

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

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through *International Higher Education*, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, Russian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at www.bc.edu/cihe.

International Issues

- 2 Nix the BRICs: At Least for the Higher Education Debate
Philip G. Altbach and Roberta Malee Bassett
- 5 Affirmative Action Initiatives Around the World
Laura Dudley Jenkins and Michele S. Moses
- 6 Economic and Noneconomic Benefits in Low-Income Countries
Rebecca Schendel, Tristan McCowan, and Moses Oketch

Mobility and Internationalization

- 8 World Economies and the Distribution of Branch Campuses
Li Zhang, Kevin Kinser, and Yunyu Shi
- 9 International Visiting Scholars: Brain Circulation and Internationalization
Yukiko Shimmi
- 11 Global Student Mobility: The Changing Landscape
Philip G. Altbach and David Engberg
- 14 Graduate Student Learning Abroad: Emerging Trend?
John M. Dirkx, Kristin Janka Millar, Brett Berquist, and Gina Vizvary

History and Contemporary Universities

- 15 Introduction: Historical Perspective on Contemporary Issues
Adam Nelson
- 16 Research Universities in Brazil: 1930 and 2030
Renato H. L. Pedrosa
- 17 Long Road Ahead: Modernizing China's Universities
Yang Rui
- 19 Foreign Influence, Nationalism, and the Modern Chinese Universities
Shen Wenqin

Countries and Regions

- 21 The Problem with Public University Salaries in Kenya
Ishmael I. Munene
- 22 Privatization of Australian Higher Education
Anthony Welch
- 24 Chile's Universities: Reasons for Success
Juan Ugarte
- 25 Experimental Colleges in China
Qiang Zha and Quibo Yang
- 27 Israel: Access to Higher Education
Iris Ben-David and Yaakov Iram

Departments

- 28 New Publications
- 31 News of the Center

Nix the BRICs—At Least for the Higher Education Debate

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND ROBERTA MALEE BASSETT

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, USA. Roberta Malee Bassett is Senior Education Specialist, Europe and Central Asia Region, The World Bank. E-mail: rbassett@worldbank.org. This article also appears in the October 2014 issue of Change.

Though the BRIC concept has become almost trite in encompassing the new economic power brokers—that Brazil, Russia, India, and China seem to represent—the concept of this bloc is actually of little relevance in understanding the complex higher education environment in these or other emerging economic powers. Indeed, the BRIC collective is itself a marketing artifice, identified a dozen years ago by former Goldman Sachs economist, Jim O’Neill, as much for its clear and basic imagery as with any actual commonalities among these particular countries. We posit here that higher education research, at least, needs to step back and take a new and different look at the BRICs. We do not think that the four countries actually have a lot in common, and it makes little analytic sense to discuss them together. Indeed, in an article in *Times Higher Education* (December 5, 2013), O’Neil has shifted his focus to the MINTs (Mexico, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Turkey). He sees MINTs as demographically poised for economic success for a number of reasons, which now contrast the experiences of the BRICs, including population aging. The MINT populations are growing and relatively balanced, while the BRICs, with the exception of India, have older populations less well suited for rapid economic expansion in the coming decades.

Our argument here is simple. Looking at the BRIC countries—Brazil, Russia, China, and India—might make some arguable sense in terms of economic development, and grouping them for analytical purposes in higher education is simply not relevant. Further, a capital “S” was added to the original BRICs in 2010 to admit South Africa into the grouping, further weakening the links among this multinational bloc, although O’Neill did not include that country. South Africa is so much smaller than the other BRIC nations—with an economy significantly smaller than the other four.

VARIATIONS BUT FEW THEMES

In vitally relevant and comparative respects, the four BRIC nations differ greatly from each other across the spectrum of higher education measurement norms. The four use dif-

ferent languages, come from different academic traditions (with some similarities between China and Russia), have had quite different academic strategies, and have no history of academic cooperation or competition. Neither students nor professors from these countries mingle much. Two of the four, China and Russia, focus on breaking into the “world-class” league tables, and Russia is only now beginning its efforts. India trails far behind.

Two of the four, China and India, are major “sending” countries in terms of international students, with China alone accounting for 17 percent of the world’s overseas student population. Students from these two countries go mainly to the major English-speaking universities. Brazil, which only recently began a major overseas scholarship program, focuses more on Europe; and Russia is not a significant player.

China, alone among the four, has a significant national strategy to build world-class elite research universities and has invested heavily and with considerable success. It has been effective in building an effective differentiated academic system that serves a range of national needs and student populations. Particularly important now, China has the world’s largest student population, with 24 percent of its age cohort enrolled in postsecondary education, similar to the gross enrollment rate of Brazil, which is approximately 25 percent. Unlike China, with its politically power-

We posit here that higher education research, at least, needs to step back and take a new and different look at the BRICs.

ful and embedded strategy for higher education expansion, India has had no higher education strategy, per se, although the recently promulgated 12th Five Year Plan articulates elements of a policy. The country has no highly ranked universities, and there is general agreement in India that the quality of the entire system is poor.

Russia has permitted its higher education system to deteriorate dramatically in the decade following the collapse of the Soviet Union and is only now starting to rebuild the system and focus on the research university sector. Brazil also lacks a coherent strategy, and the national government seemingly has little interest in improving the quality of the system as a whole. One Brazilian state, São Paulo, has invested heavily in its higher education sector and, as a result, has several of the best universities in Latin America, though none yet considered among the best in the world.

CHINA AND RUSSIA: SIMILAR CHALLENGES

While neither Russia nor China look carefully at one another for examples of good practice—or common problems, in fact—both share many similar characteristics. China's post-1949 higher education system was largely copied from the Soviet model, with the emergence of many small specialized institutions linked to government ministries and a separation of research from teaching by delineating research as an activity mainly for the Academy of Science institutions and not for universities. The Soviet model, for the most part, did not benefit either country, in separating the training and education benefit of conducting research from the vast majority of students and teachers. At least, before its dissolution, the Soviet Union, at least, could claim a few top-ranking academy institutions and some universities.

In the immediate aftermath of the 1991 collapse of the Soviet system, however, higher education and research were drastically decoupled and underfunded, resulting in many top scientists leaving the country, and severely weakening the academic system. China's higher education development after 1949 was similarly unimpressive. The Cultural Revolution, which began in 1966 on Mao Tse-tung's orders, closed down all of higher education for a decade, basically destroying the system; and the intellectuals needed to sustain academic viability for any country.

China began to rebuild its higher education and research infrastructure in the 1980s, largely looking to Western, and especially to American, models. Massive resources were, and continue to be, put into the system, resulting in the development of some 100 research universities, with a dozen or so approaching world-class status. Russia did not promote such levels of investment in its higher education sector during this same period, causing a marked differentiation in global status of its higher education sector from that of China. In the past decade, however, the Russian government has developed several key initiatives, such as the creation of federal "flagship" universities and most recently a program to provide additional support to a group of 17 competitively selected universities, with the goal of having some of them enter the top 100 universities in the global rankings by 2020.

Using the Soviet model, both countries relied predominantly on the institutes of the Academy of Science for much of their research. Thus, the universities were largely excluded from research mission. For various reasons, including the integration of research into teaching and learning and economies of scale for the best use of the most talented academic staff, this model no longer works very well; but both countries have found it difficult to achieve reforms in this area, often due to the conservative nature of academic staff and the limited capacity of university facilities to absorb research initiatives. Moreover, academic salaries are quite low

in both countries—at the bottom of a group of 28 countries recently analyzed. These low salaries make it difficult to recruit bright young people to the academic profession and make it necessary for many to hold more than one job.

Both Russia and China have paid little attention to the nonelite segments of their higher education systems, with the result that quality tends to be low. Both countries rely on the questionable system of admitting the best-qualified students—as determined by one-off high stakes examinations—to universities based on a state allocation of seats at low or free tuition levels, then filling out their classrooms with students who are not as well qualified but who pay a much higher tuition—thus helping to balance the budget but creating quality variations and other inefficiencies in the system.

While neither Russia nor China look carefully at one another for examples of good practice—or common problems, in fact—both share many similar characteristics.

BRAZIL: FOR-PROFITS AND PROVINCIALISM

Like much of Latin America, more than 80 percent of Brazilian postsecondary students attend private institutions, most of which are for-profit and of variable quality. Similar to the almost regressive admission and financing policies in China and Russia, the top students in Brazil choose to go to public universities, where tuition is free and entry standards frequently quite high. Thus, students from wealthy families, which can afford private secondary schools and coaching classes, get access to the best and least expensive higher education, while lower socioeconomic status students pay more for lower quality. Further, Brazil has paid little attention to building high-quality universities or competing globally, often attributing this gap in global or regional recognition on the language barriers caused by working—teaching, conducting research, and publishing—in Portuguese. The lack of English-language publications, in particular, is a barrier for China and Russia, as well, in this regard. An exception to this generalization is São Paulo, Brazil's richest state, with several of Latin America's top research universities.

