INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 93: SPRING 2018

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

International Higher Education is the quarterly publication of the Center for International Higher Education.

Through *International Higher Education,* a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Links to all editions can be found at *http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe.* ***IHE*** articles appear regularly on ***UWN's*** website and monthly newsletter.

International Issues

Questionable Practices

Declines in International Student Mobility

Branch Campuses

Loans and Debt: Policies and Consequences

Private Higher Education

China Focus

Countries and Regions

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

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College. The Center offers an M.A. and a Certificate of International Higher Education. For additional information see: https://www.bc.edu/IHEMA https://www.bc.edu/IHECert

Editor
Philip G. Altbach

Associate Editors
Laura E. Rumbley, Hans de Wit

Publications Editors
Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Lisa Unangst

Editorial Assistant
Salina Kopellas

Editorial Office
Center for International Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467- USA
Tel: (617) 552-4236 **Fax:** (617) 552-8422
E-mail: highered@bc.edu
http://www.bc.edu/cihe

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policymaker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a digital subscription; a fee of $35/year applies to a subscription to the print version.

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)

Are We Facing a Fundamental Challenge to Higher Education Internationalization?

Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director, and Hans de Wit is professor and director, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mails: altbach@bc.edu; dewitj@bc.edu.

The global landscape for higher education internationalization is changing dramatically. What one might call "the era of higher education internationalization" over the past 25 years (1990–2015) that has characterized university thinking and action, might either be finished or, at least, be on life support. The unlimited growth of internationalization of all kinds—including massive global student mobility, the expansion of branch campuses, franchised and joint degrees, the use of English as a language for teaching and research worldwide, and many other elements—appears to have come to a rather abrupt end, especially in Europe and North America.

Trumpism, Brexit, and the rise of nationalist and anti-immigrant politics in Europe are changing the landscape of global higher education. We are seeing a fundamental shift in higher education internationalization that will mean rethinking the entire international project of universities worldwide.

First, the Good News

Knowledge remains international. Cross-national research collaboration continues to increase. Most universities recognize that providing an international perspective to students is central in the 21st century. Global student mobility continues to increase, although at a slower rate than in the past—with about 5 million students studying outside of their home countries. The major European mobility and collaboration scheme, ERASMUS+, remains firmly in place—and might even receive additional funding. The ASEAN region is moving in similar directions as the European Union in promoting harmonization of its academic structures, improving quality assurance, and increasing regional mobility and collaboration in its higher education sector. "Internationalization at Home" and comprehensive internationalization have entered the vocabulary of higher education around the world.

But these positive trends do not hide that 2018 is adding some troubling trends to 2017 realities. The major eruptions of 2016—Brexit followed by the election of Donald Trump—have proved to be as problematical as pre-

dicted. Increased problems obtaining visas, an unwelcoming atmosphere for foreigners, and other issues are causing a decline in international student numbers in the United Kingdom and the United States.

Recent developments portend future trends that are likely to influence the international aspects of higher education in profound ways at least in the medium term. Several examples illustrate these trends.

Limits to the Rise in Numbers of International Students and Use of English

In the Netherlands, arguably one of the most internationally minded countries in the world, an intense debate about the limits of internationalization has started, in the media, in politics, and in the higher education sector itself. Comments from the rector of the University of Amsterdam, arguing that English-taught academic programs are too widespread and should be cut back, and that there are too many international students, received wide support, and the expansion of such programs may be curtailed or reduced.

In other countries, including Germany, Denmark, and Italy, there is also debate about the negative impact of English on the quality of teaching. English will remain the predominant language of scientific communication and scholarship, but its dominance may be reaching a ceiling.

Trumpism, Brexit, and the rise of nationalist and anti-immigrant politics in Europe are changing the landscape of global higher education.

The Challenges of Transnational Education

Separately, a branch campus established by the University of Groningen (The Netherlands) in Yantai, Shandong province, with China Agricultural University was suddenly cancelled by the university after protests by faculty and students in Groningen concerning possible limitations on academic freedom in China, and because of a lack of local consultation about the project. This might well affect other joint ventures in China, and perhaps elsewhere, as both sides look more critically at the structural, academic, and political implications of branch campus development and other initiatives. Overall, it is possible that the halcyon days of growth of branch campuses, educational hubs, franchise operations, and other forms of transnational education are over.

Academic Freedom vs Control

The issue of China's influence on Australian higher education has become widely discussed. Chinese student groups in Australia and the Chinese government have been accused of trying to limit criticism of China and disrupt academic freedom. Combined with criticism, in Australia and elsewhere, of Chinese-funded Confucius Institutes for seeking to influence universities, these trends reflect a growing concern about the influence of China, and potentially of other countries, on universities. Academic freedom, also a strong argument in the cancellation of the Groningen branch campus and in American branch campuses in China and the Middle East, is challenging the future of transnational education and international student recruitment, particularly in countries where academic freedom is not assured.

Increased Concern about Ethics

The Danish government has found that some foreign students and students from immigrant backgrounds in Denmark were using false addresses to claim student financial benefits. Reports from several other countries have claimed that international students were cheating on examinations. Such stories increase negative views of international students.

Free Tuition for International Students to an End

Norway has increased visa fees for international students—a move that critics claim is a first step toward charging fees to international students. Two German states also have started to introduce fees for international students, a drastic break with the past. Discussions concerning increased fees for foreign students are more common, as countries seek to use international students to subsidize domestic higher education—a practice that has been employed in Australia for decades. While the debate about free tuition for local students is more intense than ever, it looks like tuition fees for international students are continuing to be on the rise.

The Nationalist–Populist Factor

The success of right-wing nationalist and populist forces in many European countries will have a significant impact on higher education policy—although the specifics are not yet clear. The controversy relating to the Central European University in Hungary shows one effort to eliminate an international university known for its liberal views by an increasingly authoritarian government. The advent of nationalist governments in Austria, the Czech Republic, and Poland will likely have an impact on higher education policy and on international higher education in those countries. Even where not in power, as in France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands, the ideas of these parties, once relegated to an unimportant fringe, now have an influence on the pub-

lic discourse. The Conservative government in the United Kingdom is still struggling with the consequences of Brexit on British universities' participation in the European programs, and with the importance of international students and faculty for its knowledge economy.

Countervailing Trends?

While there are increasingly powerful political, economic, and academic challenges to the internationalization process in Europe and North America, the non-Western world shows an increasing interest in internationalization. But, even there, there are problems. The two largest players, China and India, present some challenges.

Many have commented that China, in some respects, is becoming more "academically closed," in spite of significant increases in inward student mobility. Increased restrictions on internet access, increased emphasis on ideological courses, problems of academic freedom (especially in the social sciences), and other issues are indicative.

For the first time, India has made internationalization a key goal of national higher education policy. But India lacks relevant infrastructure, and it struggles with problems in shaping its academic structures to host large numbers of international students. The logistical challenges are considerable.

It is likely that students seeking foreign academic degrees or an international experience will, to some extent, shift their foci away from the major host countries in North America and Europe, which are seen as less welcoming. But these potential beneficiaries have their own problems.

Needed Perspectives

The first thing that is required is that all involved with international higher education explicitly recognize that realities have changed and that current, and likely, future developments are beyond the control of the academic community. These new realities will have significant implications for higher education in general and for internationalization specifically.

The current criticism about the unlimited growth of teaching in English, recruitment of international students, and development of branch campuses, is coming from two completely opposite sources. On the one hand, there is the nationalist–populist argument of anti-international and anti-immigration. More relevant are concerns about quality, academic freedom, and ethics in the higher education community itself. The call for an alternative approach, with stronger emphasis on "Internationalization at Home" by the rector of the University of Amsterdam, as well as by Jones and de Wit (UWN 486) for a more inclusive internationalization, may be seen as an opportunity for internationalization, with a shift from quantity to quality. If the nationalist–populist argument prevails, though, then indeed this might lead to the end of internationalization. Leaders in higher education around the world must make a strong stand in favor of the quality approach. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10377

Higher Education Leadership and Management Training: Global Maps and Gaps

Laura E. Rumbley, Hilligje van't Land, and Juliette Becker

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education, US. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu. Hilligje van't Land is secretary-general, and Juliette Becker is programme and membership development officer at the International Association of Universities, Paris, France. E-mails: h.vantland@iau-aiu.net and j.becker@iau-aiu.net.

Successful leadership of higher education institutions in the contemporary context worldwide requires a remarkably sophisticated set of skills, knowledge, and sensibilities. Yet, globally, there is limited information about how higher education's leaders, managers, and policymakers are provided with the training they need to carry out their work. Furthermore, where information about such training and capacity-building programs is available, the picture remains incomplete and often disheartening. In fact, the structured opportunities on offer to build leadership and management capacity in higher education are limited in number, almost universally small in scale, and largely unable to offer systematic accounts of the long-term impact of their efforts. This is a critical concern in the face of the myriad opportunities and imperatives facing higher education institutions and systems around the world, now and into the foreseeable future. Without question, the vast majority of higher education leaders and managers enter their positions with no training whatsoever—they learn "on the job"—or run the risk of failure.

Uncharted Territory

Two recent studies—one by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), on behalf of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and German Rectors' Conference (HRK), and another by the International Association of Universities (IAU) on behalf of

the World Bank—have mapped various dimensions of the global landscape of higher education management and leadership training programs. In the case of IAU, the goal was to identify training programs around the world focused specifically on leadership (typically in mid- and senior-level administrative positions) in higher education. CIHE's purpose was slightly different, given its aim to make sense of major players offering management training schemes specifically in relation to international development cooperation efforts (i.e., for capacity building in lower-income and emerging country contexts).

In exploring the existence and profiles of such training schemes worldwide, both IAU and CIHE discovered that very little work has been done to date to take stock of these types of programs at a global level. Extensive networking and dogged online research were required to identify programs, and to piece together fundamental characteristics of training program size, scope, design, delivery, evolution, and aims. Unlike postgraduate degree-granting programs focused on different aspects of higher education, which are typically offered by single universities (or clearly defined university partners), training programs geared toward higher education professionals may be delivered by a wide range of providers. Some are also characterized by what might be considered a chain of providers, whereby different actors are separately responsible for funding, managing/organizing, and/or delivering specific training programs. To date, there is no clear "typology" for the global field of higher education management, training providers, or approaches.

You Name It, They Do It

There is significant diversity in the way that training programs approach their work. This diversity is apparent across such dimensions as the ages of programs, the sizes of their cohorts, the frequency with which program iterations are offered, the target audiences they aim to serve, the "pedagogical approaches" they employ, the length of programs, and the topics on which programs focus, among other key characteristics.

This diversity presents an interesting panorama across the global training landscape. Programs range in age from decades old to the very recently launched. In terms of target groups, they may cater to senior leadership or middle- and upper-middle level managers and administrators, or to specially identified populations, such as promising early-career individuals, administrators with specifically defined roles and responsibilities, or members of underrepresented groups, such as women.

Program modes of delivery may involve workshops, conferences, seminars, lectures, case studies, site visits, internships, group projects, personal projects, or independent research. Training schemes may even be anchored in long-term institutional partnerships, as seen particularly in some European initiatives focused on international cooperation for development. Trainings may feature face-to-face and/or online delivery.

The frequency and duration of trainings may also vary from a matter of days or weeks, or—more unusually—to months, and even a year or longer. Some programs consist of quite standardized "off the shelf" offerings in terms of structure and content, while others may be more specifically tailored to client or participant needs. There is, quite literally, a world of possibility when it comes to training content, approaches, target audiences, and rationale.

Emerging Contours in a World of Variety

Although training programs in higher education worldwide display significant variation in their form and function, several key trends are apparent from the data now available about these schemes.

First, the training of higher education leaders and managers stands out as a "growth industry" globally. This is indicated by the significant numbers of training programs and schemes that have been initiated in the period since 2000.

To date, there is no clear "typology" for the global field of higher education management, training providers, or approaches.

Notably, however, higher education training and leadership development programs are predominately on offer in the world's wealthier countries, or are delivered (or otherwise made possible) by providers, funders, and/or partners who largely hail from the Global North.

Where data exist, we see that most programs feature small numbers of participants, often under 50 per group. Additionally, cohorts tend to be rather "homogenous," in the sense that they tend not to include different kinds of participants in the same training groups (for example, at different levels of seniority). Little evidence exists that much special attention is being paid to the training or leadership skill cultivation of women in higher education, despite their significant representation in student enrollment and (at least early stage) faculty ranks globally.

Training programs are also relatively short in duration, most often ranging from several days to one or two weeks. They are typically fee based and do not tend to award any kind of credential, beyond merely documenting attendance.

Finally, there is very little indication that training programs are undertaking the kinds of assessment activities that yield clear evidence of their mid-term outcomes or longer-term impact. Often, assessment rests on the testimonials of beneficiaries or the organizations offering the training courses, without providing information on the monitoring tools developed to measure the impact of these courses on participants or their respective professional environments. One of the most commonly cited impacts is the importance of the networking opportunities provided, a result that is difficult to translate into any kind of impact assessment.

