INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

For weekly global higher education news and comment see our partner

University World News

universityworldnews.com

BOSTON COLLEGE
Lynch School of Education and Human Development

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

DUZ medienhaus

CONTENTS | INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER **119**_SUMMER **2024**

2

linkedin.com/company/bc-cihe

twitter.com/BC_CIHE

facebook.com/Center.for.International.Higher.Education

The Dysfunctional Academic Publishing Ecosystem: The Need for Reform

Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit

3

Academic publishing is in the midst of an unprecedented crisis. The academic communication network that has served science well since the late nineteenth century is no longer effective. A key problem is the sheer expansion of scientific production. Articles, books, and other knowledge products have expanded, stimulated by the massification of higher education, the increased scope and complexity of the scientific enterprise, and the pressure on the academic profession to publish more. The global rankings, which predominantly stress publications and research, and the actions of the traditional and new—in many cases predatory—publishing industry actors, contribute to this trend.

The internet has revolutionized the production of knowledge, dissemination of research, and collaboration among scholars. Preprints became ubiquitous, and many journals moved from print to online. But, while the internet has democratized access to knowledge, the proliferation of low-quality and predatory journals with no or low standards, like a disease, threatens the health of the academic ecosystem. These journals generally charge authors to publish. This problem is exacerbated by the pressure on academics to publish more, often at the expense of quality.

All of this has created immense problems. Traditional journals, which rely on careful peer review to ensure quality and accuracy, face challenges in finding qualified reviewers. These issues are compounded by the fact that many journals are now owned by Western-based multinational publishers.

While open access has indeed increased the availability of research, it has also created serious problems. These publishers often charge high prices for providing open access, creating profits for themselves and disadvantaging those who cannot pay fees, such as scholars in the Global South, emerging scholars, and those in poorly funded disciplines.

The crisis in academic publishing extends beyond journals to books, which are also facing significant challenges. Print-on-demand and e-books have made it far less costly to produce books, resulting in too many books of poor to mediocre quality. Even high-quality books are not getting the recognition they warrant, as evidenced by the rare reference to books and book chapters in journal articles, even in the humanities and social sciences.

The crisis in publishing also extends to issues of reproducibility and data sharing. Many studies cannot be replicated due to the unavailability of data, code, and other materials. Additionally, citation metrics can be easily gamed and do not adequately capture the societal impact of research.

The combination of the rapid expansion of science and scholarship, the massification of higher education, the rapid growth of technology, the increasing marketization of "knowledge industries," and the entry of unscrupulous players has created chaos in areas that require high standards of quality. While there are no easy solutions to these challenges, we cannot ignore the fact that all of these problems are potentially contributing to doubts around science. Addressing them will require a concerted effort from all stakeholders, including researchers, publishers, funders, and policy makers.

Journal Peer Review: What Are the Challenges and What Might be Done?

Hugo Horta and Jisun Jung

4

Abstract

Peer review remains the golden standard of scientific practice, but one that was never easily accepted, and often subjected to different criticisms. This has become more acute in recent years. Some of the challenges faced are lengthy review periods, difficulties by editors in finding willing reviewers, biased reviews, and a lack of incentive or recognition of the reviewers. What can be done to improve the journal peer review process?

Due to the recent wave of massification of knowledge production, as part of "publish or perish" (in some cases "publish and perish") dynamics, the increased volume of manuscript submissions to journals has overburdened those involved in peer review management and activities (i.e., editors and reviewers). This challenge is particularly serious in international peer-reviewed journals that are indexed by the Web of Knowledge and Scopus. These journals tend to be the most scientifically recognized, and therefore used by universities when it comes to recruitment, promotion, and other evaluations of academics. Such data is also used by funding agencies when it comes to evaluating projects and institutions.

Researchers also rely on publications in these journals to demonstrate research proficiency and ability. In the context of a fast massification of knowledge production (and competition), many authors complain that peer reviews take too long. They worry that the research findings may become outdated by the time the journal accepts the manuscript for publication. It is even worse in case the manuscript is rejected, and the authors need to resubmit. Authors also complain that the reviews often come back with unfair and ungrounded decisions, sometimes based on rushed, poor-quality, unconstructive comments, and the reviewers' biased opinions, including ideological biases. Although double-blind review was introduced to mitigate biases related to authors' gender, ethnicity, nationality, institutional reputation, or previous accomplishments, several journals continue to rely on single-blind review. Even with double-blind review processes the current peer review system continues to struggle with a multitude of biases, reliability, or dubious ethical standards.

Editors of international peer-reviewed journals complain that they receive too many submissions, while struggling to find available quality reviewers. The rejection rate of invitations to review manuscripts is rising, and those that do quality reviews tend to be overwhelmed with nonstop solicitations to review. There are reports of editors who need to send more than 20 review invitations to find one willing reviewer for a single manuscript. Part of the challenge here may relate to the fact that editorial boards tend to be dominated by researchers from developed countries, often English-speaking communities, and may rely too much on reviewer pools with similar backgrounds and epistemologies. This may have two effects: underrepresentation of reviewers from nonmainstream topics and developing countries, which may cause them to continue to be isolated from global science while preventing new ideas from emerging, and untapping of a potentially important pool of reviewers that could mitigate challenges such as time to review, and even possibly, the quality of reviews.

Researchers who are getting a deluge of invitations to review must decide how many and which manuscripts to review, considering growing workloads and the need to publish themselves, sometimes for the sake of career survival or progression. Researchers are often forced to be highly selective in accepting review invitations. It is important to consider that serving as a reviewer is a largely invisible type of service work that is often not recognized in the institution where the reviewer works. For a long time, it has been voluntary work that relies only on goodwill, scientific and academic citizenship, and identity and duty towards one's community.

The peer-review system as we know it today is relatively recent, but the peer-review crisis is part of the continuous development of science, and the current solutions presented continue to rely on the central tenets of the peer-review system suggesting

that the practice is more likely to be finetuned and improved, rather than outright replaced by a new system.

What Might Be Done?
There have been discussions around possible solutions to improve peer review, and some disciplines have initiated different practices. We highlight these possible solutions around three axes.

Being more inclusive. The work that peer-reviewers do in service of the scientific community is invaluable. While the pool of peer-reviewers used is limited, there may be the possibility to extend it significantly. This can be done by opening the pool of reviewers to groups that so far have been engaged in peer review only in limited ways. Women researchers, for example, are less often invited to do reviews compared to men. Researchers from developing countries can also be more engaged in peer-review activities, and so can PhD students and postdocs. There is a growing set of resources and training on reviewing provided by journals, researchers, and scientific communities that can be used to train and give competencies to these groups to do more reviews for journals, but they need to be engaged and encouraged by journals and publishers.

Providing incentives. It is becoming clear that simply relying on the prosocial and voluntary behaviors of researchers to do reviews is not sufficient. This is not to argue that these values do not serve as a key motivation to review, but other incentives are needed. Incentives such as paying to review may create perverse effects, but other incentives such as a journal waiving article processing fees for open access publications for reviewers after completing a few reviews for the journal could be implemented. Having peer review acknowledged in project and career evaluations may also instill a much needed institutional recognition.

Improving transparency. Although double-blind review process has improved transparency, it does not suffice. Submissions to journals should probably engage in a "triple-blind" review, where editors are also left blind about who the authors and their institutions may be. There should also be an effort to mitigate some problematic bias-related issues.

Conclusion
The solutions above can be synergetic and contribute to potentially mitigating some of the issues related to the peer-review process. Others can be devised, too, and those that have been devised so far—some more out of the box than others—tend to maintain existing key elements of the peer-reviewing process at their core. The current challenges related to peer review are concerning, but they also represent opportunities for peer review to adapt to a fast-evolving scientific system that would be more participatory, complex and global, and to drive forth a more inclusive, transparent, and fairly rewarded assessment of scientific works.

There have been discussions around possible solutions to improve peer review, and some disciplines have initiated different practices.

Hugo Horta is associate professor at the faculty of education, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China. E-mail: horta@hku.hk.

Jisun Jung is associate professor at the faculty of education, University of Hong Kong. E-mail: jisun@hku.hk.

International Students and the "Hostile Environment": Recent Trends in the United Kingdom

Jenna Mittelmeier

Abstract
The United Kingdom hosts the world's second largest number of international students, with recruitment encouraged through national education policies. Yet, restrictive migration policies contradict this narrative. Recent oppressive migration policies have been dubbed in the United Kingdom as a "hostile environment." This article reflects on how the hostile environment politicizes migration, specifically for international students, considering how international students are positioned as both desired and unwanted by the national government.

The United Kingdom is the world's second largest host of international students, with over 670,000 currently studying in the country. In recent years, the topic of international students has become increasingly politicized through contradictory migration and education policies. On one hand, the United Kingdom's 2023 International Education Strategy outlines social and economic benefits of hosting international students, claiming that "continued export growth is welcome." On the other hand, the home office's restrictive migration policies include international students in net migration figures, and the Conservative Party is pushing for "the biggest ever cut in net migration." The tension between these two policies is the key focus for this article, highlighting how international students are impacted by the United Kingdom's so-called "hostile environment," which is described next.

The United Kingdom's Political Migration Environment
In 2012, the United Kingdom's then home secretary Theresa May declared that "the aim is to create here in Britain a really hostile environment for illegal immigrants," building upon the strict immigration policies initially introduced by the Labor Party government in 2007. This phrase—"hostile environment"—has come to symbolize the United Kingdom's oppressive immigration policies that aim to make life and access to public services purposefully difficult for migrants, with the ultimate aim that they may leave or choose not to immigrate in the first place. In response, scholars and activists have demonstrated how the hostile environment is frequently structured through xenophobia and racialization, particularly considering the United Kingdom's colonial history and its impact on modern migration structures. An illustrative example of this was the 2018 Windrush scandal, which brought to light the mistreatment, harassment, and deportation of predominantly Black residents and citizens who arrived in the United Kingdom in the 1940s–1970s from the colonies via the British Nationality Act.

Brexit is also intertwined with British migration policies, both as a catalyst and an outcome. On the one hand, antimigrant policies were a leading campaign promise for politicians urging the United Kingdom to leave the European Union (EU). On the other hand, Brexit has led to significant decreases in migration to the United Kingdom from the European Union, including international students, whereby students from EU countries now pay international rather than home student fees. This has resulted in shifting conceptualizations of "international" and "migrant" categories, spurred on by public debates about the fates of those already in the United Kingdom with EU settled status at the time of Brexit. The tendency for some not to see European citizens as "migrants" despite their moving across borders has resulted in bifurcated understandings of who has the "right" to remain in the United Kingdom and who is expected to be impacted by the hostile environment.

This has resulted in shifting conceptualizations of "international" and "migrant" categories, spurred on by public debates about the fates of those already in the United Kingdom with EU settled status at the time of Brexit.

International Students in the United Kingdom's "Hostile Environment"
One symbol of international students' entanglement within the hostile environment is rising visa costs, including the introduction of a National Health Service (NHS) surcharge argued to offset costs of accessing health services. Student visa application fees have risen from GBP 115 to GBP 490 in 10 years. The NHS surcharge was introduced in 2015 at GBP 150 per year of study (paid up front), which has since risen to GBP 776 per year. This means the full cost of a student visa application for a three-year undergraduate

program has risen from GBP 115 in 2014 to GBP 3,798 in 2024 (without additional fees such as translation costs, biometric appointments, etc.). These costs are astronomical in comparison to countries such as the United States, where a F-1 type student visa application costs USD 510 (approximately GBP 398).

The inclusion of international students and their dependents in net migration figures also sees them targeted by attempts to reduce their numbers. Most recently, a changing home office policy no longer allows international students to bring dependents (spouses, children, etc.) into the United Kingdom during their studies (postgraduate research students being the only exception). The impacts this will have on international student mobility to the United Kingdom remains unknown. Regardless of the outcome, though, there are wider human concerns about the ethics of not allowing students to live with their families and dependents during their studies.

Another example is the attendance monitoring that international students experience upon arrival. Higher education institutions, as sponsors of student visas, were one of the first instances of the home office "outsourcing" immigration checks. Shifting this onus toward institutions comes with strings, with the threat of universities losing their status as student visa sponsors should an audit render their monitoring insufficient. Given the UK higher education sector's reliance on international students' high fees for survival, this has led to uneven reactionary policies, including spot checks, check-in stations, electronic monitoring, and fingerprint scanning. Other hostile environment policies have shifted migration policing towards everyday citizens, rendering it illegal, for example, for housing, banking, or health industries to provide services to "illegal" migrants. This has led to increased "right to remain" checks of migration paperwork for everyday acts such as renting housing or opening bank accounts.

The hostile environment is also present in the shifting politics around whether and how international students can remain in the United Kingdom after their studies. The United Kingdom's poststudy work visa (currently existing as a two-year graduate visa) has a long on-and-off political history, its form shifting and shaping depending on existing migration policies. These changes make long-term planning difficult for international students. For example, the current graduate visa, introduced in 2021, is already under discussion by the Conservative Party to be potentially axed in 2024. Minimum salary thresholds for sponsored skilled worker visas have also risen significantly, from GBP 20,500 in 2014 to GBP 38,700 in 2024, despite a national median salary of GBP 35,000. These examples show how international students are caught within political whims and increasingly unlikely to find routes for remaining in the country after their studies.

