Rankings Season Is Here

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

With the arrival of the new academic year in much of the world, the rankings season must be under way. The major international rankings have appeared in recent months—the Academic Ranking of World Universities ([ARWU] (the "Shanghai Rankings"), the QS World University Rankings, and the *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings (*THE*). Two important US rankings have also been published—the *US News & World Report* America's Best College Rankings and the much-delayed National Research Council's Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs. These are but a few of the rankings available on national or regional postsecondary institutions. For example, the European Union is currently sponsoring a major rankings project. In Germany, the Center for Higher Education Development has formulated an innovative approach to rankings of German universities. The list can be extended. This discussion will provide some comments on each of these rankings and on the current debate on rankings generally.

THE INEVITABILITY OF RANKINGS

If rankings did not exist, someone would invent them. They are an inevitable result of mass higher education and of competition and commercialization in postsecondary education worldwide. Potential customers (students and their families) want to learn which of many higher education options to choose—the most relevant and most advantageous. Rankings provide some answers, to these questions. Mass higher education produced a diversified and complex academic environment, with many new academic institutions and options. It is not surprising that rankings became prominent first in the United States, the country that experienced massification earliest as a way of choosing among the growing numbers of institutional choices. Colleges and universities themselves wanted a way to benchmark against peer institutions. Rankings provided an easy, if highly imperfect, way of doing this. The most influential, and widely criticized, general ranking is the *US News & World Report* America's Best College Ranking, now in its 17th year. Numerous other rankings exist as well, focusing on a range of variables, from the "best buys" to the best party schools and institutions that are most "wired." Most of these rankings have little validity but are nonetheless taken with some seriousness by the public.

As postsecondary education has become more internationalized, the rankings have, not surprisingly, become global as well. Almost three million students study outside their own countries; many seek the best universities available abroad and find rankings quite useful. Academe itself has become globalized, and institutions seek to benchmark themselves against their peers worldwide—and often to compete for students and staff. Academic decision makers and government officials sometimes use the global rankings to make resource choices and other decisions.

For all their problems, the rankings have become a high-stakes enterprise that have implications for academe worldwide. For this reason alone, they must be taken seriously and understood. An indication of the extent of the enterprise is the IREG Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence, which recently concluded its fifth conference, which attracted 160 participants from 50 countries, in Berlin.

RANKINGS PRESUME A NONEXISTENT ZERO-SUM GAME

There can only be 100 among the top-100 universities by definition. Yet, because the National University of Singapore improves does not mean, for example, that the University of Wisconsin–Madison is in decline—even if NUS rises in the rankings, perhaps forcing some other institutions

---

For example, the European Union is currently sponsoring a major rankings project.

---

down. In fact, there is room at the top for as many world-class universities that meet the accepted criteria for such institutions. Indeed, as countries accept the need to build and sustain research universities and to invest in higher education generally, it is inevitable that the number of distinguished research universities will grow. The investments made in higher education by China, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore in the past several decades have resulted in the dramatic improvement of those countries' top universities. Japan showed similar improvements a decade or two earlier. The rise of Asian universities is only partly reflected in the rankings since it is not easy to knock the traditional leaders off their perches. The rankings undervalue the advances in Asia and perhaps other regions. As fewer American and British universities will inevitably appear in the top 100 in the future, this does not mean that their universities are in decline. Instead, improvement is taking place elsewhere. This is a cause for celebration and not hand-wringing.

Perhaps a better idea than rankings is an international categorization similar to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education in the United States. Between 1970 and 2005, the Carnegie Foundation provided a carefully defined set of categories of colleges and universities and then assigned placements of institutions in these categories according to clear criteria. The schools were not ranked but rather delineated according to their missions. This would avoid the zero-sum problem. Many argue that the specific ranking number of a university makes little difference. What may have validity is the range of institutions in which a university finds itself. Moreover, what may be useful is whether an institution is in a range of 15 to 25 or 150 to 170—not whether it is 17 or 154. Delineating by category might capture reality better.

If rankings did not exist, someone would invent them. They are an inevitable result of mass higher education and of competition and commercialization in postsecondary education worldwide.

Where Is Teaching in the International Rankings?

In a word—*nowhere*. One of the main functions of any university is largely ignored in all of the rankings. Why? Because the quality and impact of teaching is virtually impossible to measure and quantify. Further, measuring and comparing the quality and impact of teaching across countries and academic systems are even more difficult factors. Thus, the rankings have largely ignored teaching. The new *Times Higher Education* rankings have recognized the importance of teaching and have assigned several proxies to measure teaching. These topics include reputational questions about teaching, teacher-student ratios, numbers of PhDs awarded per staff member, and several others. The problem is that these criteria do not actually measure teaching, and none even come close to assessing quality of impact. Further, it seems unlikely that asking a cross-section of academics and administrators about teaching quality will yield much useful information. At least, *THE* has recognized the importance of the issue.

What, Then, Do the Rankings Measure?

Simply stated, rankings largely measure research productivity in various ways. This is the easiest thing to assess—indeed, perhaps the only things that can be reliably measured. The several rankings approach the topic differently. Some, especially QS, emphasize reputational surveys—what do academics around the world think of a particular university? As a result, QS mainly assesses what a somewhat self-selected group of academics think of various universities along with some other nonreputational factors. *Times Higher Education* looks at a number of variables, including the opinions of academics; but, along with its data partner Thomson Reuters, has selected a variety of other variables—the impact of articles published as measured by citation analysis, funding for research, income from research, and several others. The Shanghai-based Academic Ranking of World Universities measures only research and is probably the most precise in measuring its particular set of variables.

Research, in its various permutations, earns the most emphasis since it is relatively easily measured but also because it tends to have the highest prestige—universities worldwide want to be research intensive and the most respected and top-ranking universities are research focused. These two factors have been a powerful force for reinforcing the supremacy of research in both the rankings and in the global hierarchy.

Centers and Peripheries

The universities and academic systems, located in the world's knowledge centers, and the scholars and scientists in these institutions not surprisingly have major advantages in the rankings. The academic systems of the major English-speaking countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia have significant head starts. Historical tradition, language, wealth, the ability to attract top scholars and students worldwide, strong traditions of academic freedom, an academic culture based on competition and meritocracy, and other factors contribute to the dominant positions of these universities.

All of the rankings privilege certain kinds of research and thus skew the league tables. There is a bias toward the hard sciences—the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics)—which tend to produce the most articles, citations, and research funding. The rankings are biased toward universities that use English and the academics in those universities. The largest number of journals included in the relevant databases are in English, and it is easiest for native English speakers and professors at these universities to get access to the top journals and publishers and to join the informal networks that tend to dominate most scientific disciplines.

Universities in western Europe and Japan have relatively easy access to the key knowledge networks and generally adequate support. Academic institutions in Hong Kong and Singapore have the advantage of financial resources, English as the language of teaching and research, and a policy of employing research-active international staff. This trend has permitted their universities to do well in the rankings.

The emerging economies, most notably China, are increasingly active as well, and they are moving from periphery to center. Even well-supported universities in peripheral regions, such as the Middle East, have disadvantages in becoming academic centers. There are strong links between the central or peripheral status of a country or academic culture and the placement of their universities in the rankings.

In the age of globalization, it is easier for academic institutions to leapfrog the disadvantages of peripherality with thoughtful planning and adequate resources. Individual academics as well as institutes and departments can also make a global mark more easily than ever before. While the barriers between centers and peripheries are more permeable, they nonetheless remain formidable.

Changing the Goalposts

Many of the rankings have been criticized for frequently changing their criteria or methodology, thus making it difficult to measure performance over time or to usefully make comparisons with other institutions. *US News & World Report* has been particularly prone to changing criteria in unpredictable ways, making it extremely difficult for the colleges and universities providing data to do so consistently. It is likely that the *Times Higher Education* rankings, in its first year, will likely change to some extent as an effort is made to improve the methodology. The Shanghai rankings have been most consistent over time, contributing no doubt to the relative stability of institutions and countries.

A 2010 Critique

It may be useful to analyze briefly the main rankings as a way of understanding their strengths and, more important, their weaknesses. While this discussion is neither complete nor based on a full analysis of the rankings, it will provide some reasons for thinking critically about them.

The QS World University Rankings are the most problematical. Between 2004 and 2009, these ranking were published with *Times Higher Education*. After that link was dropped, *Times Higher Education* is now publishing its own rankings. From the beginning, QS has relied on reputational indicators for a large part of the analysis. Most experts are highly critical of the reliability of simply asking a rather unrandom group of educators and others involved with the academic enterprise for their opinions. In addition, QS queries the views of employers, introducing even more variability and unreliability in the mix. Some argue that reputation should play no role at all in ranking, while others say it has a role but a minor one. Forty percent of the QS rankings are based on a reputational survey. This probably accounts for the significant variability in the QS rankings over the years. Whether the QS rankings should be taken seriously by the higher education community is questionable.

The Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), often referred to as the Shanghai Jiao Tong rankings, are now administered by the Shanghai Rankings Consultancy. One of the oldest of the international rankings, having been started in 2003, ARWU is both consistent and transparent. It measures only research productivity, and its methodology is clearly stated and applied consistently over time. It uses six criteria, including numbers of articles published in *Science* and *Nature*, numbers of highly cited researchers as measured by Thomson Scientific, alumni and staff winning Nobel and Fields prizes, citations in Science and Social Science Citation indexes and several others. ARWU chooses 1,000 universities worldwide to analyze. It does not depend on any information submitted by the institutions themselves. Some of AWRU's criteria clearly privilege older prestigious Western universities—particularly those that have produced or can attract Nobel prizewinners. The universities tend to pay high salaries and have excellent laboratories and libraries. The various indices used also heavily

> **As fewer American and British universities will inevitably appear in the top 100 in the future, this does not mean that their universities are in decline.**

rely on top-peer-reviewed journals in English, again giving an advantage to the universities that house editorial offices and key reviewers. Nonetheless, AWRU's consistency, clarity of purpose, and transparency are significant advantages.

The *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings, which appeared in September is the newest and in many ways the most ambitious effort to learn lessons for earlier rankings and provide a comprehensive and multifaceted perspective. *Times Higher Education* gets an A grade for effort, having tried to include the main university functions—research, teaching, links with industry, and internationalization. It has included reputation among the research variables and has combined that with analyses of citations, numbers of publications, degrees produced, and other measures. Disappointingly but not surprisingly, there are problems. Some commentators have raised questions about the methodologies used to count publications and citations. There are a number of inconsistencies—due to administrative problems apparently no Israeli universities are included and some of the American universities are not

single campuses but rather systems are included together (examples include the University of Massachusetts, Indiana University, the University of Delaware, Kent State University, and others). This problem increases the rankings of these "systems" unfairly. If, for example, the University of California was included as a system rather than as individual campuses, it would clearly rank number one in the world. Some of the rankings are clearly inaccurate. Why do Bilkent University in Turkey and the Hong Kong Baptist University rank ahead of Michigan State University, the University of Stockholm, or Leiden University in Holland? Why is Alexandria University ranked at all in the top 200? These anomalies, and others, simply do not pass the "smell test." Let it be hoped that these, and no doubt other, problems can be worked out.

A word should be said about the long-awaited National Research Council's evaluation of American doctoral programs. This study, years late, has been widely criticized for methodological flaws as well as the fact that it is more of a historical artifact than a useful analysis of cur-

---

Times Higher Education **gets an A grade for effort, having tried to include the main university functions—research, teaching, links with industry, and internationalization.**

---

rent reality. Nonetheless, the National Research Council attempted to use a much more sophisticated approach to assessment, including considering 20 key variables relating to doctoral programs. The other rankings tend to use many more arbitrary measures and weightings. Even if total success was not achieved, there are no doubt lessons to be learned.

The *US News & World Report's* annual ranking juggernaut continues. Widely criticized in the United States for the constant changes in methodology, over-reliance on reputational indicators, and oversimplifying complex reality, it is nonetheless widely used and highly influential. College and universities that score well, even if they grumble about methodological shortcomings, publicize their ranks. At least, *US News & World Report* differentiates institutions by categories—national universities, liberal arts colleges, regional institutions, and so on. This recognizes variations in mission and purpose and that not all universities are competing with Harvard and Berkeley.

Where Are We?

No doubt university rectors and presidents, government officials, and anxious students and parents from Beijing to Boston will be analyzing one or more of the rankings discussed here or the many others that exist. Decisions will be made in part based on the rankings—on funding and other support from government, on which departments and programs to build, and perhaps which programs to eliminate; and at what college or university to attend, at home or abroad, by students and their families.