Is More Needed? Yes

The majority of higher education leaders and managers around the world receive no formal/specialized training for their work. As higher education systems continue to grow and diversify, increasingly pressured to meet key performance indicators while also achieving excellence in education and innovation production, the need to train effective managers and leaders becomes more widespread and more urgent. Yet, the current picture of training opportunities on offer to meet this massive need falls desperately short. Indeed, the CIHE and IAU inventory exercises, albeit tailored to seek out some kinds of programs and not others, collectively identified fewer than 120 such training schemes worldwide. Relatively short, small-scale programs, clustered in (or provided largely by actors based in) the Global North, operating without clear evidence of mid- or long-term impact—collectively, these do not provide a viable roadmap for the kind of large-scale support needed by higher education systems, particularly in the world's low-income and emerging economy countries. There, the needs are urgent to scale up management and leadership capacity through the provision of high-quality, relevant, and equity-enhancing training mechanisms. Significantly more research is needed to make sense of the full census of management and leadership training actors around the world, as well as the scope and real-world impact of their efforts, in order to ensure the deployment of skilled higher education managers and leaders for the twenty-first century. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10368

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 KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).**

Predatory Conferences: A Case of Academic Cannibalism

James McCrostie

James McCrostie is a professor in the Department of Business Administration, Daito Bunka University, Tokyo, Japan. E-mail: jamesm@ic.daito.ac.jp.

Less than 20 years after appearing in the groves of academe, predatory conferences now outnumber legitimate congresses held by scholarly societies. Today, one can attend multiple predatory conferences every month of the year in nearly any major city, from Tokyo to Toronto and Sydney to Helsinki. Competition between predatory companies has become so fierce that even smaller cities have become targets. There are even conference alert websites devoted entirely to promoting predatory events. The sheer number of predatory conferences, sometimes called questionable conferences, combined with the increasing sophistication of the organizing companies, means any unknown conference should be viewed as predatory until proven otherwise.

What Is a Predatory Conference?

To be classified as predatory, the conference organizer needs to meet three criteria: the organizer holds low-quality academic meetings for the primary aim of making money—not supporting scholarship; there is no effective peer review, allowing anyone to purchase a speaking slot; the organizer employs deceit, the most common forms being false claims of peer review, hiding the company headquarters' true location, and concealing the for-profit nature of the company.

With few exceptions, this paper will avoid naming specific predatory conference organizers, for two reasons. First, many companies closely follow what is written about them and quickly make cosmetic changes to their websites in an attempt to escape the predatory label. Second, companies frequently change names or rebrand their conferences. For example, OMICS International, currently being sued by the US Federal Trade Commission for deceptive trade practices, organizes conferences under at least four different brands, including: Conference Series, Pulsus Group, EuroSciCon, and Life Science Events.

Some predatory organizers started out as predatory publishers and expanded into conferences. Others focus exclusively on conference organizing, though they may also funnel papers to predatory publishers. University faculty

members own some of the slickest predatory conference companies and manage to convince other academics to join their organizational boards. Many, but by no means all, predatory companies are based in Asia, including China, Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, and Taiwan. However, more developed countries including Canada, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States also have multiple predatory conference companies.

The Danger

Too many academics think predatory conferences are not worth worrying about, especially if their research field places less importance on conference presentations and proceedings publications compared to journal publications. Nevertheless, predatory conferences do threaten the foundations of the ivory tower. Lacking real peer review, they allow anyone to present and publish poor, plagiarized, or phony research. At predatory conferences, the United Nations created AIDS to reduce the world's population, and global warming does not exist.

Some predatory organizers started out as predatory publishers and expanded into conferences.

Predatory conferences typically combine several conferences together in a single hotel conference room, forcing attendees to listen to presentations on topics outside their field, and tricking well-intentioned but ignorant academics into participating and wasting their limited research budgets and time. Their honest efforts may also be tainted by appearing alongside nonsense papers in the conference proceedings. Furthermore, as predatory conference organizers have grown, they have been buying legitimate publishers and conference organizers, blurring the line between predatory and legitimate. Scholarly societies that rely on their annual conference for funds can also find themselves competing with the ever-increasing number of predatory events.

The Enemy Is Us

The main reason predatory conferences have become such a big problem is that researchers and institutions are doing basically nothing to address the problem. Little action is taken to warn researchers or universities about the danger, and even less to punish those who present at, or help organize, the events. The notion that only young or developing world researchers get tricked into attending provides one excuse for inaction. In reality, scholars from Western universities regularly present at, and help organize, predatory conferences. Blinded by the excitement of receiving an invitation to deliver a keynote speech, too many overlook red flags out of ignorance. Unfortunately, others knowingly participate. Researchers in countries or fields that place emphasis on conference presentations purposely use predatory conferences to pad their CVs to win university jobs and promotions. Connections between predatory conference organizers and predatory publishers are common, with conference papers accepted for publication in predatory journals for an additional fee. Unfortunately, many researchers view such publication opportunities as a bonus rather than a problem.

Disturbingly, during my research, it has been incredibly rare for any of the academics involved with predatory conferences to admit wrongdoing, either on their part or by the company. Even when faced with evidence such as faked peer review, hidden for-profit companies, and stolen identities, the researchers involved have refused to distance themselves. Instead, current and former employees, feeling disgusted by the actions of their companies, have proven to be the most valuable source of information on predatory organizers.

Universities throughout the developed world regularly host predatory conferences, their desire to rent out conference rooms seemingly outweighing any risk to their reputation. For example, at the end of September 2016, I notified Clare College at the University of Cambridge that the predatory conference organizer, the American Society for Research (ASR), was scheduled to hold its International Conference on Educational and Information Technology (ICEIT) at their institution in March 2017. I pointed out that while the ASR claimed to be a nonprofit, it was a registered as a for-profit company and its headquarters was based in China. I also warned that one of its conferences had previously accepted a machine-generated nonsense SCIgen paper that I submitted, and that the owners could be linked to at least eight other predatory publishers and conference companies. Forcing the company to remove the college logo from the conference website proved to be the strongest action the college's conference administrator took. Renamed "the Asian Society for Researchers" after being exposed in a newspaper article, the March 2018 ICEIT is scheduled to be held at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford.

Far too many researchers view the plethora of predatory conferences as opportunities to spend research funds on junkets. There is a reason so many predatory conferences take place in locations like Bali, Miami, and Hawaii. After a presentation on the topic that I held at a conference in Japan, an attendee complained bitterly to me that I risked ruining the party for everyone. The "party" being the abil-

ity to travel someplace warm every winter using research funds. At the predatory conferences I attended in Tokyo, I found it rare for presenters to stay after finishing their own presentations. Exiting with family members carrying guidebooks suggested they had important data collection duties to perform at Tokyo Disneyland.

What Can Be Done?

There is no magic answer. University faculty, graduate students, and administrators all need more education about the dangers of predatory conferences. Those making an honest mistake and accidently presenting at a predatory conference need to warn colleagues and the wider academic community. Universities need to take greater steps to avoid hosting predatory conferences and to start refusing to hire, promote, or give funding to researchers attending and doing the organizing. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10370

Combating Academic Corruption: Quality Assurance and Accreditation

Judith S. Eaton

Judith S. Eaton is president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, US. E-mail: eaton@chea.org.

When the Council for Higher Education Accreditation/International Quality Group (CHEA/CIQG) issued its *Advisory Statement for Effective International Practice: Combatting Corruption and Enhancing Integrity* in 2016, the intent was to focus the attention of the quality assurance and accreditation community on the vital issue of academic corruption. Positioning itself as "... a wake-up call to higher education worldwide—particularly to quality assurance bodies ... in both developing and developed countries ... to challenge and overcome these corrupt practices," the *Advisory Statement* provides an opportunity to move forward and to engage this important topic.

But deciding how quality assurance and accreditation, our primary means of assuring quality in higher education worldwide, can play a more creative and constructive leadership role in fighting this phenomenon is not easy. Even establishing the boundaries of what we mean is a major challenge. "Academic corruption" in higher education is complex and can include many things, from bribery to fraud to extortion and more, as is clear from examining the Transparency International definition, turning to various reliable dictionaries, or adopting an operational definition (as done by the *Advisory Statement* and UNESCO's ETICO, a web-based resource platform targeting the issue of ethics and corruption in education).

Central Issues

Moving forward, three issues are central to the quality assurance/accreditation community. First, we tend to view fighting corruption through the familiar lens of sustaining academic integrity. It would be useful to address whether tools to enhance academic integrity are the same as tools to fight corruption. Arguably, the tasks are not the same. Second, we may not yet be fully aware of the extent of the role played by corruption in the lives of institutions and programs. Perhaps we need tools to expand this awareness. Third, we need additional means to understand and address the inherent cultural variations in what does and does not count as "corruption" in various countries around the world in order to fight it successfully.

Examining the role of quality assurance/accreditation in addressing corruption primarily through the lens of academic integrity has led to the belief that we are already fighting corruption and there is little more that we need to do. We point to our existing laudable commitment, with quality assurance/accreditation standards and policies that require institutions and programs to demonstrate that they support and take steps to enhance integrity. This includes standards and policies that call for, e.g., honesty in working with students and the public, dedication to the highest of ethical standards in teaching, learning, and research, and full transparency in the conduct of college or university business.

However, are existing standards and policies adequate? Is not fighting corruption more than urging faculty and administrators to affirm academic integrity? Are there practices in place, for example, to make sure that plagiarism does not occur with students or faculty—beyond calling for honesty in assignments, research, and writing, as important as this is? Are steps taken to preclude falsification of transcripts or other credentials using today's technology, going beyond assertions that such practices should not occur? What steps are needed to block the sale of grades or admissions, beyond condemning such practices? The aspirations and exhortations associated with academic integrity are vital, but they are not a substitute for needed action against corruption, as described by the various suggestions in the *Advisory Statement*.

With regard to increasing the awareness of the importance of addressing corruption, some in the quality assurance/accreditation community, when asked, say that there is no need—corruption has yet to emerge as a significant

issue for them. They rarely encounter corruption in the course of their examinations and reviews of institutions or programs. Why, in light of the absence of even preliminary evidence of corruption, should they apply their limited resources to address this issue? And in the rare instances in which it is encountered, do not other actors—not quality assurance/accreditation—have primary responsibility here? Corruption, even academic corruption, is an issue for government, for law enforcement, or for the courts.

When it comes to academic corruption, it is not enough to articulate common principles at a general level that we can all embrace and that provide an umbrella for variations in quality assurance practice around the world.

The challenge here is to acknowledge that, however strong higher education may be in any given country, corruption can and does occur and that we need to act. Are we actually looking for corruption as part of the peer review or self-study process? Is there a set of indicators or triggers that produces greater scrutiny for the presence of corruption? Is there an "anti-corruption" checklist? What are telltale signs that peer reviewers are trained to catch? Yes, this is not the most pleasant of topics, but neither is corruption unearthed by other authorities at the same time that quality assurance/accreditation bodies are asserting that a college or university is meeting its academic integrity expectations.

About cultural variation, what counts as "corruption" differs, sometimes widely, from country to country. Plagiarism, for example, is acceptable in some societies but not others. Nepotism is appropriate within some borders but not others. The selling of degrees or academic credit or college admission is considered corruption in some countries. In others, such practices are viewed as unfortunate but necessary. While quality assurance/accreditation leaders have readily agreed on common practices in many areas—academic leadership role of the university, the importance of scholarship and research, commitment to students throughout higher education—agreement about what counts as corruption is more difficult because of these variations.

How to Move Forward

When it comes to academic corruption, it is not enough to articulate common principles at a general level that we can all embrace and that provide an umbrella for variations in quality assurance practice around the world. This typical practice in addressing quality assurance issues can certainly help, but we need more. Beyond our attention to academic integrity, we can strengthen anti-corruption practices through additional quality assurance/accreditation standards and policies that focus explicitly on corruption. We need additional training to expand effective scrutiny for the presence of corruption in a college or university as part of ongoing quality review. We can map the variability of what counts or does not count as corruption from country to country. The stakes are exceptionally high with corruption, with enormous potential for harm to students, employers, and the public—and the undermining of the legitimacy of higher education.

Academic corruption is an uncomfortable space for quality assurance. It will take time and a willingness to operate with this discomfort to address these issues more fully as part of establishing a needed leadership role. Moving forward, the suggestions in this article can be part of a successful response to the *Advisory Statement* wake-up call.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10371

The Growth of International Student Mobility Is Faltering

Dirk Van Damme

Dirk Van Damme is head of division, OECD Directorate for Education and Skills. E-mail: dirk.vandamme@oecd.org.

Over the past decades, the numbers of international students have steadily grown. According to data collected by OECD and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the total number of internationally mobile students studying in another country than that of their citizenship exploded from 1.7 million in 1995 to 4.5 million in 2012. The rationale for this growth is clear. To some extent, international student mobility can be seen as a consequence of global academic inequality. Students are moving to other parts of the globe in order to find the best possible education their money can buy. International student mobility is one of the ways through which the geographical gap between supply and demand is overcome. Investing resources in their children's education in order for them to secure high-quality credentials has become a preferred strategy of affluent middle-class families in emerging countries, especially after their purchasing power started to increase. Some countries were quick to tap into this opportunity and developed strategies to market their higher education offer. International student mobility is one of the most visible ways through which

globalization manifests itself in higher education.