The Hostile Environment and Current Pressing Issues
The above outlines an environment of growingly hostile and oppressive migration policies towards international students in the United Kingdom, despite education strategies which aim to increase their numbers. Within this fraught political environment, a number of so-called "scandals" have come to light in the British press regarding international students, leading to growing negative public sentiments. Most recently, a *Sunday Times* article has critiqued unequal admissions criteria between home and international students, claiming that international students can "buy their way in through secret routes." Yet, the data reflected in the article was not like-for-like, comparing entrance criteria for full degree programs with foundation courses aimed at supporting international students with developing English proficiency and academic skills prior to applying for a full degree program. This has led to calls from within the higher education sector, including from Universities United Kingdom, to denounce the "poorly researched" claims. Nonetheless, sentiments such as this continue to be used by politicians as evidence for greater migration restrictions.

Together these issues highlight the growing politicization of international students in the United Kingdom, where pivots toward the hostile environment significantly impact students' lives. This further enmeshes the ethical treatment of international students with the treatment of all migrants, whereby antimigrant policies create a need for greater solidarity between those with different reasons for migration. At present, the future of international students in the United Kingdom remains unclear in light of contradictory government policies which render them caught in the middle. ◢

Jenna Mittelmeier is senior lecturer in international education at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom. E-mail: jenna.mittelmeier@manchester.ac.

X: @JLMittelmeier

How International Geopolitics Drives Student Mobility in East Asia

Kyuseok Kim and Minjun Park

8

Abstract
This article explores the interplay between evolving geopolitical dynamics in East Asia and international student mobility, focusing particularly on South Korea's shifting alliances. It examines the influence of national policies and geopolitical shifts on individual study abroad decisions, using data trends and case studies like the Campus Asia Project. It argues for the crucial role of educational institutions in fostering diplomacy and mutual understanding, particularly in times of shifting alliances and geopolitical uncertainties.

The evolving geopolitical dynamics in East Asia have significant implications for higher education in the region. The administration of South Korea's president Yoon Suk Yeol appears to be delineating a distinct line between the Korean Peninsula and mainland China, tilting towards another neighbor, Japan, and forming ever-stronger ties with the United States. This repositioning is in response to the changing geopolitical dynamics in the region, influenced by China, Russia, and North Korea.

East Asia's Power Trio

China, Japan, and South Korea are economic and political powerhouses in East Asia. Thus, shifting relationships among these nations often result in changing higher education policies. A prime example is the Campus Asia Project, a trilateral student exchange program facilitated by a consortium of universities from each nation. In 2010, three countries' leaders held a summit and earmarked this as a pivotal collaborative initiative.

Presently, the project even stretched to include a few ASEAN countries, 20 project groups encompass top-tier universities. In 2022, through this initiative, 1,300 students went on exchange programs between South Korea and its two partner countries. This total included 76 dual-degree, 352 long-term exchange, and 872 short-term study abroad students; 382 and 452 were invited from China and Japan, respectively.

The Rise and Fall

A decade after South Korea and China formalized their diplomatic relations in 1992, the number of Chinese students in South Korea began surging. In 2003, the figure stood at roughly 5,600. The count of credential seekers from China skyrocketed tenfold in six years, reaching over 50,000 in 2009 and surging further to 71,000 in 2019. Even during the recent pandemic, the numbers held firm, hovering around 67,000, representing about 35 percent of all international students in South Korea. This trend underscores the competitive edge and value attached to South Korean qualifications in the Chinese job market.

There is a stark contrast in the opposite direction. The number of South Koreans studying in China plunged from 73,240 in 2017 to 16,968 in 2022—a staggering 75 percent drop. China's status as the top study abroad destination for South Koreans, even surpassing the United States in 2016 and 2017, dwindled rapidly. While this decline can be partly attributed to South Korea's dwindling youth population, other factors are also at play. The geopolitical tensions between South Korea and China around 2016–2017 over the deployment of the United States military defense system in South Korea and subsequent Chinese economic sanctions played significant roles.

It acted as a trigger to set two countries apart for a while. While South Korea tried to recalibrate its position between the United States and China, it might have been too late to redirect the dispersion of South Korean students. The COVID-19 pandemic also disrupted both human and material interactions between the two countries. The situation was exacerbated via online platforms and social media, leading to further decline in mutual understanding. Moreover, the evident inclination of the current South Korean government towards a United States–South Korea alliance, coupled with apprehensions about studying in nondemocratic settings with considerable anti-US sentiments, is likely to further play a significant role in influencing student choices.

Beyond Historical Strains

In comparison, student exchanges between South Korea and Japan have remained relatively stable. While historical and territorial tensions between South Korea and Japan persist, these factors have had limited impact on educational exchanges between the two nations. It appears that these factors have not significantly hindered educational and academic exchanges at least by the exhibited numbers of mobile students. The longstanding nature of these issues and their perceived impact, when juxtaposed against recent tensions with China, might explain this steady flow. They were not strong enough to deter students' and parents' aspiration to learn in South Korea or Japan. In fact, Japanese higher education attracted many South Koreans even before they began to consider studying in the United States.

For instance, during the 2019 period of economic sanctions imposed by Japan on South Korea and the subsequent South Korean public boycott of Japanese products, the number of each country's students at the other end remained steady. Japanese enrollment in South Korean institutions doubled from 2,486 in 2003 to 5,733 in 2022. On the other hand, the count of South Korean students in Japan has remained stable over the past 20 years, reaching its peak at 27,965 in 2010 and now stands at approximately 15,000. The Study Korea 300K Project, a national effort to attract more international students, is set to gain momentum. This strategy resonates with the government's geopolitical objective to fortify ties with both the United States and Japan by focusing on student exchanges with these nations.

A noteworthy observation is the academic focus of these students: nearly 43 percent of Japanese students in South Korea are enrolled in Korean language programs, with only 5 percent in graduate programs. This contrasts sharply with the 6 percent of Chinese students in South Korea studying the Korean language, while 39 percent are enrolled in graduate studies. It implies that Japanese students in credential mobility are more attracted to South Korea for its cultural components, including language. Chinese students tend to engage in degree mobility to seek greater academic value from South Korea. Even for Chinese educators lacking advanced degrees, South Korean universities present an avenue to fulfill their requirements.

The Campus as a Diplomatic Frontier

The fluidity of student mobility in Northeast Asia mirrors the broader geopolitical shifts in the region. While government-sponsored student mobility programs thrive, the geopolitical landscape has substantially impacted individual or nonsponsored study abroad decisions. South Korea's alignment with the United States and Japan, coupled with strained relations with mainland China, will most certainly affect the region's educational landscape in the following years. The complex interplay of national sentiments, global hegemony, and educational purposes is more evident than ever.

It is vital to promote educational collaborations that transcend political discord. Building on triumphs such as the Campus Asia Project, often called "East Asia's Erasmus program," can enhance the academic and career paths of students in this region. Such partnerships not only enhance multilateral understanding of historical and cultural contexts but are also crucial in laying the groundwork for long-term symbiotic relationships essential for peace, sustainable growth, and collective prosperity. ◀

The fluidity of student mobility in Northeast Asia mirrors the broader geopolitical shifts in the region.

Kyuseok (Mick) Kim is PhD student in the department of education at Korea University, with a focus on educational administration and higher education, and team lead at State University of New York — Korea. E-mail: k.s.mick.kim@gmail.com.

Minjun Park is professor in the department of Chinese language and literature at Duksung Women's University, South Korea. E-mail: karmalet@duksung.ac.kr.

Policy Response to International PhD Students' Mobility in France: Immigration, Europeanization, Internationalization

Farkhad Alimukhamedov and Teele Tõnismann

10

Abstract
France, among top countries for doctorate abroad, grapples with labor market challenges for its 39 percent international PhD candidates. Despite alignment with EU's strategies, disparities persist, because integration of international PhDs into the domestic labor market involves not only research and development but also migration policies. Policy analysts and decision makers must address this complexity for international PhDs, fostering diversity and knowledge-based economies in the EU and OECD.

France is a major recipient of international PhD students among Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. In the 2020–2021 academic year, foreign nationals constituted 39 percent of all doctoral candidates in France, totaling 27,600 individuals. This surpasses the indicator in the United States (25 percent) and Germany (12 percent), though it remains slightly behind the United Kingdom (41 percent). This notable proportion of international PhD candidates aligns with the European Union's research and development (R&D) and innovation policy strategies where the inclusion of foreign (non-EU) doctorate students is employed to evaluate the member states' "international competitiveness of the science base."

However, France faces challenges in integrating international PhD students into the domestic labor market. Unlike many other OECD countries where a PhD is a distinctive qualification, France encounters difficulties ensuring that its doctoral candidates acquire the diverse skills necessary for a successful career in the country. Furthermore, the French example is relevant for the context of other European countries, illustrating that doctoral-level international scientific mobility is not solely a topic within R&D and innovation policies but also within migration policies.

Europeanization of the "Traditional" Foreign Student Policy in France
As a major receiving country for international PhD students, France is a good example of how contradictory rationales such as attracting best international students and limiting immigration play out in practice. Sociological observations over a long period indicate that international students are less and less seen as students, and more and more categorized as immigrants. Although France is a good example of the global trend of international student circulation from the Global South to the Global North, it remains relatively less attractive to students from the Global North. Most international PhD candidates are from the African continent (around 34 percent) and Asia (31 percent), followed by European Union nationals (18 percent) and North Americans (12 percent). Over the past decades, the French government has aimed to reduce immigration from its former colonies and the Global South through various laws and regulations (such as the Bonnet law in 1977, the Imbert law in 1979, the Pasqua law in 1993, and the Guéant law in 2011), as well as institutional practices. The purpose of these measures is to restrict the prospect of securing a stable and durable stay in France, and they have rendered the status of foreign students extremely vulnerable. Even when in 1998 the French government set up residence permit cards specifically for "scientific researchers," this was a restrictive policy that did not target international PhD candidates and PhDs already in France. It was mainly designed to foster exchange and mobility of researchers working abroad.

In 2006, a significant shift in this "traditional" French migration policy occurred with the introduction of the temporary resident permit (known as APS), allowing non-EU students to stay for up to one year after graduation to seek employment. In fact, it was the result of the alignment of various laws resulting from European Council Directive 2004-114 of December 13, 2004. With this directive, France had to align itself with all the other European Union member states and introduce specific measures to manage the study and employment conditions of international students. Prior to 2006, there were more international students changing their residence status based on family reasons rather

than economic reasons. But after the implementation of these new measures the number of permit changes from "student" toward "salaried work" has become far more significant than changes for family reasons.

This attempt also fits in with French migration policy, which favors "desirable immigration" by selecting students from graduate level onwards and promoting professional immigration. The "competences and talents" card introduced in 2006 allowed graduate students with "skills and talents whose project contributes to the economic development of France and their country of origin" to apply for a three-year residence permit. Subsequently, the 2016 reform replaced the "competences and talents" card with a series of special multiannual "talent passports," with the aim of "increasing the attractiveness of France". In line with this approach, the "job seeker/new business creator" card, implemented in 2018, is the most recent addition to the temporary residence card types. Therefore, French migration policy in higher education and research has been moving toward an employer-led system, where eligibility for the visa is determined by assessing the conditions under which applicants can qualify. As a result, PhD candidates and PhD holders can apply for various types of multiannual residence permits, contingent on their income. For example, a gross monthly salary of 2,404.67 euros grants a "talent passport – researcher" permit, an annual gross salary of 38,475 euros entitles the holder to a "talent passport – qualified employee" permit, and an annual gross salary of 53,836.5 euros qualifies for a "talent passport – EU Blue Card" permit.

Need for More Targeted Policies for Doctoral Students
Nevertheless, there is a dilemma when it comes to what is known as "professional immigration," and the interface between this and the absorption of international students into the domestic labor market. Current doctoral-level international mobility and job integration statistics highlight important structural disparities. It is estimated that almost two-thirds of international PhDs stay in France for three years after obtaining their degree. Between 2019 and 2020, 9.9 percent of researchers, including PhD candidates, in public institutions were foreign nationals, totaling 16,938 individuals. Nevertheless, the share of non-EU PhD holders in R&D jobs in both public and private sectors is much lower.

For example, in terms of placement in French higher education and research institutions, European Union nationals have a rather high recruitment ratio (50.2 percent for the entire public research sector) compared to PhDs from Asia and Africa (15.9 percent and 13.5 percent respectively). In R&D companies, 7 percent were foreign nationals, totaling 20,700 individuals; again, European Union nationals were the most recruited (38 percent), followed by researchers from Africa (37 percent) and Asia (13 percent). Therefore, while migration policy in the higher education and research arena leans toward an employer-led system with an emphasis on the employability of international PhDs, we can still observe geographical inequalities influencing the actual employment of PhDs in both public and private sector R&D because a PhD obtained in France appears not to offer the same "merit-based immunity" for PhDs from the Global South.

The French example shows that using the number of foreign doctoral students as a sole indicator of innovation is insufficient, as disparities in their integration into the national labor market persist. Despite a significant influx of international PhD holders, enduring structural inequalities in job market assimilation reflect political decisions spanning decades. Integrating PhD candidates into the labor market is, therefore, not solely a matter of R&D policies but also encompasses migration policies. Targeted policies at the national and European Union levels, specifically designed for international PhDs, have the potential to alleviate disparities in career pathways. This complex issue demands attention from policy analysts and decision makers in European Union and OECD countries aiming to enhance diversity in the higher education sector and cultivate knowledge-based economies. ◢

There is a dilemma when it comes to what is known as "professional immigration," and the interface between this and the absorption of international students into the domestic labor market.

Farkhad Alimukhamedov is postdoc at the Laboratoire des Sciences Sociales du Politique (LaSSP), Sciences Po Toulouse, France. E-mail: farkhad. alimukhamedov@univ-toulouse.fr.

Teele Tõnismann is researcher at the Laboratory of Interdisciplinary studies on the Doctorate at Adoc Talent Management, Paris, France, and member of LaSSP. E-mail: tonismann@adoc-tm.com.