INDIA SLOWLY EMERGING

There is much debate in India concerning the country's "demographic dividend"—a large population of young and

potentially highly productive people failing to be properly educated or prepared for a 21st century globally engaged economy by a poor quality and inadequate higher education establishment. It is universally agreed that the overall quality of India's universities and colleges is poor, and this is reflected by the fact that few Indian institutions appear in any of the league tables and none are highly ranked. India's governmental authorities, at both the state and central levels, have invested comparatively little in higher education, and there has been no strategy for harnessing higher education to development goals. India has the potential advantage of using English as the medium of instruction for more than half of the higher education system, but the country has no internationalization strategy.

BRIC REALITIES

There are some realities that are shared by at least some of the BRIC nations, although the details vary and there are few, if any, common strategies in place or even suggested. Among these are:

- All of the BRIC countries have serious problems of internal university management and governance. None has a pattern of shared governance that most deem necessary for academic success, particularly for research universities. Internal governance tends to be highly bureaucratic and very often rather inefficient.

- Public universities in the BRIC countries are subject to often rigid government control, leaving little scope for institutional autonomy or creativity. Politics often enters into academic decisions—in China often ideological in nature, while in India, Russia, and Brazil politics may be linked to local issues or particular political agendas.

- The academic profession faces significant challenges. In China and Russia, salaries are extraordinarily low for most, while a few top researchers are able to obtain decent remuneration. Plagiarism and other misconduct remains a concern.

- Equity of access and success in each of these countries is problematic, as few resources are focused on providing students from lower socioeconomic groups, rural areas, or other underrepresented group avenues for achievement in higher education. Moreover, the regressive nature of dual-track enrollments and high-stakes entry examinations ensure that the elites will continue to reap the rewards of the higher education sector—at little or no cost—while forcing poorer students and those with less access to quality secondary education to subsidize the elites, through taxation and the paying of tuition and fees.

A DISCUSSION OF REALITIES

Without doubt, the four BRIC countries are important players globally. All are large countries with considerable higher

education capacity. China has achieved much, and the other three have considerable potential and some important successes. All, except Russia, have rapidly expanding higher education systems and face challenges of serving a larger proportion of their young people.

Yet, in fact, there is little in common among them. Indeed, each of these four countries has emerged from significantly different pasts—politically, socially, and economically—and face rather different current realities. It is not evident that their challenges are in any significant way common. Indeed, it is possible that by grouping these countries together, we do a disservice to each by envisioning common realities that are unrealistic and not helpful to solving the genuine and different challenges faced by each. So far, each of these countries has looked in different directions for insights and is developing different responses to their current challenges—with a common thread that, perhaps with the exception of Brazil, all have looked to the major mainly English-speaking academic systems.

We question, then, the utility and validity of talking about the BRICs in understanding the comparative realities of global higher education. Does the concept shed light on the higher education experience of other emerging economies? Not really. Do they offer any collective insights unique from what can be learned in other country contexts?

India's governmental authorities, at both the state and central levels, have invested comparatively little in higher education, and there has been no strategy for harnessing higher education to development goals.

Again, not really. Chile, Mexico, Korea, Nigeria, Poland, and others are all countries with important higher education reform histories that provide useful comparative contexts for understanding what has been done and what might work for others.

We wonder if this focus on the BRICs gives credence to an idea of a bloc experience that is not supported by each country's individual reality. So, we posit here, that perhaps it is time to stop talking about the BRIC bloc as if there is anything significant in common among them. We should start anew with thinking about shared experiences and different approaches to higher education that can expand our thinking about what is possible for higher education to serve emerging and developing economies to the best of

its abilities. (This article has appeared in *Change* and is reprinted here with permission). ■

Affirmative Action Initiatives Around the World

LAURA DUDLEY JENKINS AND MICHELE S. MOSES

Laura Dudley Jenkins is associate professor of political science at the University of Cincinnati. E-mail: Laura.Jenkins@uc.edu. Michele S. Moses is professor of educational foundations, policy, and practice, at the University of Colorado Boulder. E-mail: michele.moses@colorado.edu. Additional discussion can be found in L. D. Jenkins and M. S. Moses, eds. Affirmative Action Matters: Creating Opportunities for Students Around the World (New York: Routledge, 2014).

Is affirmative action in higher education on its way out? If you take a global perspective, the answer is “no.” In April 2014, the US Supreme Court’s decision in *Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action* reinforced a common perception that affirmative action will not be around for much longer. *Schuette* makes it even more difficult for some American colleges and universities to engage in affirmative action by affirming the constitutionality of state ballot initiatives that ban affirmative action programs. Yet about one quarter of the countries of the world have some form of affirmative action in student admissions into higher education, and many of these programs have emerged over the last 25 years.

This is just one of the findings drawn from a new country-by-country database on affirmative action for students in higher education worldwide. Three significant patterns emerge from these data. First, as noted above, affirmative action policies have expanded globally in the last quarter century. A second finding is the salience of gender. Gender is the most prominent demographic category used for eligibility for affirmative action, rivaling race, ethnicity, and class/income. A third trend is that institutions of higher education and governments have been experimenting with race-neutral affirmative action policies or multifaceted notions of disadvantage, in response to legislative threats, legal challenges, or social criticism.

COUNTRIES THAT HAVE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

About one quarter of nations across the world use some form of affirmative action for student admissions into higher education. Although these policies go by many names—affirmative action, reservations, alternative ac-

cess, positive discrimination—all are efforts to increase the numbers of underrepresented students in higher education. Various institutions or governments on six continents (Africa, Asia, Australia/Oceania, Europe, North America, and South America) have programs to expand admissions of nondominant groups on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity, class, geography, or type of high school.

Several combine these categories. These combinations show that policies to offset racism or other forms of xenophobia can complement policies to fight economic disadvantages. Although some nations—such as India, Tanzania, and the United States—have had affirmative action policies and programs for a longer time period, most programs for students in higher education started in the 1990s or 2000s.

GENDER A POPULAR POLICY TARGET

Another finding is the popularity of policies targeting women. These policies may get less attention in some cases than those targeting underrepresented racial or ethnic groups, but they increasingly dominate the affirmative action landscape. Programs that started more recently are more likely to include women. Even more countries have programs to advance schooling for girls. More countries have gender-conscious affirmative action than any other type of policy target. When women are overrepresented in colleges and universities, some of these affirmative action policies are specific to certain fields in which women remain underrepresented.

About one quarter of the countries of the world have some form of affirmative action in student admissions into higher education, and many of these programs have emerged over the last 25 years.

The next most popular foci for affirmative action efforts are ethnicity (including policies organized by ethno-regions) and class (which is also sometimes conceptualized by residence, namely areas determined to be underprivileged). Less prevalent are policies based on race or disability, and rarest of all are caste-based policies, although their implementation in India means that the population of students eligible for caste-based affirmative action is substantial.

BEYOND RACE

Programs in several countries target multiple forms of social inequality and avoid solely race-conscious policies. Brazilian affirmative action is race-conscious but also includes other students considered to be disadvantaged, such as graduates of government secondary schools or students with low-family income. Even South Africa, only free from apartheid for two decades, has some alternate access programs that have begun admitting disadvantaged white students, and other admissions programs consider a range of socioeconomic indicators related to housing, schooling, and family circumstances.

Some policies attempt to combine poverty with other indicators of disadvantage to select students, such as French policies prioritizing and recruiting from low-income neighborhoods or schools, based in ZEPs (*Zones d'Education Prioritaire*, or priority education areas). An inverse strategy to achieve similar ends excludes the wealthy, as in India's policy of skimming the economic "creamy layer" of more prosperous individuals from eligibility for reserved seats for the groups officially designated as "Other Backward Classes"—a category that already combines both caste- and class-conscious criteria. Israel has successfully integrated ethnicity/nationality and socioeconomic status as targets of affirmative action programs aimed at diversifying selective higher education institutions. Admissions categories focus on the structural challenges students face based on living in disadvantaged neighborhoods and attending low-quality secondary schools.

IMPLICATIONS

What are the implications of these international policy examples for countering social inequality in higher education? Affirmative action is not a comprehensive solution for poverty or discrimination, but systems of higher education can provide more equitable chances for impoverished or underrepresented students to attend selective colleges and universities. Indices, zones, and other measures are not replacing the role of race, ethnicity, or gender in well-designed affirmative action programs but are increasingly combined with these categories.