Many expected this growth to continue and even to accelerate. But that is not what happened: from 2012 onward, the growth rate fell to almost zero. Between 2012 and 2015, a mere 100,000 students were added to the 4.5 million. Recent figures, published in OECD's *Education at a Glance 2017*, suggest that it is not just a temporary setback, but a more structural phenomenon.

Domestic Expansion

What could the reasons be for this change? We probably need to look at developments both on the demand and the supply sides. Regarding demand, the obvious explanation is the improvement of domestic education in the most important countries of origin. China, and to a lesser extent India, have invested huge resources in developing their higher education systems, including a select number of universities that are predestined to achieve world-class status in the next few years. Chinese universities are now aggressively entering global rankings and continue to improve their rankings every single year. The Chinese research output is the most rapidly increasing of the whole world. Changing prospects at home have an impact on the investment strategies of affluent middle-class families in these nations. China also seems to monitor and manage its outgoing student flow more carefully.

International Students, No Longer Welcome

Still, changes on the demand side alone cannot explain the lack of growth. Indeed, the potential reservoir of interested students in many countries around the world remains immense. We also have to look at the supply side, to developments in the main countries of destination. It is evident that in the main countries active in the field of exporting education services, things have fundamentally changed as well. From a very hospitable and welcoming approach to international students, popular and political attitudes have reversed into a much more hostile stance. This has happened in main destination countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, but also in upcoming players such as the Netherlands, Sweden, or Switzerland. The general backlash against migration, aggravated by the refugee crisis and flows of asylum seekers, has also turned the climate upside down for foreign students. Populist and often false accusations that foreign students are only interested in permanent migration, and that they take the future jobs of domestic students, are now in the media every day.

The 2017 *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*, published by the Institute of International Education (IIE), points to a decrease of 7 percent in the numbers of new international students enrolling in US higher education institutions. The majority of surveyed institutions (52 percent) in the IIE survey expressed concern that the country's social and political climate could deter prospective international students. The recently released 2018 Science and Engineering Indicators report from the National Science Foundation's (NSF) governing board, the National Science Board, mentions a 19 percent drop in students coming from India to the United States. The decrease in international students, especially at the doctoral and postdoctoral levels, confronts many research laboratories of US universities with huge staffing shortages.

In the United Kingdom, the share of international students in universities' intake has stalled around 19 percent since 2013. Data published at the end of 2017 by the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) points to a slight decline in the numbers of students from EU countries applying to UK universities. For the university sector, it is clear that the Brexit referendum and its aftermath are factors deterring European students from coming to the United Kingdom. A political decision is currently being discussed of removing international students from the government's target of reducing net immigration. Even with a favorable decision for international students, general feelings of uncertainty and a hostile climate against migration to the United Kingdom are probably becoming a deterrent for international students. Vice-chancellors are trying to fight the hostile climate, among others with research reports that demonstrate the beneficial impact of international students on local and regional economies. In a recent study, international students are said to be contributing 10 times more to the UK economy than what they cost the taxpayer.

To some extent, international student mobility can be seen as a consequence of global academic inequality.

Similar developments can be seen in other countries of destination. Only a few years ago, countries were engaged in a competition to attract fee-paying international students to their campuses. Nowadays, most destination countries are not trying to grab other countries' lost shares of international students, but seem to align on a generally hostile stance against international students. This is at least the impression one gets from looking at the situation in countries like Australia, the Netherlands, Sweden, or Switzerland.

International Students Shaping the World in the Twenty-first Century

What is happening both on the demand and supply sides of international higher education is fundamentally reshaping the size and direction of international student mobility flows. In a strange way, they are reshaping global academic inequalities. At the same time, they are also redefining where and how the future professionals and leaders of the twenty-first century will be educated. Academic education was an important instrument shaping the post-WWII global order. Likewise, the current changes in international education will have a profound impact around the world in the twenty-first century. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10382

Attracting and Retaining Global Talent: International Graduate Students in the United States

Rajika Bhandari

Rajika Bhandari is head of research, policy, and practice, Institute of International Education (IIE), New York, US. E-mail: rbhandari@iie.org.

The Open Doors *project is carried out by IIE in partnership with the US Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (www.iie.org/opendoors).*

The new *Open Doors* 2017 data was released in November 2017 during a time of much speculation in the US higher education sector on whether the flows of international students to the United States would decline. But these data, as well as several snapshot surveys conducted in 2017 by IIE and partner higher education associations, ultimately revealed a mixed picture. While there were clear declines in new enrollments, pointing to a flattening of international student numbers at best and a future decline at worst, there were some surprises: whether or not institutions saw declines was based on the type of institution, its geographic location, and its selectivity. Among those that saw declines, there was clearly a mix of factors to which this downturn could be attributed, and the flattening of numbers actually preceded the political and social developments in the United States in 2017.

In the context of this uncertain climate, some populations of international students deserve closer attention. While the *Open Doors* survey includes international students at all levels of postsecondary education, this article focuses on the status of international graduate students in the United States.

What Attracts International Graduate Students to the United States?

Three key aspects of the US higher education sector have been instrumental in attracting graduate students and top talent from around the world. The first is the quality and diversity of US institutions—over 4,000 of them. Surveys of prospective international students have shown that the United States is ranked the highest for the quality of its institutions and overall academic experience. Second, the significant investments and emphasis on science, technology, and innovation within the higher education sector; campus-based research facilities; and university–industry collaborations are critical components of US graduate education, attracting graduate students from all over who aim to pursue advanced research. Third, and relatedly, is the availability of poststudy opportunities such as Optional Practical Training (OPT), which enables international graduate students to apply their academic knowledge while also serving as a pathway for longer-term employment and retention in the US workforce and talent pool.

Current Findings

Against this backdrop, what does the current evidence tell us about the status of international graduate students at various points of the talent pipeline—from enrollment, to work–study opportunities immediately following their graduation, and to full-time employment in the United States? Looking first at current enrollment, we note that 36 percent (or 391,124) of all international students enrolled in the United States are graduate students. In recent years, the absolute numbers of international graduate students in the United States have continued to rise, and the United States hosts more graduate students than any other competing host country, as indicated by Project Atlas. Nonetheless, findings from the recent *Open Doors* data on new enrollments, based on a Fall 2017 snapshot survey and two recent reports by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), suggest that international graduate student growth might be slowing down. The NSF analysis found a decline of almost 6 percent in international graduate enrollment between 2016 and 2017, and the CGS survey of new international graduate enrollment also found an overall decline of almost 3 percent. The latter declines were at the master's and certificate program levels and at less research-intensive institutions, indicating once again that the current fluctuations in international student enrollments vary by institutional type.

International graduate students in the United States are predominantly from Asia (73 percent), with half of them from India and China alone. Thus, the flows of students from these two key countries matter. While the enrollment of Indian graduate students declined by 13 percent between 2016 and 2017, the number of new Chinese graduate students increased by 5 percent. Despite this mixed picture, institutions report that both Indian and Chinese students, particularly at the graduate level, are concerned about possible future constrictions of either OPT or work visas. Overall (regardless of academic level), international students from India and China accounted for more than half of all OPT approvals from 2012 to 2015, according to an analysis by the Pew Research Center.

OPT, the next step in the pipeline, is where international student numbers have increased over the past couple of years, with more and more students availing themselves of a work–study opportunity. Thus, more students have remained within the US higher education system, while the enrollment of new, incoming students has not grown at the same rate. As of fall 2016, 175,000 students were on OPT, due in large part to the extension for STEM students, who can remain in the United States for a total of 36 months under the terms of the program. A majority of international graduate students (62 percent) are in STEM fields and thus avail themselves of the expanded OPT option. However, this has also resulted in a situation where there are large numbers of international graduate students who complete OPT, but not enough H1B visas (employment-based, non-immigrant visas for temporary workers) for those who may wish to stay in the workforce. An analysis by the Pew Research Center shows that H1B visa applications have exceeded supply over the past five years. Indeed, 41 percent of campus administrators who reported declines in new international enrollments in IIE's Fall 2017 snapshot survey indicated that the drops could be due to student concerns about not being able to secure a job in the United States after study completion.

International graduate students in the United States are predominantly from Asia (73 percent), with half of them from India and China alone.

An additional challenge around retaining international graduate students relates to financial support, and the fact that students have long relied on research and teaching assistantships provided by their departments. A decade ago, in 2006–2007, roughly equal proportions of international graduate students supported themselves through personal resources (45.4 percent) and through college and university funding (46.6 percent), primarily in the form of teaching and research assistantships. A decade later, the proportion of graduate students funding their studies primarily through personal and family means has grown to 61 percent. This could be due to a combination of reasons, including an increasing number of international master's students who may be less likely to receive assistantships that are more common at the doctoral level, as well as overall declining support for all graduate students (domestic and international). Add to this the fact that the average cost of a US higher education for an international student obtaining a master's degree at a public institution increased by 52 percent between 2008 and 2016, and by 46 percent at private institutions.

The multiplier effects of international graduate students and what they bring to the US higher education enterprise cannot be underestimated. A recent 2017 analysis by Kevin Shih shows that international graduate students help expand the enrollment of domestic graduate students, while also subsidizing the enrollment of domestic students. For those international graduate students who stay on, many go on to fuel the US knowledge economy. For instance, a substantial proportion of firms in Silicon Valley were founded by what might be considered new immigrant entrepreneurs—most of whom came to the United States as international students—and many of the US-based Nobel laureates also came to the country as international graduate students. Finally, those who return to their home countries help establish trade, diplomatic, and educational ties between other countries and the United States, especially in the form of joint research and international partnerships.■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10372

What an International Branch Campus Is, and Is Not: A Revised Definition

Stephen Wilkins and Laura E. Rumbley

Stephen Wilkins is an associate professor in business management at the British University in Dubai, UAE. E-mail: stephen.wilkins@buid.ac.ae. Laura E. Rumbley is assistant professor of the practice and associate director at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu.

According to the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE) and the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT), there were 263 international branch campuses operating worldwide at the end of 2017. Although the international branch campus has become an established part of the cross-border higher education landscape—and definitions of this phenomenon have been elaborated by OBHE, C-BERT, and HESA (the United Kingdom's Higher Education Statistics Agency), there is still debate about what an international branch campus actually is.

In any scholarly field, researchers need to use the same terminology and definitions, otherwise meaning is subject to misunderstandings among readers, and comparisons of findings become, at least to an extent, pointless. Thus, clarifying what an international branch campus is, and is not, requires further attention.

It omits certain key features that are vital to the essence of what a branch is, notably how the terms "branch" and "campus" are used in business and higher education.

Pushing Forward the Current Definition

During the last few years, the definition of international branch campuses used most often by researchers is C-BERT's, which was modified slightly in the November 2016 OBHE/C-BERT report on international branch campuses as follows:

"An entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; and provides an entire academic program, substantially on site, leading to a degree awarded by the foreign education provider."

This definition has provided a sound point of departure for researchers. However, it omits certain key features that are vital to the essence of what a branch is, notably how the terms "branch" and "campus" are used in business and higher education. While international branch campuses are not generally considered businesses, they *are* parts of multinational enterprises (MNEs), because the term "MNE" refers to any organization that engages in foreign direct investment (FDI) and operates in multiple countries. Business terms and concepts can help us make sense of what an international branch campus is, so that a clearer and more implementable definition may be developed.

The OBHE/C-BERT definition of international branch campus not only omits certain key features, but it also specifies unnecessary criteria. In business, a bank, hotel, or retail company does not always offer exactly the same products and services at every branch; similarly, it seems unnecessary to insist that an overseas campus "provide an entire academic program" or one that "leads to a degree" in order to be categorized as an international branch campus. Indeed, there are a range of possibilities that might be considered. The programming offered to students enrolled in branch campuses should bear the name of the foreign institution, but should *not* encompass study abroad centers, which are intended mainly to provide a short-term study experience for students from the institution's home campus.

Core Features

A refined understanding of international branch campuses recognizes several core features, as described below.

- **Ownership, a key criterion**: International branch campuses are owned, at least partially, by a specific foreign higher education institution. Foreign-backed institutions like the American University of Beirut or the British University in Dubai are not international branch campuses since these are typically private institutions that have adopted a foreign higher education system, which often involves accreditation by foreign organizations. Confederations or educational systems, like Islamic Azad University, which has four campuses outside Iran, should also not be considered as branch campuses, since there is no clear "parent" campus.
- **The bottom line matters**: MNEs make investments in foreign countries, typically to establish operations in these countries. If the home institution earns only a fixed fee or a commission based on student enrollments, then it is clear that the home institution does not truly "own" the foreign operation, and it is not a branch campus.
- **Substantive control is crucial**: The home institution may not actually own the land or premises from which the branch operates, but it does own the brand name, and it is responsible for curricula and accrediting awards. Although host country governments may provide the financial investment needed to establish branch campuses—as Abu Dhabi did for New York University and Paris-Sorbonne—when a true branch campus is established, the parent institution has control, at least to some extent, over strategic decisions such as scale of operations, curricula, and faculty appointments. It is also responsible for academic standards and quality assurance.
- **Partnerships**: If a foreign campus is really an international branch campus, it will be recognized as such on the websites of the home and branch

institutions. For example, Westminster University's website refers to Westminster International University in Tashkent as a partner institution, not a branch campus. Similarly, Xi'an Jiaotong–Liverpool University in China and Yale–NUS College in Singapore, which both resulted from partnerships, are not described by any of the founding institutions as a branch campus. However, some branch campuses do have a partnership ownership structure. Partners may be private entrepreneurs, for-profit companies, or not-for-profit organizations. For example, Heriot-Watt's campus in Dubai is jointly owned with a company called Study World. Profits resulting from the campus's operations are shared between the two organizations.