Challenges and Opportunities in the Pursuit of Professorship by International Academics at German Universities

Susanne Jaudzims and Axel Oberschelp

12

Abstract
Germany is one of the most important host countries for internationally mobile students and academics. In comparison to students and academic personnel, however, international professors are underrepresented. The research project "International Academics at German Universities: From Postdoc to Professorship" explores the hurdles faced by international academics in making the transition from postdoc to professorship at German universities.

Germany serves as a significant host country for international academics and is considered a highly appealing scientific destination on a global scale. This is evident in the substantial presence of foreign academics working as doctoral candidates or postdoctoral professionals at German universities.

However, considering the 19 percent of international academics among academic staff, the low (10 percent) proportion of international professors is striking. This indicates that there are barriers impeding international academics from obtaining professorship at German universities.

As part of the research project "International Academics at German Universities: From Postdoc to Professorship" (InWiDeHo), 21 junior scientists from all regions of the world were interviewed: 33 percent from Europe and Central Asia, 19 percent from East Asia and Pacific, 14 percent from Middle East and North Africa, 10 percent each from North America, Latin America and Caribbean as well as South Asia, and 5 percent from Sub-Saharan Africa. 43 percent of the scientists surveyed specialize in natural sciences, 33 percent in economics and social sciences and 24 percent in engineering.

Institutional Support

Support from the university is highly valued and is mostly rated positively. Nevertheless, there is recognizable potential for improvement and optimization.

Insufficient German language skills are one of the main obstacles for international academics. Services offered by universities play a central role in the necessary language acquisition. Yet, these often do not cater to the unique requirements of foreign scientists. Therefore expansion of language course offerings is recommended, with heightened attention to the particular requirements of postdoctoral researchers and professors from abroad. In addition to focusing on everyday language, greater emphasis should be placed on the language of academia, as well as administrative and self-governance aspects.

Furthermore, there are significant gaps in the implementation of family-friendly initiatives, especially when it comes to dual-career services. It is clear that primarily scientists applying for or already holding a professorship are attracted by dual-career offerings. Support measures, such as better information and counseling, and more dual-career service centers should be expanded.

International Orientation

In many areas of everyday university life, the international orientation of German universities is still rather weak.

In many areas of everyday university life, the international orientation of German universities is still rather weak. Beyond research, the application of multilingualism as an intercultural practice is relatively limited. This is particularly evident in teaching and in academic self-governance. This also worsens the prospects of international academics with limited German language skills in appointment procedures.

Across the board, university administrations are not yet fully attuned to the needs of scientists from abroad. Multilingualism as a cultural practice should therefore be more strongly established in all relevant areas, especially in teaching, in academic self-governance, in appointment procedures and in research support facilities, thus enabling better support of international researchers. Furthermore, universities should take a more proactive role in advancing the strategy development for appointing international professors.

Nonuniversity Living Environment

Beyond the university environment, numerous impediments may hinder international academics from residing in Germany for an extended period.

Obtaining a residence permit, which entitles holders to live and work in Germany, has proven to be a significant hurdle—especially for people from outside the European Union. Furthermore, the interviewed scientists highlight deficiencies in both multilingualism and service orientation at immigration offices. Moreover, the presence of xenophobia often is a factor that deters from the idea of permanent residency in Germany.

In order to cushion the particular hardships that result for scientists from abroad from the usual practice of fixed-term contracts in the German academic system, suitable transitional regulations should be developed and implemented by policy makers and universities. In addition, the multilingualism of staff at immigration offices could be increased, and the transparency and speed of processing the concerns of international academics improved.

Furthermore, the society in general and in universities in particular should foster a more welcoming culture, which would contribute to positively influencing the intentions of international academics to stay.

The Attractiveness of Germany as a Science Location

Germany's attractiveness is rated highly in terms of the support of junior scientists and availability of research funding. However, due to legal framework conditions and limited job opportunities, respondents are cautious about long-term career prospects. From the perspective of the interviewed scientists, career paths to professorship are often unclear. For example, the time-consuming habilitation, which is the classical path to a professorship in the German-speaking world, is hardly known in the Anglo-Saxon higher education system and in the broader international context. In addition, professorial duties in Germany with its high teaching load and the obligation to participate in academic self-governance do not correspond to international practices and are also not very flexible.

International academics are often unaware of the specific features of the German higher education and research system at the beginning of their stay, which is why an improvement in information resources on academic careers in Germany seems necessary. The qualification paths and career opportunities should also be brought into alignment with international standards. For example, more positions with a tenure-track option as an alternative to the habilitation procedure and more flexible teaching loads could increase Germany's attractiveness for international academics.

Conclusion

Germany is already an attractive science location and an interesting labor market for young international scientists who aspire to a professorship. However, this attractiveness could be further increased if barriers in the nonuniversity environment were removed and university support measures were better tailored for the target group. Finally, consideration should be given to aligning academic career paths in Germany more closely with international standards. This could mean making more tenure-track positions available as an alternative to the habilitation procedure and making teaching commitments more adaptable. ◢

Susanne Jaudzims is a senior researcher and head of the InWiDeHo project at the German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), Research Area Governance in Higher Education and Science, Hannover, Germany. E-mail: jaudzims@dzhw.eu.

Axel Oberschelp is a senior researcher at the German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies (DZHW), Research Area Governance in Higher Education and Science, Hannover, Germany. E-mail: oberschelp@dzhw.eu.

This article is based on the survey report that is freely available online.

13

International Scholar Mobility to the United States Claws Back from Its Pandemic Plunge

Chris R. Glass

Abstract

Geopolitics are reshaping global science as the United States decouples from China and aligns with India. Scholar mobility from South Korea maintains resilience while mobility from Brazil continues its steady ascent. Post-pandemic scholar mobility to the United States lingers at levels from 15 years ago. As emerging powers expand academic partnerships and research activity, adaptation imperatives loom for the United States to retain leadership in science.

NUMBER **119**_SUMMER **2024**

14

The data reveal divergent trends in international academic mobility to the United States.

This year's Open Doors 2023 Report on International Educational Exchange not only captures the current state of scholar mobility in the United States but also reflects a complex nexus of geopolitical tensions, national security concerns, and the evolving nature of global scientific collaboration. At its core is the United States' strategic pivot away from China in science and technology, leading to stricter visa policies and increased scrutiny for Chinese scholars. Internationalization, once a unanimously positive goal in higher education, now receives a more mixed reception among policy makers.

The data reveal divergent trends in international academic mobility to the United States. While international student enrollment at United States higher education institutions has rebounded to prepandemic levels, international scholar mobility lingers at levels from 15 years ago. Though the number of scholars climbed 13 percent in 2022-2023 to 102,366, this recovery remains below the 106,123 scholars hosted in 2007-2008 and lags 25 percent behind the prepandemic high point of 2018-2019—an inflection point reversing 20 years of expansion.

The United States, traditionally a leader in global science, is witnessing changes in its position due to simmering geopolitical tensions, new strategic alliances, and the diversification of historic patterns of academic mobility. The pandemic introduced additional volatility, impacting travel, visa processing, and funding, as well as the growth of virtual collaborations in addition to physical mobility, which will influence long-term academic mobility trends. Nonetheless, challenges for the United States also present opportunities for expansion and diversification as emerging powers like China and India, among others, reshape global science.

Mobility Restarts, Tensions Remain

China, India, and South Korea remained the top three nations sending scholars to the United States, and Brazil, ranked fourth, exhibited the most substantial average annual growth in the number of scholars heading to the United States over the last two decades. STEM fields maintain their stronghold in international scholar mobility, representing 78 percent of international scholars in the United States. This year's report shows steady growth in the physical and life sciences, which make up half of all STEM scholars in the United States, a reflection of the urgency of addressing global health and environmental challenges. The data reflect broader geopolitical changes, the rise of nationalism, and a strategic reevaluation of relations with China, United States strategic alignments with India, and the diversification of mobility patterns.

US-China Tensions

The number of Chinese scholars in the United States saw remarkable growth from 2000-2001 to 2020-2021, peaking at 46,256. However, escalating tensions between the two countries, fueled by trade disputes, intellectual property rights issues, and intensifying competition in technology and higher education, have led to tighter United States visa policies for Chinese scholars, particularly in high-tech and strategically crucial fields like artificial intelligence. The United States Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security have implemented more stringent visa policies affecting Chinese scholars.

Policy shifts and political rhetoric have culminated in a drastic reduction of Chinese scholars to 19,556 in the 2022-2023 academic year, marking a 59 percent decrease from 2018-2019. This sharp decline is indicative of wider United States initiatives aimed at

mitigating China's growing influence and safeguarding national security interests. The 2018 China Initiative resulted in a decline in joint scientific papers between the two countries, falling from 62,904 in 2020 to 58,546 in 2022, and a notable percentage of American scientists have severed ties with Chinese collaborators due to the China Initiative. In response to United States policy shifts, China has implemented strategies to encourage its overseas academics to return home, utilizing their knowledge to enhance its national development—a strategy commonly known as "reverse brain drain".

US-India Strategic Alliances

India showed significant growth in sending scholars to the United States, with a record number of 16,608 in the 2022-2023 period, paralleling the all-time high of 268,923 Indian international students and its role as a key United States ally. The country's scientific publications have soared, growing annually by 11.4 percent between 2003 and 2022, ranking India as the world's third-largest producer of science papers, surpassing the United Kingdom, Germany, and Japan in volume.

In sharp contrast to the United States' strategies towards China, India's burgeoning academic relationship with the United States is exemplified by the US-India initiative on Critical and Emerging Technology (iCET) which aims to bolster collaboration between businesses and academic institutions. Moreover, the Indo-US Global Challenges Institute, a collaboration between the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Council of Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT Council), focuses on high-impact research partnerships in key areas such as semiconductor technology, sustainable energy, pandemic preparedness, and other critical scientific domains.

US-South Korea Resilience

South Korea's scholar numbers increased to 6,646 in the 2022-2023 academic year. Despite being off from its peak of 9,975 in 2008-2009, mobility between the two countries demonstrates remarkable resilience. South Korea's rebound in scholar numbers is more than a mere recovery from pandemic-induced disruptions; it represents a strategic recalibration of academic alliances in a world where distrust between the United States and China has grown, and the dominance of Euro-American powers is being contested. It also reflects South Korea's robust investment in research and development, which has positioned the country as a global innovation leader, especially in technology and engineering.

US-Brazil Ascendancy

This year's data also illustrate how mobility patterns are diversifying beyond the traditional East-to-West movement. Brazil has been steadily climbing the ranks as a top origin country for scholars and the fourth leading place of origin in the 2022-2023 academic year, sending more scholars to the United States than Canada, Germany, and Japan. This increase aligns with Brazil's focused efforts in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. The country has significantly invested in scientific research, infrastructure development, and incentives for international collaboration.

The New Geopolitics of Academic Mobility

As the United States adopts a more inward-looking stance, other nations are poised to step in, potentially altering the epicenters of knowledge production and collaboration. This transition may herald a more multipolar scientific landscape fueled by diverse global partnerships and alliances. Such changes in the global landscape pose challenges for the United States in retaining its status as a premier destination for international academic talent. Fundamental to this transformation is the United States's strategic shift away from China, particularly in fields of science and technology, resulting in more stringent visa regulations and heightened scrutiny of Chinese scholars.

Chris R. Glass is professor of the practice in the Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education and affiliated faculty at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, United States. E-mail: chris.glass@bc.edu.

The future of United States scholar mobility and its role in the global scientific exchange will depend on how well it adapts to the new geopolitical landscape of academic mobility. To adapt, the United States must tackle key barriers hindering international scholar mobility. This includes extending visa durations, creating clearer paths to permanent residency for STEM scholars, and boosting research funding for collaborative projects and exchange programs. The effectiveness of the United States response will determine whether it continues as the leading destination for research talent and scientific collaboration.

16

Abstract

Our survey reveals that Chinese-origin faculty in Canadian universities used to work in the frontiers of collaborating with China, leveraging their cultural and linguistic competencies, as well as personal networks. Now, they are caught in geopolitical conflicts and even become victims of implicit or explicit racial profiling, as a result of policies that link research collaboration with China to national security concerns.

Racial Profiling amidst Geopolitical Tension: Chinese Faculty in Canada

Qiang Zha and Xiaojie Li

The growing rivalry between the United States and China has now resulted in linking research and university collaboration to national security concerns. As such, the United States has taken serious steps to safeguard its research and intellectual property from potential espionage by China. The best known example of such efforts is the China Initiative. Canada has followed the United States and launched similar initiatives or strategies. In July 2021, the government of Canada introduced National Security Guidelines for Research Partnerships, initially requiring obligatory national security risk assessment on funding requests from university researchers in science and engineering with the aim to "protect Canadian intellectual property from falling into the hands of authoritarian governments." In early 2023, the government started screening funding requests in all areas from Canadian universities that were planning to collaborate with China, as well as a few other "hostile states," in sensitive research areas. There have been concerns, expressed principally by academics of Chinese descent in Canadian universities, that such mandatory national security assessment for research funding could lead to "racial profiling of Chinese researchers as foreign agents," and thus impact their career development.

Against such a backdrop, we conducted a survey in order to comprehensively and empirically capture the perceptions of academics of Chinese descent in Canadian universities regarding research engagement with scholars and students in China, about the consequences of restricting such collaboration, and, more importantly, any racial profiling effect towards their career development.

This survey reveals some concerning results, which could have significant policy implications for Canadian universities and research funding agencies.