In the world of rankings as in much else it is caveat emptor—the user must be fully aware of the uses and the problems, of the rankings. Too often this is not the case. The specific ranking of universities is persuasive to many users. This of course is a mistake. It is erroneous not only because of the limitation in the rankings themselves but because the rankings only measure a small slice of higher education. A government should be just as concerned about how a university fits into the higher education system as about its research-based rank. Students should be concerned about the fit between their own interests and abilities as well as the prestige of an institution. And few take into account the shortcomings of the rankings themselves.

Railing against the rankings will not make them go away; competition, the need to benchmark, and indeed the inevitable logic of globalization make them a lasting part of the academic landscape of the 21st century. The challenge is to understand the nuances, uses—and misuses—of the rankings. ∎

Nine Common Errors in Building a New World-Class University

Jamil Salmi

Jamil Salmi, a Moroccan education economist, is the World Bank's tertiary education coordinator. E-mail: jsalmi@worldbank.org.

In the past decade, the term "world-class university" has become a catch phrase to describe research universities at the pinnacle of the tertiary education hierarchy, as measured by the various international rankings. Around the world, governments have responded to this global reputational competition with additional funding to promote their national elite universities, as illustrated by the

various "Excellence Initiatives" in countries as varied as China, Denmark, Germany, Nigeria, Russia, South Korea, Spain, or Taiwan. In some cases, the government has also encouraged its top universities to merge so as to achieve economies of scale and reach a better position to compete globally. A few countries have even decided to establish new universities from scratch, with the explicit purpose of creating world-class institutions.

Achieving the ambitious result of launching a high-quality, new university is easier said than done, however, as building a world-class institution requires more than knee-jerk reactions to the rankings or massive infusion of government money. This engagement is a complex and lengthy process that only recently has begun to receive careful attention. The following paragraphs outline the most common pitfalls encountered in some of the current projects that aim at establishing a new flagship institution.

> **Achieving the ambitous result of launching a high-quality, new university is easier said than done.**

With a Magnicient Campus, Hope for Magic

The physical infrastructure is obviously the most visible part of a new university. A lot of care is usually given to the design and construction of impressive facilities—and rightly so. A good infrastructure is certainly an important part of the education experience of students, and researchers need adequate laboratories to carry out leading-edge scientific inquiries. Yet, without an appropriate governance setup, a strong leadership team, a well-thought curriculum, and qualified academics, the beautiful campus will remain little more than an empty shell.

Designing Curriculum after Constructing Facilities

It is often assumed that teaching and learning can easily adapt to the physical environment of the institution. This may be true for traditional lecture-based teaching, but innovative pedagogical practices require appropriate facilities. For example, interactive approaches, problem-based learning, or pedagogical methods relying heavily on teamwork and peer learning are constrained by the physical limitations of conventional lecture halls or even classrooms. The promoters of a new university should refrain from launching into the architectural design stage of their institution until they have established a clear definition of the vision and mission of the new institution. It is particularly essential to prepare the academic plan of the new institution ahead of the construction of the physical infrastructure and to tailor the latter to the requirements of the former rather than the other way around.

Import Content from Somewhere Else

Why reinvent the wheel? The teams in charge of establishing new universities logically look at top institutions in industrial countries to "buy" elements of their curriculum instead of going through the lengthy process of designing their own programs. But, while this may seem expedient and practical, it is not the most effective way of building the academic culture of a new university that aims to reach high standards. The Harvards and MITs of this world are unique institutions, and it is unrealistic to think that reproducing their organic, academic models is possible. Moreover, it is impractical to envision shopping around and bringing curricular fragments from a variety of top-notch institutions across different countries and cultures and guessing everything could easily gel together and fall in place to create an authentic learning and research culture in the new university.

Planning with an Ecosystem in Mind

Replicating the features that make flagship universities in North America and Europe successful—concentration of talent, abundant resources, and favorable governance—is a necessary condition but does not encompass the full complement of consideration that underpin a successful world-class institution. Creating and maintaining thriving universities constitute a difficult if not impossible process when the tertiary education ecosystem within which they operate is not fully supportive. The main dimensions of the ecosystem include leadership at the national level (existence of a vision about the future of tertiary education and the capacity to implement reforms), the regulatory framework (governance structure and management processes at the national and institutional levels), quality-assurance frameworks, the articulation mechanisms integrating the various types of tertiary education institutions, the financial resources and incentives, and the digital and telecommunications infrastructure. The absence of even only one of these elements or the lack of alignment among these various dimensions is likely to compromise the ability of new universities to progress and endure.

Postponing the Board and the Leadership Team

The resolution to establish a new university is often a political decision that a ministry or a technical project team is then charged with putting into action. This often leads to a centrally managed design and implementation process. But, a new university cannot be built by a disinterested committee. A project of such magnitude needs to be owned and carried out by a dynamic leadership team, working under the authority of an independent board with the capacity to provide guidance and empowerment. Putting in place an appropriate governance framework from the outset is a key factor of success.

Planning for Up-Front Capital Costs, but Ignoring Long-Term Financing

The promoters of a new university usually announce with enthusiasm the huge endowment dedicated to the establishment of the new institution, but the initial capital investment is only one part of the total project. It is essential to provide adequate support for the first few years of operation and to establish a thoughtful business model that allows the new institution to grow and endure in a financially sustainable manner.

> **Without an appropriate governance setup, a strong leadership team, a well-thought curriculum, and qualified academics, the beautiful campus will remain little more than an empty shell.**

Being Too Ambitious in Your Quantitative Targets

The leaders of new institutions sometimes think that they can rapidly enroll large numbers of students, often in the tens of thousands. This is rarely achieved without sacrificing quality. In the 1970s, E. F. Schumacher wrote in his famous book—*Small Is Beautiful*—that successful development projects were preferably of a small size. Small is still beautiful today, especially when it applies to setting up a new college or university. It is almost always a better idea to begin with a small number of programs and student body if quality is a priority. Once a strong academic culture is in place, it is easier to scale up from there.

Expecting You Can Do It All in 18 Months

A variant of overambitious planning is assuming that a new institution can be launched in a matter of months, and that high-quality teaching and research can be accom-

plished within a few years of establishing a new university. In reality, rushing through the initial phase of design and implementation can often lead to hasty decisions that can have an adverse effect on the quality and cost of the project. Furthermore, institution building is a long-term process that requires stable leadership, continuous improvement, and patience. This is especially true when it comes to developing the robust scientific traditions needed to produce leading-edge research and technological applications.

Relying on Foreign Academics without Building Up Local Capacity

Hiring foreign academics is a common practice to accelerate the launch of a new university. Indeed, engaging experienced teachers and researchers to help input new programs makes good sense; it can also form an effective capacity-building strategy when a key part of the mission of the foreign academics is to train younger, less-experienced academics from the host country. On the other hand, it can be a risky and counterproductive approach in the absence of systematic efforts to attract and retain qualified national academics. As with most plans that include reliance on outside actors and forces, this strategy of bringing on foreign academic staff should be one that complements the more fundamental aim of local capacity building.

Conclusion

Launching a new tertiary education institution that aspires to attain the highest possible standards is a noble but extremely difficult enterprise. The road to academic excellence is full of avoidable pitfalls, as illustrated by the preceding discussion of most commonly observed errors. More importantly, the decision to build a world-class university must always be examined within the proper context to ensure full alignment with the national tertiary education strategy and to avoid distortions in resource-allocation patterns within the sector. With thoughtful and realistic planning, however, reaching for excellence in tertiary education, at all levels, can only be viewed as a good and significant approach. ■

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

The Corruption of Ethics in Higher Education

STEPHEN P. HEYNEMAN

Stephen P. Heyneman is professor of International Education Policy at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee. E-mail: s.heyneman@ vanderbilt.edu.

Once the dean called me about a grade for the daughter of the rector. The rector was in the hospital. The dean said that he has suffered enough already and that I should not make him suffer any more, so I should give his daughter a good grade.

—ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN KAZAKHSTAN

Admissions were a way to make money. Big money.

—ADMINISTRATOR IN GEORGIA

Universities are commonly thought to be a haven for young adults. No matter how unstable the polity or how dismal the prospects for the economy, education investments are treated as sacrosanct. Recently, however, it has been discovered that education systems can be as corrupt as other parts of government and the economy; and that values of fairness and impartiality, once thought to be universal characteristics of university systems, can be supplanted by the interests of specific individuals, families, ethnic groups, and institutions.

Such misconduct includes the abuse of authority for both personal and material gain. Higher education can be corrupt through: the illegal procurement of goods and services; cheating in the provision of its normal functions (admissions, grading, graduation, housing, and academic products); professional misconduct (favoring of family members, sexual exploitation, bias in grading, research plagiarism, etc.); and cheating in the paying of taxes and the use of university property.

HOW COMMON IS IT?

In student surveys of Bulgaria, Moldova, and Serbia, between 35 and 45 percent believed that the official selection process could be by-passed. Approximately one in five admitted to having bribed a university official; in Moldova the figure was two in five. Within universities a wide variation exists in the propensity to bribe. Disciplines in highest demand—economics, finance, and law—have higher competition for entry, higher tuitions and fees, higher potential for earning, and hence higher stakes. These disciplines are more likely to be corrupt.

Education corruption is universal but the type differs from one region to another. In North America the problem appears to be student and faculty plagiarism and cheating on examinations. In addition, breaches in institutional ethics include the misconduct of research, ethical questions surrounding fund-raising and sports, admissions and testing, academic governance, as well as classroom improprieties—showing up late for class, unfairly assessing homework assignments, and showing preference to specific genders, nationalities or opinions.

Outside the countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), corruption is more frequent but occurs in different ways. In Vietnam, Cambodia, South Asia, eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union, the main problem appears to be corruption for monetary gain—the propensity to seek bribes in exchange for higher grades, accreditation, and entrance to selective programs of study. In sub-Saharan Africa, corruption includes frequent instances of professional misconduct and sexual exploitation in the classroom.

IS CORRUPTION CULTURAL?

Some people might argue that corruption and cheating is cultural and imbedded within the moral standards of the community. This situation might imply that students favor it and have no shame when participating. Generally, however, students express shame and remorse. In Croatia, 89 percent claimed that it was "wrong" to cheat on an examination, approximately the same portion as in the United States (90%). On the other hand, some reports suggest that American students who cheat also say they are satisfied with their personal ethics. This suggests that, in certain circumstance, cheating can become a behavioral norm, "disconnected" from personal ethics.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS

Corruption may enhance efficiency when prices (tuition, fees, or wages) are distorted by regulations. Some university systems require that faculty salaries remain uniform across disciplines; hence, retaining talent may require unregulated payments. However, the net benefits of efficiency from corruption are less likely in universities because corruption affects other social goals for making the education investment. Because universities serve to model good behavior, allowing a university to become corrupt may be more costly than allowing corruption in the customs service or the police. Since one purpose of the university is to purposefully teach how to behave in the future, if the university is corrupt, one can expect future citizens to be corrupt as well.

Corruption has a negative effect on quality. The university becomes a high-priced, low-quality good if officials

admit or give high grades to the less qualified. Instead of increasing internal competition, corruption limits it. Since honesty rests on the proof of a lack of violations, a university suspected of being corrupt reduces the power of its graduates in the labor market. With the private sector and particularly with companies that draw from international labor markets, the effect of having a reputation for corruption may be more serious than with local governments and state-owned enterprises.

Corruption negatively affects both private and social economic returns to investments in education. If students can purchase grades they have less incentive to learn. An employer does not know whether the student completed the degree on the basis of academic ability or because he or she bribed university officials. The signaling value of a university degree is reduced. Employers reduce risk by avoiding graduates from suspect institutions and by putting into place testing, internship, and other filtering mechanisms. Graduates need to accept significantly lower salaries until they can demonstrate their economic value through on-the-job experience. Graduates from universities suspected of corruption are not likely to be considered for technical and professional jobs. If they sort into government jobs where the potential for bribes is high (customs, police, etc.), the private income costs of corruption are reduced, but the social costs remain.

Such misconduct includes the abuse of authority for both personal and material gain.

Who Can Resist?

In circumstances where corruption is the norm, such an issue among faculty is not universal. Faculty "resisters" exist even in the most debilitating environments—some directed by virtue of moral principle and others on the basis of pragmatic assessment. Regardless of the source, their strength leads to the judgment of a universal standard for the professoriate. This standard consists of the promise to treat all students with fairness and impartiality. It requires the selection of universalistic norms (of fairness to students and colleagues) over loyalty to family and friends. In this simple but meaningful way, certain faculty in some of the world's most isolated universities represent, in fact, "quiet heroes." They stand up for their principles, without legal or administrative support, and not based on the possibility of professional recognition or financial reward; instead, they often stand up for fairness in defiance of senior administrators.