- **The need for a campus**: Finally, to be recognized as a branch campus, the institution's infrastructure should fit with the definition of a campus. The word "campus" refers to the grounds and buildings of an educational institution and suggests that students receive a certain study experience. However, many universities run foreign outposts that offer only a single qualification, or a very small number of qualifications, operating from a handful of rooms in an office block, while others employ no full-time faculty in the host country. At a minimum, students at a branch campus should have access to a library, an open access computer lab, and dining facilities.

Revised Definition, and Moving Forward

This refined understanding of international branch campuses suggests a new working definition for the field, which speaks to the key elements that should ideally frame the phenomenon:

"An international branch campus is an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a specific foreign higher education institution, which has some degree of responsibility for the overall strategy and quality assurance of the branch campus. The branch campus operates under the name of the foreign institution and offers programming and/or credentials that bear the name of the foreign institution. The branch has basic infrastructure, such as a library, an open access computer lab, and dining facilities, and, overall, students at the branch have a similar student experience to students at the home campus."

Transnational higher education operates in a myriad of forms and modes. Although this article has identified some of the core features of an international branch campus, these campuses are far from homogenous. For example, shared campuses exist in countries such as Malaysia and the United Arab Emirates, where multiple institutions share infrastructure such as catering and sports facilities. Thus, while our proposed definition may be an improvement over existing definitions, a degree of personal judgement will still always be needed to classify certain campuses. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10379

International Branch Campuses: Success Factors

Richard Garrett

Richard Garrett is director, Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. E-mail: richard.garrett@i-graduate.org.

In November 2017, the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE), a think tank concerned with transnational education, online learning, and other innovations, published the second part of its latest report on international branch campuses (IBCs). The first part, focused on IBC numbers, was published in November 2016 and covered in *International Higher Education*, Spring 2017. Both parts of the report were produced in conjunction with the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at the State University of New York at Albany and Pennsylvania State University. The Observatory and C-BERT are the world's two leading authorities on international branch campuses. Our definition of an international branch campus is "an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; and provides an entire academic program, substantially on site, leading to a degree awarded by the foreign education provider."

The second part of the report considers the success factors of mature international branch campuses. Based on in-depth interviews with leaders at selected IBCs, it examines their organizational evolution, relationship to the home institution, and their expectations and outcomes, ultimately identifying and discussing the models and practices that have been critical to their operation long-term. The report also includes a full and updated list of known IBCs in operation, along with data on year established, number of programs offered, student numbers (where available), and IBCs currently in development.

IBC growth continues, with the number of international branch campuses worldwide reaching 263 in late 2017. Around half (130) of these institutions are at least ten years old. The fact that 133 IBCs were founded more recently indicates that IBCs continue to be a relevant and enticing form of transnational education, despite the invest-

ment and risks involved. The ambition behind many IBCs make them particularly fascinating. Little research has been done, up to this point, on the factors that have contributed to the long-term success and sustainability of international branch campuses.

The new report considers eight mature IBCs founded by institutions based in Australia, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, with IBCs in Austria, Belgium, China, France, Malaysia, Singapore, Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates, and Vietnam: Curtin University (Curtin University, Malaysia); ESSEC Business School (ESSEC Asia–Pacific); Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech–Lorraine); Heriot-Watt University (Heriot-Watt University Dubai); Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT Vietnam); University of Kent (Brussels School of International Studies, University of Kent); University of Nottingham (University of Nottingham Ningbo China; University of Nottingham, Malaysia Campus); Webster University (Webster University, Geneva Campus; Webster University, Vienna Campus).

Leaders of mature campuses emphasize the importance of having positive working relationships with local regulators and complying with local regulations.

In depth interviews with leaders from the institutions and branch campuses, combined with information supplied by the institutions and publicly available, allowed a multifaceted understanding of the elements that have contributed to the successful and sustainable operation of these IBCs. Key success factors and points of evolution, include:

Institutional Integration

- **Origins:** IBCs often originate from a desire to enhance global reputation, though personal connections and timing frequently play a strong role. Most home institutions already have experience in international partnerships and operating across borders.
- **Institutional integration:** In all cases, the IBC has strong support from the highest levels of the university and is integrated into the academic and administrative functions of the institution, as opposed to being siloed and wholly separate.
- **Self-definition:** None of the IBC leaders interviewed use the term "branch campus" in their self-definition; most prefer terminology that emphasizes a single institution with an international presence.
- **Collaborative leadership:** There is a close relationship between home and branch campus leaders, with constant contact between the two. Decision-making is often a collaborative process, with some IBC autonomy.
- **Measuring success:** Progress is tracked, monitored, and supported by the home campus, though the IBC operates with a certain degree of autonomy in order to achieve its particular goals.

Host Country Support and Resources

- **Evolving relationship**: The relationship with the local partner and/or government of the host country evolves over time. For example, the Knowledge and Human Development Authority (KHDA), the educational quality assurance and regulatory authority of the government of the United Arab Emirates, was not in existence when Heriot-Watt Dubai was founded in 2005, though the two entities now work together closely. Relations with local operational partners adapt to changing needs and capabilities.
- **Finances and resources:** The focus of the home and branch is on quality over profit, but financial sustainability is obviously the goal. Some campuses were operated at a loss or subsidized by the home institution during certain periods. It is the norm that some or all net revenue is reinvested in the campus. In some cases, host government restrictions are also a factor.
- **Location:** IBCs tend to be located near other IBCs or other centers of transnational education, or have specific justifications for locating elsewhere, such as local connections or mission-focused rationales.

Regulatory Environment and Academics

- **Cooperation:** Leaders of mature campuses emphasize the importance of having positive working relationships with local regulators and complying with local regulations.
- **Research:** Research, if conducted, is a function of the needs and capabilities of local, regional, and national contexts. There is active collaboration between the parent and branch campuses that do research.
- **Faculty and staff:** Over time, there is a clear preference to use faculty based in the country, and an avoidance of the "flying faculty" model. Mature IBCs have introduced academic staff development and elements of home country academic practices, especially around pedagogy and assessment of student learning.

- **Alumni relations.** Tracking and engaging IBC alumni is acknowledged as a key dimension of long-term success, but is typically at a nascent stage.

Student Experience

- **Student body:** IBC leaders perceive their students to be international or internationally minded, with an openness to new models of education. IBCs tend to enroll large numbers of international as well as domestic students, depending on the host country.
- **Relative replication:** Institutions insist on consistent academic standards and practices between the home campus and all IBCs. Other areas (student experience, program offerings, fee structures, staffing models, etc.) may be more diverse, in line with local needs and norms.
- **Student mobility:** While student mobility between institutional sites is usually a pillar of IBC strategy, it is not always as active as desired and is often skewed in one direction.
- **Online delivery:** There is potential to use online technologies to link students and academic programs between locations, but this is a minor component of current delivery models.

The full report—90 pages in length—offers considerably more detail about the eight mature IBCs studied, including quotes from the interviews with institutional and campus leaders. Both parts of the IBC report are free to Observatory members and available for purchase to nonmembers. Please contact info@obhe.org for login details or to purchase the report. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10374

Student Debt in the United States: Rhetoric vs Reality

Sandy Baum

Sandy Baum is a fellow at the Urban Institute, Washington, DC, US. E-mail: sbaum@urban.org.

The idea of student debt "crushing a generation" pervades discussions of higher education in the United States. Anecdotes about former students struggling with large amounts of debt and low earnings get a lot of press coverage, and political candidates vow to make college "debt free." There are, in fact, significant systemic problems in the higher education system, but most of the stories garnering attention are atypical. The real crisis is obscured by calls for easing the burdens on young college graduates, who are, in fact, among the groups with the most promising life prospects.

Because of the association between higher levels of education and higher incomes, education debt holders tend to be relatively well off. In 2013, the 25 percent of households with the highest incomes held almost half of all outstanding student debt. The 25 percent of households with the lowest incomes held 11 percent of the debt. The people who are having the most trouble making ends meet are those who have not gone to college and may not even have graduated from high school. Some student loan borrowers face very real problems that public policy should address. But some proposals for general student debt relief would provide the largest benefits to individuals with relatively high earnings.

The idea of student debt "crushing a generation" pervades discussions of higher education in the United States.

Basic Facts about Student Debt

The press finds individual students with staggering amounts of debt and few job prospects, but two-thirds of borrowers with outstanding student loan debt owe less than $25,000. Only 5 percent owe as much as $100,000. Two-thirds of the students graduating with $50,000 or more in debt, and 94 percent of those with $100,000 or more in debt, have graduate degrees. The average debt of 2015–2016 bachelor's degree recipients at public and private nonprofit colleges and universities who took student loans was $28,400; about 40 percent did not borrow at all. In light of the fact that median earnings for 25-to-34-year olds with bachelor's degrees were $18,900 higher than the median for those with only a high school diploma in 2015, this is not a daunting amount.

Debt levels have, however, grown rapidly. Between 2003–2004 and 2011–2012, the share of bachelor's degree recipients in the United States who had borrowed $40,000 (in 2012 dollars) or more rose from 2 percent to 18 percent, rising from 1 percent to 12 percent at public colleges and universities (which award almost two-thirds of all bachelor's degrees) and from 4 percent to 48 percent in the for-profit sector (which awarded 8 percent of bachelor's degrees in 2011–2012).

Talk about a "student debt crisis" fails to differentiate among groups of students. For example, only 11 percent of students who completed bachelor's degrees in 2011–2012 when they were age 23 or younger had borrowed as much as $40,000, but about 30 percent of those who completed their degrees at age 30 or older had accumulated this much debt. Black bachelor's degree recipients are much less likely to graduate without debt and much more likely than members of other racial/ethnic groups to borrow $40,000 or more. Contributing factors likely include lower income and wealth among black families, longer time to degree, and disproportionate enrollment in for-profit institutions among black students.

When Borrowers Do Not Repay Their Debts

The federal income-driven student loan repayment options, in which a quarter of all borrowers now participate, limit monthly payments to affordable amounts. But, unlike students in some other countries, US students have to overcome considerable bureaucratic hurdles to enroll in these programs and many borrowers still default.

Default rates are highest for those with the lowest levels of debt; two-thirds of defaulters enter repayment owing $10,000 or less. Default rates are two to three times as high among borrowers who did not complete a degree or certificate as among those who graduated. They are much higher among students who borrowed to attend for-profit and two-year public institutions than among students from four-year public and private nonprofit colleges and universities. Again, it is not the traditional college students frequently making the front page of the newspaper, but the nontraditional students—older, independent students seeking occupational preparation—who are most likely to encounter repayment problems.

Promising Solutions

The alarmist narrative about student debt distracts from serious problems that could be addressed without totally transforming the system of higher education finance, or arbitrarily and disproportionately shifting burdens from the people who benefit most from higher education to taxpayers in general. Too many students borrow to enroll in colleges and programs from which they are unlikely to graduate and/or which, even if they do graduate, are not likely to lead to positive labor market outcomes. The recent recession exacerbated these problems. Many adults who could not find jobs went back to school, frequently to expensive for-profit institutions. Public college prices rose rapidly and families were less able to support students. And students who completed college entered the labor force while the economy was weak and unemployment was high.

Some well-targeted policy options would be fairer and more efficient than broad debt-relief policies. US students need stronger precollege academic preparation, better guidance about choosing schools and programs, better policing of postsecondary quality, and better student support systems. The United States needs stricter rules for institutional eligibility for federal student aid programs and stronger incentives for institutions to improve performance and reduce student debt levels. We should limit borrowing through lower loan limits for part-time students and by tracking students across institutions so they do not accumulate more and more debt without any progress toward a credential. And we should stop allowing graduate students and parents of undergraduates to borrow to cover all of their expenses no matter how high those costs.

The United States needs a single income-driven repayment plan into which borrowers would be placed automatically and through which payments would be withheld from paychecks, along the lines of systems that already exist in a number of other countries. Forgiving unpaid balances after a set period of time is reasonable, but terms should be set so most borrowers repay their entire balances. Total payments should bear some relationship to the amount borrowed and there should be limits on the amount of debt that can be forgiven.

Conclusion

Student debt *is* seriously harming too many former students. But federal extension of credit to undergraduate students makes it possible for many individuals, particularly those with limited financial means, to pursue postsecondary studies, enroll into an appropriate college, and succeed. Some policies to alleviate debt burdens that sound progressive can actually skew subsidies away from those who need them most.