Chinese Scholars and Collaborations with China perceived as important
Chinese-origin (83.7 percent) and non-Chinese (78.6 percent) faculty highly appreciated Chinese scholars, concurring that Chinese scholars made significant contributions to research and teaching programs in their respective fields. The top benefits stemming from Canada's collaboration with Chinese researchers feature diverse perspectives, fresh ideas, and cultural exchange, followed by new research techniques, strong work ethic, data otherwise not available in Canada, sites for future research data collection, increased publications through coauthorships, etc. Given such a wide spectrum of benefits, the

surveyed faculty, both of Chinese-origin and non-Chinese, expressed a positive attitude towards research collaboration with China. Furthermore, 70.1 percent of the Chinese-origin faculty and 63.7 percent of the non-Chinese faculty believed that both countries had benefited equally from research collaboration.

As such, 95.8 percent of faculty of Chinese descent and 92.5 percent of the non-Chinese stated that they interacted with peers from China at least once a year. Moreover, 69.4 percent of Chinese-origin faculty and 58.1 percent of non-Chinese faculty expressed willingness to continue working with Chinese scholars, despite the challenging geopolitical situation. Apparently, Canada–China research collaboration means more to Chinese-origin faculty: 66 percent of them emphasized that collaborating with scholars in China was important to their scholarly research, while 40.6 percent of the non-Chinese faculty shared this perspective.

Restricting Collaboration with China Has Adverse Impact on Chinese-origin Faculty

A majority of the Chinese-origin faculty (63.5 percent) conducted research collaboratively with scholars in China over the three years prior to the survey, whereas a significantly lower proportion (31.7 percent) of the non-Chinese faculty participated in such collaboration. Therefore, Chinese faculty demonstrated a more negative attitude towards the National Security Guidelines, compared with their non-Chinese peers. Among non-Chinese faculty, 44.4 percent expressed full support for the Guidelines, and 42.6 percent believed that the scrutiny effort of this nature could be justified. However, only 20.0 percent and 18.2 percent of the Chinese faculty held the similar perspectives respectively. In addition, 41.8 percent of the Chinese faculty believed that the Guidelines were excessive and overblown, while only 22.2 percent of the non-Chinese faculty shared this opinion.

Among the faculty who collaborated with China over the previous three years, a considerable portion had to adapt and make changes under the circumstances. For Chinese-origin faculty, 21 percent adjusted the focus or approach of their current research projects, 19.3 percent limited communication with collaborators in China, 10.9 percent decided not to work with collaborators in China in future projects, 8.4 percent decided not to involve China in future projects, and 7.6 percent changed funding sources. Non-Chinese faculty made similar changes, with the exception that a significantly smaller proportion limited communication with collaborators in China (4.3 percent), and none changed funding sources. Presumably, Chinese-origin faculty used to communicate more frequently with peers in China, and obtain project funds from sources likely related to China. More importantly, a notable percentage of both Chinese-origin (11.3 percent) and non-Chinese faculty (15.1 percent) prematurely or unexpectedly ended or suspended research collaboration with scholars in China over the past three years.

Chinese-origin Faculty Feeling Targeted and Racially Profiled

Since China is implicitly targeted in the research risk assessment exercise, this survey result shows that a noticeable portion of the Chinese faculty felt racially profiled by the Canadian government (19.2 percent), their home institutions (15.5 percent), and their colleagues (18.7 percent). These figures are significantly higher than the respective percentages expressed by non-Chinese faculty, which stood at 4.8 percent, 8.3 percent, and 7 percent. Additionally, 31.9 percent of the Chinese faculty reported having experienced challenges for their professional development as a result of their race, nationality or country of origin, and 19.6 percent having encountered difficulty securing funding for a research project for the same reasons. In comparison, 17.5 percent and 8.8 percent of non-Chinese faculty experienced similar professional development and research funding challenges due to such factors.

Moreover, among the faculty familiar with the research risk assessment exercise, 40 percent of the Chinese-origin faculty reported feeling fear and/or anxiety that they were being surveilled by the Canadian government, whereas only 11.1 percent of the non-Chinese faculty shared such fear or anxiety. At the institutional level, 20 percent of the Chinese-origin faculty and 1.9 percent of the non-Chinese faculty expressed considerable fear and/or anxiety of being surveilled by their institutions. Arguably, such racial profiling sentiment is likely to become a pushing factor for global migration. Among those faculty who were not Canadian citizens, 30.6 percent of Chinese-origin faculty said they

17

40 percent of the Chinese-origin faculty reported feeling fear and/or anxiety that they were being surveilled by the Canadian government.

were considering leaving Canada due to geopolitical tension and racial profiling experience, while only 4.2 percent of the non-Chinese faculty expressed the same intention. Notably, among such Chinese-origin faculty, a larger portion (35 percent) in sciences and engineering areas stated they would consider relocation.

Concluding Thoughts

Like the United States, Canada increasingly links research collaboration with China to national security agenda. This survey empirically detects a Canadian pattern parallel to that shown in a 2021 survey of the US scientists of Chinese descent: an absolute majority endorsed the value of Chinese academics and collaboration with China (over 80 percent in Canada versus over 90 percent in the United States), a vast majority reported negative impact of restricting collaboration with China (nearly 80 percent in Canada versus over 90 percent in the United States), and a significant portion experienced challenges for professional development as a result of their Chinese origin (slightly over 30 percent in Canada versus close to 40 percent in the United States). Such factors would have implicit or explicit implications for talent mobility: a noticeable proportion indicated having an intention or plan for relocation (about 30 percent of surveyed non-citizens in Canada versus over 40 percent in the United States). ◀

Qiang Zha is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca.

Xiaojie Li is a recent PhD graduate from the University of Arizona. E-mail: xiaojieli@arizona.edu.

This article is a short version of a full-length paper in Canadian Ethnic Studies.

Toward an Improved Shared Understanding of TNE

Janet B. Ilieva, Eduardo Ramos and Michael Peak

Abstract

Transnational education (TNE) has experienced significant growth recently, with more students enrolling in TNE programs and more institutions involved in TNE. This article develops a framework that captures the impacts of TNE on local education systems and explores the host country's perspective on TNE. TNE is crucial in bridging the gap between supply and demand for higher education, supporting access for disadvantaged groups, and capacity building. It supports nations' aspirations for an international student hub.

Transnational education (TNE) has increased its reach over the past two decades: more students are enrolled in programs, and more education institutions are engaged in its delivery. Most notable developments include the following.

Collaborative forms of TNE have a growing prominence and have expanded at the expense of independently delivered TNE. Examples of collaborative provision include joint international branch campuses, dual and double degrees, and agreements for franchised education provision, among others.

COVID-19 appears to have acted as a catalyst of this development—program mobility made up for disruptions in student mobility during the pandemic. Most learners were pushed to engage with academic provision online and sometimes from their home countries.

Recent economic downturns have negatively impacted public funding for higher education, significantly restricting access to domestic higher education options. This resulted in a significant expansion of TNE in countries like Sri Lanka, where the number of TNE students reached almost 46,000 in 2021 from 30,000 in 2019.

There is a growing recognition of TNE at the national level. While this signals openness to engage in TNE, there is also an attempt to regulate it. The most recent examples of such policy shifts are noted in India and Nigeria. The introduction of regulations suggests a need to harness market forces in order to bridge demand and supply, enhance quality or improve employability. Those are not new developments. The East Asian currency crisis in 1997 stimulated one of the early significant expansions of TNE across the region—such developments were noted in Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand, among other countries.

Growing Focus on the Host Country Perspective

Sustainable development and a focus on impact are becoming more embedded in universities' strategies, and the local impact of TNE is growing in prominence in the literature and empirical studies. These developments contributed to strengthened partnerships with benefits aimed at the wider society. Regulatory bodies are strengthening their rules to protect student interest, and TNE widens student choice.

However, there is a lack of internationally binding frameworks and taxonomies to regulate and measure TNE. In effect, TNE regulation is often managed at the individual country level by several bodies that supervise, audit or conduct the various regulatory and quality assurance processes. In some countries, all functions may reside within one agency, while in other countries, the responsibility for quality assurance may be shared and benchmarked with international agencies or standards.

Multiple instruments, mainly regional, support the mobility of programs and institutions through quality assurance and qualification recognition, from the European Standards and Guidelines and the UNESCO-OECD Guidelines on Quality Provision in Cross-Border Higher Education to the different regional Qualification Recognition conventions and the recent Global Convention under UNESCO. While they enhance longstanding country-based efforts, no single set of international standards regulates TNE and its quality.

Development of a TNE Framework

To best capture TNE developments and to address a gap in our understanding of TNE, the British Council drew on expertise from Education Insight and the UK's Quality Assurance Agency to develop a TNE framework that reflects host country priorities and captures macroeconomic and higher education developments globally and nationally.

The study found that TNE can play a crucial role in bridging the gap between supply and demand in countries and territories with high demand but low supply of higher education. Similarly, TNE can support the diversification of local provision, supplying courses that are not available locally. The study utilizes Hans Rosling's GapMinder tool to plot together statistical resources from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the International Monetary Fund, and the United Kingdom's Higher Education Statistics Agency. Bespoke data sets developed for this project complement these data collections.

During a QAA (Quality Assurance Agency) International Partner Forum held on November 2023 with the attendance of regulatory bodies from Bangladesh, China, Cyprus, Ghana, India, Kuwait, and Malaysia, participants identified different levels of maturity in data collection, recognition of TNE qualifications (particularly those delivered online), systems to assure quality, and the movement of partnerships beyond teaching-only validation-based to holistic, including research collaboration.

TNE Widens Access and Supports Access for Disadvantaged Groups

One example was the increase in online courses in Afghanistan, reported by FutureLearn, where most of the demand is believed to be from female learners. Similarly, more than 15,000 Afghan women applied to courses offered by Arizona State University and a Canadian nonprofit.

A case study from Sri Lanka shows significant constraints in meeting local higher education demand, which was exacerbated by the recent economic crisis.

In 2010, the country's gross enrollment ratio in tertiary education (GER) was 16 percent, and TNE students as a proportion of local tertiary enrollments were estimated at 2 percent. In 2020, Sri Lanka's GER increased by 6 percent and reached 22 percent, whereas TNE estimated 11 percent of the local tertiary enrollments. As Sri Lanka's policy focus shifts from the supply of higher education to safeguarding the quality of tertiary education provision, the shape and pace of TNE changes, too. The development of a TNE regulatory framework with a quality focus is imminent.

Supporting Recruitment and Hub Aspirations

TNE can support the internationalization of local higher education provision. The rise of the United Arab Emirates to become one of the world's largest host destinations is

However, there is a lack of internationally binding frameworks and taxonomies to regulate and measure TNE.

19

Janet B. Ilieva is the founder and director of Education Insight, a research consultancy specialising in international higher education, Bristol, United Kingdom. E-mail: janet.ilieva@educationinsight.uk.

Eduardo Ramos is director of international and professional services at the Quality Assurance Agency, Gloucester, United Kingdom. E-mail: E.Ramos@qaa.ac.uk.

Michael Peak is head of education research at the British Council, the United Kingdom's international cultural relations organization. E-mail: Michael.peak@britishcouncil.org.

The report will be available online at www.britishcouncil.org/research-insight.

evidenced by the 344 percent growth in its number of international students. Over the past decade, the number of international students in the United Arab Emirates increased from 48,653 in 2011 to 215,975 in 2020, ranking it ninth behind Japan and China.

Initially, TNE catered mainly to the education needs of the expat community, which accounted for approximately 90 percent of the population. Liberalization of international education provision became a policy preoccupation and a top priority for Dubai's Knowledge Human Development Authority (KHDA), the regulatory body for the quality of the overall education provision in Dubai, which has become one of the most recent examples of a talent hub and has the world's highest concentration of international branch campuses. Increasingly, international branch campuses and programs in the country are attracting international talent.

Next Steps

The most notable gap in our knowledge is the host country's perspective on TNE. The lack of knowledge covers several areas, including regulatory bodies' plans and considerations for the future of TNE in the country. While the major home country of TNE providers collects data and monitors TNE provision, activities in the host countries are not consolidated. Most TNE data collections are at the program level—local regulatory bodies monitor the local provision of programs through the reaccreditation process and the requirements for reaccreditation. However, robust data on student enrollments is not systematically collected.

To address this deficiency, this study has proposed convening an annual forum with national TNE stakeholders, where lessons learned and practices are shared. This forum would also present an opportunity to discuss changes in regulatory environments in countries where such changes are scheduled. Greater transparency of the process and improved data collection globally would contribute to an improved shared understanding of TNE and its impact.

Educational Institutions Still Eager to Establish a Branch Campus in Dubai

Stephen Wilkins

The Emirate of Dubai, one of the seven emirates that make up the United Arab Emirates (UAE), has a population of only 3.65 million but more than 70 higher education institutions. In recent years, researchers and commentators have concluded that Dubai's higher education market is saturated and has reached its peak. Indeed, the total enrollments at some institutions have fallen by as much as 30 to 40 percent compared to enrollments five to seven years ago. Still, each year foreign institutions continue to arrive, eager to establish a new campus in the emirate. This begs the question as to why any institution would want to enter such a competitive market. This article reports the findings of research that sought to discover the motivations of the new arrivals for establishing a campus in Dubai, the strategies they intend to implement, and the impacts of these new ventures on Dubai's higher education market.

New Arrivals to Dubai in 2022–2023

In 2022 and 2023, seven foreign institutions arrived in Dubai to establish a branch campus. Two of these institutions are based in the United States (Georgetown University and Harrisburg University of Science and Technology), two in France (ESCP Business School and EM Normandie Business School), two in Italy (Luiss University and Istituto Marangoni), and one in Germany (University of Europe for Applied Sciences). Most of these institutions occupy relatively high positions in regional and global rankings, or they are well-regarded in their specialist field. The new arrivals bring the total number of international branch campuses operating in Dubai at the start of 2024 to 29.

