

colleges and not on the central campus. In India, most undergraduate and some postbaccalaureate colleges are affiliated to a public university.

A comparison of data for some leading universities, for 2008–2009 and 2012–2013, suggests that internationalization has not been accepted as a priority area by most of the public universities. On the other hand, the private universities are enrolling increasing numbers of international students. One is led to the conclusion that the public universities in India, with assured sources of government revenue, are not convinced about the importance of internationalization through international student mobility. The self-financing universities, under private management, see international students as an important revenue-source and actively pursue them through advertisements and even make use of agents.

The growth in the number of international students in India, from about 7,000 in 2000–2001 to a little over 20,000 in 2012–2013, is, in comparison, anaemic.

2012–2013 DATA

As a part of this study, data from 28 university-level institutions falling in three regions were evaluated. These are Western India extending on the West Coast from Pune to Bengaluru (9 institutions); the North East from Amritsar to Kolkata (10 institutions); and the South East running parallel to the Eastern Coast from Bhubaneswar to Coimbatore (9 institutions). These respectively have 9,578, 4,478, and 2,812 international students. They are predominantly from Asia (71.23%) and Africa (24.25%) with minor contributions from the Americas (3.29%), Europe (0.85%) and Australasia (0.41%).

The Western region includes three large public universities (Pune, Mysore, Bangalore), each with many affiliated colleges covering diverse disciplines; a public professional university (Visveswaraya); four private deemed universities (Manipal, Symbiosis, Bharati Vidyapeeth, and Dr. D. Y. Patil); and a public deemed university specializing in arts and social science (Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute). These nine institutions together have almost half

(9,578) of the number of international students (20,176) in 121 institutions. Pune city, with five institutions, alone has 4,298 students, which is one-fifth of all international students in India. This makes Pune the International Students' Capital of India.

CONCLUSION

Analyses of the data relating to the nine institutions lead to three important conclusions. Contrary to popular perception, as many as 40 percent of the international students are female. About 80 percent of the students come for undergraduate studies, about 18 percent for postgraduate studies, and approximately 2 percent for doctoral programs or research. Clearly there is a need to promote postgraduate programs abroad.

The choice of disciplines of the students is varied. About 30 percent of the students are in the liberal arts (arts, social sciences, science, and commerce). The remaining 70 percent of students are enrolled in professional education programs. The breakdown is health care (35%), engineering & technology (23%), management (9%), and law (about 3%). Clearly, India is now recognized in the developing world as a provider of professional education. What is required is the vigorous promotion of international student mobility. ■

Governance and Regulation: Do UK Messages Have International Relevance?

ROBIN MIDDLEHURST

Robin Middlehurst is professor at Kingston University, UK. River House, 53–57 High Street, Kingston-upon-Thames, KT1 1LQ, UK. E-mail: r.middlehurst@kingston.ac.uk.

The four countries of the United Kingdom have witnessed considerable debate over the last three years, about both system-level governance (the balance between autonomy and accountability in the relationship of the state's funding bodies to higher education institutions) and board-level governance (the appropriate balance between external lay members and internal faculty and student membership at corporate level). Governance reviews have been initiated in Wales (2011) and Scotland (2012); and in

England, there has been work done and reports written by key stakeholders, policy commentators, and academics on system-level regulation. In England, debates have followed rather than preceded—as one might have expected—significant changes to the funding of undergraduate education introduced in 2012 by the ruling Coalition Government.

In 2013, the Committee of University Chairs (CUC—the national committee of Chairs of Governing Boards of universities) commissioned a review and rewriting of its code and “Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK,” last published in 2009. This code sets out the principles of governance for universities and the roles and responsibilities of board members. The new code should have emerged in early 2014; it is still not ready. The debates, arguments, and negotiations between interested parties (institutions and sector agencies, funding bodies, and students) from across the United Kingdom continues behind the scenes. Meanwhile, the Committee of Scottish Chairs achieved consensus for its “Scottish Code of Good Higher Education Governance” in 2013. In Wales, the discussion has shifted up a gear from governance to regulation with a new Higher Education (Wales) Bill published in May 2014, now passing through the National Assembly of Wales.

What is going on in the United Kingdom is of course of local interest, but there are wider messages for other countries engaged in “Modernizing Higher Education,” adding new universities to the system or rebuilding higher education postconflict or major political change. At the heart of developments in the United Kingdom there are different philosophies about relationships between the state and institutions, the role of the market and alternative providers (such as for-profit institutions) in higher education, and internal relationships between managers, staff, students and lay governors. Both ideological debates and the operational responses should be of interest beyond the United Kingdom.

IDEOLOGICAL DEBATES AND OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The Welsh and Scottish reviews of governance reveal subtly different perspectives on autonomy and accountability. In Wales, the present government wants strong and strategic system-level governance that “holds management to account,” and reflects “the national need for change rather than institutional self-interest.” The Welsh review concluded by outlining three principles of governance that had to be addressed through governing bodies: governance for accountability and compliance; governance for maximizing institutional performance and success; and governance for representation and democracy. These principles mean that governors should be involved in “strategic planning and institutional evaluation of strategic direction against na-

tional imperatives” and in “rigorous scrutiny of probity and institutional performance against sectoral and peer group benchmarks.”