The borrowers who are struggling most with student debt are those who borrowed relatively small amounts but did not earn credentials of value in the labor market. Forgiving debt across the board or even lowering interest rates on that debt will provide the largest benefit to people who do not really need the help. No one should borrow money to go to a postsecondary institution with an abysmal graduation rate or poor job outcomes for those who do graduate—no one should put time and effort into such an institution even if it does not require borrowing. This does not mean that all borrowing for college is bad. It just has to be cautious and well informed.

Producing high quality education opportunities requires significant resources. Someone has to pay. Students are and should be responsible for a portion of that funding. Acknowledging that reality, and working to develop a

system that both prepares and protects people seeking to invest in themselves through postsecondary education, should be high on the national policy agenda. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10381

Income-Contingent Loans: Not a Miracle Solution

Ariane de Gayardon

Ariane de Gayardon is researcher at the Institute of Education Centre for Global Higher Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: a.gayardon@ucl.ac.uk.

With massification and the rising costs of higher education, governments worldwide have to resort to cost sharing to alleviate the weight of higher education funding on the state. With the rise of tuition fees, however, governments have to structure financing options ensuring that students from all walks of life have the opportunity to access higher education. This has led to the creation of government-guaranteed student loans.

While individuals are able to take up loans from private banks to finance different products like homes and cars, higher education is rarely one of them. Investing in students is indeed a risky investment for banks given high noncompletion rates and the impossibility of taking back the product invested in—like taking possession of a home when a mortgage is no longer being repaid. For these reasons, governments have to be heavily involved in the provision of student loans.

Income-Contingent Loans

Government loans for education usually take one of two forms: a mortgage-style loan or an income-contingent loan (ICL). In the case of a mortgage-style loan, the individual has to repay the total amount of his/her loan plus interest during a set period of time, leading to mandatory fixed monthly payments. The main disadvantage of this type of loan is that higher education is no guarantee that one will have the means to repay—these loans can lead to repayment hardship, default, and subsequently credit reputation loss.

ICLs are designed to propose a fairer option for students. Repayment of the loans is tied to income, with individuals repaying a share of their income, usually for a fixed amount of time. This insures against high repayment burdens. It also eliminates default, as governments automatically forgive outstanding balances once the payment period is over: this is called the "hidden grant." For these reasons, ICLs have many advocates across the world: they are seen as a way to provide free higher education at the point of entry and ensure a smooth and equitable repayment.

What Is Currently Happening?

In 2017, however, there were increasingly heightened debates on the financing of higher education in three flagship countries for ICLs: Australia, England, and New Zealand. Examining the relevant issues and learning from them is important at a time when student debt is rising, leading to a revival of the concept of free-tuition higher education.

Australia is at a political standstill over higher education financing because of the balance of power in the senate, which has been unable to pass any legislation on higher education financing since 2013. Failed legislative proposals in recent years include fees deregulation, reducing the income repayment threshold, and introducing a student loan fee. These proposals all aimed at reducing the expenses of the Higher Education Loan Program (HELP) to ensure its sustainability. In December 2017, the government took a radical measure by including higher education financing reforms in the 2018 budget. The reforms lowered the repayment threshold by AU$ 11,000 (US$9,000), which will negatively impact individuals with lower incomes, and froze university budgets for two years, reducing institutional ability to fund students. The decision of the Australian government to pass these changes as part of the budget is a direct testimony of its inability to sustain the current system.

What the examples of these three countries show us is that systems with ICLs are also prone to issues and questionable policy decisions.

England has also been overwhelmed by debates on higher education financing since the Labour Party regained popularity thanks to a proposal to make higher education tuition free, a sign of the general discontent with the high cost of higher education and increasing levels of student loan debt. Among the issues under discussion in England: the fact that the financial protection afforded by ICLs has led to an inflation of the cap on tuition fees, from £ 1,000 (US$1,400) means-tested in 1998 to £ 9,250 (US$13,000) for all in 2017. The high rate of interest (up to 3 percent plus inflation) that is in effect during the student's course of study also contributes to increased debt levels and angry loan recipients. Additionally, as of 2016, grants have completely disappeared and been replaced by loans—a financial move to reduce the national deficit. As a result, low-income

students are now those graduating with the highest debt—quite a regressive system. One last issue worth mentioning is the collapse of the number of part-time students since the cap on tuition fees was raised in 2012, showing the inadequacy of the financial aid system for this type of student. Several changes have already been made, including raising the repayment threshold to alleviate debt burden, but a major review of higher education is in the works, and most experts agree that it should lead to definitive changes in the English financing system, with, very probably, a lowering of tuition fees.

Finally, New Zealand has also been struggling with student loan debt and its ICL system, as evidenced by contradictory policies on interest adopted in the 2000s and an increase in the rate of repayment from 10 percent to 12 percent—far higher than in England (9 percent) and Australia (up to 8 percent). This debate concluded with the election of the current government in 2017, which is committed to introducing tuition-free higher education, a radical move away from ICLs.

Lessons from Australia, England, and New Zealand

What the examples of these three countries show us is that systems with ICLs are also prone to issues and questionable policy decisions. These national cases also demonstrate the need for flexibility in the implementation and specifications of ICLs, to be able to adapt the system to a changing economic and social context. Additionally, no ICL system exists without some government subsidization of those loans that are never repaid in full. This must be part of the design from the start, with a conscious decision by the government to subsidize students in this way.

What is also easy to forget, when considering how ICLs fit economically in the current higher education context, is that an ICL is still a loan. Not only does it mean that the borrower's take home pay is lowered by loan repayment, it also has psychological implications tied to the mere concept of debt. Debt aversion, in particular, is strong among individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds. If ICL is the only financial option, participation from these strata of society could drop. These individuals are also less likely to repay their loans in full, and will end up being subsidized by the government. This highlights the necessity of designing a fair financial aid system, achieving a balance between a means-tested grant system and a well-designed ICL system, to best accommodate all types of students. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10373

African Private Higher Education: Progressive Policies and Ambivalent Stances

Wondwosen Tamrat and Damtew Teferra

Wondwosen Tamrat is associate professor and founding president of St. Mary's University, Ethiopia. E-mails: preswond@smuc.edu.et and wondwosentamrat@gmail.com. Damtew Teferra is professor of higher education, leader of Higher Education and Training Development, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, and founding director of the International Network for Higher Education in Africa. E-mails: teferra@ukzn.ac.za and teferra@bc.edu.

The rise of private higher education (PHE) in Africa has been mainly driven by such factors as the inability of the public sector to meet growing demands, strain on public finance that called for alternative sources of funding, and consequent economic policies that led to structural reforms. By global standards, the growth of the PHE sector in Africa remains low—currently hovering around 20 percent of the overall tertiary enrollment. However, the sector's importance is strongly felt in terms of addressing the deficiencies of the public sector, creating job opportunities, enhancing managerial efficiencies, and infusing an entrepreneurial culture into the traditionally conservative higher education arena. The significant role governments play through appropriate legislation and policies remains one of the most critical levers for lending credence to, and advancing the growth of, the PHE sector. However, arguments against PHE have been equally strong due to a host of controversies surrounding the use of taxpayers' money on private institutions.

We argue that while direct support to PHE could be difficult and in most cases controversial, an indirect form of support to PHEIs, even in resource-depleted contexts like Africa, could help the sector thrive. This type of support, some of which we consider progressive, could come in various forms, as regional experiences discussed here indicate.

Loans and Scholarships

Loans to students and/or institutions are common forms of support to PHEIs, though instituting efficient mechanisms in Africa has not been particularly easy. In Kenya, students from chartered private universities benefit from loans disbursed by the Higher Education Loans Board. In Ghana, the Student Loan Trust Fund provides loans to students enrolled at accredited institutions—including PHEIs. Lesotho's interest-free Loan Bursary Fund is open to all students who have obtained admission to HEIs. Botswana provides student loans and scholarships to privately enrolled stu-

dents. In Nigeria, PHE students excluded from the public higher education tax fund can access loans operated by the Nigerian Education Bank. Banks in Namibia avail collateral-based loans for higher education at commercial rates. Mozambique's Provincial Scholarship Fund is dedicated to poor students enrolled in public and PHEIs. Meanwhile, in Ethiopia, Malawi, Mauritius, Uganda, and Zimbabwe, government-sponsored student loans are either nonexistent or exclude students from PHEIs, although recently, the Ethiopian ministry of education started supporting academic staff at PHEIs for studies at public institutions—by granting tuition remission.

Loans made available to institutions—at concessional interest rates—are critical in many ways. The Tanzanian Education Authority encourages the provision of loans and grants to PHEIs to meet costs for construction and rehabilitation of educational facilities, purchase educational equipment, and develop their human resources. In Mozambique, PHEIs are entitled to benefit from the Quality Enhancement and Innovation Fund, which is dedicated to strengthening institutional capacity. In the Ethiopian context, however, special loan arrangements that are common for such sectors as manufacturing and export trade are not yet available to the PHE sector.

We argue that while direct support to PHE could be difficult and in most cases controversial, an indirect form of support to PHEIs, even in resource-depleted contexts like Africa, could help the sector thrive.

Auxiliary Enterprises and Taxation

In Kenya and Tanzania, governments do not provide direct subsidies to PHEIs; however, they encourage the private sector to invest in such institutions. PHEIs in Kenya are encouraged to set up auxiliary enterprises that engage in activities such as agriculture, cafeterias, bookstores, clinics, laundry, carpentry, and leasing of conference facilities. In Tunisia, government incentives for PHEIs include offering grants that cover up to 25 percent of their total establishment costs and 25 percent of faculty salaries for a period of ten years. Ethiopia has lately announced competitive research funding for HEIs, but it is not clear yet whether private institutions will be part of this scheme.

Favorable taxation measures have usually been a common means of spurring PHE growth. The Ethiopian investment law exempts duty taxes on building materials used for educational institutions. It also allows exemption from income taxes for the first three years; this, however, has had limited effect due to the brevity of the gestation period for such an investment to take off. The Ghanaian government has recently announced that it will scrap the 25 percent corporate tax imposed on private universities to enhance their roles in national development.

Provision of Land

Governments can also assist PHEIs by providing land for free or at discounted prices or rent. This is crucial, especially where the cost of land happens to be exorbitant and PHEIs are spending an inordinate amount of funds for rented facilities. In Uganda, the government allegedly donated 300 acres of land to Mbale University to help generate additional income through rentals. The Tunisian experience involves selling parcels of land to PHEIs for one dinar—as a symbolic gesture of support to the sector. Ethiopia has also granted plots of land to many PHEIs as an investment incentive.

Leveling the Regulatory Field

Leveling the playing field for both private and public providers of higher education is a notably progressive policy track pursued by governments. In Egypt, the National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education serves as an independent accrediting body for all types and levels of education. The same is true for Ghana's National Accreditation Board, Kenya's Commission for Higher Education, and Uganda's Council for Higher Education, which regulate both private and public HEIs. The Council on Higher Education of Lesotho regulates both public and private institutions, despite their differences in establishment. However, accreditation requirements in Ethiopia continue to be only applicable to PHEIs.

Conclusion

PHEIs will grow and may even thrive in the African HE landscape as the global and regional thirst for higher education continues to surge. It is thus high time to change the discourse on PHEIs along with emerging realities, to harness their potential through favorable and progressive policies. Progressive government policies can be instrumental in fostering PHEIs as effective partners in national and regional endeavors for social and economic development.

Of course, government policy pledges need to be honored to translate intentions into realities—an area where African countries are often cited for falling short. All the same, African PHEIs will find it hard to respond to wider societal expectations without substantial support, both in

the form of policies and of real action. Similarly, progressive policies to advance PHEIs ought to be meticulously implemented, without hampering the competitive spirit that drives private business. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10375

Mexico's Strong and Sustained Private Growth: What Is Government's Role?

Jorge Arenas and Daniel C. Levy

Jorge Gamaliel Arenas Basurto is professor at Universidad de las Américas Puebla, Mexico. E-mail: jorge.arenas@udlap.mx. Daniel C. Levy is SUNY distinguished professor, Department of Educational Policy and Leadership, State University of New York at Albany, US. E-mail dlevy@albany.edu.

The new century has already seen a near doubling of Mexican private higher education (PHE) enrollment, now approaching one million students. This is a powerful surge—even though the growth in the private share of total enrollments, hovering just above 30 percent, is modest. For several basic social, economic, and political reasons, demand for publicly funded public higher education has continued unabated and government has continued responding liberally.

But what is the (national) government's role in the striking recent growth of *private* higher education? While the left blames the government for laxity in allowing inappropriate private expansion, the right (though chronically complaining of restrictive regulation) mostly ignores the government's role, instead attributing PHE growth to a healthy private market of supply and demand. In reality, one mistake is to imagine any clear government plan concerning the size of the PHE sector, while another mistake is to ignore the impact of government's de facto role—through both inaction and action. Government has in fact facilitated the growth of PHE.

