

from 62 percent in 2001 to 50 percent in 2006. It is important to note, however, that there are major differences in these findings by institutional type. More than half of doctorate-granting, master's, and baccalaureate institutions had such general education requirements; and 50 percent of doctorate and master's colleges and universities with such a requirement required two or more courses with an international focus.

The survey data indicate that formal institutional commitments to internationalization are lackluster.

LOW NUMBERS OF BRANCH CAMPUSES AND PROGRAMS

Despite expanded media coverage on the establishment of high-profile branch campuses in the Middle East and the implementation of degree-granting programs with partners in China and India, few US institutions actually offer such programs. The ACE survey found that 8 percent of all responding institutions offered such programs abroad, with doctorate-granting institutions being the most likely to do so. Approximately two in five of those institutions with programs abroad offered some or all of them through branch campuses. The majority of degree programs abroad were offered in China (40%) or Western Europe (30%); and in the field of business/management (64%).

IT'S NOT ALL BAD NEWS . . .

From 2001 to 2006, ACE saw a dramatic increase in the proportion of institutions that offer study-abroad opportunities—from 65 percent in 2001 to 91 percent in 2006. More institutions are also offering internships abroad (31%, 9% increase from 2001), international service opportunities (24%, 11% increase from 2001), and field study abroad (29%, 7% increase from 2001). Additionally, ACE found that institutions are signaling their support for education abroad by creating guidelines to ensure that undergraduate students can participate in approved education-abroad programs without delaying graduation. Sixty-six percent of institutions had such guidelines in 2006, up from 56 percent in 2001. Still, the proportion of students participating in such programs remained low. Twenty-seven percent of institutions reported that no students who graduated in 2005 had participated in study abroad, and 46 percent indicated that less than 5 percent of their 2005 graduating class had done so.

Institutions are also increasing opportunities and funding for international research and travel for faculty members. In 2006, 58 percent of institutions supported faculty to lead study abroad programs, compared with 46 percent in 2001. Similarly, the proportion of institutions supporting faculty travel to meetings abroad rose from 40 percent in 2001 to 56 percent in 2006. Appreciably more institutions offered funding

for faculty to study or conduct research abroad in 2006 than in 2001 (39%, compared with 27%). More institutions offered opportunities for faculty to increase their foreign-language skills (36% in 2006, up from 16% in 2001). Both ACE's experience working directly with institutions and the literature on internationalization show that faculty play a leading role in driving campus internationalization. Institutional investments in faculty international experiences, therefore, can have a significant impact on internationalizing the curriculum.

The data show that US institutions are making slow and uneven progress toward comprehensive internationalization. Although survey data present an incomplete picture, there is ample evidence that institutional policies and practices have not yet caught up with the rhetoric of internationalization. Overall, internationalization does not permeate the fabric of most institutions; it is not yet sufficiently deep nor as widespread as it should be to prepare students to meet the challenges they will face. ■

The Private Nature of Cross-Border Higher Education

JASON E. LANE AND KEVIN KINSER

Jason Lane is assistant professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, SUNY. Kevin Kinser is a PROPHE collaborating scholar and associate professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, SUNY. E-mail: jlane@albany.edu; kkinser@albany.edu.

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/>.

Many observers have noted that the relatively easy international mobility of students, faculty, and curriculum facilitates the growth of cross-border higher education. Equally important, new foreign providers are encouraged in many countries by a policy environment that supports private-sector involvement in education. Private higher education institutions, especially for-profit providers, are clearly interested in the cross-border market. Still, public-sector institutions have been and continue to be significant participants in cross-border higher education. When abroad, however, these public institutions nearly always operate and are legally recognized as private entities. Indeed, most foreign operations are supported primarily through tuition and fees and typically do not receive funding from either the home or the host governments.

NONENDEMIC ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

In ecology, an endemic organism is the native inhabitant of a unique and often geographically constrained environment. In a similar way, public institutions are endemic to a particular policy environment defined by state borders. However, cross-border public higher education, by establishing locations outside of its native political and financial home, exists apart from its home environment. This introduces something new into the host country and establishes nonendemic academic institutions in cross-border higher education.

Rather than expanding in their own environments, institutions from developed nations are moving into the less-regulated and less-competitive environments of developing nations.

We first used endemism as a way to describe domestic cross-border activity within the United States. In a little noticed phenomenon, many public, state-supported institutions such as Central Michigan University and Troy University (Alabama) have established campuses outside their home state. These educational organizations are regulated as private-sector entities in the new state, while experiencing almost no oversight from the home state. This regulatory disparity means that it is often easier for a public institution to pursue new markets in the private-sector environments of other states than within their native state environment.

Similar activity seems to be occurring with cross-border higher education internationally. Rather than expanding in their own environments, institutions from developed nations are moving into the less-regulated and less-competitive environments of developing nations. As Daniel C. Levy has long noted, the private sector of most countries have limited regulations, and governments often do not anticipate growth of the private sector. This trend makes it difficult to predict how the entry of a new nonendemic institutional type will affect existing educational structures, policies, and capacities.

Indeed, countries actively encourage foreign institutions to offer higher education within their borders without making a policy distinction between public or private institutions. The Dubai International Academic City, for example, recruits public institutions from other countries to open programs in Dubai, and those programs are being authorized to operate as autonomous private entities. The impact of these foreign institutions on existing regulatory frameworks in the emirate is uncertain, but they may herald the unanticipated consequences of emerging new institutional forms in other countries.

