research associate at the American Council on Education. E-mail: lbrajkovic@acenet.edu.

The recent reforms and developments in European higher education have been extensively discussed, researched, and written about. However, the Western Balkans (WB), a region of Southeast Europe encompassing seven countries (Albania; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Croatia; Former Yugoslav Republic (FYR) of Macedonia; Kosovo; Montenegro; and Serbia) with a combined population of 22.7 million, has remained underresearched. The lack of prior studies is mostly due to the absence of systematic data collection on national and institutional levels. This article describes and analyzes some of the most salient challenges and issues facing the academic sector in this region.

ENROLLMENT, COMPLETION RATES, AND STRUCTURAL ISSUES

In the Western Balkans, the vast majority of students in higher education are enrolled in public institutions. Even though tertiary enrollment rates in the region are relatively high—on average close to 50 percent of the traditional, college-going age-class—the degree completion rates are rather low. Available estimations reflect, on average, graduation rates below 40 percent for students within 10 years of their enrollment for Croatia, FYR Macedonia, and Albania. These educational outcomes, coupled with structural issues and high unemployment rates, present major challenges for WB countries.

Most of the countries in the region faced a difficult transition period after the war following the dismantling of socialist Yugoslavia in the early 1990s. Political and structural weaknesses (namely inefficient bureaucratic structures, weak governmental accountability, and corruption) have continuously affected the countries' academic sectors, especially because they are overseen by their respective governments. The higher education systems in the region have also been influenced by successive, and often contradictory, policies resulting from changes of the political parties in power (i.e., conservative governments often resorted to changing previous liberal legislations, and vice versa). This sociopolitical context and related practices have led to stagnation with regard to the development of long-term national strategic goals in these countries.

In the Western Balkans, the vast majority of students in higher education are enrolled in public institutions.

Universities are still financed almost exclusively by the national governments, and governments are very closely involved in the decision-making process regarding the allocation of funds to higher education institutions; their rules must be followed, even in matters such as student enrollment quotas and faculty and administrators' salaries. In light of these circumstances, there is a call for reforms from the local academic community, mostly related to increasing institutional autonomy and moving away from direct state supervision; increasing the quality of education and research productivity; and integrating and professionalizing university leadership and management.

Another structural problem pertains to the lack of institutional or country-level schemes to offset tuition costs and ensure equal access for, and retention of, students from low-income and underserved populations. Some countries in the region have free tuition for at least a portion of their students, and some financial aid is available at certain institutions, as well as in the form of national scholarships. However, these amounts are still far from covering all education-related costs for students, such as fees, books, and living expenses. In some countries, there are projects underway to create solutions and introduce a more robust student aid system (e.g., the Institute for the Development of Education is working on such project in Croatia).

GROWTH OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

In the Western Balkans, the rapid growth of the private higher education sector stems from the particular political circumstances in the region (i.e., the transition from socialist regimes to a market economy), combined with a rapid increase in student demand. Several countries, especially those involved in armed conflict after the dismantling of former Yugoslavia, lacked the capacity to develop a comprehensive higher education policy and strategy, which resulted in a proliferation of private (often for-profit) institutions.

For the most part, experience with private institutions in these countries has not been positive. These institutions typically represent a second choice for those students who do not make the cut for admission into public universities. Where regulations do not explicitly define the status of a university, private institutions tend to use the name "university" in their designation, even if they only offer vocational or two-year degrees. At system level, the emergence of private institutions has not significantly contributed to program diversification; the vast majority of programs offered by the private sector are in profitable areas such as business, information technologies, and tourism.

Private institutions in the WB typically have scarce resources and depend to a great extent on faculty from public institutions working for both their home institution and the private one. Part-time employment, contract work, and the employment of practitioners and teaching staff without a doctorate degree are the predominant practice. Faculty "moonlighting" has also substantially affected the quality of education at public universities. In several countries, there are persistent calls for stronger regulations and greater transparency in private higher education.

