

This requires engagement in university-wide and continuous awareness programs. In doing so, it is important to consider a few points. First, the program should reach the entire university community. Engaging with those who are thought to have less awareness or those who are naturally drawn to the issue is not enough. Second, considering that certain aspects of gender bias and sexual violence are so deeply rooted in social norms, it is important to start with a clarification of the meaning of sexual violence and its manifestations. Third, programs should include different mechanisms of engagement and incentives to increase participation and sustainability.

Cognizant of resource constraints and limited qualified personnel, a possible remedy is the use of volunteer training of trainers, with standardized materials and quality control, that multiplies through a pyramid scheme to reach every part of the university over a certain period. Once that is achieved, offering mandatory training to all new students and employees can be a possible further step in order to ensure sustainability.

This peer-based approach is not a substitute for other strategies, nor is it sufficient on its own. It has to be used as an integrated component of broad-based approaches, both top-down and bottom-up. It is worth noting that the explicit commitment of university and system-level leadership is a crucial force for success. Promoting a safe and supportive working environment for women in senior management and among faculty and staff, as well as strengthening student services with qualified staff and sufficient resources, are indispensable measures to be taken by institutions and by the government. However, the perceivable absence of genuine commitment from the top should not deter student services and gender affairs offices from striving for change within current constraints. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.94.1051>

***International Higher Education* would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) for its support of coverage of higher education in Africa and for its general support of our publication. CCNY has long recognized the importance of higher education in Africa and beyond, and this generosity significantly enables both our work as well as that of our partner at the University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).**

## Brexit and Universities: Toward a Reconfiguration of the European Higher Education Sector?

ALINE COURTOIS

*Aline Courtois is research associate, Centre for Global Higher Education, Institute of Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: a.courtois@ucl.ac.uk.*

In a 2016 referendum, 51.9 percent of registered voters were in favor of the United Kingdom leaving the European Union. The “Brexit” process—the practicalities of which are still largely unknown—was officially triggered in May 2017. Brexit may have serious implications for higher education in the United Kingdom and beyond.

At present, the United Kingdom is the second largest recipient of competitive research funding from the European Union after Germany. UK researchers are more likely to be chosen as leaders in collaborative funding bids, and the United Kingdom is a favorite destination of individual recipients of research fellowships. Six percent of students and a staggering 17 percent of staff at UK universities are from other EU countries. While the prestige of UK higher education institutions plays a part in this success, the United Kingdom benefits from its position as a “gateway” to Europe, attracting students and researchers for this reason also.

In addition, nearly half of the academic papers produced by the United Kingdom are written in collaboration with at least one international partner—and among the top 20 countries UK academics cooperate the most with, 13 are in the European Union. A significant proportion of these jointly authored papers arise from research collaborations funded by the European Union. Finally, several key pan-European research facilities such as the High Power Laser Energy Research Facility are based in the United Kingdom. Free movement, which is guaranteed under the rules of EU membership at present, is essential for these research facilities to be used to their full potential.

A “hard Brexit” could be devastating for the UK higher education sector. Yet, it is clear that the UK higher education system will not be the only one affected in the event of a “hard Brexit” where, in the worst-case scenario, EU students would be charged full international fees to study in the United Kingdom, freedom of movement for researchers would be restricted, and the United Kingdom would no longer be able to participate in collaborative bids for funding.

### THE BREXIT AND EUROPE RESEARCH PROJECT AT CGHE

In this context, the Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE) set out to investigate the potential impact of Brexit on higher education and research across Europe. We were able to gather researchers from 10 research centers on higher education in Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, and Switzerland, as well as the United Kingdom. Over the following few months, 127 interviews were conducted across these countries with key individuals at the national level as well as with university leaders, academics, and internationally mobile early-career researchers. Research participants were encouraged to reflect on the impact of Brexit on their institutions and their respective national systems.

### BETWEEN RISK AND OPPORTUNITY: AN UNEVEN IMPACT

The research revealed contrasting attitudes from one country to another. Strikingly, participants in Eastern European countries such as Hungary and Poland (as well as some interviewees in Portugal) expressed the view that they were not valued collaborators of the United Kingdom in the first place, and that the impact of Brexit would therefore be relatively limited.

---

### A “hard Brexit” could be devastating for the UK higher education sector.

---

The bigger countries in our study, such as Germany, may in fact benefit from a possible reallocation of funds. Northern European countries such as Denmark and the Netherlands were more ambivalent. On the one hand, given their performance in terms of grant capture and research productivity, and also given the fact they tend to offer courses in English, they are well positioned to benefit from a withdrawal of the United Kingdom. Yet, part of their success owes to their Anglo-Saxon orientation. In this sense, it was felt that the departure of the United Kingdom would compound the negative impact of political changes in the United States on future collaborations with valued partners. Dutch and Danish participants also made it clear that they relied on the United Kingdom as a political ally in discussions at the EU level—where there are tensions between countries favoring competitive research funding and countries preferring a less competitive and more egalitarian system. Ireland may find itself in an ambiguous situation, poised to benefit in terms of international student flows, yet largely dependent on the UK system in many ways. The fate of students and expatriates in the United Kingdom was also

a matter of concern, in particular for Poland and Portugal.