Ingredients of the Moral Academy

In what ways must a university with international aspirations prove its adherence to universal principles? A university that reveals no public stance on the issue might be judged as having little interest in how the public perceives its integrity. A number of mechanisms exist to lessen the possibility of corruption and lower the perception that a university system could be corrupt. These include codes of conduct for faculty, administrators, and students; statements of honesty on public Web sites; university "courts" to hear cases of misconduct; and annual reports to the public on changes in the number and types of incidents on a year-by-year basis.

Faculty "resisters" exist even in the most debilitating environments— some directed by virtue of moral principle and others on the basis of pragmatic assessment.

What Can Be Done?

Many non-OECD countries are trying to participate in the Bologna process so as to make university degrees equivalent and facilitating transfer of course credits and credentials. It is hard to imagine why a country or a university in the European Union with a high reputation would allow its degrees to coincide with those of a university or a system of universities that face a perception of corruption. On the other hand, the European Quality Assurance Register or other mechanisms might include anticorruption evidence as criteria in the process of European accreditation; hence the process itself might be used as a means to clean up that problem from higher education systems.

Another implication concerns development assistance agencies that make investments in higher education. These agencies may have to rethink if their investments are made in systems with high levels of perceived corruption. However, an effective policy intervention must acquire information about the experience and cost of corruption. Regular surveys of students and faculty would be helpful. In fact, a survey of one university at two points in time demonstrated a decline in corruption. This suggests that when the potential of exposure and professional embarrassment becomes real, the propensity to engage in corruption declines. ∎

Liberal Education in the Global Perspective

Patti McGill Peterson

Patti McGill Peterson is senior associate at the Institute for Higher Education Policy and is project director for a nine-nation study of the role of the liberal arts in higher education, sponsored by the Christian A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation. E-mail: ppeterson@ihep.org.

The liberal arts hold a central place in the history of higher education. From Greco-Roman origins and curricular incarnation in medieval universities to the academic program of Harvard College in the 17th century, the liberal arts were a fundamental part of higher education in the West. In the late 19th century, however, liberal education, based upon the study of the liberal arts, began a steady decline. Forces for this erosion also had origins in the West. A new university model that emerged from Germany challenged the moorings of liberal education by placing greater emphasis on research and graduate education than on the teaching of undergraduates. The core curriculum that once had a compatible and narrow assemblage of courses in classical languages, literature, history, religion, math, and basic science would see many more entrants by the mid-20th century, all making a claim for space in the curriculum as a result of the increasing specialization of the academic disciplines. Clark Kerr, in his Godkin Lectures in 1963, stated that increasingly the research enterprise would take priority over undergraduate education and that the humanities would be diminished by greater funding for science. The result, he noted, was that the coherence of the curriculum would suffer.

Keeping Liberal Education Alive in the West

Not only did universities prove Kerr's predictions correct, but also liberal arts colleges, devoted to undergraduate education, were impacted by the complex departmentalization of knowledge that flowed from graduate schools. Yet, it is possible to point to a continuous discourse in American higher education since the mid-1960s about the undergraduate curriculum. Disagreement about the content of liberal education became a central issue. This was fueled by opinions such as those of E. D. Hirsh's book (*Cultural Literacy,* 1987), in which he advocated a return to a more narrowly defined canon of Western thought. Those who warned of loss regarding cultural identity, illiterate students, and general education running amok were met by passionate charges of elitism, cultural hegemony, and a curricular idée fixe. The most salutary outcome of the claims and counterclaims formed a general consensus that undergraduate education was important and the curriculum needed to be structured carefully to provide students breadth and depth in their academic programs.

While no consensus was reached on exactly what subject matter should constitute a liberal education program, considerable agreement existed among American educators about which attributes to foster. The Association of American Colleges and Universities, representing its member institutions, stated that liberal education should provide students broad knowledge of culture, science, and society (general education) as well as in-depth study in a specific area of interest. It characterized liberal education as helping students develop a sense of social responsibility as well as strong and transferable intellectual and practical skills—such as communication, analytical and problem-solving ability, and a demonstrated competency to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings.

The United States is viewed as a stronghold of liberal education, but its colleges and universities have had to respond to increasing demands from students and their families for more utilitarian education. Liberal arts disciplines compete with the desire for more practical curricula that support such programs as business administration. In Europe, early specialization trumped liberal education. While there are some longstanding liberal arts institutions such as the American University of Paris, only the past dozen years have engaged glimmers of new life within the region that gave birth to the liberal arts. A prominent example is the Netherlands, where eight liberal arts colleges have been established as part of the university system. Poland now has an active and successful liberal education movement affiliated with its public universities, which has grown steadily in prestige. There are relatively new liberal arts colleges in Berlin and Bratislava. The European Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science consortium was founded in response to these developments. As a matter of perspective, however, it is important to note these liberal arts institutions enroll a small number of students in the European Union region.

Liberal Education beyond Its Wellsprings

Liberal education exists outside the geography of its origins, principally through external assistance and not as indigenous undertakings. Americans have had a role in establishing liberal arts institutions in non-Western countries. Two early examples are the American Universities of Beirut (1866) and Cairo (1919) that now have deep roots in the Middle East and have for many years educated the elite of the region. More recently, in another wave of activity, the National University of Singapore has just announced a partnership with Yale University, to introduce a liberal arts college to Singapore's higher education offerings. New

York University has established a residential liberal arts college in Abu Dhabi. Bard College has developed, with local partners, liberal education institutions and programs in Russia, Central Asia, and more recently, Palestine. The Asian University for Women stands as an outpost for liberal education in Bangladesh. These and other examples help to conclude that liberal education is enjoying a global migration.

> **While no consensus was reached on exactly what subject matter should constitute a liberal education program, considerable agreement existed among American educators about which attributes to foster.**

For much of the non-Western world, including countries that have a transplant from an earlier era, liberal education is generally a foreign concept. For example, despite its own success, the American University of Cairo has had little influence on bringing liberal education to Egypt's huge public higher education system. The strength of undergraduate education in the United States notwithstanding, in much of the developing world graduate education and the research enterprise has inspired the greatest attraction for educators from other countries. With no strong reason to understand the nature of baccalaureate education, there is also little incentive to understand the role of liberal education and its general education component in the curriculum. In addition, donor agencies, such as the World Bank, further marginalized liberal education by emphasizing workforce and market studies as key elements for higher education planning in developing countries.

The big question is whether liberal education can develop on its own and be available to larger numbers of students in developing countries. Without a definitive answer, some noteworthy recent developments are under way. China exhibits a significant focus on the undergraduate curriculum that features a general education component. Poland has a mixed picture that includes the previously mentioned vigorous liberal education movement that exists alongside curricula left over from the Soviet era. India and Turkey, while neither is a great repository of liberal education, have institutions attempting to align the broader underpinnings of liberal education with professional education. A new development in South Africa holds promise. The minister of higher education and training has recently launched an initiative to strengthen the social sciences and the humanities. The goal is to have stronger education and research in the liberal arts to support South Africa's transformation beyond its apartheid past. These examples, unfortunately, are outliers. Countries struggling with higher education reform efforts tend to focus foremost on noncurricular issues—such as, access and finance. With limited resources and a huge enrollment demand, their ability to engage in academic reform efforts that include liberal education is a doubtful outcome.

Curricular reform that includes liberal education will require some fundamental understandings. First and foremost, the student and his/her personal and intellectual development must matter, alongside preparation for the workforce. As part of this focus, baccalaureate-level education and the quality of its content and pedagogy must be viewed as a significant part of the higher education system. These are sine qua nons. Beyond the benefits of preparing students with broad intellectual skills for life and transferable analytical skills for the workplace, liberal education also educates for well informed citizenship, a critical aspect of nation building. ∎

Agents and Third-Party Recruiters in International Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach

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

A specter is now haunting international higher education—the dramatic proliferation of third-party recruiters and agents. Their job is to recruit prospective students in countries that send large numbers of students abroad to study at specific institutions as well as to provide general information about studying abroad. Many officials are authorized by academic institutions in the receiving countries—specifically in the United States, Britain, and Australia—to offer admission to students and facilitate their enrollment.

While by no means a new trend, this phenomenon is growing in size, scope, and notoriety, as international enrollments have become a compelling part of some universities' bottom lines. The operators, of course, do not work

without any source of income. They are paid by the universities that utilize them, usually by providing a fee, based on how many students are enrolled. Sometimes, shockingly, they are also paid by prospective students.

This article has a simple argument that agents and recruiters are impairing academic standards and integrity and should be eliminated or severely curtailed. Providing information to prospective students is fine, but money should not change hands during the admissions process, and universities should not hand the power to admit—after all, a key academic responsibility—to agents or entities overseas.

Old Ways and a New Wave

Thirty years ago, most students interested in studying abroad would locate information, apply to his or her preferred institutions, and enroll. In the days prior to the Internet, information could be obtained directly by writing to overseas universities or in some cases by going to libraries sponsored by embassies and information centers in major cities in the developing world supported by the main host countries—the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and the United States. Internationally mobile students were relatively few in number. In 1981, there were 912,300 internationally mobile students. The total has grown by three times in the past 30 years. Many students came from relatively sophisticated families able to access information and make informed choices or were sponsored by governments or other agencies. Universities in host countries seldom placed internationalization at the top of their agendas, and few, if any, looked to make money from overseas students. Cold War politics and neocolonial ties stimulated the major powers to sponsor information centers overseas.

This environment has changed. Indeed, practices only a few decades old seem quaint in today's globalized world, where higher education is big business for many and perhaps 3 million students study abroad—the large majority coming from Asia and going to the main English-speaking Western countries and Australia. The United States hosted 671,000 of these foreign students—or 21 percent of the global total. These students contributed more than $17.65 billion to the US economy and many billions more to the other main host countries.

The key shifts include the rise of the Internet, the commercialization of international study, the transformation of study abroad from an elite to a mass phenomenon. While formerly limited mainly to an elite few, participating students were often provided with scholarships from home or host countries. International study is now a mass phenomenon where funding comes overwhelmingly from individual overseas students or their families, and the students themselves come from much wider social-class backgrounds and from many more countries than was the case in the past.

The Internet permits easy access to information concerning higher education institutions everywhere, although even a cursory glance at the Web sites of many universities reveals a striking lack of transparency that even borders on false advertising. Even degree mills can be designed to look like Oxford—sometimes even stealing pictures of Oxford. But good information is available to individuals who have the ability to carefully separate fact from fiction—not an easy task.

The Cold War ended by 1990, and most host countries have eliminated or cut back their overseas information centers. Some, like Australia, have purposely commercialized international student recruiting. The Australian government established the IDP agency to build higher education as an export industry. Other countries, including the United Kingdom, have moved to commercialize international higher education.

At the same time, the United States has repeatedly cut the budgets for overseas libraries and information centers without thinking about the consequences and now faces the costly investment of reopening centers and libraries and rebranding and remarketing one of America's most valuable "exports."

> **Thirty years ago, most students interested in studying abroad would locate information, apply to his or her preferred institutions, and enroll.**

As the number of overseas students has grown, the level of sophistication of the applicants has declined. At one time, fewer applicants were in large part interested in top universities overseas, although some government-sponsored programs placed students in less prestigious institutions. However, many of today's potential students have little knowledge about higher education prospects and may want to study abroad because they cannot find access at home. Moreover, they feel that somehow an overseas qualification will boost their job prospects or serve as a prelude to migration abroad.

Many more academic institutions have entered the competition for international students. Most of these new entrants are not top "name-brand" universities but are rather lesser-known—and sometimes lower-quality—schools of all kinds. These schools turn to recruiters since they feel that they have no alternative way to attract students from other countries. It is surprising that some quite respectable American universities have turned to agents and re-

cruiters—perhaps feeling insufficient confidence that their quality and brand could attract overseas students. Top-ranked universities remain preferred destinations for the best and brightest students, but they can accommodate only a tiny minority of those who apply.

Agents and Recruiters Enter

This new environment produced an information and access vacuum that needed to be filled. Unfortunately, this deficiency has been accommodated in the worst possible way. Many universities, especially those with no international profile, seeking to attract international students find that they cannot easily obtain access to the potential market. Students find it difficult to locate reliable information about possible places to study amidst the thicket of competing Web sites and the myriad of advertisements that one can find in newspapers, train stations, and elsewhere in the developing world. The Internet has not solved the problem in part because it does not distinguish quality and provides unevaluated and unfiltered information. There is no way to easily evaluate the quality or veracity of information. Agents and recruiters have stepped into this environment of information overload and claim to provide a roadmap to the plethora of "information" currently available on the Internet and elsewhere.