EUROPEAN UNION FUNDING

The EU narrative of investment in "knowledge-based" economy has also permeated WB countries. However, even though member and candidate countries are eligible to apply for funds from the EU to finance research and development, competition for these resources has proved very difficult for institutions in the WB. These countries have limited resources at their disposal to begin with, unlike developed countries that are able to invest significantly larger resources in the necessary expertise and infrastructure, to successfully tap into these funding streams. Consequently, the proportion of funding obtained from the EU in the WB is still very low, as the current funding mechanisms employed by the EU are perpetuating the status quo regarding the distribution of funds across Europe. Without significant modifications, this approach could lead to further widening the gap in quality and productivity between the more affluent academic sectors in Western countries and the EU periphery.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

In conclusion, it is worth noting that decision-makers in the region should avoid adopting policies that do not address the countries' specific needs and socio-political and economic circumstances, with a sufficient allocation of resources. The developed EU countries that are able to spend significantly more in absolute terms on higher education are seen as examples to be followed by WB countries. However, experience in post-transition countries, especially in this region, sug-

gests that some of the institutional and systemic challenges in these societies exceed anything that developed countries have ever faced—such as strict government oversight paired up with inefficient bureaucratic structures, lack of long-term strategies, and, in some cases, corruption. If these considerations are not into account, the adoption of various generalized trends and policies may worsen already existing issues faced by the tertiary education sector in these countries.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Berg, Maggie, and Barbara K. Seeber. *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016. 115 pp. C\$26.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4426-4556-1. Website: www.utpress.utoronto.ca.

An argument against the corporatization of universities, this slim volume advocates careful attention to both research and teaching. The increasing fast pace of modern academic life does not permit careful consideration of significant problems. The authors ask for careful consideration of humanistic education in a corporate age.

Douglass, John Aubrey, ed. *The New Flagship University: Challenging the Paradigm from Global Ranking to National Relevancy*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2016. 216 pp. \$100 (hb). ISBN 978-1-137-50048-9. Website: www.palgrave.com.

A discussion of the nature and role of flagship universities—the academic institutions that focus on research and are at the top of the academic systems of their countries. Among the themes discussed by the authors are the role of rankings in shaping flagship universities, and the role of flagships in specific countries and regions such as Russia, Scandinavia, Latin America, and others.

Ferrara, Mark S. *Palace of Ashes: China and the Decline of American Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016. 240 pp. \$29.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1799-8. Website: www.press.jhu.edu.

This book discusses developments, both historical and contemporary, in American and Chinese higher education and makes the argument, unsupported by facts, that a perceived decline in American higher education is related to a rise in China's higher education system. Developments in both countries are discussed.

Goastellec, Gaële, and France Picard, eds. *Higher Education in Societies: A Multi Scale Perspective*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2014. 213 pp (pb). ISBN 978-94-6209-744-5. Website: www.sensepublishers.com.

This volume consists of papers stemming from a conference of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers. The focus of most of them is on issues of access in the European and North American contexts.

Jarton, Michèle. *IFCU: A Prophetic Organization*. Paris: FIUC, 2016. 406 pp Euros 32. ISBN 978-88-209-9567-6.

A history of the International Federation of Catholic Universities from its founding in 1924

to the present, this volume presents information about the organization's activities and leaders. It provides some insights on the modern development of Catholic universities.

Luescher, Thierry, Manja Klemenčič, and James Otieno Jowi, eds. *Student Politics in Africa Representation and Activism*. Cape Town, South Africa: African Minds, 2016. 267 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-928331223. Website: www.africanminds.org.za.

Student political activism is an increasingly salient issue for higher education worldwide. This book focuses on Africa—with chapters devoted to student representation in governance of universities as well as more traditional forms of activism. Cases from a range of countries in Anglophone and Francophone Africa are provided. Although this book relates to Africa, it is relevant for an international audience.

OECD. *Trends Shaping Education 2016*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2016. 120 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-92-64-25017-8. Website: www.oecd-bookshop.org.

The aim of this OECD publication is to provide a stimulus for thinking about major tendencies that have the potential to influence education, and conversely, the potential of education to influence these trends. This fourth

edition of this volume has been significantly updated with a special emphasis on the emerging economies of Brazil, China, India, and the Russian Federation. Focusing on topics such as globalization, the future of the nation-state, and the emerging importance of cities, modern families, and new technologies, this publication raises some interesting reflections on the role of education in society in 2016. (Aisling Tiernan)

Reflections of South African University Leaders, 1981 to 2014. Cape Town, South Africa: African Minds, 2016. 181 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-928331094. Website: www.africanminds.org.za.

This fascinating volume focuses on interviews with eight South African vice chancellors who served during the key transformational period of the country. The experiences and reflections of these thoughtful university leaders reveal considerable insight into both university leadership and the specific challenges of the universities involved.

Rhoads, Robert A. *MOOCs, High Technology, and Higher Learning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 184 pp. \$29.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1779-0. Website: www.press.jhu.edu.

A critical analysis of MOOCs in a broad perspective, this vol-

ume discusses how connectivity works in terms of delivery of knowledge, the resistance to MOOCs, and the changing organizational system of higher education in the context of MOOCs. The book concludes with a discussion of the future of MOOCs.