So long as past or present racism, casteism, sexism, or other barriers shape opportunities in a particular society, equity policies can be better designed to reflect and counteract the way multiple forms of disadvantage intersect in the lives of students. Whether motivated by a desire to increase access, expand diversity, or simply recalibrate existing policies in response to court rulings or state referenda, administrators and policymakers should look abroad for ideas. Affirmative action is alive and well—and indeed increasing—around the world. ■

The Economic and Non-economic Benefits of Tertiary Education in Low-income Contexts

REBECCA SCHENDEL, TRISTAN MCCOWAN, AND MOSES OKETCH

*Rebecca Schendel is lecturer in Education & International Development, Tristan McCowan is senior lecturer in Education & International Development, and Moses Oketch is reader in Education & International Development at the Institute of Education, University of London. E-mails: r.schendel@ioe.ac.uk; t.mccowan@ioe.ac.uk; m.oketch@ioe.ac.uk. Material for this article comes from: Oketch, McCowan, and Schendel, *The Impact of Tertiary Education on Development: A Rigorous Literature Review*. Download the full review at: <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/195887/>.*

There have been debates around the social impact of tertiary education in developing countries for decades. In the late 1980s, a series of studies commissioned by the World Bank seemed to indicate that, in developing contexts, investment in tertiary education would yield a much lower social return than that in lower levels of education. In contexts where primary education was scarce and illiteracy was rampant, there was a clear economic argument for prioritizing basic education to fuel economic growth. These economic arguments were also supported by social justice concerns that emphasized the ways in which university admissions processes disadvantaged marginalized groups. In contexts where only a small proportion of the population reaches university, advocates for prioritizing funding for primary education have long argued that public support for higher education is likely to perpetuate socioeconomic divisions within society. Although these concerns were valid in many contexts, the unfortunate result was a reduction in both international aid and domestic funding for tertiary education in many low-income contexts, a decision that triggered a "crisis of quality" across the sector.

However, shifts in the nature of production associated with globalization and the rise of the "knowledge economy," as well as increasing demand as a result of expanding primary and secondary enrollment, have redirected international attention to the importance of tertiary education in development. Development agencies and national governments are now considering renewing their financial commitment to tertiary education; and, as a result, the question of impact has returned to the discourse. In line with these developments, the Institute of Education, University

of London, was recently commissioned by the UK Department for International Development to complete a rigorous review of the evidence of how tertiary education impacts development in lower-income contexts. Although the findings of the review may not always be surprising for those working in the field of international higher education, a number of important social functions of the university have been highlighted that have not been sufficiently emphasized in debates around public funding for tertiary education in the developing world.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

In terms of the economic benefits of tertiary education, the review yielded some significant and, in some ways, unexpected findings. The most robust finding was the clear impact that tertiary education appears to have on the individual earnings of graduates. Although this may appear an obvious point, there has not always been a strong relationship between higher education and higher earnings in low-income contexts. However, the findings of the review suggest that, as increasing numbers of young people access lower levels of education, the earnings of higher education graduates have also increased. The review also yielded important evidence of the impact of higher education on economic growth (typically measured as per capita gross domestic product). Given the mixed evidence in the literature around the respective contribution of different levels of education to economic growth, there is clear link between the proportion of individuals with higher education and growth; and some studies suggest that tertiary education may have a greater impact on growth than lower levels.

NONECONOMIC BENEFITS

In addition to economic benefits, the review also highlighted the substantial noneconomic benefits that tertiary education contributes to society. Although the evidence is limited, what exists clearly demonstrates that tertiary education has a positive effect on individual graduate capabilities in a range of different areas—including political participation, health and nutrition, and women's empowerment. The review also identified a number of studies that demonstrate how tertiary education strengthens institutions—such as civil society organizations, governments, and public services—and positively impacts social norms and attitudes toward concepts such as democracy and environmental protection.

GAPS IN THE EVIDENCE

Overall, the review exposed a significant lack of robust empirical evidence of impact in less-resourced contexts. Although there is a lot of literature that discusses impact,

much of it is normative. From an initial list of nearly 7,000 titles, only 99 studies were included in the final synthesis. Within the existing literature, the body of evidence relating to the economic benefits of tertiary education is substantially larger than that relating to the noneconomic benefits. More research is clearly needed into the ways in which tertiary education contributes to human development in low-income contexts beyond measures of economic growth.

There is also a clear gap in the evidence around the ways in which different conditions affect impact. While many studies investigate the way that tertiary institutions and systems function, very few consider how the manner in which institutions function impacts development. For example, there is little evidence of how public versus private provision—or how particular models of curricu-

These economic arguments were also supported by social justice concerns that emphasized the ways in which university admissions processes disadvantaged marginalized groups.

lum or modes of delivery (e.g., distance education versus face-to-face)—influence developmental outcomes. There is also little evidence of the impact of changes in other mediating conditions, such as the nature of the job market or the policy environment. Without evidence of how different conditions affect development outcomes, external agencies and national governments run the risk of supporting interventions and reforms that may not ultimately make a positive contribution. Conditions likely to act as barriers to impact include: insufficient primary and secondary education; low quality of teaching and research; limited academic freedom; and inequality of access and opportunities within the tertiary sector. As these conditions are often the norm in low-income contexts, the lack of impact observed in some of the included studies is likely to be the result of such barriers. A supplementary overview of studies assessing interventions funded by external agencies suggests that the most frequent intervention models do not directly address the principal barriers to impact. This finding carries significant implications for reform efforts across the developing world.

In recent years, widespread interest in revitalizing tertiary institutions in low-income contexts has been expressed. This interest has largely been inspired by the notion that tertiary education can be an “engine of development” and reflects an understanding that circumstances are

changing in many lower-income contexts. As increasing numbers of young people complete primary and secondary education—and as the youth population surges across the globe—tertiary education is positioned as being crucial for economic development. This review supports such assertions. However, it also highlights the diverse noneconomic benefits that should also be acknowledged and considered in the development of policy. ■

World Economies and the Distribution of International Branch Campuses

LI ZHANG, KEVIN KINSER, AND YUNYU SHI

Li Zhang is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies and research assistant for the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at the State University of New York at Albany. E-mail: lzhang6@albany.edu. Kevin Kinser is associate professor and chair of the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies and co-director of C-BERT at the State University of New York at Albany. E-mail: kkinser@albany.edu. Yunyu (Stephanie) Shi is a visiting scholar in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies and researcher for C-BERT at State University of New York at Albany. E-mail: stephaniesyy@hotmail.com.

The international branch campus has become a symbol of higher education internationalization in recent years. Perhaps because the dominant exporting countries have been the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia, many people assume that the higher education export flows from developed countries to developing countries, in a West-to-East fashion. However, using data from the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at the University at Albany, State University of New York alongside an economic framework provided by the World Economic Forum, we look at the distribution of international branch campuses around the world. There are distinct patterns between host and home countries and the interests countries have for establishing international branch campuses are connected to economic competitiveness.

WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM'S GLOBAL COMPETITIVE INDEX

Since its development in 2004, the World Economic Forum's global competitive index has been widely used to measure and compare countries' productivity and economic prosperity. It uses 12 competitive index measures, to cat-

egorize countries into three types of economies. The index measures are designed to describe economic competitiveness in a country more accurately than the controversial categories of developing or emerging countries.

The first four pillars—institutions, infrastructure, macroeconomic environment, and health and primary education—create *factor-driven* economies. Fifty-eight countries belong to this category where they use low wages and natural resources for competitive advantage. A second category of 53 *efficiency-driven* economies are determined by six different pillars: higher education and training, good-market efficiency, labor-market efficiency, financial market efficiency, technology readiness, and market size. These countries compete through the development of a skilled workforce and increased product quality. Finally, *innovation-driven* economies rely on the two pillars of business sophistication and innovation, to boost their economic development. Thirty-six countries are innovation-driven economies that have advanced production processes and the capacity to create unique products.

Since higher education competitiveness is one indicator of a country's economic competitiveness, the former usually reflects the latter, but that is not always the case. For instance, Bahrain is listed as an innovation-driven economy, but its higher education competitiveness is ranked 53rd among the 147 countries. Barbados, Estonia, Lithuania, Costa Rica, Poland, Chile, and Latvia are efficiency-driven economies, but their higher education competitiveness is on par with that of innovation-driven economies. In the same vein, Saudi Arabia, Brunei, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Venezuela, and Armenia are factor-driven economies with more competitive higher education than many efficiency-driven economies.

INTERNATIONAL BRANCH CAMPUSES

C-BERT has identified 201 international branch campuses in operation worldwide. Using the World Economic Forum framework, we grouped these campuses into 9 categories based on the classification of the home and host countries, as either factor-, efficiency-, or innovation-driven economies.

There are a total of 12 international branch campuses established by 5 factor-driven economies—including India, Iran, Pakistan, Philippines, and Venezuela. All the factor-driven economies establish their branch campuses in innovation-driven economies, rather than factor-driven or efficiency-driven economies. United Arab Emirates (UAE) is the biggest importer, hosting eight of such international branch campuses, while India becomes the biggest factor-driven exporting economy, having 9 branch campuses worldwide, mainly in UAE.

Seven efficiency-driven economies have opened a total of 21 international branch campuses. These countries include China, Malaysia, Russia, Chile, Mexico, Lebanon, and Estonia. Unlike the factor-driven economies, such campuses from efficiency-driven economies are roughly evenly distributed among the three types of economies: 7 branch campuses are established in factor-driven economies, 8 in efficiency-driven economies, and 6 in innovation-driven economies. It is noteworthy that these efficiency-driven economies tend to establish the campuses in their neighboring countries or within the same region. For example, Russia has branch campuses in Armenia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, and Tajikistan, which were

Since its development in 2004, the World Economic Forum's global competitive index has been widely used to measure and compare countries' productivity and economic prosperity.

part of the former Soviet Union. When neighboring countries have a less-competitive higher education sector and share similar culture and language, they are less risky as hosts compared to more far-flung locations.