Motivations of Institutions for Establishing a Campus in Dubai

For many institutions, owning campuses in all corners of the globe provides support for their claims of prestige and world-class status. In many cases, international branch campuses are regarded as a lucrative opportunity that also helps a university to establish a global brand. Many institutions appear to have become addicted to international expansion, seeking to open as many branches as possible, as quickly as possible, and in as many exotic locations as possible. For example, EM Normandie Business School aims to establish three more branch campuses in 2024 and 2025, in the United States and Vietnam.

Governments and infrastructure providers invite desirable institutions to establish a branch campus, and these invitations often come with incentives such as funding or ready-made premises. In some cases, the Dubai government makes clear to institutions the programs that are needed to achieve the country's economic and social objectives. For example, ESCP Business School was asked to deliver programs that will meet the challenges of the future in the areas of smart cities, digital transformation, and sustainable development. Once established, there appears to be no shortage of student demand for places in the new ventures.

Foreign institutions often find it easier to begin operations in Dubai compared to other countries because the Dubai government is supportive, there are few onerous requirements, and the higher education infrastructure is well-established. Harrisburg University opened a campus in Panama in 2022 and has found progress slow due to the less developed higher education infrastructure. The institution claims to have learnt from this, and accepted ready-made premises in Dubai Knowledge Park, one of Dubai's two major purpose-built education hubs.

Abstract
The Emirate of Dubai has a population of only 3.65 million but more than 70 higher education institutions, making its higher education market fiercely competitive. However, each year foreign institutions continue to arrive, eager to establish a new campus in the emirate. This article discusses the motivations of these institutions for establishing a campus in Dubai, the strategies that they intend to implement, and the impacts of these new arrivals on Dubai's higher education market.

21

Competitive Strategies of the New Institutions

In a competitive market, it makes sense for institutions to identify subject areas for which there is demand but no or minimal existing provision. Harrisburg University claims to be a leading STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) university in the United States, and it recognizes that Dubai has few STEM-focused providers.

Most of the new entrants seek to offer something new or different, even in a subject area with abundant provision like business. For example, students at Luiss University's Dubai campus can study fashion and luxury business, tourism management, and sport management. Other institutions aim to deliver applied and vocational education that prepares students for the labor market. The University of Europe seeks to appeal to students who are prepared to "get their hands dirty" (the university's words). Also, by having a physical environment that is bright, open-planned, but cozy—including a small library complete with an electric fireplace—this university hopes to create a unique "boutique vibe."

Dubai's transnational education institutions serve mainly the huge expatriate population, and few institutions have already started capitalizing on Dubai's potential as a regional education hub that could attract international students from the entire Middle East region, as well as from East Africa and South Asia. Harrisburg University hopes to recruit students from neighboring countries as well as from within the UAE. The university recognizes that the Dubai government is keen for students to stay and work in the country after they graduate.

The new institutions may appeal to students who would like to undertake some of their programs at the university's main campus—which most of the institutions allow—or who hope to live and work after they graduate in the country where the university is based. For example, students who graduate from the University of Europe in Dubai are eligible to apply for a six-month German job-seeker's visa, but if they complete their last semester in Germany, they will qualify for an 18-month visa.

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, most higher education stakeholders in Dubai viewed online and virtual education with a degree of suspicion, but attitudes changed quickly during the pandemic. Online and hybrid models of learning are now much more accepted by students, parents, employers, and the UAE ministry of education. This has encouraged several of the new institutions to deliver graduate programs in hybrid mode, using both virtual and in-person learning.

Impact on Dubai's Higher Education Market

The new universities in Dubai have expanded higher education capacity, which will make it easier for students to obtain a higher education place. The increased competition may also help keep tuition fees from rising too much. But most importantly, the new arrivals offer subjects that are currently not available or which are under-supplied. In most cases, the new programs will support the educational and research aspirations of the Dubai government as well as delivering social, cultural, and economic benefits for the emirate. By delivering in-demand programs that equip students with the knowledge and skills demanded by employers, graduates will enjoy increased employability.

Supporters of transnational education often claim that the presence of foreign institutions increases market competition and encourages existing providers to improve their quality. Indeed, the high level of competition in Dubai has helped ensure the survival of only the highest quality institutions. Students have quickly shunned poorly performing institutions or those with declining reputations. During the last decade, at least eight institutions have closed, either because they were no longer financially viable or because they were compulsorily closed by the regulators for failing to achieve the required quality and accreditation standards. As a result, new institutions may recruit students who would otherwise have enrolled at one of the failed institutions, but they still need to differentiate themselves from the competition, whether through rankings and accreditation or graduate employability and campus vibe. ◢

Supporters of transnational education often claim that the presence of foreign institutions increases market competition and encourages existing providers to improve their quality.

Stephen Wilkins is professor of strategy and marketing at The British University in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. E-mail: stephen.wilkins@buid.ac.ae.

Retrenchment or Expansion? The Future of US International Campuses

Kyle Long and Melissa Danvers

For decades, economic, political, and academic motives have operated as complementary "push" factors in the internationalization of higher education. The rise of neoliberalism, the fall of the Soviet Union, and the maturation of international science accelerated education across borders. Indeed, the search for new markets, alliances, and knowledge brought the branch campus boom—with American institutions leading the way. According to the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT), the United States is the largest of 39 exporting countries, contributing roughly 30 percent of the 333 international branch campuses worldwide. A reactionary political movement in the country, however, signals the onset of a conflicting "pull" factor: isolationism. After leading on the global stage for nearly a century, worrisomely growing numbers of Americans want the country to turn inward. A recent and high-profile international branch campus closure—not for economic reasons, but ostensibly political ones—encapsulates this concern and has observers wondering if it is the canary in the coal mine. Earlier this year, Texas A&M University's board of regents voted to close the institution's 20-year-old, fully-funded branch campus in Qatar. The board cited heightened instability in the Middle East as a key contributing factor, but analysts have pointed to mounting political pressure on a university caught up in the state's culture wars and ask, will others be next?

The prominence of the United States in the global landscape for international campuses renders the Texas A&M case a particularly useful lens for considering the future of the phenomenon more generally. Critics have been presaging the doom of international campuses for almost a decade now. But the reports of their collective death are greatly exaggerated. An international campus provides the educational framework, methodologies, and standards typical of higher education from one country to students in a different country. There will always be a market for that service. Still, we do see the United States' international campuses caught in the middle of a national tug-of-war between isolationism and neoliberalism. We therefore expect intermittent closures and openings to continue while the United States electorate sorts out whether it wants to withdraw from or engage with the world. In the meantime, emerging markets and innovations in cross-border education will be worth watching.

Pull Factor: Politics

The forces that would bring the United States' international campuses back to shore largely come from the political right. The political left, too, has problems with campuses that it considers neoimperialist outposts that uphold global power structures. But the "Make America Great Again" (MAGA) movement has shown greater interest in curtailing higher education, which it fears is subject to malign foreign influence. During the Trump administration, the department of education investigated 19 universities—including Texas A&M—for failing to comply with a law that requires them to report foreign donations. During the Biden administration, right-wing scrutiny of universities' foreign financial ties has persisted via conservative state governments and think tanks, where it has also dovetailed with support for Israel. At the end of 2023, a conservative pro-Israel group alleged that the Qatar Foundation's support for Texas A&M's campus in Qatar (TAMUQ) allowed the Gulf state undue influence on federally-funded research and therefore posed a national security risk. The university's board of regents voted to shutter TAMUQ four months later.

Abstract
This article examines dual forces impacting international campuses of US universities: isolationist retrenchment and neoliberal expansion. It uses the recent closure of Texas A&M University's branch in Qatar to explore how domestic disputes are playing out internationally. It argues that the overall landscape for international campuses remains favorable to expansion, while also acknowledging worrisome trends. The analysis underscores the importance of global engagement for fostering economic growth and international cooperation.

23

The forces that would bring the United States' international campuses back to shore largely come from the political right.

24

The TAMUQ episode has drawn considerable attention but is not an isolated incident. Due to the expansion of a state law limiting public institutions' engagement with "countries of concern," Florida International University abandoned the international joint university it operated with Tianjin University (China) and terminated multiple dual-degree programs with other Chinese partners. Together, the cases demonstrate how fraught with political landmines the current environment can be for international cooperative ventures, at least from institutions based in states where legislative bodies and gubernatorial offices are dominated by isolationists. Sustaining transnational partnerships in these contexts now necessitates concerted cultivation of state political and opinion leaders through expensive and long-term lobbying efforts. In view of these growing difficulties and the prospect of a second Trump administration, which would further embolden isolationists, the decisions to retrench could prove prescient.

Push Factor: Economics
The forces that would push more United States campuses to foreign shores largely come from the established economic order and traditional higher education business model. Universities from the United States still dominate global rankings, and the postpandemic recovery of the United States as the leading destination for international students shows its institutions still hold great appeal. Meanwhile, new markets for international campuses continue to open. India, Greece, and Saudi Arabia have all passed recent legislation allowing international campuses. The Philippines may soon as well. Notably, domestic political discourse in these countries includes prominent voices that consider international branches a threat to national security, culture, and identity. Consequently, onerous restrictions have emerged in some locations that quell immediate growth. In India, for example, only two Australian universities—Deakin University and the University of Wollongong—have so far ventured to start campuses.

But as long as public subsidies are low and global demand is high, there will be suppliers for North American higher education abroad. And indeed recent headlines confirm that United States institutions still seek to launch new campuses overseas: Baylor College of Medicine has agreed to establish a medical college in the United Arab Emirates; Arizona State University intends to build a campus in Saudi Arabia; Georgetown University is considering one in Indonesia; and Temple University, long a stalwart in Tokyo, is adding a second Japanese site in Kyoto. While we should not expect public institutions from Florida or Texas to venture abroad anytime soon, other state universities are showing how the challenging terrain offers opportunity for innovation. The University of Arizona's microcampuses, which furnish partner institutions with onsite degree programs, could be poised for expansion in emerging markets like India, which is especially interested in US education. India recently surpassed China as the largest sender of students to the United States and microcampuses could reach them more efficiently than the full-fledged international campuses constrained by law. The University of Arizona's in-state neighbor, Arizona State University, has its own promising model, in which the university's for-profit subsidiary Cintana Education provides turnkey programming to independent institutions to help them startup faster. This is the model that got American University in Kyiv off the ground last year—even in the middle of a war.

Looking Forward
Resurgent isolationism has destabilized the previously complementary relationship between economic and political goals, bringing these now rival forces into direct conflict: neoliberalism is pushing providers to find new markets, while isolationist attitudes are clawing them back to shore. In this sensitive political landscape, institutions—especially public ones—must be prepared for new challenges that make maintaining global higher education partnerships significantly more arduous. Meanwhile, the higher education sector is likely to see growth and disruption simultaneously. As each opening or closure of an international campus is unlikely to represent a broader trend, observers looking for clues should take a wide and long view extending past the upcoming presidential election.

Kyle Long is a visiting scholar at the department of educational leadership at George Washington University, Washington, DC, United States. E-mail: kylelong@gwu.edu.

Melissa Danvers is a graduate student at the international education program at George Washington University. E-mail: mdanvers@gwu.edu.

Uzbekistan Ranks Third Globally as Host of International Branch Campuses

Stephen Wilkins and Bobir Muratov

Abstract
To achieve its economic and social development goals, the Uzbek government has established a vibrant transnational education sector. At the start of 2024, Uzbekistan had 38 transnational higher education institutions, including 30 international branch campuses. This has resulted in the country becoming host to the third largest number of international branch campuses globally, behind only China and the United Arab Emirates. This article considers why and how Uzbekistan implemented its transnational education strategy.

Governments of many countries around the world have decided that transnational education, and specifically international branch campuses, can help them achieve their economic and social development goals. In recent years, Uzbekistan, a country in Central Asia, has actively supported foreign universities that want to establish a campus in the country. Quite unnoticed internationally, Uzbekistan is now host to the third largest number of international branch campuses globally, behind only China and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). This article considers why and how Uzbekistan implemented its transnational education strategy.

Higher Education in Post-Soviet Uzbekistan
The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 saw Uzbekistan and the four other former Soviet republics of Central Asia become independent states. They were all expected to transition from planned to market economies. Initially, the five Central Asian states took different approaches to higher education reform. For example, while Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan aimed to achieve mass participation in higher education, Uzbekistan chose to retain its elite system with relatively low levels of participation, which was still below 10 percent as recently as 2010. Further, the Uzbek government retained centralized decision-making, whereby it was wholly responsible for determining institution finances, program structure and content, and admissions policies.

A series of acts passed in the 1990s and 2000s resulted in the establishment of new institutions, higher enrollments, introduction of standardized entrance tests, and increased international cooperation. However, the most extensive reforms came after 2016, the year in which Shavkat Mirziyoyev became president. The government began promoting transnational education as a way to help achieve its goals of increasing higher education capacity and improving educational quality.

Internationalization
The internationalization of Uzbekistan's higher education began before 2016. Uzbek institutions established links with foreign universities for cooperation and collaboration, and special funds were allocated by the government so that hundreds of young Uzbeks could study abroad. Under special circumstances, it was possible for a foreign university to establish a branch campus in Uzbekistan. The first international branch campus was established in 1995 by the Russian University of Economics named after G.V. Plekhanov, followed by two more Russian universities in 2006 and 2007. It was perhaps natural that the first foreign-owned campuses came from Russia since Uzbekistan retained strong ties and trade links with Russia, and a high proportion of the population spoke Russian as their second language.