Savicki, Victor, and Elizabeth Brewer, eds. *Assessing Study Abroad Theory, Tools and Practice*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, 2015. 335 pp. \$35 (pb). ISBN: 978-62036-214-3. Website: sty.presswarehouse.com.

This volume explores the concept of study abroad by discussing the outcomes of study abroad and debating how these outcomes can be measured and understood. Following an account of how, and why, assessment in the field of study abroad has evolved, the first part of the book analyses different elements of the study abroad experience. The second part of the book offers an overview of appropriate tools and strategies for assessing study abroad, emphasizing the importance of carefully formulating and prioritizing assessment questions, and understanding the advantages and drawbacks of different instruments. (Asling Tiernan)

Tiede, Hans-Joerg. *University Reform: The Founding of the American Association of University Professors*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 268 pp. \$34.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1826-1. Website: www.press.jhu.edu.

A history of the first decades of the American Association of University Professors, which was established in 1915 and had a strong influence on the development of the academic profession in modern American higher education. Issues such as the development of the tenure system, the role of the faculty in governance, and other seminal issues are discussed from the perspective of the role of the AAUP.

Varghese, N. V., and Garima Malik, eds. *India Higher Education Report 2015*. New York: Routledge, 2016. 467 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-1-138-12117-1. Website: www.routledge.com.

The first in an annual series of books relating to current issues in Indian higher education, this volume provides 18 detailed essays on key aspects. Among the topics covered are emerging trends in higher education policy, quantitative expansion, social group disparities, gender issues, quality assurance, employability of graduates, higher education

and international migration, public expenditure, trends in private higher education, institutional autonomy and leadership, internationalization, and others. This volume is sponsored by the new Center for Policy Research in Higher Education at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration.

Universidad de Palermo—Cátedra UNESCO-UNU. Colección de Educación Superior (Higher Education Series). Multiple authors, multiple editors. Website: <http://www.palermo.edu/cienciassociales/investigacion-y-publicaciones/coleccion-educacion-superior/index.htm>.

The series of books on higher education from the Universidad de Palermo keeps growing, with an interesting mix of translations (mostly from English) and new books written in Spanish. Most of the books added to the collection after *IHE's* first review in Fall 2013 (No. 73) are translations, including: Philip G. Altbach (Ed.) *Leadership for World-Class Universities*; Jorge Balán (Ed.) *Latin America's New Knowledge Economy: Higher Education, Government and International Collaboration*; Charles Homer Haskins *The Rise of Universities*; Lisa R. Lattuca and Joan S. Stark *Shaping the College Curriculum: Academic Plans in Con-*

text; Donald Levine *Powers of the Mind*; Gastón Milaret and Jean Vidal *World History of Education*; André Tuilier *History of the University of Paris and the Sorbonne*; and Charles Vest *Pursuing the Endless Frontier*. There is also one original book: *University Assessment and Evaluation: Actors and Policies in Perspective* (Evaluación y Acreditación Universitaria: Actores y Políticas en Perspectiva) edited by Raquel San Martín, with works from Argentinian authors. (Iván Pacheco)

Zgaga, Pavel, Ulrich Teichler, Hans G. Schuetze, and Andrä Wolter, eds. *Higher Education Reform: Looking Back—Looking Forward*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 2015. 431 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-3-631-66275-5. Website: www.peterlang.com.

A global overview on university reform and related issues, this book features a range of perspectives. Among the topics discussed are access and social class issues, conflicting narratives on higher education policy, mass and market in higher education, reforming European universities, trends in Chinese higher education, and others. Most of the chapters were presented at a conference in Slovenia.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

We are delighted to announce that *IHE* now appears in a French-language version thanks to an agreement with the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie. With the addition of French, *IHE* is now published in seven different languages, making it one of the most uniquely “international” publications in our field. We are also pleased to be collaborating with colleagues around the world on the development of publications modeled on *IHE*, which offer perspectives on

higher education from within specific regions. Most recently, the HEAD Foundation of Singapore has laid the groundwork to launch *Higher Education in Southeast Asia and Beyond*. And an agreement between CIHE and our colleagues involved in *IHE's* Spanish- and Portuguese-language editions—i.e., CEPPE in Chile and SEMESP in Brazil—together with the Universidad del Norte (Colombia) should soon result in a Spanish- and Portuguese-language publication focused on

higher education trends and issues in Latin America.