The majority of international branch campuses, however, are established by innovation-driven economies: 168 out of a total of 201 such campuses worldwide. The innovation driven economies of the United States, United Kingdom, France, and Australia are the biggest exporters of higher education. United States alone has 77 branch campuses worldwide, more than the number established by the United Kingdom, France, and Australia combined. Only 11 of these international branch campuses are established in factor-driven economies, while 66 are established in efficiency-driven economies and 91 are established among innovation-driven economies. Among these branch campuses worldwide, export from innovation economy to innovation economy is therefore the most common form of them.

The United Arab Emirates, Singapore, and Qatar are the major innovation economies that host international branch campuses. These three countries aspire to become regional hubs by providing preferential policies for foreign institutions. China and Malaysia are the major efficiency-driven economies that import higher education from innovation countries. The Chinese government encourages

the "bring in" of foreign education in order to improve its own higher education quality and plans to host another 5 to 10 international branch campuses in the following decade. Malaysia aspires to become a regional hub by inviting foreign institutions to open branch campuses in hubs at Iskandar and Kuala Lumpur Education City.

CONCLUSION

Our focus here is not on specific countries and their interests in the international branch campuses phenomenon, but the patterns suggested by this worldwide distribution under the World Economic Forum framework. The analysis presents a picture of institutional mobility, different from an outdated model that presumes flows are predominately from developed to developing countries. The majority of international branch campuses have been established between innovation-driven economies, as well as some factor-driven and efficiency-driven economies extending their presence into innovation-driven economies. It is important to understand the myriad of reasons why emerging economies welcome such campuses, and how this might reflect national development agendas. Unmet demand for education and an emphasis on building a competitive workforce are often combined with regulatory incentives that encourage foreign investment in the direct provision of education. The multinational university may reflect the innovation economy's dominant entrepreneurial response to this scenario. ■

International Visiting Scholars: Brain-Circulation and Internationalization

YUKIKO SHIMMI

Yukiko Shimmi is an assistant professor at the Graduate School of Law at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, Japan. She recently received her doctorate from Boston College. Her doctoral dissertation is focused on the experiences of Japanese visiting scholars in the United States. E-mail: yshimmi@gmail.com.

International visiting scholars are scientists and professors who attend universities in other countries to engage temporarily in research or teaching, while also maintaining their affiliation and position at their home universities and returning after their visiting period ends. They usually have doctoral degrees or are professionally trained. Unlike international students, visiting scholars come and leave at

their own schedules. The length of their visits varies, ranging from several months to a few years. While some visit by themselves, others travel with their family members. Some are junior academics, while others are senior professors. Their previous international academic experiences also may vary. Despite the fact that there are large numbers of visiting scholars globally, they have received only limited attention.

Since international visiting scholars usually do not have specific obligations at their host universities, they are very flexible regarding their activities during the visits.

The application procedures and the fees to become visiting scholars vary between institutions, departments, and even between academic programs. Some universities offer programs that provide events, seminars, and other support for international visiting scholars, while other universities provide close to no services. International visiting scholars often rely on one or more funding sources, including their home and host institutions, governmental or private grants, fellowships, or scholarships; they sometimes also use their own savings to supplement their income, while living abroad. Due to the variances in scholars' backgrounds and situations, the experiences of international visiting scholars can be quite different for several ones.

Though some countries or individual fellowship programs report the number of visiting scholars, most countries do not report any information on the number of visiting scholars. In fact, UNESCO and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development do not report data, regarding the number of international scholars in their annual reports. As for the trend of international visiting scholars in the United States, it is useful to understand the differences and trends of the three categories of J-1 exchange visitor visas in the United States: professors and research scholars are each allowed to stay for six months to five years, and short-term scholars are allowed to stay for less than six months. While this broader group of scholars on J-1 visas does not precisely match the characteristics of the group I—studied with academic afflictions, this data provides a trend of the group of people who largely overlaps the population of international visiting scholars.

The Institute of International Education reported in 2011 that there were 1,369 professors, 26,370 researchers, and 18,106 short-term scholars on a J-1 visa in 2009

in the United States. Chinese visiting scholars were the largest group in all three categories, and this number has dramatically increased recently. India also moderately increased numbers of scholars during the same time period. On the other hand, most other leading countries in sending J-1 scholars—including South Korea, Japan, Germany, Italy, France, Brazil, and Spain—decreased numbers of research scholars, while increasing the number of short-term scholars. Though there are some differences by country of origin, a trend seems to be that the number of short-term visits is increasing in relation to that of long-term visits.

FLEXIBILITY: OPPORTUNITIES OR CHALLENGES?

Since international visiting scholars usually do not have specific obligations at their host universities, they are very flexible regarding their activities during the visits. They can enjoy the opportunities at the host universities by utilizing their physical presence to use library resources, audit courses, participate in seminars, and interact scholars and students. While many of them use their time to engage in their individual research, some might participate in collaborative research projects with scholars at the host universities. They can also be involved in teaching activities at the host universities or work on institutional relations between the home and host universities.

While to a great extent scholars can decide on what activities they want to engage in during their visits, the lack of structure might be challenging to some of them. Scholars must take initiative in actively seeking out opportunities at host universities; otherwise, they likely will underutilize the opportunities. They can easily feel isolated from the community of the host university, unless they consciously try to interact with other scholars. Although there is institutional support for international visiting scholars to promote interactions with other scholars and students at some universities, these arrangements often rely on individual scholars. Finding opportunities for interaction can be especially challenging for scholars who have not had previous international academic experiences or existing networks with scholars at host universities, as well as for those who are not comfortable using the native language of the host country. This issue can be especially relevant for scholars in humanities and social sciences who do not work in labs that allow scholars to see other members on a daily basis.

BRAIN CIRCULATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION

The importance of studying and serving this population can be discussed from the perspective of brain-circulation and internationalization. International visiting scholars who temporarily visit host countries, and then return to their home countries are considered one form of short-term brain circulation. Unlike brain drain or brain gain, brain

circulation emphasizes the potential benefits for both the sending and receiving countries as a consequence of the continuous and circular moves of scholars. Previous studies have discussed the benefits of short-term brain circulation, such as the development of international scholarly networks, knowledge transfer and exchange, and the addition of human capital through return mobility. In order to fully realize the potential benefits from the circular moves of the international visiting scholars, further studies and policy arrangements on the population are crucial.

From the perspective of the internationalization of higher education, international visiting scholars are relevant in some key approaches in internationalizing universities. As participants in the international scholarly exchanges at universities, they can potentially stimulate international connections of scholars at universities in other countries. They might also engage in international research collaborations during their visits. In addition, their international experiences create important learning opportunities to broaden their professional and personal perspectives. As faculty members, their international academic experiences could influence university education through their instruction and curriculum, which directly or indirectly affects the education of their students. At universities that host international visiting scholars, they can be resources for internationalization by effectively integrating themselves in the community.

From the perspective of the internationalization of higher education, international visiting scholars are relevant in some key approaches in internationalizing universities.

Although brain circulation and internationalization highlight potential uses of international visiting scholars, current institutional and national initiatives have not paid much attention to international scholar exchange—as compared with international student exchange. Although there are some governmental initiatives for international visiting scholars, such as Fulbright visiting scholar programs or the China Scholarship Council, many international visiting scholars move individually with little relevance to the institutional and national policies on the internationalization of higher education. The development of a more coordinated system of scholarly exchange through international visiting scholars will be meaningful—not only for the individual scholars but also for the institutions to enhance

the research and teaching capacities, as well as the overall internationalization of the universities. ■

Global Student Mobility: The Changing Landscape

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND DAVID ENGBERG

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. David Engberg is executive director of the Global Opportunities Group, a consulting firm. E-mail: dave@g-o-group.com. This article appeared in the New Statesman, London.

Student mobility is at the heart of higher education globalization. While massive open online courses (MOOCs), branch campuses, and education hubs may be au courant, students who cross borders to study remain the single, most-important element of internationalization. Over 4.3 million students studied abroad in 2011, more than double the number of mobile students a decade earlier. Based on the large majority for degrees, however, many stay for a semester or year of overseas experience. The flow of international students is mainly from South to North, and particularly from Asia to the main English-speaking academic powerhouses of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, although large numbers also study in France, Germany, and other countries.

Contrary to popular wisdom, the majority of these students are self-sponsored—they shoulder the entire cost of their education—often bringing large amounts of money to the major host countries and their universities. At the same time, they are costing their families and their country's balance of payments large sums. Overseas study is now big business, with the United Kingdom and the United States each earning around US\$24 billion per annum. International mobility is a significant expense for the sending countries, mainly for the students and their families and to some extent for governments.

Why do students study abroad? The reasons are manifold and include obtaining knowledge—and credentials—unavailable at home, gaining the prestige of a foreign degree, gaining access abroad when the doors may be closed at home, and, of course, emigration. For example, about 80 percent of overseas students obtaining doctoral degrees in the United States, from both China and India, do not return home immediately after graduation.