> **Even a cursory glance at the Web sites of many universities reveals a striking lack of transparency that even borders on false advertising.**

The Actual Practices

If agents and recruiters only provided information, today's situation would not amount to a crisis. It would simply be problematical because the evaluation of the information would still be questionable. They are, of course, hired chiefly by potential host universities and other higher education providers to attract students to their institutions. Not information providers, the agents are salespeople. Their purpose is to sell a product, and they can use any required methods. They do not present alternatives or provide objective guidance to the potential applicants. Many of these operators—although it is not known how many—have authorization to actually admit students, often based on murky qualifications. Some of the least-scrupulous agents accept payment from both sides—their employing school or schools in the host country, as well as from the applicants—a clear

violation of ethical standards. Most agents and recruiters are independent operators who have contracts with one, or more, overseas institution. The universities in the host countries that employ these personnel typically are the less-prestigious schools with little visibility overseas and often a tremendous financial need for foreign students to balance their own "bottom lines."

American federal law forbids payments to recruit domestic students. Thus, one wonders why it is appropriate, or even legal, for a university to pay agents to "import" international students whereas not domestic students.

Agents and recruiters have no stated qualifications, nor are they vetted by anyone. Efforts are now underway to create "standards" for this new "profession" but with no powers to either measure compliance or discipline violators. Organizations like NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the largest membership organization of international education professionals, accept these operators as members with no questions asked, thus giving an aura of respectability to them. Other groups, such as the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, have raised serious inquiries about their role. Current efforts to set standards and somehow "legitimize" agents and recruiters through a new organization called the American International Recruitment Council may be seen as too closely linked to them.

The Solution

The solution to this growing phenomenon is simple: abolish them. Agents and recruiters have no legitimate role in international higher education. They are unnecessary and often less than honest practitioners who stand in the way of a good flow of information to prospective students and required data about these students to academic institutions in the host countries.

Objective and accurate information and guidance are needed for both institutions and students. These sources can be provided through the Internet, preferably through Web sites with some "seal of approval" from a group of respected universities or an international or regional organization that has universal credibility. It would be helpful if countries that eliminated or cut back on information centers and libraries overseas could restore them. The cost is not high and the yield in goodwill and reliable data would be immense. A significant role may exist for independent consultants who provide information and prepare students for the application process overseas but have no links and receive no money from the universities. Actually, a new organization, the Association of International Graduate Admissions Consultants, has been founded to establish and enforce appropriate standards relevant to this new role.

Universities in the host countries should immediately cease using agents and recruiters. Better and more useful information should be provided by universities themselves to more effectively inform prospective applicants. This goal may include visits by university admissions staff to potential students overseas for the purpose of information sharing.

The stain of commercialization in international higher education has been tremendously aided by agents and recruiters. It is high time that these operators are eliminated and replaced with open and transparent ways of providing information to prospective students. The admissions process should be put back where it belongs—students applying for study and colleges and universities choosing those best qualified—based on reliable individually submitted applications. ∎

Five Myths about Internationalization

Jane Knight

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

As internationalization matures, it is becoming a more important and complex process. Yet, it is also becoming a more confused and misunderstood concept. Internationalization is definitely past the "new flavor of the month" stage. It is firmly embedded in institutional mission statements, policies, and strategies as well as national policy frameworks. This signals that internationalization has come of age and is a legitimate area of policy, practice, and research in higher education. However, because of internationalization's high profile it is now used to describe anything and everything remotely linked to worldwide, intercultural, global, or international. In short, it is a catchall phrase and losing its meaning and direction. This article suggests that over the years implicit assumptions have developed about internationalization, myths perhaps, that need to be exposed and discussed. A brief overview of five prevalent myths follows.

Myth One: Foreign Students as Internationalization Agents

A long-standing myth is that more foreign students on campus will produce more internationalized institutional culture and curriculum. While this may be the expectation of universities, reality often paints a different picture. In many institutions international students feel marginalized socially and academically and often experience ethnic or racial tensions. Frequently, domestic undergraduate students are known to resist, or at best to be neutral about undertaking joint academic projects or engaging socially with foreign students—unless specific programs are developed by the university or instructor. International students tend to band together and ironically often have a broader and more meaningful intercultural experience on campus than domestic students, without having any deep engagement with the host country culture. Of course, this scenario is not applicable to all institutions, but it speaks to the often unquestioned assumption that the primary reason to recruit international students is to help internationalize the campus. While this is a well-intentioned rationale, it often does not work out that way and, instead, serves to mask other motivations—such as, revenue generation or desire for improved rankings on global league tables.

Myth Two: International Reputation as a Proxy for Quality

Myth two rests on a belief that the more international a university is—in terms of students, faculty, curriculum, research, agreements, and network memberships—the better its reputation. This is tied to the false notion that a strong international reputation is a proxy for quality. Cases of questionable admission and exit standards for universities highly dependent on the revenue and "brand equity" of international students are concrete evidence that internationalization does not always translate into improved quality or high standards. This myth is further complicated by the quest for higher rankings on a global or regional league table such as the *Times Higher Education* or the Academic Ranking of World Universities. It is highly questionable whether the league tables accurately measure the internationality of a university and, more importantly, whether the international dimension is always a robust indicator of quality.

Myth Three: International Institutional Agreements

It is often believed that the greater number of international agreements or network memberships a university has the more prestigious and attractive it is to other institutions and students. But practice shows that most institutions cannot manage or even benefit from a hundred plus agreements. To maintain active and fruitful relationships requires a major investment of human and financial resources from individual faculty members, departments, and international offices. Thus, the long list of international partners often reflects paper-based agreements, not productive partner-

ships. Once again, quantity is seen as more important than quality, and the international agreements list is used more as a status symbol than a record of functional academic collaborations. In fact, a more recent trend is the paring down of the number of agreements to 10 or 20 institution-wide priority partnerships. This can lead to more comprehensive and sustainable relationships but also to a sense of disgruntlement among faculty members and researchers about a top-down approach to internationalization and the curtailment of individual international research or curricular interests.

A long-standing myth is that more foreign students on campus will produce more internationalized institutional culture and curriculum.

Myth Four: International Accreditation
International accreditations from foreign external national quality assurance agencies (especially from the United States) or professional engineering and business accreditation bodies are currently quite popular with universities in all parts of the world. The premise is that, the more international accreditation stars an institution has, the more internationalized it is and ergo the better it is. This is simply not true. A foreign recognition of quality does not speak to the scope, scale, or value of international activities related to teaching/learning, research, and service to society either through public engagement or private enterprise.

Myth Five: Global Branding
Myth five relates to the incorrect assumption that the purpose of a university's internationalization efforts is to improve global brand or standing. This confuses an international marketing campaign with an internationalization plan. The former is a promotion and branding exercise; the latter is a strategy to integrate an international, intercultural, and global dimension into the goals and teaching, research, and service functions of a university. The objectives, anticipated outcomes and investment in a global branding initiative, are different from those required for academic internationalization. Thus, it is a myth that an international marketing scheme is the equivalent of an internationalization plan. This does not deny the fact that a strategic and successful internationalization agenda can lead to more international visibility, but recognition is not the goal—namely, it is a by-product.

A common element in many of these myths is that the benefits of internationalization or the degree of internationality can be measured quantitatively—the number of international students, foreign faculty, institutional agreements, cross-border education programs, research projects, foreign accreditations, branch campuses, and so on. While trying to quantify outcomes as key performance indicators may serve accountability requirements, they do not capture the human key intangible performances of students, faculty, researchers, and the community that bring significant benefits of internationalization.

Summary
These five myths do not apply to all higher education institutions or to all countries, but they reflect very common and misleading assumptions. Of course, there are additional myths, as well as fundamental truths, about internationalization that require further reflection and discussion. The purpose of identifying and reflecting on these myths and truths is to ensure that internationalization is on the right track and that we are aware of intended and unintended consequences as higher education sectors weather these rather turbulent times where competitiveness, rankings, and commercialism seem to be the driving forces. ∎

The End of Internationalization

Uwe Brandenburg and Hans de Wit

Uwe Brandenburg is project manager at the Centre for Higher Education Development. E-mail: Uwe.Brandenburg@che-consult.de. Hans de Wit is professor of internationalization at the School of Economics and Management, Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands. E-mail: j.w.m.de.wit@ hva.nl.

Over the last two decades, the concept of the internationalization of higher education has moved from the fringe of institutional interest to the very core. In the late 1970s up to the mid-1980s, activities that could be described as internationalization were usually neither named that way, nor carried high prestige, and were rather isolated and unrelated. The exception was joint international research, which, however, has never seriously become part of the internationalization fashion. In the late 1980s, changes occurred: Internationalization was invented and carried on, ever increasing its importance. In the past two decades, new components were added to its multidimensional body,

moving from simple exchange of students to the big business of recruitment and from activities impacting on an incredibly small elite group to a mass phenomenon. In our view, it is time for a critical reflection on the changing concept of internationalization.

From Substance to Form

Gradually, the "why and wherefore" have been taken over by the way internationalization has become the main objective: more exchange, more degree mobility, and more recruitment. Even the alternative movement of "internationalization at home" of the late 1990s has shifted rapidly into this instrumental mood.

This development coincided with the dawn of a second, rivaling term: globalization. In fact, it seems that both terms act like two connected universes, making it impossible to draw a distinctive line between them. Today, internationalization has become the white knight of higher education, the moral ground that needs to be defended, and the epitome of justice and equity. The higher education community still strongly believes that by definition internationalization leads to peace and mutual understanding, the driving forces behind programs like Fulbright in the 1950s.

> **On the other side, globalization is loaded with negative connotations and is considered more predominant than internationalization.**

While gaining moral weight, its content seems to have deteriorated: the form lost its substance. Internationalization has become a synonym of "doing good," and people are less into questioning its effectiveness and essential nature: an instrument to improve the quality of education or research.

The Devaluation of Internationalization

On the other side, globalization is loaded with negative connotations and is considered more predominant than internationalization. This formula sees internationalization as "good" and globalization as "evil." Internationalization is claimed to be the last stand for humanistic ideas against the world of pure economic benefits allegedly represented by the term globalization. Alas, this constructed antagonism between internationalization and globalization ignores the fact that activities more related to the concept of globalization (higher education as a tradeable commodity) are increasingly executed under the flag of internationalization,

as the increasing commercialization illustrated at the conferences of NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the Asia Pacific Association for International Education, and the European Association for International Education.

Internationalization: From Innovation to Tradition

Effectively, this attitude exacerbated the devaluation of internationalization and the inflation of defensive measures. Nowadays, with the tendency of becoming advocates rather than pioneers of internationalization, we are no longer the spearhead of innovation but, rather, defenders of traditions. This creates the danger of self-depreciation and defensive self-perception—holding firmly onto traditional concepts and acting on them while the world around moves forward. We—and the authors explicitly add themselves to the group of "we"—lament about the loss of real mobility and the commercialization of higher education in general and its international component in particular. Yet, we lose sight of innovative developments such as the emergence of the digital citizen for whom mobility can be at least as virtual as real.

A New Dawn? The Postinternationalization Age

But how can we resume the active role and gain ownership of our own fate? The main points are the following:

1. We have to move away from dogmatic and idealist concepts of internationalization and globalization.

2. We have to understand internationalization and globalization in their pure meanings—not as goals in themselves but rather as means to an end.

3. We have to throw off the veil of ignorance and ask ourselves: Why do we do certain things and what do they help in achieving the goal of quality of education and research in a globalized knowledge society? We also have to regard mobility and other activities as what they really are: activities or instruments—and therefore by definition not goals in themselves.

4. We should carefully reconsider our preoccupation with instruments and means and rather invest a lot more time into questions of rationales and outcomes.

While in need of more philosophy we also require a greater sense of reality. We cannot continue to assume that certain types of mobility and other international activities (such as exchanges and study abroad) are good in themselves and that other types (such as recruitment and transnational education) are bad. We have to dig deeper, place the options within a new set of values and rationales, and ensure that we really achieve what is meaningful.