How? We identify two fundamental motors: 1. government inaction, namely a lack of purposeful policy on the size of PHE, and 2. government action (policies), aimed at public-sector reform. In this case, neither inaction nor action are designed to facilitate the growth of PHE, but each does. Government inaction has left ample higher education terrain free for private activity—and private suppliers have vigorously exploited the opportunities. Meanwhile, government action has, paradoxically, made the public sector less attractive.

Government Inaction Allowing Private Action

Government inaction is not new. The point here is government's continued, benign accommodation of the private sector, or "permissiveness," in critics' words. This has allowed private institutions to form, become licensed for operation, and function legally. Restrictive regulations remain limited, making it perhaps as easy to start a private university as opening a *tortilleria*. A spate of new regulations in the mid-1990s was enough to arouse concern among PHE providers, but proved no decisive turning point. Good quality private institutions meet government regulations easily, while others find ways around them.

PHE's vigorous exploitation of free space has recently assumed novel forms: private networks, for-profit chains, and online delivery. Online education is growing rapidly at the graduate level and 80 percent of that growth is private, but here we discuss only the networks and the chains.

Government inaction has left ample higher education terrain free for private activity—and private suppliers have vigorously exploited the opportunities.

Private networks in Mexico come in multiple forms. The first began with the famed Tec de Monterrey's 2002 founding of U Tecmilenio, which now stretches across 29 campuses in 18 states. Catholic networks rooted in several venerable elite Catholic universities in Mexico City followed closely behind. The Universidad Iberoamericana is now part of a seven-institution Jesuit network. Similar patterns hold for the (also Catholic) Universidad La Salle, Legionnaires of Christ, and Opus Dei. This surge of religious networks has not been reported in global PHE literature and undercuts any argument that, in Mexico at least, religious higher education is merely a lingering vestige of the past. A third wave of network creation has been a nonelite wave, including the large, demand-absorbing University Insurgentes; at mid-level, with strong job orientation, are the UNITEC and large Universidad del Valle networks. The robustness of all of these private networks demonstrates that, in spite of the overall lack of government planning for PHE and even for higher education in general, multiple private groups have done their own planning—and followed through on it.

UNITEC and Universidad del Valle are also examples of another form of private expansion: for-profit and international. Given the ambiguity of Mexican legislation about

for-profit universities, businesses have long owned nonprofit universities paying rent for land and facilities, buying their curriculum, and so forth. What is new is ownership by a foreign international chain, itself focused on higher education. Easily the largest in Mexico, as it is in Latin America and all over the world, is Laureate Education (which includes UNITEC and Universidad del Valle in its holdings).

Public-Sector Reform

All of these new PHE forms reflect vigorous private initiative. In contrast, we will now turn to the government initiative to reform the *public* sector, where we can identify three salient areas: evaluation, study field distribution, and institutional diversification beyond the university. In each of these areas, the aim has been to make public higher education a more economically rational endeavor. But each initiative has had the unintended effect of creating obstacles to public expansion, and, in the last two areas, reforms have pushed students from the public to the private sector.

Evaluation: In the 1990s and into the new century, the government has turned against its own longstanding practice of distributing funds to public higher education largely based on enrollment numbers or precedent, without regard to performance level. This has been a blow to a major foundation of previously automatic public-sector expansion, which now depends in part on performance evaluation.

Study-field distribution: Similarly, Mexico's government decided that it should discontinue funding traditionally popular fields of study that, once saturated by students, undermine the public interest. Thus, government placed admission quotas on medicine, civil engineering, law, business, and management. An unplanned result, however, has been that students, with the support of their families, mostly continued in their preferred fields of study—in no small part because these fields continue to provide a better income. Many applicants who fail to make the public universities' field quota settle for openings in their desired fields in private institutions.

Institutional diversification: Likewise, government decided it should no longer automatically pay for a *university* degree for the great mass of higher education students. Such "overdemand" for university studies was said to follow social traditions, contributing to irrational saturation on the labor market. Already restrictive prestigious public universities came to reject up to 90 percent of applicants. Additionally, government halted the creation of public universities and from 1990 to 2009 created 343 new institutions of higher technical education, including two-year program institutions. But as the labor market continued to pay more for university graduates than for technical institution graduates, students not gaining admission to a public university often settled for a private university. In 2017, the government tried to partly offset this flow from public to private universities by launching the "A Place for You" program, meant to secure "second chance" access to a university (public or private) to those rejected by selective public universities.

In sum, without any grand overarching design or goal, the Mexican government continues to enable private growth in the education sphere. It does so through a generally accommodating policy for the private sector and through public-sector reforms that sometimes end up also promoting private sector growth—while the private sector actively seizes the opportunity to expand. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10383

Competitor Analysis in Egyptian Private Higher Education Sector

Rami M. Ayoubi and Mohamed Loutfi

Rami M. Ayoubi is project consultant, and Mohamed Loutfi is professor and pro-vice-chancellor (International), Cardiff Metropolitan University, UK. E-mails: rayoubi@cardiffmet.ac.uk and mloutfi@cardiffmet.ac.uk.

Competition in the higher education market is increasingly changing the attitude of universities in the sector. In Egypt, the demand for higher education is growing and the sector is undergoing considerable change, with a range of new, private providers joining established publicly funded universities. The higher education sector in Egypt has witnessed considerable changes since launching Law n. 101 in 1992 on regulating private universities and Law n. 12 in 2009 on amendments to govern private and national (nonprofit) universities. Both laws have contributed to introducing the concept of "competition for customers" to the Egyptian higher education sector.

The establishment and operation of private profit-oriented universities in Egypt are regulated by the Supreme Council of Private Universities, a regulatory body within the ministry of higher education whose members include all presidents of private universities, in addition to some presidents of public universities. In 2014–2015, there were 2,624,705 students registered in the higher education system, of whom 110,859, or 4.2 percent, attended private universities, a small part of the total number. In 2016, 24 private profit-oriented universities were operating in Egypt; their main source of income is tuition fees. These universities do not receive any funding from government. Being financially independent, private higher education institu-

tions have full financial autonomy. Fees in private higher education institutions are generally much higher than in public universities, and are determined by the council of each university. Students usually choose private universities for several reasons, mainly related to their lower academic performance in secondary school compared to students choosing public universities.

Four Categories of Competitors

Based on two criteria, price (annual fees per undergraduate student) and quality (academic staff reputation measured by quality international academic publications indexed in Scopus), and based on a google search for private universities in Egypt (along the following criteria: 1. total/partial teaching of courses in the English language; 2. total/partial accreditation by international universities outside Egypt; 3. international research production in the English language), we conducted a competitor analysis for Egyptian private profit-oriented universities and identified four segments of universities, as follows:

- **Segment 1**: "higher quality–higher price" universities, with high quality staff, research, and facilities. The average annual fees for universities in this category exceed US$7,000. We found three universities in this segment: the American University in Cairo, Arab Academy for Science, Technology & Maritime Transport, and the German University in Cairo.
- **Segment 2**: "higher quality–lower price" universities, with high quality staff, research, and facilities, and lower fees compared to segment 1. Two good examples of universities in this segment are the British University in Egypt and Nile University.
- **Segment 3**: "lower quality–lower price" universities, with lower quality academic staff, research, and facilities, and lower fees compared to segment 1. The average annual fees for universities in this category are less than US$4,000. We found that the type of students enrolling into universities in this segment are different from students in segments 1 and 2: they have lower scores in secondary school and belong to lower social classes. Nineteen universities can be found in this segment, including Misr University for Science and Technology; Misr International University; Future University; October 6 University; Sinai University; El Shorouk Academy; Pharos University in Alexandria; the French University in Egypt; Modern Academy in Maadi; Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale; Canadian International College; and Al-Ahram Canadian University.
- **Segment 4**: "lower quality–higher price" institutions, with lower quality academic staff, research, and facilities, but fees similar to segment 1. Our analysis shows that none of the current private universities in Egypt are in this segment. However, in theory, some universities may, in the future, be categorized there, when the sector reaches a sufficient maturity and if the National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education (NAQAAE) launches a national university ranking.

Conclusion and Possible Future Developments

Public authorities in Egypt recognize that in the future, the higher education sector should have a key role in the development of the country. Two major objectives are to produce enough graduates (i.e., increasing demand, leading to increased fees), and to improve the quality of research and development carried out by private universities (i.e., increasing overall quality). These two objectives are stated in a ten-year vision by the government to transform Egypt's universities into modern, autonomous, research-intensive, market-oriented, and student-centered organizations.

Being financially independent, private higher education institutions have full financial autonomy.

Apparently, the Egyptian government is striving to establish more private universities in segments 1 and 2 through partnerships with international providers, mainly UK universities. The future may bring about some dramatic changes for the sector. Some current providers may disappear from the market, particularly some of those in segment 3. The predicted increase of providers in segments 1 and 2 of the higher education market, with the support of the Egyptian government, will probably marginalize the role of universities in segment 3 (which includes most private universities in Egypt). We do not foresee that universities in that segment have the potential to move to segments 1 or 2, as they have their own type of customers. But acquisitions from universities in segment 1 and 2 of universities in segment 3 is a potential scenario in the next ten years. This scenario may require the government to think through alternative solutions to respond to the predicted unmet needs of customers in segment 3. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10384

The Closing of China? Possible Implications for Universities Worldwide

Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director, and Hans de Wit is professor and director, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mails: altbach@bc.edu and dewitj@bc.edu.

The news that China's constitution will be amended so that president Xi Jinping can be president beyond his current second term is only the latest indication of fundamental political change taking place. Experts have noted that president Xi has amassed the most power since Mao Zedong, and seeks long-term authority to carry out his policies. While higher education, research, and internationalization are far from the center of contemporary political developments, they will unquestionably be affected and may be "collateral damage."

Over the past several decades, we have seen a dramatic growth in higher education internationalization, student mobility in and out of China, and cross-border presence of foreign universities in China, all contributing to the establishment of world-class universities and a significant rise of Chinese universities in the rankings. Current changes at the top in China will have lasting implications for both Chinese higher education and for China's academic relations with the rest of the world, and might seriously impact what has been accomplished so far. It is essential that the higher education community, inside China as well as globally, pay careful attention to the likely prospects.

Internal Developments

When considered together, recent developments show significant change in the Chinese academic landscape of the past half-century. The internet has been tightened, making it more difficult to access information freely. Virtual Private Networks (VPN) used to permit reasonably easy access to the global internet for those able to manipulate the system—this is no longer the case. In addition, many have noted that more material considered "sensitive" has been eliminated from the web in China. While such restrictions affect the social sciences most directly, the entire academic community is impacted by both the perception and the reality of a lack of access to the world's knowledge.

While Communist Party supervision of universities has traditionally been a central part of academic governance, it has recently been strengthened. The role of ideological education as part of the university curriculum has been enhanced, including the "thought of Xi Jingping." Emerging programs of US-style liberal education at some of China's elite universities have come under criticism, and some are trying to think of a less "provocative" name and perhaps making changes in the relevant curriculum.

External Reactions

There has also been some reaction against aspects of China's higher education international initiatives. Criticism of some of the more than 480 Confucius Institutes, established by the Chinese government worldwide and primarily located on university campuses, is growing, and a few have been closed down by host institutions. There has also been criticism of what is seen by some as heavy-handed Chinese involvement in Africa, including in higher education. A major controversy is taking place in Australia, where Chinese agencies are accused of trying to influence Australian researchers working on China and engaging in other perceived interference, as well as putting pressure on Chinese students in that country, as well as elsewhere, to spy on fellow students and scholars. A Dutch university cancelled a planned branch campus in China after concerns about academic freedom were raised in the Netherlands. And a storm of protest took place when a prominent British publisher eliminated some content from its journals deemed objectionable by Chinese authorities. The content was restored after complaints by Western academics. What is significant here is that Chinese authorities are increasingly attempting to interfere overseas—and that there is growing pushback by Western academics and institutions.

While Communist Party supervision of universities has traditionally been a central part of academic governance, it has recently been strengthened.

Implications

Of course, the most important implications of a "closing" of Chinese higher education will be on the universities. It will be more difficult for the top institutions to achieve true "world-class" status if their academic culture is infused with restrictions, problematic access to knowledge, and constraints on the emergence of a truly free and innovative academic culture. A restrictive academic environment will make it more difficult to attract talented foreign faculty to

work in China, and it is likely that international students, especially at the graduate level, will be reluctant to study in China.

Meanwhile, there is an increase in the return rate of Chinese students and scholars who have studied abroad, according to the president of the National Natural Science Foundation of China. "Just 10 years ago, the flow of talent was at about seven Chinese students leaving for every one that came back. Now it's six [students] returning in every seven," he said, adding, "The brain drain is almost over" (Times Higher Education, March 1, 2018). This trend is unlikely to continue as circumstances change. Further, that comment was limited to STEM fields and mainly to undergraduates. According to most statistics, 70 to more than 80 percent of Chinese doctoral degree holders are not returning home—a number that has been holding steady.

Conclusion

After decades of attempting to create a more open academic environment, it is clear that China is rapidly changing direction. The new direction is inevitable, given recent political developments. China's investment of billions of dollars in the upgrading of its top universities to create "world-class" institutions may be, at least in part, put at risk. China's internationalization efforts of recent years will be significantly damaged. The investments made by Western universities in developing branch campuses and other academic relationships in China may be threatened—and very likely will slow down. China's efforts to convince Chinese students who have studied abroad to return, particularly those at the masters and doctoral levels, will be less successful, as many will question what is happening to academic life in China.