Overall, it was felt that the United Kingdom had a lot to lose in terms of attractiveness and reputation. UK participants were particularly concerned about the risk of losing funding in the humanities and social sciences, doubting that the UK government would replace the funding for these sectors in a context of the growing marketization of higher education. Fears were also expressed by staff on temporary research contracts interviewed in Switzerland that nonpermanent academics would suffer most.

### A RECONFIGURATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH LANDSCAPE

While cooperation is a key principle of the current system, not all countries are equal partners. The Erasmus program was designed as a reciprocal student exchange scheme. However, some countries receive a lot more students than they send: this is the case in particular of Ireland and the United Kingdom, where only a limited number of home students take up this European mobility opportunity. Success rates in European Research Council applications vary widely from one country to another, and networks of affinities are clearly discernible—often clustered around one of the bigger countries such as Germany and the United Kingdom, and to a lesser extent Spain, France, and Italy.

Planning ahead for an unpredictable Brexit, in most countries interview participants envisaged replacing the United Kingdom with another strong research partner and/or reinforcing existing links within and outside the region. On the one hand, some participants—in particular academics—were eager to continue collaborating with their UK colleagues no matter what shape Brexit would take. On the other hand, the majority of research participants shared pragmatic views and emerging strategies to minimize the cost of Brexit to their own national systems and institutions; and these often implied partially excluding UK partners from collaborations.

### A THREAT TO THE EUROPEAN PROJECT AT LARGE

EU membership has played a significant role in the success of the United Kingdom, but the research productivity and reputation of UK institutions have also helped the region in achieving great visibility in the global higher education and research landscape.

One salient point that came up repeatedly across the study is a concern not only for the quality and reputation of European higher education and research, but for the future of the European project at large. Regional reputation would be under strain if the United Kingdom was completely cut off in “punishment” for the Brexit vote. On the other hand, favorable terms and a more positive outcome for the United Kingdom might encourage anti-EU movements elsewhere.

This would send a rather xenophobic message to potential international applicants and ultimately put the whole European project at risk. Brexit is thus a matter of concern on many different levels for the whole region.

The full report “Higher education and Brexit: current European perspectives” can be accessed at <http://www.researchcghe.org/publications/higher-education-and-brexit-current-european-perspectives/>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.94.10517>

## India and China: Two Major Higher Education Hubs in Asia

P.J. LAVAKARE

*P.J. Lavakare is the former secretary of the Science Advisory Council, government of India, and the former executive director to the US–India Education Foundation, New Delhi, India. E-mail: lavakarepj@gmail.com.*

India and China are considered to be potential major hubs in Asia for international students. Both have large and diverse higher education systems. Students from both countries are keen to enter the global employment market. It is this challenge that demands the respective national education systems produce “global citizens” with the high-level, high-quality, diverse, and international educational backgrounds needed on the global market. International higher education also involves having a diverse international student population enrolled in local higher education institutions (HEI). Both countries are trying to attract large numbers of international students into their systems. This article briefly reviews the international education status of India and China and highlights some crucial parameters governing the two systems.

### HIGHER EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE

India has 799 universities and nearly 38,000 (mainly undergraduate) affiliated colleges; China has 2,880 universities. Their respective national enrollments are 34.5 million and 47.9 million. Both systems encourage the establishment of private HEIs. China has made major efforts to improve more than 100 of its universities, and seven of them are now ranked in the top 200 by the *Times Higher Education* (THE) world university ranking. India has been tinkering with some reforms, trying to improve its top universi-

ties, but so far none of the Indian universities are ranked in the top 200 globally. In spite of the fact that English is the language of instruction at most Indian HEIs, they have not been able to attract international students because of their poor ranking. Chinese universities have gone out of their way in this regard and are offering programs taught in English at some of their good universities. Chinese English-medium medical institutions are even attracting students from India, as Chinese authorities have ensured that these institutions are recognized by the Medical Council of India. India has not made any such major reform to attract international students. Further, China has set up the China Scholarship Council (CSC) as a nonprofit organization under the Chinese ministry of education, offering scholarships to international students to study in China. This council also offers scholarships to Chinese students for study abroad. The Indian agency coordinating the higher education sector, the University Grants Commission (UGC), does not have any such promotional measures to attract international students or to encourage Indian students to get international exposure. Clearly, the Chinese educational infrastructure is significantly more favorable to international education and international students.

### STUDENT MOBILITY IN INDIA AND CHINA

The mobility of both inbound and outbound students has become an important dimension of internationalization programs. In 2015, there were 181,872 Indian students studying abroad, while during the same period, 523,700 Chinese students were studying abroad. India does not restrict studying abroad, but, unlike China, it does not offer many scholarships. While India has demonstrated steady growth, China has shown sizable upward and downward variations. But the trend is clear: China is keen to expose its students to study abroad and has taken concrete steps to provide them with national scholarships. In India, a few elite institutions like the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) have recently started some internship abroad programs for their engineering students, with some scholarship support and the help of partner institutions. In the long run, the well-educated Chinese workforce will definitely provide tough competition to young Indian professionals seeking employment abroad. The Chinese are catching up on their English language skills, which for many years have been a great advantage for Indian students.

The most noticeable change in the internationalization programs of India and China is in the area of receiving international students. In 2015, India attracted only 42,420 international students, while, that same year, China was able to attract 397,635 international students. This was a result of a major national initiative, the establishment of the CSC, which not only helps to centrally recruit international