The Scottish review was focused more strongly on representation and democracy, with staff and student leaders seeking reform of institutional decision-making processes. The 2013 Scottish code that emerged from the review and associated debates focused most strongly on safeguarding autonomy. The code begins with an overarching purpose for the governance of higher education institutions: “to promote the enduring success, integrity and probity of the institution as a whole,” while the main principles reflect the tone of Scottish concerns about governance and include: “promoting an appropriate participation of key constituents including staff and students,” as well as “matching authority and responsibility with accountability to key external and internal stakeholders.”

Governance reviews have been initiated in Wales (2011) and Scotland (2012); and in England, there has been work done and reports written by key stakeholders, policy commentators, and academics on system-level regulation.

While subtle differences of tone and focus can be seen between Wales and Scotland, more overt differences can be seen between England and Wales in legislative and regulatory arenas. In 2004, new legislation in England changed the rules on gaining university title, beginning the deregulation and market opening of the higher education sector to “alternative providers.” This has continued through funding changes introduced from 2012. Following the United States, the ruling Coalition government in England has allowed an expansion of private and for-profit providers—including giving them access to student loans. In contrast, draft Welsh legislation before the Assembly government distinguishes between “regulated and unregulated” institutions. Only providers that are (nonprofit) charities may apply for Welsh Funding Council approval of new “fee and access plans.” These arrangements reflect the Assembly’s core policy objectives for higher education—economic regeneration and widening access—as well as their ideological preference for planning a higher education system based on collaboration between publicly funded Welsh institutions. For-profit providers are to be kept out of Wales. This political stance is starkly different from the current English

agenda of fostering competition between public and private (nonprofit and for-profit local and foreign) providers to recruit domestic students and acquire associated fee-income. Competition between institutions for research income and to recruit international students is already well-established.

National policies are having an operational impact on governance at sector and institutional levels, and the international context is also impinging on governance. New reports from the Leadership Foundation identify some of the main operational issues that governing bodies are dealing with, including their ethical stance and approach to corporate social responsibility; the relationship of academic to corporate governance; the assessment, mitigation, and management of risk; and the size and membership of institutional governing boards. These issues not only reflect national concerns, but also the expanding international operations of UK institutions through branch campuses, other forms of collaboration in transnational education and distance-learning. As countries seek both to “modernize” and “internationalize,” the different philosophies of governance and structural arrangements in evidence across the four countries of the United Kingdom could provide useful practical examples of how to balance competing interests and requirements for autonomy, accountability, democracy, open or regulated markets, and planned and responsive higher education systems and institutions. ■

Croatia’s New Linear Tuition System: Students’ Friend or Foe?

LUCIA BRAJKOVIC

Lucia Brajkovic is a PhD student at the Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, US. E-mail: lucia@uga.edu.

Croatia’s higher education system (in Southeast Europe) is nationally regulated and has been undergoing intense reforms since 2003, driven by the Bologna process. The vast majority of students study in seven Croatian public universities; one of these is the University of Zagreb, which offers the widest range of study programs and enrolls around 50 percent of the total student population. Up until the academic year in 2010/2011, there were two categories of students in Croatia, based on tuition-paying status. Full-time undergraduate students were either enrolled within

the state-subsidized quota, and were not charged tuition, or were enrolled above the subsidized quota and therefore charged tuition. Under this system, universities typically secured a certain number of spots for tuition-paying students, according to their capacities: whether a student would enroll within or above the state-subsidized quota (i.e., would be charged tuition or not) primarily depended on merit-based criteria, such as the student’s high school grades and entrance examination scores. Students were informed whether they “made the cut” for the state-subsidized quota upon admission. When compared to other European countries, this tuition system was most similar to that in Hungary.

Full-time undergraduate students were either enrolled within the state-subsidized quota, and were not charged tuition, or were enrolled above the subsidized quota and therefore charged tuition.

DEMAND FOR FREE EDUCATION

In 2009, students occupied the Croatian University of Zagreb’s School of Humanities and Social Sciences, taking over classes and replacing them with public assemblies and student-organized lectures. The occupation lasted for more than a month. Furthermore, students protested in front of the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports and demanded an audience with the minister. Their demand was straightforward: free education for all admitted students. Students from other Croatian universities joined the protest, which turned into the largest student movement in Croatia, since the 1970s.

The demand for free education, which would translate into entirely publicly funded education, reflected a larger concern about the commercialization and commodification of higher education, and increasing perception of higher education as a private vs. public good. All these events took place during a politically sensitive period of Croatia’s final preparations for entry into the European Union. Under these rather unique circumstances, the students’ requests made a significant impact on the higher education financing policy of the Croatian left-centered government. Even though their demands were not fully met, they led to the adoption of a unique “linear” tuition model, which may be the only one of its kind in the world.