The future of higher education is a global one, and it is our job to help preparing the higher education world for this. Therefore, what we need are people who understand and define their role within a global community, transcending the national borders, and embracing the concepts of sustainability—equity of rights and access, advancement of education and research, and much more. But essentially, we need to reaffirm the core role of universities: to help understand this world and to improve our dealing with it. Called for is a common commitment at the institutional and personal level of how we and our students will be prepared to live and work in a global community. Possibly we must even leave the old concepts of internationalization and globalization and move on to a fresh unbiased paradigm. The most important in any case is to rethink and redefine the way we look at the internationalization of higher education in the present time. ∎

African Higher Education: The Rise and Fall in the 20th Century

Goolam Mohamedbhai

Goolam Mohamedbhai is former secretary general of the Association of African Universities and former vice chancellor of the University of Mauritius. E-mail: g_t_mobhai@yahoo.co.uk. This article is based in part on the author's paper, "Higher Education in Africa: The Challenges Ahead," to be published in Higher Education Forum, *a publication of the Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University, Japan.*

Centers of higher learning had existed in Africa several centuries ago, well before the arrival of Europeans. Examples of these are the University of al-Karawiyyin in Fez, Morocco; Al-Azhar University in Cairo, Egypt; and the University of Timbuktu in Mali. However, modern higher education in Africa has its roots in university colleges that were created and affiliated to universities in Europe, during the European colonial period. Right from the start, these institutions were patterned on the European higher education system. They were staffed by Europeans or Africans trained in Europe, and their major objective was training manpower for the public sector to replace the colonial staff as well as teachers for the rapidly expanding secondary education sector. After independence of the colonies in the 1960s, the university colleges became autonomous universities and, again, their academic structure, governance mode, course curricula, and methods of instruction were modeled on European universities. All the institutions used a European language for instruction, giving hardly any attention to local languages. They were all created in the suburbs of the major cities, meant for the elite of African society, and alienated from the rural areas where the majority of the population lived and where the development challenges were greatest. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the relevance of such higher education institutions to Africa's postindependence development has often been questioned.

For a couple of decades after independence, African universities thrived as they received the generous support from Europe and their own governments and continued their close affiliations with universities in the Western world, mostly the United Kingdom and France. They soon developed into centers of excellence, as judged by European university norms. This was true for Makerere University in Uganda, University of Ibadan in Nigeria, Univerity Cheikh Anta Diop in Senegal, and University of Khartoum in Sudan, to name a few. Once created, new universities were essentially patterned on existing ones.

Economic and Political Turmoil

The late 1970s and 1980s became the difficult years of economic turmoil. The severe deterioration in African economies made it difficult for governments to invest in higher education. Also, budget cuts resulted as externally imposed structural adjustment programs, and financing of higher education suffered. Around the same period major political crises, often of ethnic or tribal origin and at times caused by African states getting embroiled in the Cold War between the East and the West, started to occur in many African countries. This resulted in poor governance and even dictatorship in some countries, leading to political repression. African universities, having inherited the concept of academic freedom from the West, did not hesitate to criticize their governments, and they soon came to be regarded as hotbeds for political opposition. This inevitably led to increased involvement of governments in university affairs. As a result, many African universities witnessed the flight of their academics, often persecuted, to countries in the North. One example is Makerere University in Uganda where several leading academics disappeared, allegedly killed by President Idi Amin, while others fled the country, bringing the famous institution to its knees.

Rate of Return on Investment

At the same time, the output from the primary and secondary education sectors started to increase dramatically as a result of positive measures taken earlier to improve access to primary education. This created huge pressures on African universities to increase their student enrollment. In the 1990s, as the era of peace was dawning on many African

countries, their universities started to respond to the huge demand for higher education and turned to their governments for much-needed support.

Around the same time came another blow. Some economists came to the conclusion, which later proved to be erroneous, that the rate of social return on investments in higher education was lower than in basic and primary education. These findings guided donor and development agencies in their support to African governments. The effect of this policy can be gauged from the fact that the World Bank's worldwide education-sector spending on higher education, which was 17 percent between 1985 to 1989, dwindled to just 7 percent from 1995 to 1999. Hence, throughout the 1980s and 1990s, higher education institutions in sub-Saharan Africa suffered from abandon and underfunding.

Deplorable State

In the 1990s, most universities in sub-Saharan Africa stood in a deplorable state. Their physical infrastructure—lecture halls, libraries, laboratories, and student residences—badly needed expansion and renovation to serve the huge influx of students, far more than they could accommodate. Having

> **For a couple of decades after independence, African universities thrived as they received the generous support from Europe and their own governments**

suffered from brain drain, these institutions were equally desperately short of qualified faculty to teach and undertake research. Their curricula were out of date and not responsive to the needs of their communities, including the burgeoning industrial and business sectors, which resulted in large unemployment of graduates. Access to information and communications technology was so low level that they could not benefit from the technological revolution taking place in other parts of the world.

However, despite being neglected by their own governments and in spite of numerous hurdles, African universities demonstrated their resilience and survived, learning to do more with the same, or even fewer, conditions.

Turning Point

The turning point in the African universities' fate came with the UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific,

and Cultural Organization) World Conference on Higher Education held in 1998. The declaration from the conference emphasized that higher education carried an important role to play in finding solutions to the development problems faced by developing countries. The conference called on universities in industrialized countries to assist their sister institutions in developing and poor countries. This created a framework for renewed support to higher education and led to a revitalization of African universities, which effectively started a few years later at the beginning of the 21st century. It is significant to note that development assistance to postsecondary education in Africa, which averaged US$110 million per year during the decade 1990–1999, increased to US$515 million per year during the period 2000–2005. ∎

Private Higher Education and Regional Inequalities: The Ethiopian Experience

Tilahun Gidey and Pedro Teixeira

Tilahun Gidey is lecturer in the Department of Psychology, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia. E-mail: tilahung2000@gmail.com. Pedro Teixeira is director of the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies and associate professor in the Department of Economics, University of Porto, Portugal. E-mail: pedrotx@fep.up.pt.

IHE devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See http://www.albany.edu/.

Until recently, Ethiopian higher education could be characterized as an elite system, with one of the lowest rates of enrollment worldwide. With political changes in the early 1990s, measures were taken to reform education, including the introduction of private education.

Rapid Expansion

Over the last decade, Ethiopia has seen a major leap in education enrollment. Access has increased at all levels, with a significant increase in female participation. Between 1999 and 2008, enrollment in primary schools increased by 237 percent, secondary by 263 percent, and higher education has exhibited the largest proportional increase with a massive expansion of 846 percent.

The private sector has provided a significant contribution to this expansion at all levels of education, notably in higher education. Currently, 56 private higher education institutions are either preaccredited or accredited to offer undergraduate degree programs. The private sector expanded rapidly to attain 16.9 percent of total enrollments in higher education in 2007/08. The pattern of expansion is also observed by the evolution regarding numbers of graduates. The share of graduates from the private sector has moved from 2.4 percent in 2003 to 18.1 percent in 2008.

This expansion is even more striking since private higher education institutions in Ethiopia do not receive any financial support from public sources. Private institutions' funding comes mainly from tuition fees, which are regarded as significant when compared to the country's average family income. The average annual tuition fee in private institutions for degree programs seems to be around US$231, corresponding to 24.8 percent of the household income of an average family. The financial effort required is also very significant since the level of savings in the country is rather low, especially for rural families.

This financial pressure is particularly relevant since access and equity have been cited in several reports as some of the most serious problems of Ethiopian education. These problems in higher education were expected to be addressed more effectively with diversification, including better geographical coverage. In addition, the development of the private sector was regarded as a positive contribution for regional equality in access to higher education, especially as regards rural areas.

Privatization and Regional Coverage

The expansion of higher education has been accompanied by an attempt on the part of the government to establish at least one university in each regional state. Currently, the public higher education institutions are distributed in 8 of the 11 regional states and city administration councils. Three regional states still have no public higher education institution, though these states together represent only 1.6 percent of the Ethiopian population. The high concentration of institutions in the three main regional states is explained partly by the fact that these regions represent more than 80 percent of the country's population. When we look at the private sector, the picture is even more striking (as is generally the case globally). Of the current 56 private institutions, 41 operate in Addis Ababa, the political and economic capital, and the remaining ones are thinly spread across other regions. The limited number of programs in some regions can also be explained by the lack of qualified academic staff or low demand for the institutions' programs.

Although the private sector is highly concentrated in Addis Ababa, several institutions whose headquarters are located there also operate in other regions. Hence, the coverage of the private network is less unequal when we look at these data. These results also suggest that the pattern of expansion is from the capital to the other regional states. On the other hand, more than 85 percent of the institutions offering degree programs in the different regions are located only in the capital cities of those regions.

The first decade of private higher education expansion in Ethiopia indicates that, as in many other parts of world, the private sector's regional expansion has been mostly determined by market opportunities. Nevertheless, the country's capital seems to be working as the major platform for new institutions to establish their headquarters and that some of these institutions are expanding their activities to other regions. Although private institutions are heavily concentrated regionally, existing room for improvement and policymakers may stimulate a different approach.

> **Over the last decade, Ethiopia has seen a major leap in education enrollment. Access has increased at all levels, with a significant increase in female participation.**

It will be interesting to see what stance the regulatory powers will adopt toward the expansion of the private sector and its regional diversification. This is particularly relevant vis-à-vis the more market-oriented institutions, which tend to nurture significant social and political mistrust. Recent signs indicate problems ahead. In late August the government issued a statement that every institution should stop admitting students for distance-education programs and that private institutions are blocked from registering additional students in teacher education and law programs. These decisions were justified on quality grounds, and many private institutions are likely to be severely affected.

Conclusion

Like in many other countries, the expansion of the private sector in Ethiopia seems to be moving to a different and more demanding stage. In the coming years, the National Quality Agency is expected to make quality audits in private higher education. This evaluation process will face significant dilemmas, notably via the extent to which the quality system will accept the existence of different types of institutions (or rather to apply similar criteria to all institutions). Since private sectors are often characterized by significant diversity in size, breadth, and academic strength, the im-

pact of those choices will not be trivial for the development of the private sector in Ethiopia, especially in less-developed regions where access to qualified staff is more limited. The overall coming years will certainly feature increasing tension between the private sector and the government, and it is unclear to what extent regional diversification will benefit from that environment. ∎

International Education in Australia: A Long Way Down

Simon Marginson

Simon Marginson is professor of higher education at the University of Melbourne, Australia. E-mail: s.marginson@unimelb.edu.au.

In Australian universities, more than one in four students are full-fee-paying international students, and education is the nation's fourth-largest export sector after coal, iron ore, and gold. In the last two decades international students have grown by a remarkable 12 percent per annum. Australia enrolls almost as many students from China, including Hong Kong, as the United States.

Australia, a modest nation of 21 million people, commands 6 percent of the world market in international education. Its research universities have more than half as many foreign students as does the whole US doctoral sector, though the US population is 15 times larger than that of Australia. It is impressive or, to be strictly accurate, it was impressive. The Australian business model of international education has long been noted by other countries as a sign of the potential—and limits—of what educational marketing can achieve.

But if you live by the sword you die by the sword. When market forces rule, while business is booming everything looks sweet, but in the world of the market, boom is *always* followed by bust.

Australian international education is in trouble, and the downgrade is likely to be large and long. But this drop was not triggered by the subprime sector or the global financial crisis. Worldwide demand for international education is robust, driven by continuing high economic growth in Asia. The problem is of Australia's own making and is largely government-policy driven.

A sharp reduction in international enrollments in higher education is expected next year. This is a serious problem for universities, which receive an average 16 percent of all their income from this source. In some institutions the level of dependence is well over 20 percent.

The larger economic effects of the downturn in international education are just as important. International education employs more than 125,000 people in industries such as housing, retail, the health sector, insurance, travel, telecommunications and information technology, cinemas, and migration services. It is especially crucial to the economies of inner-urban Melbourne and Sydney and to certain regions.

NUMBERS SLIDE

International student numbers are already sliding in vocational colleges and the specialist English-language institutions. In July 2010, the total number of new (commencing) international students in all sectors was down 22 percent on July 2009. New students from India dropped by 80 percent, and from Thailand, Vietnam, and Hong Kong by 20 percent. Data on new visa applications suggest another fall of almost 20 percent in early 2011 and confirm that the universities are affected. The decline has spread to Australia's main source country—China.

> **But if you live by the sword you die by the sword. When market forces rule, while business is booming everything looks sweet, but in the world of the market, boom is *always* followed by bust.**

Why has this happened? Both demand for and the supply of Australian education are trending downwards. The main driver has been changes on the supply side. It is sad to report that Australia has become less welcoming to international students.

The first sign of trouble appeared two years ago. When a pattern of violent assaults affecting South Asian students hit the front pages of newspapers in both Australia and India, the Australian authorities were slow to respond and received a hammering in the media in India. Then, the Australian government cracked down on migration "scams" perpetuated by some private training colleges in collaboration with education agents in India. Australian education's recruiting power in India slid further.

MIGRATION RESISTANCE

Yet, the main reason why the international education "industry" is in trouble is migration resistance in the Austra-

lian electorate, which has grown in recent years.