Following Brexit, the election of Donald Trump in the United States, and the general challenges of nationalism and populism globally, we are entering uncharted academic territory. China, however, is different. There are few dissident voices and no challenges to central authority. In the end, there might be losses on both sides. Chinese universities will be seriously hampered in their move to rise to world-class standards, academic freedom will be further away than ever, and collaboration with Western universities will become more difficult. Chinese authorities seem not to worry much about these risks. They look more to higher education in emerging and developing countries, which as a sector is perhaps more dependent on collaboration with China. In the end, China may end up in a gigantic periphery. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10376

Have Chinese Universities Hit a Plateau?

Alex Usher

Alex Usher is president, Higher Education Strategy Associates, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. E-mail: ausher@higheredstrategy.com.

The massive investments in higher education made by the People's Republic of China are well known. Since the ascension to power of Deng Xiaoping in 1978, the country has placed an enormous emphasis on developing its science and technology capabilities, and universities have been central to this effort. For nearly 20 years, the "985" project has been providing billions of yuan to top institutions to make them "world-class." In the first two phases alone—that is, from 1998 to 2007—expenditures across 39 recipient universities were estimated at RMB 33 billion, or roughly US$13 billion in today's dollars at purchasing power parity (PPP). However, measuring the extent of this investment consistently has been difficult, as China does not report higher education expenditures to UNESCO and individual universities have been traditionally rather opaque about their finances.

So it is of some interest that, in 2012, the Chinese government published a "transparency directive" for the higher education sector, which included a demand that institutions publish some type of annual financial report. Compliance has not been 100 percent, and the data does not contain a high level of detail; nevertheless, at most of the major institutions, we have five full years of such information (2012–2016). And this new data tells three rather important stories.

Top Chinese Universities Are Rich

The first is that top Chinese universities—that is, the largest of the C9 universities that are sometimes described as "China's Ivy League"—are really quite wealthy, with financial muscle comparable to some top US institutions. The largest institution, Tsinghua University, had annual expenditures of RMB 13.7 billion in 2016, which translates to about US$3.57 billion at PPP, making it larger in raw terms than both MIT (US$3.34 billion in 2014) and Yale University (US$3.36 billion). The next largest institution, Peking University, had expenditures of roughly US$2.45 billion in 2016, which puts it in roughly the same category as Caltech and Washington University St. Louis. Zhejiang University and Shanghai Jiao Tong University, the two next biggest, have expenditures of US$2.3 billion and US$2.1 billion, respectively. Fudan University, in fifth place, has expenditures of US$1.5 billion, which is roughly equivalent to those of Princeton University.

If we examine expenditures on a per-student basis, the numbers for Chinese universities remain large but perhaps not quite as impressive, ranging from US$78,000 per student at Tsinghua University, to US$49,000 at Zhejiang University. That is still a long way off the larger public universities in the United States, such as the University of North Carolina (US$161,000) or the University of Virginia (US$131,000), or even the larger Japanese national universities such as the University of Tokyo and Kyoto University (both over US$100,000). Still, it compares favorably with the University of California at Berkeley (US$73,000), Sweden's Karolinska Institute (US$75,000), or ETH Zurich (US$63,000). And top Chinese universities stand well clear of the richest institutions in countries like Canada (University of British Columbia, US$53,000), Germany (University of Bonn, US$43,000, or Australia (Australian National University, US$39,000).

The second story in the data is that in terms of their sources of income, top Chinese institutions look more like North American ones than European ones.

Income Sources for Top Chinese Universities

The second story in the data is that in terms of their sources of income, top Chinese institutions look more like North American ones than European ones. At four of the top institutions—Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Xi'an Jiao Tong University, Tsinghua University, and Zhejiang University—income from public sources accounts for less than 40 percent of the total budget. A small part of the remainder comes from tuition fees, but the main part is outside income, including from business interests like Tsinghua University's massive University Enterprise Group. This is not unlike American institutions, which frequently have massive income streams from sources such as hospitals, real estate, etc. Other Chinese institutions have higher degrees of public financing, but none of the major "C9" group of universities receive more than 60 percent of their funding from public sources.

Top Universities Slowing Down

The third story is that, since 2012, there has been very little improvement in the finances of Chinese universities. For instance, Tsinghua University's expenditures per student fell by 3 percent between 2012 and 2016, while Zhejiang University's decreased by 5 percent. Shanghai Jiao Tong University, on the other hand, saw its expenditures rise by 7 percent. Expenditures are not falling; rather, inflation and student numbers are simply rising somewhat faster.

The fact is that top institutions in China are now so big that even relatively large new public expenditures are unlikely to make much difference to overall funding. For instance, it was recently reported in the *Caixin Global* (an online English-language site managed by the major Beijing media group of the same name) that Sun Yat-Sen University would be receiving RMB 480 million (roughly US$140 million at PPP) in new funding, as part of China's recently announced "Double World-Class" initiative. However, since the university's budget is currently RMB 6 billion (US$1.76 billion), this amounts to no more than an 8 percent boost. Given inflation and increases in student numbers, this amounts to no more than one or two-year bump in funding.

Value for Money?

A final question to pose is whether all this expenditure at top Chinese universities is providing "value for money." At least in terms of scientific production, the answer here appears to be "yes." Between the four-year periods 2006–2009 and 2012–2015, the number of Clarivate-indexed journals roughly doubled at all top Chinese universities. Institutions such as Tsinghua University and Shanghai Jiao Tong University are now outproducing universities such as the University of Oxford and the University of Cambridge in terms total output. True, the impact of these articles—measured by normalized citations—is somewhat lower than it is at most research universities in Europe and North America. However, citation rates at top Chinese universities have increased substantially over the past decade, and are now significantly higher than they are in top Japanese universities, if not quite at the level of the top Asian institution, the National University of Singapore.

Conclusion

In sum, while top Chinese universities have had a very rapid rise to internationally competitive levels of funding over the past two decades, it was never plausible that they would continue to grow at such a rapid rate. From such data as is available, it would appear as though the pace of growth is levelling off at a level that is above typical levels in Australia, Canada, and Europe, but lower than that of major American public—not to mention private—universities. And though overall scientific output is high, there is still room for improvement in terms of quality and impact of research. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10378

China's Opportunity: Recommendations for Liberal Arts Innovation

Kara A. Godwin and Noah Pickus

Kara A. Godwin is a CIHE research fellow, a higher education consultant, and the founding director of the Global Liberal Education Collaboratory. E-mail: kara.godwin@gmail.com. Noah Pickus is associate provost and senior advisor to the provost at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, US, and dean of curricular affairs and faculty development at Duke Kunshan University, Jiangsu, China. E-mail: pickus@duke.edu.

This article is based on CIHE Perspectives No. 8: *"Liberal Arts & Sciences Innovation in China: Six Recommendations to Shape the Future," available in English and Chinese.*

Liberal arts and science education in China is at a pivotal moment. In the last decade, Mainland China and Hong Kong have witnessed significant growth in university programs that emphasize liberal education, a holistic education philosophy that prepares lifelong learners with broad, integrated knowledge and a sense of social responsibility. That growth has happened both within Chinese higher education and as part of new joint ventures between Chinese and Western universities. It is a stark contrast to the traditional, utilitarian Chinese curricula that focus more narrowly on developing students for a singular profession.

China and Hong Kong are not alone among countries interested in leveraging liberal arts and sciences (LAS) education to advance a twenty-first century workforce and economy. Over 200 programs, the majority founded in the last twenty years, now exist outside the United States. Yet, despite its long history in US liberal arts colleges and public universities, LAS faces significant scrutiny as critics there question its value and contend that a more practical, career-oriented approach is needed.

At this ironic juncture, China faces serious challenges to LAS reform, as well as a significant opportunity. In June 2017, twenty-five university leaders and scholars from Canada, Hong Kong, Mainland China, Singapore, and the United States met at Duke Kunshan University (DKU) in Jiangsu Province to examine obstacles and opportunities for LAS. In addition to the recommendations below, they concluded that if China can expand its LAS programs in innovative and culturally relevant ways, it is poised to influence LAS education beyond its borders.

Goals and Obstacles

China's motivation for developing LAS education draws on its deep cultural traditions. This local grounding is crucial for China to fuel an innovation economy and cultivate graduates with a sense of vocational and community purpose. Many of the attributes of LAS education are not new ideas in China. As the world's oldest continuous civilization, China has deep philosophical traditions, which focus on character development and mastering knowledge content, practices closely aligned with the holistic goals of an LAS education.

China, however, faces significant obstacles to reform. These obstacles include misunderstandings about the meaning of LAS; doubts about its value and relevance; the low quality and restricted access of current offerings; a lack of qualified faculty; formal metrics and incentives that hamper educational innovation; the need for teaching about traditions beyond Chinese ideologies; and the fact that Mainland Chinese institutions are overseen by important political forces that are ambivalent about the virtues of LAS education. Of immediate concern, in the last year, the Chinese government increased restrictions on public expression and course content while escalating university monitoring and censorship, actions that can significantly impede LAS progress.

Opportunities and Recommendations

While we are not in a position to suggest political or ideological changes to the structures that govern Chinese universities, our work culminates in six key recommendations to overcome obstacles and to realize the potential for LAS in China.

- **Make general education matter**: In recent years, Chinese universities have reformed and expanded their general education offerings to enable students to study outside of their major. While an important step forward, many general education courses are of low quality. They are regarded by students as superfluous and by faculty as low status work. To develop broadly educated, creative thinkers for an innovative economy, a relentless focus on improving the quality of these courses is necessary.
- **Invest in interdisciplinary integration**: Beyond general education, the future demands problem solving that can only be achieved through integrated, interdisciplinary solutions. Although general education provides a *multi*disciplinary curriculum, it typically lacks the *inte*gration of a truly interdisciplinary LAS education. Several experimental programs such as Fudan University's Undergraduate Upgrade 2020 Plan, Peking University's Yuanpei College, Tsinghua's Xinya College, and Lingnan University in Hong Kong, as well as new joint ventures like Duke Kunshan University, suggest

the promise of this approach. Yet these programs are available only to a small number of students at elite institutions. To reach its potential as a global LAS leader, we recommend that China nurture these ventures and invest in additional programs that will facilitate experimentation and broader access.

- **Focus on faculty incentives and development**: In order to achieve LAS learning outcomes, a renewed approach to teaching is required. Empirical research illustrates that learning by rote listening and memorization without interpretation or critical evaluation, still common practice in Chinese universities, is inadequate for developing creative and critical thinkers. It is not enough, however, to call for new classroom approaches. Mobilizing faculty to teach differently requires incentives for advancing teaching quality and that faculty development be given strategic priority alongside research and publication demands.

This local grounding is crucial for China to fuel an innovation economy and cultivate graduates with a sense of vocational and community purpose.

- **Embrace innovative pedagogy**: A focus on pedagogy involves greater attention to the ways in which students learn. This means mobilizing faculty to decide together what they want graduates to be able to do and fostering a shared commitment to achieving these outcomes. It further demands a broader, pedagogy-focused institutional culture that experiments with new strategies and that purposefully integrates cocurricular activities as a central means for developing students' aptitude for adaptability, problem solving, and team work.
- **Scale quality programs**: LAS reform is only worth undertaking if it is developed with an intentional dedication to quality and continuous improvement. At the same time, China has a rare opportunity to scale crucial LAS innovations as it introduces those innovations, an opportunity not available in the United States. Key factors in going to scale include leveraging new technology and developing new paradigms for quality teaching, both of which require significant investment, extensive experimentation, and careful evaluation. If it wants to achieve a broadly innovative, entrepreneurial economy and community-minded citizenry, China will need to prioritize student access to LAS opportunities.
- **Study multiple traditions**: To succeed anywhere, LAS reforms must be relevant to both local and global conversations and conditions. This imperative offers important opportunities to advance conversation among Chinese, Western, and other cultures, to explore various knowledge contributions, and to view them in the context of worldwide debates and dilemmas. While grounding a curriculum in national traditions, placing Chinese perspectives in dialogue with views from Indian, Islamic, Western, and other cultures is crucial to the students' personal and intellectual development as well as their ability to engage successfully in a global society.

These recommendations are intended for collective and internal consideration in China. They should be considered comprehensively, not individually, as an integrated part of a holistic education philosophy. But from a global perspective, China is especially well situated to show other countries new ways to meld LAS philosophy with preprofessional education; methods to develop a truly interdisciplinary, integrated education (blending across disciplines and curricular/cocurricular boundaries); and the means to produce innovative pedagogical practices that ensure quality and access. Yet none of these LAS strategies is obtainable without an open academic dialogue that incorporates a variety of historical and cultural perspectives. While there is recent evidence suggesting greater experimentation in compulsory ideological courses, there is also evidence that the central government has escalated its oversight of content and curricula. Teaching various interpretations and the multitude of traditions within China's own complex history, as well as those outside its borders, is a crucial step and a valuable way for China to take the lead among other LAS experiments where academic content is tightly controlled. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10385

The New National Rankings in India

N.V. VARGHESE

N.V. Varghese is vice-chancellor and director of the Center for Policy Research in Higher Education, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, India. E-mail: nv.varghese@nuepa.org. Link to India Rankings : https://www.nirfindia.org/ranking2017.html

Although world university rankings cover only a small share of higher education institutions, their results at-

tract worldwide attention and debate. Quite often, though, these results indicate that the best performing national institutions in many countries do not find a respectable place in the ranking tables.