REGULATION IN THE CROSS-BORDER ENVIRONMENT

In cross-border education, foreign organizations may also disturb the existing policy environment and throw out of balance the regulatory mechanisms in the host country. As in the Dubai case, cross-border policies may regulate foreign state-sponsored entities as if they were fully private, nongovernmental organizations. In fact, foreign academic institutions remain at a competitive advantage to their true private-sector colleagues because of their public-sector connections at home. Even with firewalls to prevent state funds or other resources to directly support cross-border activities, such as with many Australian universities, the campus can benefit from brand recognition of the home campus and the existing administrative support structure of the home campus. Further, their association with a recognized government provides a level of credibility and perceived quality assurance (whether true or not) of which privates may not benefit.

Cross-border regulations may assume that foreign academic institutions, as public-sector entities, have home government endorsement of their cross-border activities. In reality, though, such organizations can complete international collaborations and commitments with little government oversight, especially in the vast majority of cases where no government resources are at risk. We found this occurring in our study of US domestic cross-border activity, and anecdotal evidence suggests this can be true in international efforts as well. These cross-border campuses can fall through the cracks of quality-assurance regulations, with both governments assuming the other (or some entity within the country) is providing oversight, but neither actively engaging in such a way.

In cross-border education, foreign organizations may also disturb the existing policy environment and throw out of balance the regulatory mechanisms in the host country.

Agreements between the host country and the foreign organization may not consider the ability of the home government to assert its authority over any cross-border activity, whether or not state funds are directly involved. The host country is allowing an agency of a different government to operate within its borders, while treating it as a private-sector nongovernmental organization. Participation in a foreign country may have domestic political concerns that contradict the ostensibly private nature of the cross-border activity. For example, the home government may question the propriety of state higher education involvement in the capacity building of a foreign country. The home government could go so far as to restrict or force redesign of the type of curriculum delivered, out of fear for national security or aiding a global competitor.

NEW QUESTIONS

Thinking of cross-border higher education as a private enterprise in the traditional sense oversimplifies the true nature of the organizations. Even though they operate in the private sector and are regulated as private entities, as extensions of a public government, many cross-border endeavors raise new questions about the role and operation of these institutions. Are such institutions truly independent institutions? To what extent does a home government's political agenda affect operations of the cross-border activity? As research continues in this arena, such questions need to be further investigated in order to provide a more robust understanding of this phenomenon. ■

Jamaica's Development Goals and GATS Commitment

TERENCE FRATER

Terence Frater holds a PhD in comparative education from the University of Toronto. E-mail: tfrater@oise.utoronto.ca.

Jamaica, a small developing Caribbean nation that ranks among the most indebted countries worldwide is plagued by high rates of violent crime, unemployment of over 13 percent, migration of its graduates estimated at over 70 percent, and one of the lowest per capita GDP in the region. It is felt that higher education—a sector particularly linked to knowledge creation, social mobility, and economic growth—can play a pivotal role in the country meeting its development needs and overcoming its social and economic deficits. This is the sector currently most associated with trade liberalization and experiencing the greatest level of expansion across national borders. Jamaican higher education originated in the 1830s with the creation of teachers colleges and theological colleges and has since expanded into a diverse and complex system of public and private universities, colleges, and other institutions, which includes a growing number of cross-border providers from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada.

The urgency to create more effective policy mechanisms for the sector and to become more competitive in navigating the complexities of emergent global accords became more acute for Jamaica with the changed geopolitical dynamics at the end of the cold war and the growing endorsement of free trade. However, the creation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)—the services agreement of the World Trade Organization (WTO)—together with liberalization trends in education raised specific concerns that developing countries

like Jamaica would be unable to implement higher education policies related to their development goals.

JAMAICA'S GATS COMMITMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In 1994 Jamaica was among a number of developing countries to include higher education in its GATS Schedule of Commitments. In doing so, it assumed legally binding obligations in the sector and subjected policy initiatives to the governance of the WTO. Interviews with Jamaican politicians, in both government and opposition, and senior education and trade policymakers revealed negotiators were able, without consultation, to set a higher education agenda based on their own experience and beliefs dealing with other sectors of the economy. No process existed at the time to trigger dialogue between negotiators and education stakeholders. The GATS commitment appeared largely affected by a culture of liberalization and free trade, together with a sense of the need to expand access to higher education.

Jamaica is not unique in this regard. Around the globe, education stakeholders reacted rather late to trade liberalization trends occurring in the sector. They considered it a “public good,” isolated from the marketplace. Consequently, trade negotiators were instrumental in crafting GATS commitments based on their own rationale—that is, contributing to economic growth, expanding access, and enhancing quality.

Jamaican trade policymakers suggested that GATS presented opportunities to position the country's higher education sector as an export industry. They proposed marketing the country's internationally recognized English-language higher education system to Latin American students, similar to how Australia and New Zealand marketed their system to Asian

Jamaican trade policymakers suggested that GATS presented opportunities to position the country's higher education sector as an export industry.

students. These policymakers also regarded the emigration of Jamaican graduates as contributing positively to the economy in the form of remittances. They were less concerned about potential threats from liberalization and the WTO.

Education stakeholders, however, were ignorant of the initiative until it surfaced in public debate almost 10 years after coming into force. They regarded the GATS commitment as a threat to both equity in higher education and introducing safeguards to maintain the quality of the system. Additionally, they were greatly concerned about the presence of foreign providers and the potential of foreign credentials to exacerbate the migration problem. Nonetheless, the potential of the commitment to expand access to higher education was embraced.

Politicians in both government and opposition were also caught by surprise and questioned the capacity of the negotiators to have crafted without dialogue a higher education com-