Australia is like the United States, Canada, and parts of South America—in that it is a high-migration nation. However, political attitudes to migration fluctuate. Currently, opinion polls are showing that almost four Australians in five say that Australia receives "too many" migrants. Resistance to migration is highest in the eastern cities of Brisbane and Sydney, where years of underinvestment in infrastructure mean that transport, power, water, and other services are under strain.

In the recent Australian federal election both parties realized the election would be decided in Brisbane and Sydney. The opposition Liberal-National parties openly pledged to cut net overseas migration by over 40 percent. But changes already instigated by the Labor government are in the process of achieving that target.

The number of international students on temporary visas is almost double that of permanent migrants. Any substantial downsizing of net overseas migration can only be achieved through major reductions in the number of visas issued to international students.

Government is reducing both the number of incoming students and of graduates who become permanent migrants. Precise figures are difficult to obtain, but it appears that about 40 percent of all international student graduates seek migration status.

The immigration department has created tougher conditions for student visas. Applications face longer delays, some well over three months, and many go elsewhere. In addition, it is now harder for graduates to obtain permanent residence because of work experience and language tests. The skilled migrant intake has been reduced. The immigration minister has the power to apply a discriminatory cap on the number of migrants from particular countries. All these changes have sent out the message that students and migrants are less welcome in Australia. This in turn is driving down demand, as shown by the fall in visa applications.

Australia's capital Canberra is aware that the change in government migration policy has severe consequences for this industry. But the protracted postelection delay before formation of a new government has compounded the problem. No one is taking policy responsibility.

Estimates of the likely downturn in the numbers of international students in Australia—if policy does not change—vary from 40 to 60 percent. Part of Australia's share of the global student market will be absorbed by English-language competitors. In the United Kingdom and United States universities are under pressure to expand the number of international students because of severe cuts in government funding. ∎

The Perils of Commercialism: Australia's Example

Philip G. Altbach and Anthony Welch

Philip G. Altbach is Monan Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Anthony Welch is professor of education at the University of Sydney, Australia. E-mail: Anthony.welch@sydney.edu.au.

More than two decades ago, the Australian government decided that international higher education should become an industry; since then it has become a major income producer for the nation. The higher education sector was motivated to make money from international education by government budget cuts—with revenue to be made up largely by entrepreneurial international activity. The result has been that, notwithstanding a further widespread and welcome internationalization of both student and staff profiles and important initiatives to internationalize programs, the prime goal of internationalization has become money-making (largely driven by government underfunding).

Government Pressure

Encouraged by government policies to marketize higher education and pushed to substitute fees from international students for declining state support, the higher education sector responded energetically with a wide range of initiatives. International student enrollments at Australian universities ballooned, as did income derived from their high tuition fees. Universities also developed a variety of overseas strategies, including branch campuses (in Vietnam, South Africa, Singapore, and elsewhere), twinning arrangements with educational institutions and business enterprises of various kinds in Malaysia and elsewhere. The Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology's Vietnam campus aims to have 10,000 enrollments by 2012 and already has more than 120 international enrollments. Monash University's campus in Malaysia is already offering full medical degrees and has a current total enrollment of over 4,000, with 400 staff. Of the total growth in international student numbers, offshore enrollments have been the fastest-growing component.

The government cooperated by providing some funding for international outreach and, most significantly, by easing visa and other immigration regulations. Thus, this policy made it easy for international students to study in Australia and then remain in the country and work after completing their degrees and certificates.

Emerging Problems

From a financial perspective, the policy created huge success. Educational services became one of Australia's top exports, with official estimates of current total earnings from international education at around US$15.5 billion (most of which is from higher education). But, from an academic viewpoint, problems soon entered the system. Overseas, questions were raised about the quality and ethics of Australian institutional transplants. South Africa wondered about its Monash campus, while the Vietnam and Malaysian initiatives, which had strong support from their respective governments, were more successful. A few initia-

> **Encouraged by government policies to marketize higher education, and pushed to substitute fees from international students for declining state support, the higher education sector responded energetically with a wide range of initiatives.**

tives failed, such as the University of New South Wales in Singapore, costing the university many millions when it withdrew after failing to attract enough students.

Bottom-feeders entered the market, as usually happens when financial gain becomes the central motivator for international higher education. In the private sector, small vocational colleges in fields such as hairdressing and cooking attracted significant numbers of students from abroad, especially from South Asia, with promises of quick certificates and (sometimes spurious) jobs thereafter. Students with marginal qualifications began to stream in, some duped by exaggerated promises made by wily education agents in India. Outbreaks of anti–South Asian prejudice, in Melbourne and elsewhere, highlighting security problems of international students, created a firestorm of criticism in India, some of it sensationalized. While a recent survey of 1,600 international students from 10 universities showed that they still believed Australia to be the safest place to study—including alternative destinations such as the United States, United Kingdom, New Zealand, and

Canada—the problem of attacks on international students was exacerbated by poor handling on the part of both police and politicians, each of whom attempted to label the attacks as opportunistic, rather than racist. The Australian Institute of Criminology has since announced a project to investigate the extent and forms of attacks on international students.

Additional problems arose. The Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, one of the country's most active international universities, has just been accused of encouraging students to cheat on examinations. Press reports about international students being awarded degrees, despite showing up to exams drunk, and to exam papers being leaked to international students are part of an as yet unreleased Ombudsman Report, to which the university will be allowed to respond, before being tabled in the State of Victoria parliament. Previous cases have included allegations of plagiarism, directed at international students enrolled at the University of New England, via a commercial provider.

Such breaches of academic standards are the predictable results of more than a decade of underfunding of higher education, as a university president recently outlined: "The investment by the federal government fell by about 30 percent (per) student in real terms between 1996 and 2004." Indeed, while *Education at a Glance* 2007 data reveal that on average public funding to higher education rose by 49 percent across the member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development over the decade from 1995 to 2004, in Australia funding actually fell by 4 percent (the only member country where this occurred). Until funding is restored to previous levels—something the current federal government has promised to move toward—including a welcome promise to fund the real costs of research, institutions will continue to suffer and resort to internationalization as a budgetary strategy, rather than a cultural and learning strategy.

New Developments

Recent moves by the federal Department of Immigration to reduce the incentive for international students to enroll in short or poor-quality courses, with an eye on migration prospects, are having a welcome shakeout effect, with a number of weaker private vocational colleges that were too dependent upon international student fees having already collapsed. A revised list of occupations that accords priority to the highly skilled who have a job offer will certainly reduce the proportion of international students who cited the prospect of migration as a reason for studying in Australia, a rate that had risen from 5 percent in 2005 to a startling 24 percent by 2009. Current estimates are that international student numbers in Australia may fall by 20 percent, albeit mainly in the vocational sector, with a concomitant decline in revenues. However, for some universities that had grown

too dependent upon high proportions of international enrollments, the effects are likely to be significant. Hopefully, the recently announced reforms will to some extent restore Australia's enviable international academic image—its "brand," which has already been significantly damaged. All of this is a predictable outcome of commercialism shaping international education. Australia's example has important lessons for other countries. The United Kingdom, for example, has not merely been pursuing similar policies, but the recently announced major budget cuts to universities will only push institutions there to pursue international student income even more vigorously. ∎

California's Downfall: Obama's Stimulus Funding Is a Lifeline, But What about Next Year?

John Aubrey Douglass

John Aubrey Douglass is senior research fellow at the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. E-mail: douglass@berkeley.edu. This essay is adopted from a new CSHE working paper, "Re-Imagining California's Higher Education System," available at http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?s=1.

California's famed public higher education system is undergoing a possibly significant redefinition, driven solely by severe budget cuts. Before the onset of the Great Recession, the state's tripartite system (the University of California, the California State University, and a network of nearly 110 community colleges) had been slowly starved of public funding. Over the past two decades, state funding for higher education on a per student basis has plummeted, while enrollment growth has steadily climbed. But now the trend has accelerated mightily, and the policy implications are unprecedented.

Enrollment Cuts

Built around the concept of broad access and quality academic programs, the logic of the system is eroding quickly. In the past, even in bad budget years, California's public universities and colleges accepted all eligible state students applying for admission (students who take required courses, get high grades, and do well on standardized tests). But those days may well be over. For the first time since the conception of this system in the early 20th century, the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) restricted enrollment in their systems.

Last academic year, UC refused some 2,300 UC-eligible freshmen from entering its campuses—equal to a 6 percent overall reduction in the university's systemwide freshman enrollment. Adjusted for inflation and enrollment growth, state funding per student at UC has fallen nearly 40 percent since 1990—from $15,860 in 1990 to $9,560 today in current, inflation-adjusted dollars.

CSU, which at 450,000 is more than twice the size of UC in total enrollment, turned away an estimated 20,000 normally eligible students for admission last year, and planned another 20,000 for this 2010/11 academic year. Combined with reductions in course offerings, one estimate is that some 56,000 students will not gain access to CSU over a two-plus-year period of budget cuts. CSU's planned limit on enrollment is in reaction to successive years of major budget cuts, including a midyear cut of some $66 million and probably larger cuts next academic year, on top of a $31.3 million cut earlier this year.

One hope was that California's community colleges could absorb some of those students who were refused admission to UC and CSU. But these local colleges, which offer two-year associate of arts degrees and various certificates, have been swamped by increased demand for higher education. Before the economic crisis, these community colleges were already the most underfunded in the nation. A budget cut of $825 million the last fiscal year led to wholesale cutting of courses, and shrinking enrollment capacity has translated into a projected 250,000 prospective community college students being denied access.

Explaining the Downturn

How did this unhappy scenario transpire? Beyond the current economic collapse that has hit California particularly hard, a number of underlying macrostructural causes continue. On the one hand, rising costs for prisons and Medicaid, along with mandates for funding the state's public schools, have squeezed out state support for higher education. Public universities, UC and CSU, have the relatively low status of "discretionary" funding, given the absence of constitutional mandates to keep higher education afloat.

On the other hand, the inability of lawmakers to manage the state has magnified the problem. Prudent budget cuts, along with marginal increases in state revenues in better economic times, would have mitigated the huge cuts faced today. In no small measure, the state budget process has been held hostage by right-wing, antigovernment ("starve the beast") conservatives empowered by the un-

usual requirement of a two-thirds vote to pass a budget in the State Assembly. There is blame to go around, that is for sure; but the fact remains that a small group of politicians in safe, heavily conservative districts have been running the budget show.

Raising fees and tuition have formed one policy lever employed to mitigate the state budget cuts. The Obama administration's economic stimulus package has also funneled much-needed funds to education, including some $640 million to UC and CSU and another $160 million to local community colleges.

But neither income source is large enough to offset the dropping of courses, staff and faculty layoffs, cuts in salaries, and ultimately reductions in enrollment. California's state government, and its public higher education system, was at the edge of a cliff of total fiscal collapse; the stimulus bill averted a complete implosion. But it remains largely a one-year fix with some $7.97 billion for California's public schools and higher education system during this fiscal year (2009/10). But because of the severity of the budget problems for higher education, all available stimulus funds for education will have been mostly spent the last academic year, forming a substantial financial hole for 2010/11.

California is already ranked among the bottom states

Built around the concept of broad access and quality academic programs, the logic of the system is eroding quickly.

---

in the number of students who enter higher education and then attain a bachelor's degree. It seems evident that California will now have a significant, further decline in the educational attainment level of its population.

But beyond the immediate effects of educational aspirations denied, and the disproportional effects it will have on lower and middle-income students and their families, the real possibility is under way of an unraveling of California's famed coherent approach to higher education. Currently, no consensus or political leadership appears to solve the long-term consequences of this dramatic breakdown in California's famed higher education system.

The size of California's 2011 state budget deficit, some $19 billion, means a small prospectus that large-scale budget relief is around the corner. States have very limited ability to borrow funds for operating costs, making the federal government the last resort. In short, *how state budgets go, so goes US higher education*; whereas most national systems of higher education financing are tied to national budgets

with an ability to borrow.

Looking into the Future

In the first glimmer of some improvement in the public funding for higher education in California, lame-duck Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed a much-delayed state budget in October 2010, which restores about $199 million, each, to UC and CSU. Combined with a decision to spend much of what little remains of federal stimulus funding for California, both UC and CSU will get an infusion of some $610 million over last year.

But this still leaves both systems some $664 million below their budget allocation in 2007/08. Community colleges received a smaller increase of about 5 percent in the budget deal. Many expect midyear corrections by a new governor as the budget is based on optimistic projections of state revenue, including a presumed $5.5 billion of federal funds to help close the $19 billion state deficit. The new budget includes no new taxes and relies on $7.5 billion in spending cuts and deferred funding payments to K–12 schools and community colleges.