International cooperation also led to the introduction of private Uzbek-owned transnational education institutions. These institutions award degrees from a foreign university, which typically assumes the role of advisor or mentor while also taking responsibility for quality assurance. The first of such institutions was Westminster International University in Tashkent (WIUT), which commenced operations in 2002 with the support of the University of Westminster, United Kingdom. Several researchers have wrongly classified WIUT as an international branch campus even though press releases of the institution have emphasized that the university is *not* a branch campus, and the University of Westminster's website refers to WUIT as "partner." Both international branch

25

26

campuses and the local privately-owned transnational education institutions quickly developed reputations for providing high quality education, and student enrollments increased dramatically.

Education Hub
Encouraged by the success of the early transnational education providers, the Uzbek government decided that expanding the transnational education sector would contribute greatly to achieving its objective of a 50 percent higher education participation rate by 2030. Since 2017, a variety of incentives have been offered to foreign universities that establish a branch campus in Uzbekistan, including grants, tax breaks, guarantees against financial loss, and premises, land, and equipment, often free of cost. The high level of unsatisfied student demand combined with the Uzbek government's generous incentives encouraged 23 institutions to open a campus in the country between 2018 and 2022. However, with relatively low tuition fees, foreign universities are not coming for profit; rather, they are satisfying their internationalization, social equity, and global brand-building objectives.

At the start of 2024, Uzbekistan had 38 transnational education institutions, where students can achieve a degree from a foreign university without leaving Uzbekistan; 30 of these institutions are international branch campuses. This has resulted in Uzbekistan becoming host to the third largest number of international branch campuses globally. The country may now be recognized as a higher education hub.

It is amazing not only that so many new campuses were established in such a short period of time, but that most of the campuses occupy large well-equipped and resourced premises, which contrasts starkly to the "single-floor in an office block" institutions that are common in many other transnational education hubs. Further, the new transnational education institutions in Uzbekistan have impressive enrollment rates. In their first two years of operation, many institutions managed to enroll several hundred students, and several providers now have more than 4,000 students.

This success has not come without challenges. There are no clear and separate regulations for transnational education providers, which is further complicated by the fact that government-sponsored campuses are usually supervised by the specific ministry that is related to the institution's main field of teaching. So, different institutions may be subject to different requirements and expectations. Some institutions have experienced licensing difficulties. Problems related to teaching that does not show awareness and respect for local values have occurred, such as when one professor was dismissed for discussing the sexual orientation of a local historical figure. Also, many students have a level of English language competency that is not equal to international standards, resulting in the need for a foundation year and/or extra language support.

Effective Strategy
Of Uzbekistan's 30 international branch campuses, 14 belong to institutions based in Russia. But an interesting and uncommon feature of Uzbekistan's transnational education sector is that institutions also come from a diverse range of other countries that include India, Italy, Latvia, Malaysia, Poland, Singapore, South Korea, Turkey, and the United States. Higher education internationalization achieved in this way makes good strategic sense for Uzbekistan, as it promotes international trade and relations without overrelying on Russia.

While many transnational education providers in other education hubs focus on business, computer science, and engineering programs, the institutions in Uzbekistan offer a diverse range of subjects that are relevant to the nation's economic development, such as energy (oil, gas, and nuclear industries), medicine, chemical technology, pharmaceutical science, computer science and digital transformation, teacher education, agriculture, and international relations.

Promising Future
All stakeholders must currently be satisfied with how Uzbekistan's transnational education sector is developing. It is widely believed that higher education quality has already improved, and the new institutions have contributed considerably to the increased

Stephen Wilkins is a professor of strategy and marketing at The British University in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. E-mail: stephen.wilkins@buid.ac.ae.

Bobir Muratov is a doctoral researcher at the National Higher Education Research Institute, Universiti Sains Malaysia, and former administrator at Inha University in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. E-mail: bobir. muratov@student.usm.my.

higher education participation rate, which reached 42 percent in 2023. It may be still early to say, but it is encouraging that no foreign provider has yet failed. Uzbekistan is well-positioned to serve as a regional education hub for Central Asia. With tuition fees that are considerably lower than international levels, it is likely that the number of international students coming to Uzbekistan will increase significantly over the next decade. However, since there is still plenty of unsatisfied demand from domestic students, institutions have not yet turned their attention to recruiting international students. ◀

It may be still early to say, but it is encouraging that no foreign provider has yet failed.

27

A Case for Better Articulating the Value of Expanding Higher Education

Vivienne Stern and Ed Castell

As participation in higher education grows, we continue to hear the argument from certain corners that too many people go to university. In the United Kingdom, prime minister Rishi Sunak made the point in a statement to party members. It is a point often made by those who went to university themselves, and by those who aspire for their own children to access the benefits higher education affords.

Despite this rhetoric, the appetite for higher levels of education does not seem to diminish. The United Kingdom has one of the highest tertiary attainment rates in the OECD but is not alone in seeking to increase its share. As more countries move towards "mass" higher education systems, we have a responsibility to regularly reexamine the evidence to check that our assertions on the value of continued expansion still ring true.

Here—with a focus on the UK system—we lay out a simple argument: the expansion of higher education has been an unequivocally good thing; it has been necessary for both economic and equity reasons. However, it may be time to rethink how we measure value. The narrow view of employment outcomes and earnings does not paint the full picture. If we are to continue to make the case for expansion, we must deepen others' understanding of the multiplicity of benefits to the individual and the wider world.

This article will still only scratch the surface of higher education's wider value. We do not, for example, explore the impact of world-changing research and development, or the community and global cohesion our institutions foster.

Higher Levels of Education Are Good for the Individual

The OECD's *Education at a Glance* tells us that 86 percent of adults with tertiary education are employed compared to 77 percent with upper secondary education. They are also likely to earn more than people without a degree: adults in the OECD with a bachelor degree earn on average 43 percent more than those with an upper secondary qualification. Other studies have shown that graduates enjoy nonfinancial benefits too, including better health and longer life expectancy.

Higher Levels of Education Benefit the Government Purse

It is not just the individual who benefits. In the United Kingdom, on average, the treasury makes a considerable profit on each graduate. In 2020, the Institute for Fiscal Studies found that each graduate has a lifetime exchequer return (i.e., the net they give back

Abstract
Across the world, more people are being educated to a higher level. Yet, in some mass higher education systems—including the United Kingdom—criticisms are being leveled at the expansion of higher education. To advocate for continued expansion, we must deepen our own and decision-makers' understanding of the breadth of benefit to the individual, to the wider economy, and to equity of opportunity.

As participation in higher education grows, we continue to hear the argument from certain corners that too many people go to university.

28

to the taxpayer due to higher earnings, minus how much the public purse "spends" on them) of GBP 110,000 for men, and GBP 30,000 for women.

Because graduates are more likely to be employed than nongraduates, they also call less on state support—for instance, data shows that 15 years after key stage 4 (usually completed by age 16) just 2 percent of graduates receive out-of-work benefits, compared to 11 percent of nongraduates. Better health, a greater propensity to volunteer, and the intergenerational effect of graduate parents supporting children who do better at school all have a quantifiable benefit to the country.

Graduates Benefit the Wider Economy

Beyond that, it is also clear that higher rates of participation benefit the economy. Research by the United Kingdom's department for education shows that skills and labor have been the only factor making a persistent and positive contribution to productivity in the last few years.

There is evidence that continued higher education expansion is needed to meet the needs of the evolving labor market. A recent study predicted that the United Kingdom will need more than 11 million extra graduates by 2035, and that 88 percent of new jobs will be at graduate level. This imperative to meet skill needs is not unique to the United Kingdom; there is evidence that the workforce within lower-income countries is more likely to be undereducated, so increasing educational attainment is more urgent.

But the future labor market is an unpredictable thing, especially in the age of artificial intelligence. It is a fair bet that it is the kind of transversal skills—creativity, the ability to work in teams, critical thinking, and perhaps above all, the ability to learn and adapt—that will position the graduates of today for the workplace of tomorrow.

Higher Education Expansion Drives Equitable Opportunity

Despite the evident wider benefits of higher education, the value of our system is increasingly judged solely by the perceived individual return of investment—i.e., the graduate salary premium. This is an understandable obsession. The student finance system differs across the United Kingdom, but in England it was conceived as a system in which the costs of supporting higher education were shared by the individual and the state. It was a copayment system, in which the state effectively underwrites the individual risk of going to university. It says: we want you to go to university because we need more people to be educated to a higher level. But if it does not work out, if you take a career break to have children, or take a job which pays less but may have high social value, we will pick up a bigger part of the tab. This is achieved through the combination of (recently much reduced) grants to universities to cover part of the cost, and individual loans, repaid contingent on income and eventually written-off if unpaid.

After the financial crash in 2008, the balance changed dramatically towards the individual shouldering a higher proportion of the cost. Today, the United Kingdom has one of the highest proportions of higher education funded by private households in the OECD. So, it is understandable that with the debt burden to the individual, the perceived return on investment is the focus.

The Unfinished Business of Massification

However, if the whole country benefits in a variety of ways from increased participation, is it time to think differently about using graduate premium as the primary measure of value? We should do a better job of quantifying the benefits of higher employment, better health, satisfaction, public and community service, equity of opportunity, and all of the other nonfinancial benefits of expanded participation. We should count the national economic benefits of participation and the contribution to productivity, as well as the economic benefits to the individual. Surely, a better balance of understanding the public and private benefits of expanded participation is needed.

If we do not grasp this, we risk losing the argument. We must clearly articulate why investment in higher education should be a priority, including in countries moving towards massification—not just to expand individual opportunity, but for its multiplicity of benefits.

Vivienne Stern MBE is chief executive of Universities UK. E-mail: vivienne.stern@universitiesuk.ac.uk.

Ed Castell is head of insight and strategy at Universities UK. E-mail: ed.castell@universitiesuk.ac.uk.

Internationalization in European Higher Education: New Data from the Frontlines

Laura E. Rumbley and Jody Hoekstra-Selten

What can some 2800 international higher education professionals, working in 46 different countries, answering several dozen questions about their roles, their employing institutions/organizations, and their personal and professional interests, tell us about internationalization in Europe today? Quite a bit, it turns out, thanks to the recently completed third edition of the EAIE Barometer, a survey exercise conducted by the European Association for International Education (EAIE).

This major data collection effort, which was first undertaken in 2015 and then again in 2018, sheds light on the realities of internationalization in higher education across the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), specifically from the vantage point of individuals operating on the frontlines of this work. Amongst other key insights, this significant body of data gives important indications of how professionals across Europe in the field today feel about their working lives, what they think about different aspects of their employing institution's/organization's approaches and performance with respect to internationalization, and how they view the effects of national and European-level actors on this work. Taken together, the data offers compelling indications of positivity as well as signals that further conversation is warranted to better align stakeholder interests and move internationalization agendas meaningfully forward.

Abstract
New research from the European Association for International Education—the EAIE Barometer, third edition (2024)—captures perspectives on the state of internationalization across the European Higher Education Area from the viewpoint of frontline professionals working in this field. Drawing on more than 2800 responses from 46 EHEA countries, insights are provided into matters of job satisfaction, institutional approaches and performance, and the perceived influence of national and European-level actors on internationalization.

29

Individual Experiences

The 2024 EAIE Barometer data gives ample evidence of job satisfaction among international higher education professionals in Europe. Strong percentages express satisfaction with their overall job/role/position (91 percent), the sense of purpose their job gives them (89 percent), the feeling of being valued by their employer (72 percent) and work-life balance (68 percent). Levels of satisfaction with salary or compensation are less robust, with a solid 40 percent indicating they are either unsatisfied (30 percent) or very unsatisfied (10 percent).

Despite concerns in relation to salary/compensation, a strong 79 percent indicate they plan to continue working in the field of international higher education in the coming three years, and most (65 percent) expect to remain at their same institution/organization during this timeframe.

While there are strong signs of job satisfaction and stability across this workforce, there are also indications of fluctuations and challenges. Job changes for many respondents in the last several years are apparent in the fact, while just 28 percent indicate they have only been working in the field of international higher education for a total of five years or fewer, more than half of respondents (53 percent) report that they have worked in their current positions for five years or fewer. Furthermore, a strong proportion of 81 percent perceive that their job now requires more time/effort, new/different skills or both, as compared to three years ago.

As many individuals change jobs or perceive evolutions in what is expected of their roles, it is perhaps not surprising that a full 84 percent—across all levels of experience—indicate a significant or moderate need for training/professional development opportunities related to the current role. Addressing the widespread perceived need for professional development in the international higher education sector is a key takeaway from this research.

Despite concerns in relation to salary/compensation, a strong 79 percent indicate they plan to continue working in the field of international higher education in the coming three years.

Institutional Realities

Several interesting insights emerge from the survey questions focused on institutional matters. For example, the 2024 Barometer exercise clearly highlights a trend away from reliance on situating responsibility for internationalization within a single central office or team. In the first iteration of the Barometer survey in 2015, 51 percent of respondents indicated that this was the organizational approach at their institution. This figure dropped to 35 percent in the second edition of the Barometer survey in 2018 and has fallen further to 24 percent in 2024.

Although satisfaction levels for these arrangements were not measured in 2015 and 2018, in 2024, 58 percent of respondents indicate they are either very satisfied or satisfied with how responsibilities for internationalization are organized and 63 percent are confident in the leadership for internationalization at their institution/organization. Just over half (56 percent) of respondents agree that their institution has a clearly defined set of goals for internationalization, and a robust 79 percent agree that their institution's goals are achievable.

The "glass half full" perspective on these findings points to enthusiasm and positivity for institutional leadership, organization, and direction. At the same time, the fact that 37 percent of respondents feel their institution does not have a clearly defined set of goals for internationalization, and 31 percent are not confident in the leadership guiding this work forward should not be easily discounted by institutional leaders or policy makers.