No doubt, international rankings contribute to promoting competition among countries to improve their positions on the lists. Rankings also lead to targeted efforts in many countries to help domestic universities attain world-class status. Countries for whom this journey is too long and difficult opt for national rankings—additionally or as a substitute.

Indian universities do not appear at the top of world rankings—a matter of serious concern in the country. The government's response seems to be twofold: establishing world-class universities/institutions of eminence, while initiating a process of national rankings. The National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) helped launch the first ranking exercise in India in 2015.

Ranking Framework and Methodology

In August 2014, the ministry of human resource development organized a consultation workshop and constituted a committee to develop a ranking framework and methodology. The committee identified a number of broad areas to be covered under the ranking framework: research and professional practices; teaching, learning, and resources; graduation outcomes; outreach and inclusivity; and perceptions. The committee, however, felt that a single ranking framework with the same indicators and weighting would be a misplaced idea for a country such as India, with different categories of institutions. The committee decided to have separate rankings for the various categories of institutions.

The committee broadly divided higher education institutions into two categories. Category A institutions include all central government institutions, state universities, "deemed-to-be" universities (high quality higher education institutions specialized in one area of study), private universities, and other autonomous institutions. Category B institutions and colleges are affiliated to universities and do not enjoy full academic autonomy to develop curriculum and award degrees.

Separate but comparable frameworks and parameters for ranking were developed for engineering, management, and pharmacy institutions, and for universities and colleges. While the areas considered remain the same, the weights assigned to each of the subareas vary depending upon the major orientation of the institutions. For example, while category A institutions are assigned more weights for research, category B institutions are assigned more weights for teaching.

Data Sources and Coverage of Institutions

Participation in the ranking exercise in India is voluntary. The exercise covers all higher education institutions with an enrollment exceeding 1000. Exceptions to this rule are specialized, monodisciplinary institutions. In total, 3,313 higher education institutions participated in the rankings of 2017. The data sources on research publications for the Indian ranking exercise are the Science Citation Index (SCI), the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI), and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI) hosted on the Web of Knowledge. The data on teaching, inclusiveness, outcomes, and perceptions are obtained directly from the institutions participating in the ranking exercise.

Ranking Results

The ranking results are published in April every year, with the results of 2016 and 2017 already available. A close look at the results reveals interesting trends. The top 10 institutions in the rankings of all categories are mostly public institutions. The exception is pharmacy education, where the majority of institutions are private, accounting for more than 90 percent of enrollments. In the case of general higher education, all but one of the top 10 institutions are public institutions. Many of them, especially centrally funded institutions, receive higher levels of funding; student admissions are based on admission tests; and they enjoy a relatively higher degree of autonomy. In other words, the top-ranked institutions in the NIRF list exhibit some of the important characteristics of world-class universities as defined by Jamil Salmi in 2009.

Measures adopted to get reliable data from participating institutions seem to be working well in India.

If we consider the results of the top 100 institutions of higher education in the 2017 ranking, there are only three private universities appearing on the list. Nearly 60 percent of the institutions appearing on the top 100 list are specialized institutions, and the remainder are public universities and colleges (there are three of the latter category). The variations in scores among the 100 top-ranking institutions are revealing. While the maximum overall mean score is 83.28 among the top 10 institutions, it declines drastically to 58.25 in the next group of institutions (ranked 11–20), which is inferior to the minimum mean scores of the top 10 institutions. The variations in maximum mean scores are

less in teaching & learning and outreach & inclusivity than in research and perceptions, where they are the widest.

The ranking results have been met with less criticism than might have been anticipated, partly because the results themselves were not unexpected. One of the criticisms is common to any ranking exercise: condensing all information related to a university into just one figure is not useful. Another serious criticism concerns variations in the relative position of institutions in the 2016 and 2017 rankings. Forty-seven of the 100 top-ranked institutions in 2017 were new entrants, while 35 of the universities ranked 50 to 100 in the 2016 ranking disappeared from the 2017 list. Yet another criticism questions the usefulness of comparing single-subject institutions with multidisciplinary universities. These criticisms are valid, and they also reflect the teething troubles of the Indian ranking exercise.

Lessons from the Indian Ranking Exercise

A closer examination of the results indicates that research and perceptions are important areas to consider in order to improve an institution's position in the rankings. Indeed, research is key to driving changes in perception. Therefore, efforts to establish research universities and world-class universities may be a necessary step to climb in global rankings.

Measures adopted to get reliable data from participating institutions seem to be working well in India. The ranking agency performs random checks on the institutions' records and audited accounts. Data submitted to the NIRF portal are uploaded for purposes of visibility and public scrutiny. Institutions engaging in unethical practices in data submission are debarred from participating in future ranking exercises. These measures put pressure on institutions to provide reliable data and improve the transparency and reliability of data used in the NIRF rankings.

A positive result of ranking efforts in many countries is to highlight the importance of research universities and of establishing world-class universities. India has plans to establish 20 institutions of eminence. However, this should not be seen as an alternative to promoting research among existing higher education institutions. Ranking is not a substitute to improving the overall quality of the sector, since a large majority of higher education institutions do not participate in the exercise. Instead of relying unduly on rankings, India needs to increase its public funding to higher education and adopt effective strategies to promote research and improve teaching and learning among the vast majority of poor quality higher education institutions. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10380

NEW PUBLICATIONS

(Editor's note: We welcome suggestions from readers for books on higher education published especially outside of the United States and United Kingdom. This list was compiled by Edward Choi, graduate assistant at CIHE.)

Breaden, Jeremy. *Articulating Asia in Japanese Higher Education: Policy, Partnership and Mobility*. London, UK: Routledge, 2018. 144 pp. $140.00 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com

Broughan, Christine, ed. *Global Perspectives on Teaching Excellence: A New Era for Higher Education*. London, UK: Routledge, 2018. 204 pp. $140 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com

Crompton, Helen, and John Traxler, eds. *Mobile Learning and Higher Education: Challenges in Context.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2018. 210 pp. $49.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Curry, Mary Jane, and Theresa Lillis. *Global Academic Publishing: Policies, Perspectives and Pedagogies.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2017. 296 pp. $49.95 (pb). Website: www.multilingual-matters.com

Dassin, Joan R., Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer, eds. *International Scholarships in Higher Education: Pathways to Social Change.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. 407 pp. $139.00 (hb). Website: www.palgrave.com

Gertz, SunHee Kim, Betsy Huang, and Lauren Cyr, eds. *Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education and Societal Contexts: International and Interdisciplinary Approaches*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. 370 pp. €114.39 (hb). Website: www.palgrave.com

Gourlay, Lesley, and Martin Oliver. *Student Engagement in the Digital University Sociomaterial Assemblages.* London, UK: Routledge, 2018. 164 pp. $47.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Grawe, Nathan D. *Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 192 pp. $39.95 (hb). Website: jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu

Kelchen, Robert. *Higher Education Accountability.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 272 pp. $39.95 (hb). Website: www.press.jhn.edu

Kumar, Krishna, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Education in India: Debates, Practices, and Policies.* London, UK: Routledge, 2018. 301 pp. £ 175.00 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com

Liston, Rebecca, and Regina Rahimi, eds. *Promoting Social Justice through the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2017. $40.00 (pb). Website: http://www.iupress.indiana.edu

Marshall, Stephen James. *Shaping the University of the Future: Using Technology to Catalyse Change in University Learning and Teaching*. Singapore: Springer, 2018. 592 pp. $159 (hb). Website: www.springer.com

Mitchell, Brian C., and W. Joseph King. *How to Run a College: A Practical Guide for Trustees, Faculty, Administrators, and Policymakers.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 216 pp. $27.95 (pb). Website: www.press.jhu.edu

Mittelman, James H. *Implausible Dream: The World-Class University and Repurposing Higher Education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017. 288 pp. $39.50 (hb). Website: press.princeton.edu

Owen-Smith, Patricia. *The Contemplative Mind in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2017. 154 pp. $28.00 (pb). Website: http://www.iupress.indiana.edu

Postiglione, Gerard A., and Jisun Jung, eds. *The Changing Academic Profession in Hong Kong: Challenges and Future.* Singapore: Springer International Publishing, 2017. 217 pp. $99 (hb). Website: www.springer.com

Scott, Robert A. *How University Boards Work.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 224 pp. $27.95 (pb). Website: www.press.jhu.edu

Sivasubramaniam, Malini, and Ruth Hayhoe, eds. *Religion and Education: comparative and international perspectives.* Oxford, UK: Symposium Books, 2018. 388 pp. £ 52.00 (pb). Website: http://www.symposium-books.co.uk

Tierney, William G., Zoë B. Corwin, and Amanda Ochsner, eds. *Diversifying Digital Learning: Online Literacy and Educational Opportunity.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 232 pp. $44.95 (hb). Website: jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu

Varghese, N. V., Nidhi S. Sabharwal, and C. M. Malish, eds. *India Higher Education Report, 2016: Equity.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications, 2018. 452 pp. $59.99 (hb). Website: www.sagepublishing.com

Walenkamp, Jos, and Jos Beelen, eds. *All the World's a Stage – Pilot studies on internationalising higher professional education.* The Hague, Netherlands: Eburon Publishers, 2017. 207 pp. €34.75 (pb). Website: eburon.nl

Wilkins, Stephen, ed. "The management of transnational higher education." *International Journal of Educational Management,* Vol. 32, Issue no. 2. Website: http://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/ijem/32/2

Zemsky, Robert, and Susan Shaman. *The Market Imperative: Segmentation and Change in Higher Education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. 152 pp. $29.95 (hb). Website: www.press.jhu.edu

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

NEW PUBLICATIONS FROM CIHE

- Laura E. Rumbley, Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Edward Choi, Lisa Unangst, Ayenachew Aseffa Woldegiyorgis, Hans de Wit, and Philip G. Altbach. *State of Play: Higher Education Management Training Schemes in the Field of Development Cooperation*, published in 2017. This study aims to provide an overall picture of the different actors and programs currently in evidence, and to identify future directions and evolving aspects of this work. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pubs/CIHE%20Perspective/CIHE%20Perspectives%207_26NOV2017.pdf
- Kara Godwin and Noah Pickus. *Liberal Arts & Sciences Innovation in China: Six Recommendations to Shape the Future*, published in 2017. The report addresses the obstacles and opportunities for innovative liberal arts and sciences initiatives in China and provides six key recommendations for the future. It builds on a meeting of 26 university leaders and scholars at Duke Kunshan University (DKU) in June 2017, to assess the significant growth in new liberal arts and sciences practices in China's educational landscape. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pubs/CIHE%20Perspective/CIHE%20Perspectives%208_ENGLISH_13NOV2017.pdf
- Robin Matross Helms and Laura E. Rumbley, eds. *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders, No. 7: "Mapping Internationalization Globally: National Profiles and Perspectives,"* published in 2018. This Brief explores the US mapping data as well as related information on higher education internationalization around the world. It features country-focused articles written by higher education scholars and experts, and explores existing policies and activities, key challenges, and emerging opportunities for internationalization in a variety of unique national contexts. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/bc1/schools/lsoe/sites/cihe/ACE/ACE-CIHE%20Brief%207%20-%20Mapping%20Internationalization%2024Jan2018.pdf
- Hans de Wit and Laura E. Rumbley. *Professional Development in International Education. The Example of the Boston College MA in International Higher Education,* published in 2017. Published in *Internationalisation of Higher Education, A Handbook,* issue 3/2017 (pp. 2 – 14), this article makes an appeal for a more comprehensive approach to professional development, including doctoral and master programs in internationalization of higher education. The Master's in International Higher Education at Boston College is described as an example of such a program, addressing the needs of those tasked to advance the cause of internationalization, at a time when internationalization has acquired a more prominent place in higher education research, policy, and practice. https://www.handbook-internationalisation.com/en/handbuch/gliederung/#/Beitragsdetailansicht/174/1787/Professional-Development-in-International-Education---The-Example-of-the-Boston-College-MA-in-International-Higher--Education
- Philip G. Altbach, Liz Reisberg, Jamil Salmi, and Isak Froumin, eds. *Accelerated Universities: Ideas and Money Combine to Build Academic Excellence*, in publication 2018. During the past several decades, several "highly-resourced, accelerated research universities" have been established around the world to pursue—and achieve—academic and research excellence. These institutions are entirely new, not existing universities that were reconfigured. *Accelerated Universities* provides case studies of eight such universities and highlights lessons to be learned from these examples. Each of the cases is written by someone involved with leadership at the early developmental stages of each university, and provides insights that only senior executives can illustrate. http://www.brill.com/products/book/accelerated-universities