California's plight is perhaps the worst among the US states, but similar stories can be found throughout the nation, with a deleterious effect on access, time-to-degree, degree production, and the morale of faculty and staff at public universities and colleges. Among competitors in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, perhaps only England and Ireland's higher education systems are facing a similar magnitude of austerity cuts. But one big difference in California is that its population is growing—from a current 37 million to a projected 60 million in 2050.

One might postulate that the decisions made today and in reaction to the "Great Recession" by nations will likely speed up global shifts in the race to develop human capital, with the United States probably losing some ground.

There is the real prospect that bachelor degree attainment rates in the United States will dip in the near term, particularly in states like California that have substantially reduced access to higher education even as enrollment demand has gone up. Even with an eventual world economic recovery, it appears that in states such as California a full recovery of public funding is unlikely for public colleges and universities.

We are in the midst of reorganization and redefinition of this famed system with no clear sense of its ultimate outcome. Ironically, 2010 marks the 50th anniversary of California's Master Plan for Higher Education, formulated in 1960. The master plan helped guide the expansion of an already tremendously successful higher education system. That was a proactive effort to balance mass higher education with a high-quality and highly differentiated network

of colleges and universities. What we are experiencing now in California is highly reactive.

How can California once again be placed in the vanguard of supporting and growing a mass system of higher education? In a new working paper informed by the history of the tripartite system, its strengths and weaknesses over time, and the reform efforts of economic competitors throughout the world who are making significant investments in their own tertiary institutions, I offer a "reimagined" network of colleges and universities and a plan for "smart growth." My desire is to start a debate on what would be the next logical phase in the further development of California's network of colleges and universities. ∎

Venezuelan Higher Education: The Chavez Revolution

DANIEL C. LEVY

Daniel C. Levy is SUNY distinguished professor and director of PROPHE, the Program of Research on Private Higher Education, University at Albany. E-mail: DLevy@uamail.albany.edu.

Hugo Chavez's clash with Venezuelan higher education is a vivid present-day example of a history of confrontation between leftist, populist regimes, and higher education in Latin America. Such regimes often regard the existing universities as elitist and thus outside the revolution, while universities often see a dangerous grab for control that restricts their academic freedom. Relations were tense and rocky in the aftermath of the Mexican Revolution of 1910 right up until the 1940s. Peru's leftist military government had a frosty relationship with higher education in the late 1960s. Salvadore Allende's socialist coalition administration faced strong opposition in the early 1970s in Chile, though it also enjoyed strong support. Peronist confrontation with university interests resurfaced in Argentina in the 1970s. Of course the most conspicuous and ongoing example is Cuba, as totalitarianism meant the takeover of higher education by the early 1960s. And, of course, Latin America also has many historical examples of confrontation between *rightist* regimes (sometimes military) and higher education, but this is not a history to which today's Venezuela attaches itself.

President since 1998, Chavez has been transforming the country's higher education. Supporters find the changes consistent with Chavez's overall Bolivarian Revolution—socialist, populist, and with a strong indigenous orientation.

Critics find the changes consistent with an overall assault on democracy and on academic autonomy and quality. Neither side questions that much has been transformed, notwithstanding that their evaluations of good and bad are diametrically opposed.

Higher education transformation must be seen in the overall context of Venezuela's regime-inspired political and socioeconomic transformation. Chavez policies have split the left both outside and inside the country. Oliver Stone's recent *South of the Border* documentary film is expansively promotional, whereas democratic socialists internationally have been disenchanted. In foreign affairs the regime, buttressed by oil revenues, is markedly anticapitalist and anti-US government. It has allied itself with countries such as Iran and

> **President since 1998, Chavez has been transforming the country's higher education. Supporters find the changes consistent with Chavez's overall Bolivarian Revolution. . . . Critics find the changes consistent with an overall assault on democracy and on academic autonomy and quality.**

Syria and naturally with populist-leftist regional counterparts in countries such as Bolivia and Ecuador. It has come close to blows with neighboring Colombia, a close US ally, and allowed refuge for Colombia's armed rebels. In higher education, confrontation with Venezuela's traditionally left-leaning national university (Universidad Central) shows the domestic rift. Student-led opposition speaks of a "third path," against both Chavez and the previously long-standing and ossified elite that Chavez has popularly rejected.

THE UNIVERSIDAD BOLIVARIANA

The latest chapter in the higher education saga during the Chavez era involves criticism of a new formula for government funding of public higher education. The basis for funding will be enrollment size. Why would the rector of the historic national university strongly criticize this approach?—because Chavez has transformed the public sector through creation and expansion of new universities. By decree he established in 2003 the Universidad Bolivariana,

which would already have a massive 180,000 student body by 2006, with a stated target of a million by 2009 (with 190 satellite campuses). Even the 2006 enrollment figure makes the university one of the largest in Latin America. Anything approaching the projected goal would make it by far the largest Latin American university. The university is not only tuition free but also offers open admissions. A lack of tuition has been the norm in the country's public sector (and in Latin America's) and there have been occasional open admissions policies in other countries (e.g., Argentina), but the admissions policy for the Universidad Bolivariana goes further. It also goes markedly further than Venezuela's traditional policy of relative high access by the standards of the region.

The Universidad Bolivariana is part of Chavez's overall

> **The recent confrontation with the national university seems to be more about diminishing the autonomous universities' relative weight rather than directly attacking them.**

"Mission Sucre," using social programs to help the poor, indigenous, and transforming society. Critics perceive in the Bolivariana yet another stroke of political control, whereas the university and its defenders appropriate the opposition's language insofar as they claim to be fostering pluralism and democracy.

Pre-Existing Private and Public Sectors

As one would expect, Chavez's policies have alienated the country's private-business sector. The regime speaks often of the "public interest" as opposed to "private interests." Private schools at lower educational levels have felt themselves challenged and restricted. In higher education there is strong antagonism with private universities. The Santa Rita university has been accused of running illegal programs. In many parts of the world such charges have often led to a denial of accreditation or to probation. However, the Santa Rita has been nationalized in 2010. Santa Rita declares the assault purely political. However, most Venezuelan private universities function with considerable continuity. A degree of private autonomy, even while the public sector is more manipulated, has precedent in the region—as in Argentina under the military in the 1960s and 1970s and Brazil under the military in the mid-1960s.

More striking than Venezuelan private-university con-

tinuity is that even the country's public "autonomous" universities have maintained a degree of continuity and autonomy. The large benefits secured over the years—perhaps unsurpassed in Latin America—remain mostly in tack. (Long before the Chavez era, public "experimental" universities were added alongside the "autonomous" universities, partly to create an alternative to them.) One can only speculate on the reasons for Chavez's relatively hands-off approach in regard to the public autonomous universities as well as the private universities. Perhaps Chavez has not wanted to take another step in hardening middle-class opposition.

The recent confrontation with the national university seems to be more about diminishing the autonomous universities' relative weight rather than directly attacking them. These universities are reduced in importance by virtue of the massive growth in the regime-aligned new public universities. Similarly, if the private sector is not directly repressed, it loses relative weight. Just five years ago it accounted for over 40 percent of the nation's total higher education enrollment; now, owing to the massive new public growth, the share is around half that.

Chavez's present term expires in 2112. Even if he is defeated at the polls (which is in doubt) and leaves power (which is also in doubt) what transpires between now and then? And what ensues after that point? Will the system presently be further transformed? ∎

Drivers of Mobility of Chinese and Indian Students

Rahul Choudaha

Rahul Choudaha is the founder of www.DrEducation.com and specializes in international higher education. E-mail: Rahul@DrEducation.com.

India and China are becoming increasingly influential, not only in the global economy but also in the supply of globally mobile students. The proportion of Chinese and Indian students among international students grew from 25 percent in 2004/05 to 30 percent in 2008/09. This translates into an addition of nearly 59,000 more Indian and Chinese students in the United States over five years. What is driving this pace and direction of mobility of In-

dian and Chinese students? It is important to understand the context of mobility so that policies and practices could be effectively implemented.

Regarding Chinese and Indian students, on the supply side, two key drivers are increasing prosperity and the ability to afford foreign education and rapid expansion of the system at the expense of quality. On the demand side, two key drivers are an aggressive outreach by universities to compensate for budget cuts and availability of a wider range of recruitment channels and service providers.

Increasing Prosperity

Chinese and Indian economies are prospering and making it more affordable to pursue foreign education. According to Asia-Pacific Wealth Report in 2009 there were 477,000 and 127,000 (US dollar) millionaires in China and India, respectively. This is an addition of 113,000 and 43,000 millionaires in one year for China and India, respectively. In addition, the number of such millionaires in China and India are expected to triple between 2008 and 2018.

This increasing prosperity reflects the changing nature and growth of the economy, which is also demanding new talent. For example, consider the case of the insurance industry in India and China. Both India and China pursued reforms in the insurance industry in the 1990s, which resulted in expansion of the sector. This, in turn, propelled the demand for new professionals, like actuaries, who are still in huge demand by the industry and command significant premium in the labor market. Likewise, there are several new sectors and professions that have created new wealth among Indians and Chinese.

Expansion without Quality

Even though the Indian and Chinese economies have grown, the supply of higher education has increased at a great pace but without emphasis on quality, although China has invested in its top universities with reasonable success in terms of academic quality. This has resulted in a skill gap and significant unemployability among educated youth. For China, the gross-enrollment ratio increased from 6 percent to 23 percent in a decade. However, according to the Chinese education ministry, more than 1.5 million college graduates from the class of 2010 are unemployed. Likewise, for India, the annual intake of undergraduate engineering seats has doubled to over 1 million in five years. However, only 25 percent of engineering students are employable.

This situation has created a paradoxical situation of high demand for talent on one side and unemployment among educated youth on the other side. Often, this issue of skill gap does not reflect the ability of the student but more so the quality of the institution that has failed to provide sufficient learning and development opportunities for students. A significant portion of these students intend to study abroad in search of better education and employment opportunities. This is also the segment that needs significant assistance in their search process and hence reaches out to agents for hand-holding. Most self-directed, high-quality students do not go through the agents and apply directly.

Institutional Outreach

On the demand side, state budget cuts for higher education institutions is pushing them to aggressively recruit and accept international students. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, at least 43 states have implemented cuts to public colleges and universities. For example, Georgia has reduced state funding for public higher education for 2011 by US$151 million, or 7 percent. International students who pay nonresident fees and get no federal financial aid help universities in overcoming some financial challenges by increasing the tuition earned per student.

Several public universities including Kent State Uni-

This increasing prosperity reflects the changing nature and growth of the economy, which is also demanding new talent.

---

versity, Iowa State University, and Arkansas State University have reported double-digit growth in international student enrollment for fall 2010. This growth is not only a result of increased outreach to leading source countries like India and China but also an increase in the acceptance of international students by some universities. For example, the proportion of freshman international students in the University of California system increased from 3.5 percent in fall 2008 to 5.3 percent in fall 2010, indicating a higher acceptance of international students.

New Models of Recruitment

Increased outreach efforts by universities are being enabled by the emergence and acceptance of new models of international recruitment. These new models include online advertising and also commission-based agent models. For example, a statement by Marlene M. Johnson, executive director and chief executive officer of NAFSA: Association of International Educators, was quoted in the *Chronicle of Higher Education:* "There's clearly an acceptance of agents or counselors that there wasn't five years ago, or even one

year ago."

While an online recruitment channel was simply non-existent a couple of years back, today many Web sites exist—like Chasedream.com in China and Pagalguy.com in India—which have become integral to the student decision-making process. Chasedream.com has nearly 220,000 members, while Pagalguy.com has more than 400,000 members; and both of them cater to prospective master of business administration students. Several institutions are now using Web sites for advertising and outreach opportunities to prospective students. While the acceptance of new models is increasing, the debate about the value-added and ethical standards employed by them is also evolving.

Conclusion

While the United States continues to see the growth in students from India and China, its share as a preferred destination dropped from 26 percent to 19 percent in the period 2000–2008. Here, the loss is not only about the numbers but more so about the talent and associated opportunities of innovation and development. Thus, in these times of increasing competition for attracting the best global talent with decreasing budgets, understanding of the drivers of mobility from the two largest-source countries—India and China—would aid policymakers, practitioners, and researchers in recruiting from these countries in an efficient and effective manner. It is also clear from these drivers that the commercial intent is becoming more dominant than the academic or intercultural values of international education.

New Publications

Gasman, Marybeth, ed. *The History of U.S. Higher Education: Methods for Understanding the Past.* New York: Routledge, 2010. 222 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-87365-9. Web site: www.routledge.com.

