students from disadvantaged backgrounds, to be distributed across the full range of study programs. This latter stipulation ensures that students from low-income backgrounds are not limited to low-cost or low-prestige degree programs. The law defines disadvantage on two grounds: low-income status and/or coming from one of the country's most isolated and deprived districts. To address the first criterion, the state now imposes means-tested tuition fees at all state HEIs. In other words, about a third of students in the HE system only pay what their families can afford. To address the second criterion, the state has introduced an affirmative action scholarship scheme targeting students from Papua and Aceh in particular (ADik Papua/3T).

To further boost participation for low-income students, the government introduced the merit-based and means-tested Bidikmisi scholarship in 2010. The MRTHE dispenses a set tuition fee contribution directly to the host institution, and a living stipend directly to the student. Accredited private HEIs are also eligible to participate in this scheme, as long as they demonstrate a minimum B-ranking at institutional and degree program level. Including trusted private HEIs in the scheme widens student access to high-quality and niche programs unavailable elsewhere. Some private providers have proven success in teaching hard-to-reach groups of students, which further aids equitable access. Of course, the scheme cannot be compared to a blanket study grant along the lines of financial aid packages offered in some European countries. In 2017, the *Bidikmisi* cohort reached 80,000 students, equating to roughly 15 percent of the state sector intake for the year, or 5 percent of the combined state and private sector intake overall. The number of applicants outstrips the quotas allocated each year. Clearly, there is still an unmet need for financial aid, but the scheme is at least a valuable start.

Conclusion

Of course, accountability of the HE sector cannot be resolved overnight, but Indonesia has at least made an impressive start. Whether this model can be replicated elsewhere is by no means clear. Arriving at the current policy framework in Indonesia was certainly a long and contested process. A policy U-turn in favor of protecting teaching quality and fair access across the whole system only came about after civil society protests, a protracted legal battle, the revoking of an earlier marketization law by the constitutional court, and disagreement between competing factions within government. Ultimately, though, Indonesia has defied the frequently espoused policy rhetoric about quality and equity being an "either–or" choice. Pursuit of one does not have to come at the expense of the other. The case of Indonesia certainly offers a tempting proposition for other massifying, emerging economy contexts—might it be possible to have your cake and eat it too? ■

Post-18 Education and Funding in England

Claire Callender

Claire Callender is professor of higher education at the Institute of Education, University College London, and at Birkbeck College, University of London, UK. E-mail: c.callender@bbk.ac.uk.

This article is based on the Augar Review report, Independent Panel Report to the Review of Post-18 Education and Funding *(UK Government, 2019), available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/post-18-review-of-education-and-funding-independent-panel-report.*

During the 2017 general election in the United Kingdom, the opposition—the Labour Party—proposed that higher education tuition fees should be abolished. Labour were rewarded with a better than expected election performance, especially from younger voters. The Conservative Party narrowly won the election. In a knee-jerk reaction, Prime Minister Theresa May in February 2018 commissioned Philip Augar, a banker and historian, to head up a review of post-18 education and funding. Its terms of reference, confined to England, were to "look at how we can ensure that the education system for those aged 18 years and over is accessible to all, is supported by a funding system that provides value for money and works for students and taxpayers, incentivizes choice and competition across the sector, and encourages the development of the skills that we need as a country." The Augar Review's report, *Independent panel report to the Review of Post-18 Education and Funding* was finally published in May 2019.

The Augar Report's core message is the need to confront the disparity between the 50 percent of young people who participate in higher education and the other 50 percent who do not. Tackling this divide "is a matter of fairness and equity and is likely to bring considerable social and economic benefits to individuals and the country." Does the report succeed?

Higher Education Funding

Starting with the 50 percent in higher education (HE)—the "cared for." The review represents the first official ex-

amination of the 2012 and subsequent reforms of higher education funding, which saw tuition fees rise to £ 9,250 per year, maintenance grants abolished, and typical student loan debt rise to £ 47,000 for a three-year undergraduate degree. The review is partly a response to increased debate around the cost and value of HE arising from these reforms and intensified scrutiny of the funding system.

The headline recommendations, and those attracting most attention, focus on HE student funding. They include reducing the maximum tuition fees HE institutions can charge from £ 9,250 to £ 7,500 per year, with the hope that the government will replace the lost tuition income by increasing HE institutions' teaching grant. But it is hard to see the government filling this funding gap, given all the other demands on its resources—potentially threatening the financial viability of teaching-intensive universities so reliant on tuition fee income. (The government has yet to formally respond in detail to the Augar Report's recommendations—it is preoccupied with Brexit.)

All undergraduate students qualify for government-backed student loans to cover all of their tuition fees, and 96 percent take out these loans. Consequently, students' loan debt would fall following Augar's suggested tuition fee reduction, but there are some stings in the tail. Currently, graduates do not have to start repaying their loans until their income reaches £ 25,000, with any outstanding loan debt being written off after 30 years. Augar recommends reducing the income threshold to £ 23,000 and extending the student loan repayment period to 40 years for new entrants from 2021–2022. Under these recommendations, students would graduate with less student loan debt, but they would have to start repaying their loans sooner and for longer, penalizing low-earning graduates. A clear bonus for low-income students is Augar's proposal to reintroduce maintenance grants of £ 3,000 toward their living costs, which would also reduce these students' loan debt. This change would address the current inequity of disadvantaged students graduating with higher levels of student loan debt than advantaged students because they can borrow more for their living costs.