CONTEMPORARY TRENDS

There are a number of discernible trends in the world of global student mobility. Among these are:

- The commercialization of international mobility: Host countries increasingly see international students as revenue generators. The United Kingdom and Australia have been most aggressive in this respect—charging overseas students higher fees than domestic students (except for students from the Bologna countries in Britain’s case) in the hope of earning income for cash-strapped higher education systems. At least two American states, New York and Washington, and many universities, have identified foreign students as income generators. State legislators in Washington have proposed adding a 20 percent surcharge to international students’ tuition fees. At two well-known universities in the midwest United States, international students pay additional fees beyond tuition.

Contrary to popular wisdom, the majority of these students are self-sponsored—they shoulder the entire cost of their education—often bringing large amounts of money to the major host countries and their universities.

- The expansion of undergraduate mobility: Traditionally, most students studying abroad were postgraduate or professional students. These still constitute the large majority, but the biggest growth area is among undergraduate students. In the United States, international undergraduate enrollments outpaced graduate enrollments for the first time in 2011, with the gap continuing to grow.

- The ongoing commitment of Europe to student mobility: The European Union stands out globally as a region, where the mobility of students and staff is a high priority for policymakers. Notable evidence of this is the European Union’s newly launched “Erasmus+” program, with a budget of €14.7 billion, which aims to provide opportunities for over 4 million Europeans to study, train, gain work experience, and volunteer abroad, in the period 2014–2020. However, there are immense differences across Europe in terms of national-level policies, support mechanisms, and practical outcomes of student mobility initiatives. These discrepancies across the region have been exacerbated by the economic crisis of recent years, which has posed particularly difficult challenges to many European countries trying to expand, and even sustain, tertiary education mobility opportunities for their citizens.

- More diverse geographical patterns of mobility: While global mobility remains mostly a South to North phenomenon, flows have become more varied and complex. Several sending countries have become receiving nations as well. An example is Malaysia, which hosts approximately 58,000 international students and has positioned itself as an “education hub,” while at the same time 54,000 Malaysians study abroad. Singapore and Hong Kong are hubs as well. Egypt hosts students from elsewhere in the Islamic world. China, the world’s largest sending country, also hosts 77,000 international students, a significant portion of them taking advantage of government scholarships to study for free.

NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Our recent research, sponsored by the British Council and the Deutsche Akademische Austauschdienst (Germany Academic Exchange Service), looks at government-funded, outward-mobility scholarships in 11 countries—Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Vietnam. Key questions include: Why are they established? How are they administered and funded? Who participates? And what impact are they having? Preliminary results reveal both similarities and differences in approaches.

In terms of scale, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, and China have made the largest commitments. Brazil’s *Ciência sem Fronteiras* (Science Without Borders) program, launched in 2011, aims to send a total of 101,000 graduate and undergraduate students abroad, for full- and partial-degree training, by 2015.

Saudi Arabia’s King Abdullah Scholarship Program is even more ambitious. It is providing full-degree scholarships for more than 164,000 students, the majority of whom study in the United States. It is funded through 2020.

Since 2007, China has created doctoral, master’s, and bachelor’s scholarships that send approximately 11,000 students abroad each year. No end dates have been announced for these programs, meaning their numbers could dwarf the Brazil and Saudi Arabia schemes in time.

In each of the remaining countries, we are studying mobility scholarship totals that equal around 1,000 per year. India was the lone exception. Despite enrolling more than 20 million students and being the world’s third-largest tertiary education system—behind China and the United States—its national government funds just one program that sends 30 students from underrepresented groups abroad each year, to pursue master’s and doctoral studies.

When examining why countries establish study abroad scholarships, similar motivations emerged. Most common was an interest in developing expertise in key fields, mostly

science and technology related, that were either unavailable or of poor quality at the countries' own universities. This motivation was not surprising—given that, to differing degrees, all of the countries in our study are striving to improve economic growth and global competitiveness.

Another shared goal is improvement of government and education infrastructure. Indonesia and Vietnam, for example, sponsor grants that send current and prospective university educators abroad for doctoral-degree training; in both countries, few academics hold doctorates. Indonesia's SPIRIT scholarships provide study grants to government workers in 11 national agencies, with the goal of improving civic regulations and human resources. China's new master's and doctoral scholarships were developed in an effort to increase collaboration with universities abroad, contribute to improvements in teaching and research, and encourage administrative reform. In every country, government scholarships are also touted as a way to support outstanding students, advance their career prospects, and improve their communication skills, especially in English.

Who is receiving these government scholarships? Our research did not collect demographic data that would allow for a refined examination of participation by sex, age, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. In general, however, participation closely correlates with a program's goals. In China, for example, applicants for scholarships, intended to help build elite universities, must themselves be enrolled at China's top institutions. Only current government workers in Indonesia may apply for scholarships geared toward promoting civic reform. Otherwise, we found that admissions criteria are generally clear, nondiscriminatory, and merit based.

How scholarship programs are administered differs between and within countries. In some cases, they are managed by the ministry of education. In others, they are coorganized between a government office and university or an organization, such as the British Council, that is affiliated with a foreign government. A more recent and popular model, especially for large programs, is oversight by a government-affiliated nonprofit organization. For example, in the case of Kazakhstan, prior to 2005, its Ministry of Education and Science managed Bolashak, the country's flagship outward mobility scholarship but contracted with agencies from other countries—to help identifying host institutions and preparing scholarship recipients for their study experience. Following an audit revealing inefficiencies in this approach, the Center for International Programs, a joint-stock Kazakh company, was founded and today oversees day-to-day operations.

Our research revealed that governments predominately fund outward mobility scholarships themselves. Egypt and Pakistan are two exceptions. Both countries sponsor a num-

ber of small-scale awards, principally to support graduate study, but often in partnership with foreign governments or organizations that underwrite some or all of the scholarships' costs.

While government-sponsored outward mobility scholarships support only a small proportion of the world's international students, they constitute a significant source of funding. In an attempt to maximize their investment and limit brain drain, many countries now require that recipients return home to work following their studies. China, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Russia, and Vietnam, among others, have all instituted return-to-work/study requirements, with sizable penalties for breaching a contract.

When examining why countries establish study abroad scholarships, similar motivations emerged.

With 100s—sometimes 1,000s—of better-educated citizens returning home each year, outward mobility scholarships are clearly having an impact on the countries that sponsor them. Yet, assessing the impact is hard to gauge—in part because few countries have established formal procedures for measuring results, beyond counting program alumni.

Nevertheless, the fact that the number of these programs is increasing suggests that countries believe their impact exceeds their cost. If nothing else, they represent an expedient way for countries with poor or limited domestic educational opportunities to invest in areas of critical knowledge need; promote institutional reform; improve communications and connections with people and organizations abroad; and support their best and brightest. They may also be symbolically important, representing a country's overt (publicly funded) effort to engage with the global higher education and knowledge communities. This may be seen as a small-scale, yet, crucial aspect of national development strategies today.

CONCLUSION

Today, outward mobility scholarships are an increasingly common aspect of the complex and expanding globalization landscape. While the benefits of overseas study scholarships accrue directly to individuals, a private good, an increase in the number of nations deploying them implies they are also understood to be a worthy investment in the public good.

Our research indicates that, in general, outward mobility schemes do produce positive benefits at multiple levels: individual, institutional, and national. The experiences of the countries we studied also show that careful upfront analysis is needed to make smart decisions regarding goals and outcomes, important precursors to a program's form and function, and that effective administration, to include attention to return and reentry issues, is central to a program's ultimate success. In short, a complex set of factors, unique to each country, must be considered in developing a program that is successful in meeting its intended goals. ■

Graduate Student Learning Abroad: Emerging Trend?

JOHN M. DIRKX, KRISTIN JANKA MILLAR, BRETT BERQUIST, AND GINA VIZVARY

John M. Dirkx is professor, Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing. E-mail: dirkx@msu.edu. Kristin Janka Millar, director of international engagement, Honors College, Michigan State University. E-mail: kristin@msu.edu. Brett Berquist, executive director, Office of Study Abroad, Michigan State University. E-mail: berquis6@msu.edu. Gina Vizvary is a research assistant, Department of Educational Administration, Michigan State University. E-mail: vizvaryg@msu.edu.

Advances in technology, the growing diversity of our population, and the influences of globalization are precipitating dramatic changes in the policy and practice of higher education and graduate study, in particular. In the past few years there has been a steady increase in the number of graduate students engaged in studying abroad and of programs and disciplines offering these opportunities. Increasingly, higher education institutions see study abroad as an important means of internationalization. In the United States, many professional schools and graduate programs are creating international experiences that range from short-term, faculty-led programs, independent study, and research, to joint and dual degree programs. In other countries, postgraduate study abroad places more emphasis on individual approaches. Despite this increased activity, we know very little about the nature of these experiences and student learning outcomes.

DIFFERENCES IN GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE STUDY ABROAD

While similar in some respects to undergraduate study

abroad, graduate level study abroad should represent a fundamentally different experience. As adult learners, graduate students often bring years of professional work and life experience to their graduate study, and tend to be more mature than undergraduate students. The average age of a graduate student in the United States is 34 years, at least 10 years older than the typical undergraduate student. Graduate programs are typically more specialized and focused on professional disciplines—such as education, law, medicine, business, or social work. These differences have important implications for the design, facilitation, and assessment of international experiences for graduate students. So what is graduate study abroad like?