National and European-level Dynamics

In the European context, national governments and regional actors, such as the European Commission, have important steering and funding roles to play in higher education, with significant implications for internationalization policy and practice. The 2024 EAIE Barometer data reflect this reality but also signals shifts that beg for additional analysis.

In this vein, it is quite interesting to note what could be a "softening" in national and European-level influence over time. This is reflected in the fact that in 2024, 58 percent of respondents signaled that national authorities are either highly influential or influential in driving their institution's internationalization goals, as compared to the 68 percent in 2015 who indicated that the national policy level was (highly) influential on the internationalization policy at their institutions. A similar drop was seen in 2024 in respondents' perceptions of European-level authorities' influence (53 percent influential or highly influential) versus 66 percent in 2015.

Unpacking the reasons behind the apparent waning of influence of these key actors in relation to internationalization deserves further attention.

Many Insights, Multiple Realities, Meaningful Stakes

Internationalization, whether considered in the narrower context of the European Union or in the wider arena of the European Higher Education Area, is understood to be a key ingredient in the mid- to longer-term strategies for the region that are focused on economic, political and social vitality. Developing workforces, fostering economic performance, shoring up democratic processes, competing and collaborating globally—many of these aspirations can be linked to higher education systems and institutions whose work is elevated through different aspects of internationalization policy and practice.

The individual professionals operating on international higher education's frontlines in Europe have much to tell us about how this work is proceeding. There is room for both optimism and ongoing critical reflection. ◢

Laura E. Rumbley is director for knowledge development and research at the European Association for International Education (EAIE), Amsterdam, the Netherlands. E-mail: rumbley@eaei.org. X: @laura_rumbley

Jody Hoekstra-Selten is knowledge development officer at the European Association for International Education (EAIE). E-mail: hoekstra-selten@eaie.org.

Exploring Possible Futures of Transnational Cooperation of European Universities to Enhance Resilience

Anna-Lena Claeys-Kulik and Thomas Jørgensen

Abstract
The article explores possible futures of transnational cooperation of European universities outlining drivers of change and four forecasts developed in the context of the European University Association's project "Universities and the Future of Europe" (UniFE). It makes a pledge for using foresight and futures thinking in combination with strategic decision-making to enhance the resilience of universities in times of uncertainty and accelerated change.

31

The sense that we are living in uncertain times with accelerated change at various levels is widespread. War, economic instability, artificial intelligence, migration and refugees, political polarization and democratic backsliding—and above all climate change and the sustainability challenge—are driving change for universities, for Europe and for the world.

In such times, it is particularly important to take a step back from the daily hustle and bustle and think about the future strategically, using tools that spark the imagination, that help to envisage possible futures, prepare for different possibilities, and enhance resilience. In such times, certain paradigms are challenged, and we may need to find new ways of relating to and working with changing circumstances. This way, we can imagine and define new narratives of a future beyond the current multiple crises.

During the past years, the European University Association (EUA) has conducted an exercise to look at the implications of long-term trends for European universities, as well as imagining possible futures on the basis of these trends. The outcomes are distilled in the report "What If? Exploring Possible Futures of Transnational Cooperation for Europe's Universities." It explores likely influences on the future of university cooperation in Europe in the next decade, and analyses drivers of change in six dimensions: political, economic, societal, technological, legal, and environmental. The report outlines four forecasts of possible futures for transnational university cooperation.

The focus of the work has been on transnational cooperation. This has long been a key feature of Europe's university landscape, including bilateral student exchange, small scale projects, research collaboration, and, more recently, deep strategic cooperation in the transnational alliances fostered by the European Universities Initiative. Cooperation across borders is part of the strength of the sector and is driving excellence and innovation. However, various crises and trends are impacting university cooperation and making it more complex. Therefore, it is important for universities to look at the future of transnational cooperation and work with different possible scenarios.

Four Possible and Imaginative Futures for University Cooperation

The report explores concrete situations: what if the international office closes because nationalist politics have made it irrelevant? Or to the contrary, how might a university rector handle the announcement of an ever-increasing influx of international students in a scenario where national student numbers are decreasing due to rapid demographic decline?

The report outlines four forecasts to describe possible futures for transnational cooperation between European universities: growth, constraint, collapse, and transformation. The analysis was inspired by the methodology of the Institute for the Future in Palo Alto, California.

Growth

International cooperation continues to grow as a key area of activity for universities. One important long-term trend here is demographic decline in Europe, and political strategies using immigration to keep local communities alive. Universities thrive on the

influx of international students, but communication to the wider community is delicate, as not everyone is comfortable with the influx of foreigners.

Constraint
Geopolitical division prompts European policy makers to limit universities' international ties. The European Union has enlarged eastwards and is a global power, so it uses academic cooperation as a carrot as well as a stick to further its international interests. Universities here try to follow shifting political agendas to seize opportunities and limit risks.

Collapse
In this scenario, a nationalist government has moved to force universities to "preserve the historic cultural composition of our territories," and clamped down on international cooperation. Moreover, an environmental disaster has made flight travel prohibitively expensive. In this environment, transnational cooperation ceases as a strategic activity.

Transformation
European Union member states respond to geopolitical, economic, and demographic pressures by pooling competences and resources. University alliances grow into superuniversities in a single market for higher education within an enlarged European Union. This creates a distribution of labor in a two-tier system where smaller, national universities serve local communities and do not have access to EU research funds.

Forecasts as Tools for Reflection
These forecasts are intended as neither accurate predictions nor normative recommendations. They are tools for reflection and creative thinking, extrapolated from the drivers of change and intended to inspire discussion. All European universities would benefit from making futures thinking and strategic foresight methodologies part of their planning.

Doing so means first examining data and evidence; there are large and obvious trends that have the potential to upend universities' activities. However, there is a need to be precise about what are the facts and what is interpretation: demographic decline is factual, but terms like "populism" are normatively loaded and need to be defined more precisely to be constructively applied to forecasts. Rigor is needed to get forecasts and scenarios right. They need to be grounded in evidence of emerging trends, but bold enough to spark discussions and provoke new insights. Examining trends should be sober and factual, but not a straitjacket that blocks creative and agile thinking, leading to bold assumptions, lightly held.

Backcasting: From Vision to Strategy
As a second step, the forecasts and scenarios can then be analyzed looking at the impact they would have on universities. From there a picture of a preferred future, a vision can be put together. Following that a backcasting exercise can start to identify what needs to be done in the present to shape the future in a positive direction. Building forecasts for the future should deepen these exercises and imagine new types of outcomes and action. This is where using these methodologies has added value: to take participants out of their comfort zone and enable them to articulate new visions and actions.

Policy Development: From Foresight to Action
To achieve lasting impact, foresight must go hand-in-hand with strategic decision-making, in universities and at the policy level. This is why in combination with the foresight report, EUA has released policy messages that call for a renewed social contract for Europe and its universities. Here, the association lays out how universities and policy makers can work together to shape a strong, open and future-proof Europe: pointing to the importance of the governance of research and higher education at the European level, but first and foremost underlining the importance of universities contributing to society with their own voice and values, without being instrumentalized by external policy agendas.

One point that has received most attention in the "renewed contract" is the call for a "university check," so that European Union regulation, for example in the digital field,

Geopolitical division prompts European policy makers to limit universities' international ties.

Anna-Lena Claeys-Kulik is deputy director for policy coordination and foresight at the European University Association (EUA). E-mail: anna.lena.kulik@eua.eu. X: @AnnaLenaKulik

does not have unintended negative impact on universities. The attention to this specific issue could be a sign that higher education institutions are more integrated in society than in the past, with the consequence that regulation outside university walls have immediate impact: privacy rules have consequences for student data practices, and regulation of online platforms on repositories for open science and open education. This is a new frontier for the future of universities. ◀

Thomas Jørgensen is director for policy coordination and foresight at the European University Association (EUA). E-mail: thomas. jorgensen@eua.eu.
X: @Thomas_E_Jorgen

Javier Milei's Argentina: What Lies Beneath His View on Higher Education?

Marcelo Rabossi

Marked by rampant inflation that in 2023 alone soared to 211.4 percent, along with a poverty threshold set at 40.1 percent, Argentines sought radical change. Thus, it could be argued that Javier Milei's advent to the Argentine presidency, as an economist who gained notoriety in mass media by offering unorthodox advice to end inflation and poverty in the country, could be an act of frustration after decades of economic stagnation and impoverishment rather than a decision based solely on conviction and rationality.

Political Weakness and Aimless Thinking in Education
In 2021, Javier Milei founded "La Libertad Avanza" (LLA, translated as "Freedom Advances"), a coalition of small political parties aligned with libertarianism. Two years later, he became Argentina's new president. This skyrocketed rise is marked by a certain weakness, since LLA is a minority in both legislative chambers, forcing them to continuously negotiate with the opposition. Regarding education, Milei took office without any leading experts in the area at his side. Consequently, during the first month of his administration, technical teams whose members were not necessarily aligned with Milei's far-right libertarianism started to be formed. This could suggest the turn education could take during his tenure.

Milei and the Clash with Reality
During his presidential campaign, Javier Milei was in favor of financing education through a voucher system. However, it is ironic that his own secretary of education had questioned such a source of funding, even before his appointment. Another peculiarity of the presidential campaign refers to the introduction of fees at national universities. In short, this meant axing free access to undergraduate education. Argentina has 67 public universities, attended by almost 2.2 million students (80 percent of the total in the system). National universities charged tuition for undergraduate education only during relatively short periods of time. The first period was from 1980 to 1983, during the military dictatorship in Argentina. The second was from 1995 to 2015, during the Menem administration and the Kirchners' three administrations, when each university was given the choice to decide independently. Since 1949, Argentina has granted free access to undergraduate education. Such a decision was reaffirmed by the end of 2015, with the amendment of an article in the higher education law enacted in 1995. It is worth mentioning that between 1995 and 2015, very few universities chose to charge tuition fees, which evidences a cultural resentment toward higher education privatization.

Abstract
The arrival of Javier Milei, an admirer of libertarian theorists such as Murray Rothbard or Friedrich Hayek, to the presidency of Argentina raises endless questions. For example, whether his almost exclusively economistic free-market views will be able to provide answers to the current educational crisis, with four out of 10 university entrants dropping out during the first year. Likewise, will his privatizing vision affect the public financing of the scientific system and national universities?

Although president Milei later made clear that the policy of tuition fees would not be enforced in the short term, a bill introduced to congress proposes charging nonresident foreign students. At the time of writing this article, it is still uncertain whether such a bill would pass in both chambers. Still, universities could refuse to comply with it due to their status as autonomous entities. National universities usually rebel, which shows the power struggle between the state and higher education institutions.

Another change that would indirectly affect higher education is crystalized in the notion of implementing high school exit exams. Since 1983, with only a few exceptions, admission to national universities has been free and does not require any sort of entry examinations, although many institutions require mandatory remedial courses during the first year. There has been a public discussion about the necessity of such exams for university admissions. The current negotiations in congress with the opposition have made clear that it will not be the case, and that admission will remain free.

Another change that would indirectly affect higher education is crystalized in the notion of implementing high school exit exams.

Argentina Unquestionably Calls for Change to Get Development Goals Back on Track

Although Milei insists that the ever-increasing state intervention in the people's economic and private affairs is what accounts for the country's impoverishment, such a view is rather simplistic. The underlying issue is not the size of the state but rather whether the government has sufficient funding resources to finance itself, and if the funds available are properly and efficiently allocated to ensure the provision of public goods like justice, health, and education, when the markets fail to provide appropriate answers. Reality for Argentina proves otherwise. Spending more than what it gets through taxation, Argentina needs constant financing for its deficits by printing money, which causes inflation. Also, the creation of 23 national universities over a 16-year period (2007–2023), many of them without any strategic logic and based solely on political reasons, reveals that irrationality prevailed for a long time.

Massive Budget Cuts and Threat to the Public University System

With the aim of reducing the fiscal deficit by means of a shock strategy, during the first two months the new government implemented a policy of unprecedented cuts to public expenditure. In fact, according to the data from the budget office of the national congress, state transfers to national universities only during January 2024 suffered a real drop of 16.5 percent. Likewise, there has been a reduction in the offer of scholarships for students. This has led some universities to declare that if the current reduction of funds continues, they will only be able to remain open for no more than four months. Moreover, some have begun to reduce the number of students admitted. Such is the case of the National Universities of Quilmes, General Sarmiento, and Hurlingham, for example. This blunt budget cut to the public university system has led to a general strike of teachers during mid-March 2024, caused by a nearly 50 percent plummet in their real salaries from December 2023 to March 2024.

Along the same lines, the current government's commitment to reduce public spending at all costs is demonstrated by the suspension of the opening of five new national universities declared by an act of congress in September 2023. According to the government, the objective will be to determine whether all the administrative procedures were duly observed. The fact remains that many institutions created during the last 15 years are seen as a response to political rather than real needs.

Conclusions

On one hand, it is a positive sign that president Milei has welcomed concrete proposals to discuss and ponder Argentina's future, and the role of universities in a new development agenda. On the other hand, his obsession with reducing public spending without considering the needs of the most vulnerable inhabitants could fan the flames of social conflict. Likewise, further reduction of the already meager funds allocated to research and development—Argentina only invests 0.6 percent of its GDP—means putting the country's future development at risk, although it is true that there is a need to rationalize spending based on a strategic view of money allocation. In any case, it is to be expected that a serious and dialogue-oriented opposition in congress on the one

hand, and the society with its conservative views on the public role and relevance of education on the other hand, would keep the new government from leading the country toward extreme radicalization, oblivious of the social role of the state. ◀

Marcelo Rabossi is a full-time professor at the School of Government, Area of Education, at the Torcuato Di Tella University, Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: mrabossi@utdt.edu.