All undergraduate students qualify for government-backed student loans to cover all of their tuition fees, and 96 percent take out these loans.

However, the grants being proposed are far less generous compared to those available prior to their abolition in 2015. Of greater concern is the overall distributional effect on lifetime loan repayments of these and other recommendations. Compared to the current system, the highest earning graduates (predominantly men) would see their lifetime student loan repayments fall substantially. Middle earners (predominantly women, teachers, and nurses) would see the largest increase in repayments, and some lower earning graduates would also repay more. Such impacts are regressive.

Other recommendations include encouraging universities to "bear down" on low-value degrees and to incentivize the provision of courses better aligned with the economy's needs. The assumption that the "value" of courses can be measured by the size of graduates' salaries is overly simplistic and mechanistic, ignoring the wider benefits of HE.

Further Education Funding

Turning to the 50 percent who do not attend higher education—the "neglected." A distinctive feature of the review is its welcomed focus on further education (FE), the sector most akin to community colleges in the United States. The report concentrates on the institutional structure of the FE sector and recommends interlocking changes to its financial and regulatory framework, which it sees as fundamental to strengthening vocational and technical education. It highlights the decline in FE funding and falling student numbers, arguing: "Largely reflecting the collapse in learner numbers, total spending on adult skills has fallen by approximately 45 percent in real terms between 2009/10 and 2017/18. This is one of the most important statistics in this entire report and cannot be justified in terms of either economics or social equity." The Augar Report recommends a much-needed additional £ 3 billion for FE colleges and other vocational training providers annually, as well as a one-off £ 1 billion capital funding boost. Furthermore, it proposes more comprehensive financial aid for students taking subdegree qualifications including lifelong learning loans. Ultimately, the new monies seek to rebalance the post-18 system so that FE is no longer the poor relation to HE and funding shifts away from universities toward FE and vocational training. Thus, the proposed freeze in the level of HE tuition fees and average per-student resource for three years is justified to help fund investment in FE. This extra funding for FE could have a transformative effect on this neglected part of the post-18 education sector and provide much needed alternative nonuniversity education and training opportunities. But should this be at the expense of HE? Should HE be pitted against FE?

Conclusions

Overall, the Augar Report is a very mixed bag. It is thoughtful but limited. It contains much careful and perceptive analysis, but ignores its own evidence. Far bolder changes are needed to address the issues it seeks to remedy. The disparities between the 50 percent who attend HE and the rest are likely to continue. Fiscal constraints on Augar alongside a lack of vision have prevented it from being sufficiently holistic—from seeing post-18 education provision as part of a whole system serving all 100 percent rather than HE serving 50 percent and FE the other 50 percent. There is no conversation in the Augar Report about the relationship between FE and HE or between academic and vocational education. The benefits of its reform package are confined, it leaves major problems untouched, and it triggers new anomalies.

It is unclear if any of the Augar Report's recommendations will be implemented. The report's future is marred by the fact that the review was commissioned by the now ousted Prime Minister May. It is possible that the report's recommendations will be cherry-picked by the Conservatives or others in the years ahead. However, the newly appointed minister responsible for universities, Jo Johnson (the new prime minister's brother) was sacked by May because he did not support such a review. He criticized the Augar Report when published, saying that reducing fees to £7,500 will leave a funding hole the Treasury would not fill. Such changes, Johnson predicted, would destabilize university finances, reverse progress on widening participation, and mainly benefit higher earning graduates. "Bad policy, bad politics," tweeted Johnson. ■

International Graduate Outcomes in the United Kingdom

Vivienne Stern

Vivienne Stern is the director of Universities UK International (UUKi), UK. E-mail: vivienne.stern@international.ac.uk

UUKi's recently published report International Graduate Outcomes 2019 is available at https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/intl-graduate-outcomes-2019.aspx.

The UK's freshly minted International Education Strategy sets a target for the United Kingdom to attract 600,000 international students by 2030, an increase of 30 percent. The UK government decision to launch this strategy is not unconnected with our decision to leave the European Union. While there have always been those in government who understand the enormous opportunities created by our popularity with international students, Brexit has focused minds on repositioning the United Kingdom globally. Suddenly, we have found that a much broader range of politicians were interested in the connections that we forge through hosting international students. Now, right across government, there is a sharper awareness of the benefits that international students and graduates confer, not only in economic terms, but in long-term positive influence on perceptions of the United Kingdom itself.

A very high proportion of graduates wanted to remain connected with their universities, including for the purposes of further study and research.

If we are to reach the new target, and return to significant growth in international student numbers, the United Kingdom needs to do two things. The first is sorting out our visa offer to ensure that the United Kingdom—like our competitors—offers an opportunity for international graduates to remain in the United Kingdom and work for a period post graduation. The second is to really understand, and where possible improve upon, the strength of our offer to prospective international students.

This context provided the impetus for Universities UK International (UUKi) to commission our recently published report *International Graduate Outcomes 2019* (i-GO).

The Approach

UUKi commissioned I-graduate to survey international graduates of UK universities who graduated between 2011 and 2016. We enlisted the support of individual universities to contact their own alumni. As a result, we were able to gather responses from over 16,000 graduates of 58 UK universities based in 183 countries worldwide. We asked them a range of questions about their experience of studying in the United Kingdom, their careers to date, earnings, and desire to remain connected with the United Kingdom for the purposes of further study, research, business, professional reasons, or tourism.

The majority of respondents were medium-term graduates, between two and five years post graduation. But a significant minority (36 percent) were longer-term graduates