NEW RESEARCH ON GRADUATE STUDY ABROAD

A new project—the Graduate Learning Experiences and Outcomes study, led by Michigan State University—focuses on understanding the landscape of international learning opportunities offered at the graduate level. This past year an online survey was administered to 15 US research institutions in the Midwest and New York University, providing information on 172 faculty-led group experiences for graduate students. Study findings indicate that graduate and professional students participate in a diverse set of experiences, across an array of academic disciplines. Programs include a mix of students with different levels of educational preparation, with about half being restricted to students at the graduate level. These programs also tend to be less than four weeks in length and made up of 6 to 20 students. Very few programs have a foreign-language requirement for participation. Most programs are offered for academic credit and receive support from their institution's study-abroad office. By and large, students are expected to contribute some or all of the program costs; and while financial support by an organization in the host country is very rare, most programs do partner with organizations in the host country, such as health clinics and hospitals, universities, businesses, and local nonprofits.

Students participating in these programs go to 59 different countries, but, by far, China is the most frequent destination followed by France, Brazil, Germany, Italy, England, Argentina, South Africa, Japan, Ghana, and India. While in country, students stay in local hotels or other tourist accommodations, such as bed and breakfasts. They participate in a wide variety of activities, including lectures and presentations and a range of experiential activities—including community engagement, academic field trips, cultural field trips, research, service, volunteer work, group discussions, and guided observations, often augmented with “alone time” and reflective activities at the group or individual level. Faculty reported they lead programs so they can collaborate with other faculty abroad, help students prepare

for international careers, create a global presence for the university, develop global partnerships, increase the number of students going abroad, and help students challenge their perceptions. Their choice of country reflects their passion for a particular region or country.

TRENDS AND TRADE-OFFS

Graduate-level study abroad is becoming increasingly common and an important means of internationalizing higher education. As evident from the Graduate Learning Experiences and Outcomes study, in the United States, study abroad at the graduate level tends to be small groups of graduate students led by faculty for no more than three or four weeks. The short length of time in the host country shapes the types of opportunities that are possible. When programs are structured so that the group always travels together and stays in hotels or tourist lodging, the opportunity to challenge one's perspective may be limited. While this arrangement may limit immersion by participants in the host culture, it does provide a 24/7 "within group" experience that may be very powerful personally and professionally for the participating graduate students. The potential for deep learning is magnified when participants in these groups represent different disciplines and nationalities.

In the United States, many professional schools and graduate programs are creating international experiences that range from short-term, faculty-led programs, independent study, and research, to joint and dual degree programs.

FUTURE RESEARCH

But what makes study abroad a graduate-level experience? Why should graduate programs bother with creating and implementing such experiences for their students? While professional development and global learning seem laudable outcomes for these programs, they alone do not seem to set graduate study abroad apart from undergraduate study abroad. Given the numbers of programs and students becoming involved, we need to know more about what distinguishes these activities as graduate level experiences. Research is needed to understand how these experiences contribute to graduate-level preparation, and how academic content and the disciplines might influence learning out-

comes associated with these experiences. We need to know more about how growing numbers of international students participating in these programs are influencing the nature of the learning derived by all students. Finally, we need to know more about individual (versus group) experiences and international graduate study, comparatively, around the world. The individual research approach is prominent in many educational systems and we may gain valuable knowledge through learning how other countries structure such postgraduate work.

CONCLUSION

Graduate study-abroad experiences should compliment and deepen the learning that occurs within a student's graduate program. But what are the indicators of such experiences? How might we know if graduate study-abroad programs are truly achieving such outcomes or whether they are simply extensions of faculty-led short-term study-abroad programs at the undergraduate level? Given the dramatic changes on the horizon for graduate education, how might programs use international experiences to address the needs arising from these changes? Our work raises more questions than it provides answers, but hopefully these findings will provide the basis for an engaging exploration of the aims and scope of study abroad at the graduate level. ■

Introduction: Historical Perspective on Contemporary Issues

ADAM NELSON, COORDINATOR

Adam Nelson is professor of Educational Policy and History at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. E-mail: anelson@education.wisc.edu.

"In the spring of 2013, the Worldwide Universities Network (WUN) commissioned a report to help university leaders think about the future of higher education. The network asked: what would the landscape of international higher education look like a generation from now? What challenges and opportunities lay ahead for universities, especially "global" research universities? In response, I convened a group of prominent historians from around the world to consider how universities in the past responded to major historical change. Specifically, I asked each to write a brief essay—identifying a "key moment" in the internationalization of higher education: a moment, when universities

responded to new historical circumstances by reorienting their relationship with the broader world. What follows are three essays from the report. The full report can be found at <http://www.insidehighered.com//blogs/globalhighered/universities-2030-learning-past-anticipate-future#sthash.kLZr18j2.dpbs>, as well as <http://globalhighered.wordpress.com/>. ■

The Research University in Brazil: 1930 and 2030

RENATO H. L. PEDROSA

Renato H. L. Pedrosa is professor in the Department of Science and Technology Policy, Institute of Geosciences, University of Campinas, Brazil. E-mail: renato.pedrosa@ige.unicamp.br.

Brazil was one of the last countries in the Americas to develop higher education. As late as 1920, 400 years after the first Portuguese villages were founded in colonial Brazil, the country had not yet developed a comprehensive university. It was well behind other countries in the Americas—like Canada, the United States, and most of the former Spanish colonies—which had universities dating back to the colonial era. Brazil was not alone among former Portuguese colonies, though: Lusophone Africa, particularly Angola and Mozambique, had to wait until 1962 before the first universities were established; and only after independence, in the mid-1970s, those institutions actually started to develop more fully.

The first university to be established in Brazil with a clear research mission was the University of São Paulo, in 1934. In just 80 years since then, Brazil has developed a relatively large and sophisticated system of universities and other types of higher education institutions, of which about 100 are public universities (federal and state). This system is the source of most of the research performed and graduate degrees granted in Brazil, attracting growing numbers of students—from all over the Americas, from Lusophone Africa, from Europe, and from Eastern countries such as China and South Korea. The University of São Paulo itself has the largest international student body in Brazil, with over 1,300 graduate students from all over the world (2012), most of them (1,042 students) from Latin American countries, but also including groups from Angola (16 students) and Mozambique (28 students).

1930

As 1930 approached, Brazil was changing considerably, economically, and politically. Since 1889, when the political system changed to a republic, power had been shared between São Paulo, due to its role as main coffee producer and its nascent industry; and Minas Gerais, a state that had been an important political player since the colonial times, due to its mining industry (gold/minerals). By the 1920s, the Brazilian coffee industry had begun to decay, due to falling prices and international competition; and the financial markets' crisis of 1929 and its consequences had a very disrupting effect on a system already under severe stress. Those effects included a disruption of the democratic system, when the results of the 1930 presidential elections were contested and the losing coalition was the one that actually took power, at the end of that year.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SÃO PAULO IS BORN

Right after the change of government, new laws established the blueprint for future universities, putting forward rules that would determine the development of Brazilian higher education for the next 30 years. A new university was planned to be established in Rio de Janeiro (then the country's capital), with 328 legal articles that detailed the new institution including courses it would offer. The era of the relative decentralized development of higher education of the early republican period was over, for good. Brazil would now follow a centralized model, similar to those of France and Italy.

São Paulo, which by 1932 had already led a failed revolt against the federal government, calling for a new constitution (a promise of the new rulers), took a very different approach. Júlio de Mesquita Filho—publisher of the most important newspaper in São Paulo—argued that only by becoming the country's intellectual leader would the state regain its dominance. The state's governor, Armando Oliveira, was thus convinced to start a modern research university in the state's capital.

Fernando de Azevedo, who had worked earlier on a project commissioned by Mesquita about modern universities, quickly developed a plan for the new institution, and, within weeks, the University of São Paulo was founded (January, 1934). In contrast to the very detailed federal law, the new university's founding document was just 54 articles long and proposed a liberal and decentralized structure for the new institution. The first item of the second article, which established the mission of the university, is very clear: it should "promote the advancement of science by means of research." Thus, Azevedo recruited intellectuals and scientists from Europe to form the young university's faculty—among them scholars like Fernand Braudel and Claude Lévy-Strauss, who would become leaders in their

fields after World War II. Many established scientists—such as Theodosius Dobzhansky, André Weil, and Richard Feynman—stayed for various periods in the next two decades, helping establish the new institution as the leading higher education center in the country.

The *paulista* enterprise has flourished. The University of São Paulo is the top university in all rankings among Latin American universities and one of the few from that continent that appears in international rankings. Brazil has developed a large group of public universities, reformed in the 1960s with the introduction of a US-inspired graduate education model. Brazil now leads Latin American countries in research and graduate education, being 13th in the world in the number of internationally published papers, with a share of 2.6 percent of the total world output. In 1980, Brazil's share of the world's published research was just 0.2 percent, indicating how fast the system has developed in just a few decades.

The new university's founding document was just 54 articles long and proposed a liberal and decentralized structure for the new institution.