Russian Higher Education Under the War: Back toward Zero Agency

Maria Yudkevich

35

Abstract
This article briefly describes the changes that the Russian higher education system experiences in curriculum, research, and internationalization at universities in war time. The state's decisions mainly take form in terms of changing normative documents and rules, and changing the directions and volumes of state funding of education and science.

More than two years have passed since February 2022 when Russia started a full-scale war of aggression against Ukraine. Immediately after the start of the invasion, the international academic community wondered what kind of reactions Russian universities would and should have. It was commonly expected that universities would condemn the war. However, while there were (and still are) many faculty and student voices against the war, at the level of organizations it never happened. On the contrary, it became clear that Russian universities are not independent organizations that build their own dialogue with the state. They are part of the state system, and under the new war conditions, fundamental changes are taking place in and around the system. The main forms these changes take are in terms of changing normative documents and rules, and changing the directions and volumes of state funding of education and science. What dynamics and changes do we see? We will discuss them based on data by Ivan Sterligov (2023).

Brain Drain
The education system is facing severe brain drain. It is still difficult to talk about precise empirical estimates, but the system has lost quite a few faculty and researchers in all disciplines and of all academic ranks, from people in the early stages of their academic careers to senior faculty who have left their privileged positions. Some of this brain drain is due to people intentionally wanting to leave (and, among other things, seeking academic employment abroad) because of disagreement with the country's actions and/or university policies, and some is due to layoffs or nonrenewal of contracts from the university side. There is much evidence on the political reasons for many of these layoff decisions. So-called "foreign agents" (a discriminatory and humiliating label imposed by the authorities on quite a few public intellectuals and academics) are not allowed to teach in educational institutions. Most of the international faculty and researchers from European countries and the United States left the country, too. This brain drain not only negatively impacts the quality of higher education and research but also its embeddedness in the international academic community.

The education system is facing severe brain drain.

Transformation of Curriculum
In spring 2022, Russia ceased to be a member of the Bologna system. This change means loss of transparency and comparability of educational programs, abandonment of uniform educational standards, and a significant reduction in broader educational opportunities for students and teachers.

There are changes in the content of education at all levels. Curricula of individual courses are being adjusted. Some topics and readings from social science and humanity

courses are excluded from the programs. New courses related to the ideological training of students are being introduced. For example, as of the 2023-2024 academic year, the course "Fundamentals of Russian Statehood" is a compulsory part of undergraduate curricula in all higher education institutions in the country.

In addition to curricular changes, there are changes in the structure of training. Thus, the "4+2" structure is being revised. While the standard classical bachelor degree is still there, there are also plans to return to the system of general higher education (with four to six years of training, depending on the area) which existed in the Soviet period. Such an experiment is now underway in several pilot universities, and it will be further expanded. According to these plans, master programs will not remain available in all universities, and not for all disciplines.

Shifts in Research Agenda
Today, priority funding is given to research areas related to the development of the country's socioeconomic system, strengthening of sovereignty/autonomy, and development of essential technologies. Science in Russia is mainly funded by the state, so to make changes in the general research agenda, it is enough to simply change the volume, distribution, and conditions of funding.

Social sciences in Russia are particularly under attack. Research on a whole range of topics falls into the category of undesirable, not to say forbidden, and falls under strict censorship. In some universities, even information about faculty publications on some topics is being removed from universities' official web pages.

Back to Isolation?
Opportunities for researchers who want to remain part of global science are narrowing. Not only because of rapidly growing censorship, but also because of the expanding isolation coming from within the country and from the global academic community. Since the start of the full-scale war, there has been a massive breakdown in contacts. All this has contributed to a decline in international collaboration and its formal indicators. For example, the number of journal articles from Moscow State University coauthored with researchers from abroad decreased by 20 percent from 2021 to 2023, and from Saint Petersburg State University by 15 percent. While the number of copublications with China increased, the number of joint Nature Index publications between Russia- and US-based researchers dropped by 50 percent in the same period.

There is a shift away from publications in international peer-review journals indexed in Web of Science and Scopus as a core indicator for research evaluation at Russian universities. At the same time, a number of international journals actually pursue a discriminatory policy toward researchers with Russian affiliations, sometimes at the journal level, sometimes at the level of individual editors. As a result, for all reasons, the number of publications in international journals exhibits a noticeable downward trend. For example, the number of publications in Elsevier journals decreased by 16 percent from 2021 to 2023, and similar dynamics can be observed for other major publishers. In 2023, we see a 40 percent reduction in the number of publications in Nature Index in the country as a whole, compared to 2021. The only one that exhibits a 50 percent increase is the set of open access MDPI journals of rather controversial standing.

University Governance and Academic Freedom
Increasingly, individual organizations are being deprived of their agency. To assure loyalty, there was a wave of changes of university rectors, which was done top-down without the approval and sometimes against the faculty's opinion.

The "5-100" excellence program ended in 2020. The former focus on international inclusion and the formation of several world-class universities is being replaced by a focus on coordination at the state level regarding the role of individual universities in addressing the country's priorities. The new Priority 2030 program, which has replaced the "5-100" initiative, aims at totally different goals and objectives. As the program documents state, it is launched "to concentrate resources to ensure the contribution of Russian universities to the achievement of the national development goals of the Russian Federation for the period until 2030." More than 100 universities are now participating in

it (compared to 21 participants in the "5-100" program), with smaller funding but much stricter control and constraints.

It is a common understanding that Russian universities have lost all of their academic freedoms. But the events of recent years show that in fact, there was never institutionally protected academic freedom in Russian higher education. There was no agreement between the state and universities that would have ensured this freedom, so everything that could have once been attributed to manifestations of freedom was a temporary lack of interest on the part of the state. The high degree of centralization and regulation by the state, the dominance of state funding, short faculty contracts (which can easily be terminated), the possibility of quickly changing the rules of allocation of funding for universities—all this leads to the fact that when the state's priorities change, a new model of the higher education system takes shape very quickly. ◢

Maria Yudkevich is associate professor at the faculty of education, Haifa University, Israel, former vice-rector at HSE University, Moscow, Russia, and author of 'Higher Education in Russia,' John Hopkins University Press, 2023.
E-mail: 2yudkevich@gmail.com.

Exile as an Institutional Response to Authoritarian Interference

Carly O'Connell and Kyle Long

In August 2021, as Kabul fell to the Taliban, administrators of the American University of Afghanistan (AUAF) burned sensitive documents to protect staff and students. The Taliban would target anyone associated with this private university partially funded by the United States government, because it championed free expression, pluralistic ideas, and gender equality. Fortunately, that was not the end of AUAF. The government of Qatar invited the university to reopen in Doha, where it now serves Afghan students in person and online. AUAF has joined the small but growing cohort of institutions operating as universities in exile around the world. In the past 20 years, at least five universities in different parts of the world have gone into exile.

How are they able to survive abroad when so many universities impacted by war and strife either succumb to new regimes or shutter? What does it even mean to be a university in exile? We define a university in exile as a higher education institution (HEI) physically displaced under duress that resumes academic activities elsewhere yet maintains a strong commitment to the national or cultural community it originally served. We hope contributing to a better understanding of this phenomenon can guide HEIs facing similar challenges in the future, encourage interventions and collaborations to reduce the dangers of exile, and generate further research on this emerging and important aspect of higher education in the modern world.

In today's increasingly volatile world order—one more and more hostile to democratic institutions—political leaders seek to exert more control over higher education. University exile occurs amid these broader geopolitical conditions. Of the cases we examine, two come from post-Soviet countries rebounding towards authoritarianism after a period of relative liberalism, another comes from a country invaded by its neighbor, and two more emerged from countries whose governments were overthrown by internal military groups.

Universities in Exile

European Humanities University (EHU) and Central European University (CEU) were private institutions founded in Belarus and Czechoslovakia (later relocating to Hungary), respectively, in the early 1990s. Their purposes were to orient the next generation towards European values, liberalism, and democracy following the fall of the Soviet Union.

Abstract
This article introduces the concept of "university in exile" and situates this phenomenon in the context of rising authoritarianism around the world. The authors examine the causes and consequences of HEIs going into exile by considering five examples. They conclude that democratically-oriented HEIs with strong global partnerships are the most likely both to go into exile and to survive it, and argue that defenders of democracy around the world should support these institutions.

However, in 2004, Belarus' president and aspiring dictator Alexander Lukashenko revoked EHU's license on a legal technicality after university leadership refused to succumb to governmental control. Likewise, Hungarian autocrat Viktor Orbán ousted CEU in 2018 in a similar manner. Shortly thereafter, the government of Lithuania invited EHU to reopen in Vilnius, where many Belarusian students can commute across the border to attend. CEU moved to Vienna, Austria, amid the COVID-19 pandemic, where it expanded its offerings to include undergraduate programs and helped found the Open Society University Network to promote open societies and access to humanities and social science education. Both universities received financial and logistical support from international organizations, the European Union, and liberal philanthropist George Soros, which helped them overcome the challenges of relocation.

Nearby in Ukraine, Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea led Russian separatist militias to overtake campuses and other infrastructure in the eastern regions of Donetsk and Luhansk. Donetsk National University was the first of 18 institutions to relocate into Ukraine's interior, with the assistance of Ukraine's ministry of education. It was renamed Vasyl Stus National University of Donetsk to pay homage to its origin while avoiding confusion with the now Russian-controlled former campus. With its new lease on life, Vasyl Stus National University committed to disseminating information about the Russian incursion, advocating for Ukrainian sovereignty, and highlighting the role higher education can play in advancing world peace.

The American University of Afghanistan was also physically overrun, in this case by Taliban insurgents in 2021. In addition to support from the governments of Qatar and the United States, online learning technology advanced by the pandemic has helped it maintain cohesion with its global diaspora of students and staff. A partnership with Bard College in New York ensures its diplomas remain relevant and internationally recognized. 2021 also saw a military coup in Myanmar endanger that country's academic community. A long history of student participation in civil protest rendered academics persona non grata to the country's military leaders. After the last coup, Parami University, a private nonprofit HEI founded in 2017, elected to move entirely online to preserve safety and maintain its values of diversity and critical thinking. Bard College and Open Society University Network were instrumental to its transition.

Preserving Democratic Ideals

These examples show that a critical factor precipitating a university's displacement is a liberal democratic orientation amid mounting nationalism. However, the qualities of a steadfast mission promoting academic freedom and strong connections to international partners are also what allow institutions to successfully move to a new location when remaining becomes untenable.

Universities in exile do more than provide continuity of teaching, learning, and research. They keep hope alive for the future among those with marginalized national identities aligned with democratic values. Instances of institutional exile have risen over the past 20 years, and we can reasonably expect this phenomenon to continue. It is therefore imperative that allies of democracy around the world proactively develop strategies for response. The Open Society University Network has emerged as a key organization. But other defenders of democracy in government, academia, and the non-profit sector should supplement their work by considering key questions such as how can diplomatic interventions upstream mitigate such extreme measures? What role should governments play in strengthening democracy in other nations? And to what extent should universities in exile orient themselves back towards their home countries with the hope to return?

Universities in exile provide value to both their original and host communities. For example, AUAF enables Afghan students to continue learning in safety, whether in Qatar, remotely (and secretly) from Afghanistan, or elsewhere amid the global diaspora. AUAF preserves networks of Afghan intellectuals and connects them to supporters around the world. It lays the groundwork for an eventual return to Afghanistan. Should the day ever come, AUAF will be poised to contribute to rebuilding the nation's educational infrastructure. Meanwhile, AUAF brings diverse perspectives and bright minds to Qatar. In turn, Qatar's generosity in providing a home for AUAF raises the country's image in the eyes of the democratic world. Supporting universities pressured into exile is a key way for the global higher education community to fight back against rising authoritarianism.

Carly O'Connell is the partnerships & communications analyst at the Institute of International Education Scholar Rescue Fund, United States. E-mail: coconnell@iie.org. X: @CarlyOC56

Kyle Long is professorial lecturer in the department of educational leadership at The George Washington University, United States. E-mail: kylelong@gwu.edu.

The views expressed in this work are the authors' own and do not represent the Institute of International Education or the IIE Scholar Rescue Fund.

Our Global Reach

Published since 1995 by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), *International Higher Education* (*IHE*) is the world's oldest continuously published source of news and analysis of global higher education. Our mission is to provide insightful, informed, and high-quality commentary and analysis on trends and issues of importance to higher education systems, institutions, and stakeholders around the world.

As such, since our establishment, IHE has aimed to be globally representative, both in terms of the topics covered and the authors represented. Our contributors are drawn from a broad network of distinguished international scholars, policy makers, and leaders, who are well positioned to offer critical perspectives on key issues and trends that shape higher education worldwide.

The *IHE* editorial team is also committed to the principle of linguistic diversity. As a result, content from *IHE* is translated into Arabic, Chinese, Portuguese, Spanish and Vietnamese by partners in Brazil, Chile, China, Qatar and Vietnam.

IHE is distributed all over the world to individual subscribers based in over 100 countries and via partnerships with the International Association of Universities (IAU), the Association of Indian Universities (AIU), the Association of African Universities (AAU), and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

CIHE and *IHE* partner with international publications, including *Taleem: The Arabic and English Higher Education Journal*, published by the Qatar Foundation; the Journal of International Higher Education, published by the School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University; and Educación Superior en América Latina (ESAL), published by a consortium of partners in Brazil, Chile, and Colombia.

39

www.internationalhighereducation.net