This book offers a collection of essays combining personal experiences and historical discussions of a variety of themes relevant to American higher education. A focus is on the methodological relevance of these topics. Among them are institutional histories of universities and colleges, using archival research, socioeconomic status, and historical research.

Hoffa, William W., and Stephen C. DePaul, eds. *A History of U.S. Study Abroad: 1965–Present.* Carlisle, PA: Frontiers Journal, 2010. 511 pp. (pb). ISSN 1085-45688. Web site: www.frontiersjournal.com.

A comprehensive set of essays on aspects of US study-abroad experience since 1965, this book features chapters on national policies and globalization and their impact on study-abroad programs, the diversification of student participants, the economics of study abroad, the impact of technology, the curriculum, campus internationalization, the professionalization of the field of study abroad, and other topics.

Johnson, David, ed. *Politics, Modernization, and Educational Reform in Russia: From Past to Present.* Oxford, UK: Symposium Books, 2010. 173 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-873927-41-0. Web site: www. symposium-books.co.uk.

This book provides a multidimensional perspective on education reform and change in Russia over time. Most of the chapters focus on higher education. Among the themes discussed are the democratization of higher education, the unified admissions test for higher education, restructuring, and management of postsecondary education.

Kaiser, David, ed. *Becoming MIT: Moments of Decision.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010. 207 pp. $24.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-262-11323-6.

A part of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's 150th anniversary commemoration, this book focuses on a series of turning points in the university's history that shaped the institution over time. Among the themes discussed are the early years of the institute, how war affected MIT's programs and research, the postwar period of expansion, the development of life sciences, and institutional mergers.

Kelo, Maria, and Tim Rogers, with Laura E. Rumbley. *International Student Support in European Higher Education: Needs, Solutions, and Challenges.* Bonn, Germany: Lemmens, 2010. €29 (pb) ISBN 978-3-932306-99-0.

The focus of this book is on non-European students studying in European universities. These students have quite different needs than European students in the Bologna era. Based on analysis of university and government policies and a survey of students, university policies and programs are described, and recommendations are made for future policies.

Maki, Peggy, ed. *Coming to Terms with Student Outcomes Assessment.* Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2010. 227 pp. $24.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-57922-435-6. Web site: www.Styluspub.com.

This volume examines how professors

think about assessing student learning and outcomes. The authors discuss their own approaches and how they have developed tools for evaluating their students. Case studies from the sciences, social sciences, and humanities are included. The context is the United States.

Marginson, Simon, Christopher Nyland, Erlenawati Sawir, and Helen Forbes-Mewett. *International Student Security*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 514 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-521-13805-5. Web site: www.cambridge.org.

Focusing on Australia and based on a series of interviews with international students as well as analysis of relevant literature, this book discusses all aspects of the security of international students. Analysis of immigration issues, housing, health, and finances in the public domain and such themes as language competency, friends and family, intercultural relations, and others in the private domain provide insights into how international students function in their academic environment. This book is the first one concentrating on these key themes. It has wide international relevance.

McMillen, William. *From Campus to Capitol: The Role of Government Relations in Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2010. 175 pp. $40 (hb). ISBN: 978-0-8018-9459-6. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Relations between universities and government are increasingly complex as well as important to the institution. Funding is central but a range of regulations including policies relating to intellectual property, research, student loans, and other relationships are all central to higher education. Written by an experienced American government-affairs official, this book explores these issues in the United States.

Poole, Gregory S., and Ya-Chen Chen, eds. *Higher Education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the Professoriate*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense, 2009. 180 pp. $45 (pb). ISBN 978-94-6091-126-2. Web site: www.sense-publishers.com.

The Asian academic profession is in the process of change reflecting university reforms and improvements. This book focuses on Japan, Hong Kong, and to some extent China and Taiwan. Among the themes are professors at private universities in Japan, Japanese reforms and internationalization, administrative work in Japanese universities, Hong Kong academics and the "Western" academic model, and others.

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University. *The Changing Academic Profession 1992–2007*. Hiroshima, Japan: RIHE, 2009. 300 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-4-902808-53-7. Web site: www.en.rihe.hiroshima-u.ac.jp.

The Changing Academic Profession study is a multination research project concerning the attitudes of the academic profession worldwide. This volume focuses on academic careers, attitudes, and changes over the past several decades. Key themes include internationalization and the academic profession and academic careers in comparative perspective. Several national case studies are also presented.

Ritzen, Jo. *A Chance for European Universities*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Univ. Press, 2009. 221 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-9089-642417. Web site: www.aup.nl.

Jo Ritzen, former Dutch minister of education and currently president of Maastricht University, argues that European universities have lost their competitive edge and must innovate if they are to compete globally. He urges that governance structures be made more innovative, that government funding be replaced by private support to some extent, that the Bologna process must include quality assurance and other Europe-wide initiatives, among other changes.

Saroyan, Alenoush, and Mariane Frenay, eds. *Building Teaching Capacities in Higher Education: A Comprehensive International Model*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers, 2010. 211 pp. $35 (hb). ISBN 978-1-57922-410-3. Web site: www.Styuspub.com.

Faculty development, or training academics specifically for teaching, has become a significant new higher education theme. This book discusses what is taking place in faculty development in different national settings—including Belgium, Switzerland, France, and Canada. Several chapters focus on the broader issues of faculty development.

Seggie, Nevra Fatma, and Reitumetse Obakeng Mabokela, eds. *Islam and Higher Education in Traditional Societies*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense, 2009. 100 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-90-8790-703-7. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

A discussion of the intersection between Islam and higher education, this book contains essays on academic freedom in the United States and Iran, the experience of Muslim academics in South Africa, Muslim women in British universities, Islam and higher education in Pakistan, and a discussion of the undergraduate core curriculum in the United States.

Segrera, Francisco López, Colin Brock, and José Sobrinho, eds. *Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean 2008*. Caracas: UNESCO-IESALC, 2009. 352 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-980-7175-03-6. Web site: www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve.

Trend essays concerning Latin America, Central America, the Anglophone Caribbean, and key countries in the region are included in this book. The chapters provide current statistical information and analysis by many of the most insightful analysts of higher education. Among the countries included are Cuba, the Andean countries, Venezuela, Colombia, Chile, Brazil, and others.

Smart, John C., ed. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, vol. 25*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2010. 567 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-90-481-8597-9. Web site: www.springer.com.

Now in its 25th year of publication, this handbook is one of the most valuable sources of research on higher education. Focusing almost exclusively on American issues and with American authors, the handbook has relevance internationally but is mainly use-

ful to US researchers. Among the themes featured in the 25th volume are the role of financial aid in promoting enrollment, student retention, reforms in STEM fields in doctoral education, research libraries, faculty-administrator relations, and others.

Stromquist, Nelly P., ed. *La Profesión Académica en la Globalización.* Mexico City: ANUIES, 2009. 319 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-607-451-008-9.

Focusing on how the academic profession has reacted to globalization, the essays in this book discuss such issues as academics in the private universities in Peru, the working conditions of the academic profession in Mexico, the changing conditions of academic work in Russia, and others.

Teranishi, Robert T. *Asians in the Ivory Tower: Dilemmas of Racial Inequality in American*

Higher Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 2010. 192 pp. $31.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-8077-5130-5. Web site: www.tcpress. com.

Asians in the United States are seen as the "model minority," with high levels of education and achievement. While this is the case for some Asian groups, it is not the case for all. This book identifies Asian American populations that have not achieved higher education and analyzes why this is the case.

Toby, Jackson. *The Lowering of Higher Education in America: Why Financial Aid Should Be Based on Student Performance.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, 2010. 208 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-313-37898-0. Web site: www.abc-clio. com.

Admissions standards have fallen in the United States, according to sociologist Toby. He proposes a radical solution—to tie finan-

cial aid to academic performance as well as financial need. His argument is that students need to be given incentives to work harder at their studies.

Weber, Luc E., and James J. Duderstadt, eds. *University Research for Innovation. London: Economica, 2010.* 358 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-2-7178-5797-9.

A volume stemming from the Glion seminars for university leaders, the focus of this book is research and innovation and the role of higher education. Several of the chapters discuss research and innovation in specific national and regional contexts, including Latin America, Singapore, Canada, and others. Others focus on strategies for change, the broader role of universities in technological development, and related themes.

CIHE's New Web Site: Using Technology to Its Fullest

In September, the Center for International Higher Education launched a newly redesigned Web site. In addition to updating "our look," the new Web site reflects a great deal of discussion, research, and development.

The Center's Web site was first launched more than 15 years ago, the veritable Stone Age of the Internet. Over time a great deal of information was compiled on the CIHE site, beginning with the *International Higher Education* archive and the International Higher Education Network for Africa and, later, the Higher Education Corruption Monitor, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse, and the podcast series. Eventually, it became increasingly apparent that the many added Web pages, with a lot of information, were rarely used, given the difficulty to access the information.

The redesigned Web site created new possibilities. It now has a content management system that organizes information hosted on the Web site. CIHE's advanced search page [http://tinyurl.com/2bv47cq] reveals the full power that is now offered.

Using the search page exposes the books, papers, journals, research centers, and people relevant to a topic or a combination of topics. The goal is to provide a key resource for researchers, graduate students, and practitioners in international higher education.

Your contributions and suggestions would be welcomed to the Web-based database. It will be a pleasure to host unpublished papers and monographs, to list research centers, associations, or publications connected in some way to the Center's field.

The CIHE database of "experts" or individuals whose scholarship contributes to international discussion can now be further developed with CVs, photographs, and better descriptions of individual activities. Please send these additions to: reisberg@bc.edu.

Given the ongoing developing and building, it is hoped that the site will often be accessed and will continually please and surprise the visitors. All suggestions and comments are welcome and should be directed to Liz Reisberg, reisberg@bc.edu.

News of the Center

The Center has received a grant of $157,000 for three years to help fund the publication of *International Higher Education*. Coverage of African higher education will be enhanced as a result of this assistance. *IHE* continues to be published in Chinese by the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University and in Russian by the Independent Quality Assurance Agency of Kazakhstan. *IHE* is distributed in English to readers in the German-speaking countries as a part the *Deutsche Universitätzeitung*, the main magazine concerning higher education.

CIHE director Philip G. Altbach spoke at several conferences during the fall. He was a featured speaker at a workshop sponsored by the Academic Cooperation Association in Brussels on the theme of world-class universities. While there, he also led a discussion of Belgian university leaders in internationalization sponsored by Education USA. He was the keynote speaker at an international conference of the heads of university-based institutes of advanced study, sponsored by the University of Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany, and he participated in a conference on the future of the Sultan Qaboos University, held in Muscat, Oman. Altbach spoke at a conference of higher education specialists in Moscow, Russia. While in Russia, he was interview by Russia Television—a link to the interview can be found on the Center's Web site. He also serves on the planning committee for the Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, higher education conference, to be held in April 2011.

The commercial edition of Altbach's edited volume, *Leadership for World-Class Universities: Challenges for Developing Countries*, has been published by Routledge. It is available in paperback. Philip G. Altbach, Liz Reisberg, and Laura E. Rumbley's *Trends in Global Higher Education*, has been published in an Arabic translation by the Ministry of Higher Education of Saudi Arabia and in Chinese by the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press.

Philip G. Altbach was recently appointed to the editorial board of *Times Higher Education*. Work has been completed on the 3rd edition of *American Higher Education in the 21st Century*, coedited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumport. The book will be published by the Johns Hopkins Univ. Press in spring 2011.

The Center is hosting several visiting scholars. Zeno Reinhardt is a Fulbright scholar from the National University for Political Studies and Public Administration in Bucharest, Romania. Mauricio Horn is also a Fulbright scholar from the University of Buenos Aires in Argentina. Manja Klemencic is a consultant working with the government of Slovenia.

CIHE-Higher School of Economics Project Enters Final Phase

The research project on academic salaries, remuneration, and contracts is moving into its final stage. Researchers from most of the 28 countries involved with the study met in Moscow at the State University-Higher School of Economics in October to discuss their research papers. Final revisions are now under way. Organized by our Russian research directors, Maria Yudkevich and Gregory Androushchak, the group also made presentations to a Russian higher education conference that marked the inauguration of a new research society for higher education in Russia. Liz Reisberg and Iván F. Pacheco are the lead researchers at CIHE. The project features the 28 country papers, five more detailed chapters focusing on Brazil, Russia, India, China, and the United States, and a series of carefully formulated statistical tables. It is expected that data should be available in mid-2011.

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

The Center for International Higher Education (CIHE)

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

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

CIHE Web Site

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of *International Higher Education* are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

The Program in Higher Education at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science–based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/.

Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.