THE RESEARCH UNIVERSITY IN 2030

Now, what would be the prospects for the research university of 2030 in Brazil? Just recently, the University of São Paulo has announced that it will start to offer massive open online courses, without any restriction regarding registration. The use of the results as credits is under debate, as it is at many universities around the world. The international trend of providing courses and even full programs, using online technology, is certainly one that the research universities will have to face; and that will likely be a very common component of most *curricula* very soon.

The on-campus student will still be there in 2030, certainly. However, more and more people will develop their own program paths without having to be in residence most of the time or having to restrict themselves to a single institution. One can see graduate education expanding even more and becoming more diversified (with more programs that go beyond the traditional academic degrees—master of science/PhD), with various distinct objectives. That will go along with a less-specialized undergraduate education, another trend that will evolve from the traditional Liberal Arts/General Education curriculum, which will need to be updated and adapted to a country like Brazil but will cer-

tainly have a place here and in other emergent economies. International scientific collaboration will certainly become even more common than it already is today.

Thus, despite a few gloomy predictions, the research university is well poised to remain a central actor in educational systems, its main roles being: enabling people to develop their full intellectual potential and keeping its status as the main source of innovative basic knowledge, as it has done for at least two centuries. ■

Long Road Ahead: Modernizing Chinese Universities

YANG RUI

Yang Rui is professor at the Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: yangrui@hku.hk.

Current universities are uniquely in European origin and characteristics, spreading worldwide under conditions of imperialism and colonialism as a result of the rise in Western modern human history. Thus, universities in non-Western societies have accepted underlying Western values that may not accurately reflect their own culture and traditions. For non-Western societies, indigenizing the Western model has been an arduous task in their development of modern universities.

With strikingly different cultural roots and higher learning heritages, China's attempt to integrate Chinese and Western ideas of a university is particularly illustrative. Although China is an old civilization with extraordinarily rich traditions in higher learning, modern universities are an imported concept for China. The ancient Chinese education system was established during the Yu period (2257–2208 BCE), and China's earliest institutions of higher learning appeared in the Western Zhou Dynasty (1046–771 BCE). The famous Jixia Academy was established 20 years before the Platonic Academy in Greece.

THE LOGIC OF THE CHINESE SYSTEM

Chinese higher education was evolved according to its own logic. By and large, it focused on the knowledge of human society rather than knowledge of the natural sciences. It generally disregarded knowledge about the rest of the world and confined the dissemination of knowledge to the provincial level. China's central focus was political utility, defined by the ruling classes and it thus started its higher learning

system with a fundamentally different relationship between the state and higher education. Whereas universities in the Western world sometimes (perhaps often) clashed with state power, institutions of higher education in China were loyal servants of the emperor and the aristocracy.

The imperial examinations and the academies were key elements of ancient Chinese higher learning. Designed for recruiting bureaucrats to ensure merit-based appointment of government officials, the imperial examinations dominated Chinese higher education up to 1905. The academies, which reached their peak during the Southern Song (1127–1279), were integrated into the government school system from the Yuan to Qing dynasties (1271–1911). Under the Qing dynasty (1644–1911), their aim shifted to preparing students for the imperial examinations. Autonomy and academic freedom—the definitive scholarly values of European universities, at least by the mid-19th century—were absent in the Chinese tradition.

WESTERN IMPACT

With the international diffusion of the European model of the university after the Opium Wars (1839–1842, 1856–1860), China's institutions of higher education could have taken a lead in assimilating Western culture, science, and technology. Instead, most continued to train scholars with an encyclopedic knowledge of Confucian values but little knowledge of the outside world. Even after Western higher education models had demonstrated their strengths, China's communication with the West was largely (and intentionally) restricted in an attempt to preserve traditional culture and protect aristocratic authority.

Only gradually, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, did this scholarly isolationism give way to a new era, in which China began to experiment with Western-style universities. The central purpose of China's modern higher education has been to combine Chinese and Western elements, to "indigenize" Western models, and to bring together aspects of both philosophical heritages. Yet, such markedly different cultural roots have led to continuous conflicts between traditional Chinese and new Western ideas of the university—and of "modernity" itself.

The late 1970s marked a key moment in the internationalization of higher education in China—when the country sought deliberately to break with the past and embrace a new future. Deng Xiaoping's strategy of "groping for stones to cross the river" sought to downplay ideological differences between China and the West. As a result, traditional values in higher education were often minimized in favor of higher education's contribution to economic growth. By the 1980s, China had incorporated a series of reforms taken from foreign models—including decentralization and marketization—without exploring the ideologi-

cal foundations of these approaches. China's emphatic determination to separate the advanced knowledge of Western capitalist countries from what were still perceived as "decadent ideas" and a "bourgeois way of life" had overtones of the formula devised in Deng's early modernization efforts: "Chinese learning as the substance, Western techniques for their usefulness."

Since the 1990s, China's higher education policies have emphasized the quest for world-class universities. The Program for Education Reform and Development in China (1993), the Education Act of the People's Republic of China (1995), the 211 Project (initiated in 1995), the 985 Project (initiated in 1998), and the dramatic expansion of Chinese higher education starting from 1999 reflect a fervent desire to "catch up" with the West. This desire reflects larger changes in Chinese society, as China reforms its economy to adopt market principles. A desire for internationally competitive universities provides the impetus for China's best institutions to follow the lead of European and North American universities and embrace "international" norms. However, the notion of world-class status is imitative rather than indigenous. In striving for "international" standing, top Chinese universities compare themselves with Oxford and Yale but forget the long history of these institutions—let alone their own.

Thus, universities in non-Western societies have accepted underlying Western values that may not accurately reflect their own culture and traditions.

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES

Today, Chinese universities routinely look to the most elite Western (often American) counterparts for standards, policy innovations, and solutions to their own development problems. This is particularly the case for the most prestigious universities. For example, personnel reforms at Peking University in the mid-2000s were patterned entirely after the perceived US experience. The reformers cited Harvard and Stanford almost exclusively to legitimize their policy moves. But the grafting of American policies onto Chinese university structures has often ignored important cultural differences. The wholesale adoption of US plans was not appropriate—indeed, not possible—in a culture with strikingly different cultural values and educational traditions.

China's latest policy initiative is the Medium and Long-Term Education Reform and Development Plan (2010–

2020), approved in May 2010. The policy has prioritized technical innovation and preparedness; but, like its predecessors, it lacks what is required for a reemerging China: namely, a vision to make *cultural* preparedness an equal priority to ensure China's well-rounded future global role. Still confined to a catch-up mentality, state policy continues to stress economic development, as the primary reference point in every part of the initiative—once again, leaving knotty issues of culture and values aside.

Modern universities are layered institutions, with technical apparatus on the surface but cultural values at the core. China's repeated attempts to import Western university models has occurred mostly on the level of technical apparatus. Based on the core values of the Western model, such as academic freedom and institutional autonomy, these have rarely been understood, let alone implemented. In the present great leap forward in Chinese higher education, what is missing is attention to cultural and institutional values. If Chinese universities cannot successfully integrate Chinese and Western values, the promise of the modern university in China will be limited. The question of culture is part of a much wider and more complex process of seeking an alternative to Western globalization. To be truly "world-class," Chinese universities must find an appropriate—one might even say uniquely Chinese—way to balance indigenous and Western ideas of the university. ■

Foreign Influence, Nationalism, and the Founding of Modern Chinese Universities

SHEN WENQIN

Shen Wenqin is professor in the Graduate School of Education, at Peking University, Beijing, China. E-mail: shenwenqin@pku.edu.cn.

Historically, the development of higher education in various countries was often influenced by other countries' models. In a globalized world nowadays, policy learning between countries is very common. This article analyzes how different foreign models influenced the development of China's higher education system, during 1917–1927, and how nationalism became a driving force of this reform.

Although China has a long tradition of higher education, the first group of Chinese universities came into being around the turn of the 20th century—led by Beiyang Gongxue (1895), Nanyang Gongxue, Capital Metropolitan University (predecessor of Peking University, 1896), and Shanxi University (1902). Until 1911, these universities generally adhered to the ancient Confucian traditions of learning.

It was in the years after the Republican revolution of 1911—a movement led by Sun-Yat Sen, which toppled the two-thousand, year-old Qing Dynasty—that Chinese higher education would truly begin to change. In the postrevolutionary era, Chinese leaders would look to "modernize" Chinese higher learning.

GERMAN MODEL

Cai Yuanpei, appointed as the first minister of education for the new Republic of China in 1912, looked west for models of higher education. One of Cai's first moves was the drafting of "The Regulation of the Universities" (DaXue Ling), which outlined the modern disciplinary system in Chinese universities. Most importantly, this document made research and postgraduate education as central to the university mission.

But it was not until Cai became president of Peking University, in late 1916, that his idea of a university with a research mission would be fully realized. In 1916, the university was not small, but most students were drawn to the professions—namely law and business—and guided by a sense of "careerism." The university's faculty similarly did not value the research enterprise. Cai, in his inaugural address, sought to change this mentality, encouraging students to work hard and attend to scholarship—not careers. He proclaimed the university to be "a place to investigate advanced knowledge."