The Center has been actively involved in various professional development seminars in recent months. In June, we co-hosted (along with BC's Global Leadership Institute, GLI) 22 university faculty and administrators from the "5-100 universities" of Russia for a two-week program focused on issues of internationalization in higher education. This project also includes a European module, to be delivered in October 2016 in cooperation with the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) in Milan. A final event in Russia will close out this program in early 2017.

In July, CIHE hosted (again with GLI) a "Summer Institute" for the Fellows Program of the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia. A group of 19 Fellows from across Asia participated in this three-week professional development and leadership training. Additionally, the Center helped design and deliver the two-day "World Education Services—CIHE Summer Seminar 2016: The Changing Landscape of Global Higher Education and International Student Mobility." Finally, in conjunction with Unnivers and Reisberg & Associates, CIHE hosted some 35 faculty and administrators from the University of Guadalajara (Mexico) for a day-long symposium on internationalization.

CIHE continues to be active in the publication sphere. The *CIHE Perspectives* series released two new numbers in recent months: *Global Dimensions of the Boston College Lynch School of Education: Analysis of a Faculty Survey (CIHE Perspectives No. 2)*, and *Catholic Universities: Identity and Internationalization, A Pilot Project (CIHE Perspectives No. 3)*. Support for No. 3 was made possible by a Luksic Fund grant, which supports collaboration between Boston College and the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile. An extension of that support now enables CIHE to undertake a wider study of identity and internationalization in Catholic universities over the course of 2016/2017. In the next several months, a new book—*International Faculty in Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives on Recruitment, Integration, and Impact* (Routledge), edited by Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley—should be released.

The Center is initiating a Körber Foundation-funded study to explore differentiation and diversity in academic systems across some 12 different countries around the world. CIHE's founding director, Philip G. Altbach, and its current director, Hans de Wit, are both involved in this work, as is CIHE Research Fellow, Liz Reisberg.

CIHE staff continue to be on the move, attending various national and international conferences and meetings. In August, Hans de Wit and Laura E. Rumbley played active roles in the First International Symposium of the Higher Education Forum on Africa, Asia and Latin America (HEFAALA), hosted by the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), under the direction of Damtew Teferra, at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in Durban, South Africa. Hans and Laura will be at the annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), in November in Columbus, Ohio, and Laura will represent CIHE at the annual conference of the European Association for International Education (EAIE) in Liverpool in September.

Hans de Wit will deliver keynotes at the Canadian Bureau for International Education's (CBIE) 50th anniversary conference in Ottawa in November and at the October 2016 annual conference of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in Denver. He will also speak at a CINDA-sponsored international seminar at the University of Campinas (Brazil) in October, and will present at a research seminar for doctoral students of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) in Milan in September.

Founding director Philip G. Altbach was in Singapore and Malaysia in August at the invitation of the HEAD Foundation, for which he is a senior consultant. He gave several lectures and workshops. He continues his work with the Russian government's 5-100 excellence commission, and will participate in a meeting in Kazan, Russia in October.

As of September, CIHE is delighted to welcome the first cohort in its new Master's in International Higher Education. Also joining the Center this semester are three new doctoral graduate assistants—Edward Choi (South Korea), Lisa Unangst (USA), and Ayenachew Woldegiyorgis (Ethiopia)—along with our third-year doctoral graduate assistant, Georgiana Mihut (Romania). We are grateful to Ariane de Garraydon who, over the past three years, has been a graduate assistant at CIHE and in that role has contributed significantly to the Center and to *IHE*. We are also hosting several visiting scholars over the course of the coming semester: Daniela Craciun (Hungary), Hang Gao (China), Nian Cai Liu (China), Patrick McGreevy (Lebanon), Adriana Pérez Encinas (Spain), and Michelle Vital (United States). Over the summer, we had Jos Beelen (The Netherlands) and Rebecca Hall (Australia) visiting the Center, as well as intern Sarah VanKirk, a graduate student from the College of William & Mary, who assisted us ably.



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

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

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the International Higher Education quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE WEB SITE

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

about how to seek connections with us in support of their studies and research.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science-based approach to the study of higher education. Specializations are offered in international higher education, administration, and student affairs. For additional information, see: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/departments/eahe/graduate.html/>.

SPECIAL SECTION ON INTERNATIONALIZATION

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

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

EDITOR
Philip G. Altbach

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Laura E. Rumbley
Hans de Wit

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR
Hélène Bernot Ullerö

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
Salina Kopellas

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

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-mail: highered@bc.edu

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

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policymaker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a digital subscription; a fee of \$35/year applies to a subscription to the print version

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)

©Center for International Higher Education