From where did Cai's intense interest in research and scholarship arise? To begin with, Cai had studied in Germany from 1907 to 1911. During this time he became familiar with the German university system and admired the German ideals of academic freedom, original research, and knowledge for its own sake. In 1917, seminars along the lines of those in German universities were founded in the division of humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Cai saw such seminars as places for "the professor and graduate students or advanced students to do research together." By 1918, 148 students (80 postgraduates and 68 senior undergraduates) participated in the seminar system.

Faculty research was another matter. In 1919, to encourage professors to engage in scientific research, Cai founded *The Journal of Peking University*, a forum for the publication of faculty research. With the addition of another academic journal, the *Chinese Social Sciences Quarterly*, in 1922, the

Peking faculty began to publish more widely. Within a few years, Peking University had come to resemble a Chinese version of Johns Hopkins University, an institution complete with research seminars, faculty governance structures, and professional journals.

AMERICAN MODEL

As more and more Chinese returned from study abroad in the United States in the 1920s, the American model also became influential. In 1918, Yanxiu and Zhang Boling, after visiting the United States and conducted a survey of American higher education, founded Nankai University—a private institution reflective of American models. From December 1919 to April 1920, a group of normal school principals and local education authorities, headed by Chen Baoquan and Yuan Xitao, visited American universities for more than five months and wrote a report on American higher education—offering suggestions for reform in China. Many other young Chinese students and scholars studied in the United States during this time, absorbing the patterns of American higher education and bringing back ideas for change in their home country. Some, including Guo Bingwen, Jiang Mengling, Hu Shi, Zhao Yuanren, and Zhu Kezhen (later president of Zhejiang University) became prominent reformers in Chinese higher education in the 1920s.

It was in the years after the Republican revolution of 1911—a movement led by Sun-Yat Sen, which toppled the two-thousand, year-old Qing Dynasty—that Chinese higher education would truly begin to change.

As a result of such transnational travel and intellectual exchange, a number of features of American higher education could be found in China by the end of the 1920s: private universities, the organization of academic work into departments, the elective curriculum for undergraduates, the credit-hour system, and the board of trustees' governance structure. Like Cai, other Chinese higher education leaders used their experience abroad to shape their own institutions in China. For instance, Guo Bingwen became the president of Southeast University in 1921, while Jiang Mengling became the executive president of Peking University in 1923. Both men received their doctoral degrees from Columbia University's Teachers College in 1914 and 1918, respectively. The influence of the American model was not

confined to these two universities. In 1929, Sun Yat-sen University set up a board of trustees that clearly borrowed from the American model.

NATIONALISM AS A DRIVING FORCE

In less than a decade, from Peking University's reform under Cai in 1917 to the founding of Sun Yat-sen University in 1924, a modern system of higher education, emphasizing research and academic freedom, had emerged in China. Why were these Chinese higher education leaders so eager to establish "modern" universities in China? One explanation is that figures like Cai Yuanpei, Jiang Mengling, Guo Bingwen, and others were all patriots: "To save the nation through education and scholarship" was their creed. For example, though they had learned from Western models, they supported a policy of reclaiming the management of China's Christian universities from foreign presidents. Making China a free, democratic, and prosperous country was the common aspiration of Chinese intellectuals of that generation. During the 1910s and 1920s, the newly established Republic of China was fragile, as warlords and political fragmentation wracked the country. These leaders were convinced that, just as the University of Berlin and other universities had made Germany into a powerful empire, so too would great Chinese universities lead China toward prosperity and freedom.

DOMESTIC TRADITION

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to suggest that modern Chinese higher education development was merely a copy of the Western model. The task of establishing a full-fledged research university was an expensive one, challenging even in times of prosperity—let alone times of political instability. Chinese reformers could only go so far in implementing Western models. For example, although Cai and other educational leaders realized that graduate education was the core of the modern university, they could not afford to establish full-graduate schools. Instead, they relied on research seminars and institutes. Similarly, because they often could not afford expensive laboratory equipment, research and study in the humanities and theoretical sciences took precedence over direct research in the physical and applied sciences.

Chinese education leaders sought to reinvigorate their country's higher education system by combining foreign and domestic ideas. For example, the Chinese Studies Center at Tsinghua University, established in 1925, made its work "adopting both the strength of modern schools and ancient Chinese Academy (Shu Yuan)." The ancient tradition of open debate and close interaction between teachers and students flourished there alongside some Western influences. The reforms between 1917 and 1927 were only

a beginning, yet they laid the foundation for the future growth of research universities in China. These years would be one of the first of many instances of Chinese educational leaders borrowing from abroad in higher education in the 20th century.

LOOKING FORWARD

Today's Chinese higher education reformers still pay close attention to higher education in other countries, yet reformers have never been able to completely cast off ancient traditions or ignore the vicissitudes of state politics. In the early 21st century, the biggest challenge for us is to establish a Chinese model of higher education and gain comparative advantage. ■

The Problem with Public University Salaries in Kenya

ISHMAEL I. MUNENE

Ishmael I. Munene is associate professor in the Educational Leadership Department, Northern Arizona University. E-mail: Ishmael.Munene@nau.edu.

The fourth faculty strike in two years, over salaries in Kenya's public universities, ended in March. If history is a guide, the truce is merely a strategic retreat before another battle. Soon drumbeats of war will be sounded for another night of long knives. The frequent high-octane skirmishes over university salaries have become toxic to the nation and disruptive to academic programs. So, what ails public university salaries in Kenya and how can the problems be ameliorated once and for all?

The discontent over university salaries stems from a triumvirate of three interrelated factors: union-initiated cost-of-living salary adjustments, merit pay, and equity. The failure by national educational authorities and the university administrators to resolve the contradictions arising from these issues only serves to amplify the stakes in salary adjustments and ensures that unions and universities are locked eternal combat. Key to resolving the incessant battle is moderating the enormous influence of Collective Bargaining Agreements in compensation enhancement in public universities.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

No doubt, trade unions play a crucial role in setting the low-

er and upper limits of university salaries. The unions have a good grasp of the macro- and micro-economic conditions, affecting the purchasing power of their member's income. The 33 percent salary and 17 percent housing-allowance increase negotiated in 2014 between the state universities and three unions—the University Academic Staff Union (representing the faculty), the Kenya University Staff Union (representing the professional staff), the Kenya Union of Domestic, Hotels Educational Institutions, Hospitals and Allied workers (representing the junior staff)—shows the dexterity of the unions in cushioning their members from the deleterious effects of inflation. Under the agreement, the most senior professors earn a consolidated monthly pay of around US\$3,300, while their junior counterparts make US\$1,757. With an average inflation rate of 12 percent and with no free public education for dependents, these salaries are barely sufficient to sustain a middle-class lifestyle for the academic staff. Even with the increase, the salaries still lag behind their counterparts in the judiciary and legislature. Twenty years ago a senior university professor, a judge, and a member of parliament earned similar monthly pay and benefits. Today, a member of parliament takes home around US\$9,400, while a judge makes US\$7,000 per month.

These across-the-board salary increases, along with the accompanying annual increases based on years of service, have exerted severe pressure on the government exchequer and university treasuries. So much so that universities diverted portions of the funds meant for payment of the new salaries toward debt clearance and facilities maintenance, thereby occasioning the latest industrial strife.

PAY FOR PERFORMANCE

While the unions have proved to be adept at reading the macro-level economic conditions, they are very poor readers of merit-pay systems in universities. Due to the stranglehold of Collective Bargaining Agreements, lecturers and professors in the same grade earn similar salaries, despite differing levels of productivity. In other words, "pay for performance" is anathema in Kenya's public university system. In a merit-based system, salary increases are also weighted on performance indicators in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and community service. The system appeals to the values of individualism, achievement, and rewards. In absence of a merit-based compensation system in Kenya today, a highly productive professor or lecturer will mainly earn the same salary as their nonproductive counterparts—longevity in rank being the only condition for annual salary increments.

To reward merit, university mandarins need to devise annual pay-for-performance salary increases weighted in accordance with teaching, scholarship, and community

engagement as per the institutional missions. Such a system will also make it possible for both the administrators and university staff to identify organizational goals that are worthy of financial reward—thereby reinforcing institutional values. In addition, merit pay moderates institutional budgetary constraints by limiting the amount of funds dedicated toward across-the-board salary increases.

MARKET PAY EQUITY

Since Kenya's universities source additional revenues from the marketplace, it is only realistic that salaries reflect the realities of the marketplace. Under Collective Bargaining Agreements, all professors and lecturers in the same rank command similar salaries irrespective of disciplinary affiliation. Professors and lecturers of medicine cost more to train, recruit, retain, and generate more research grants to the university than their counterparts in the humanities and social sciences. So why should their base pay be comparable? By infusing market-based disciplinary differentiation in the base pay for university academics, Kenyan universities will ensure that faculty retention is feasible in disciplines with high-market demand.

The discontent over university salaries stems from a triumvirate of three interrelated factors: union-initiated cost-of-living salary adjustments, merit pay, and equity.

The same policy of differentiated pay, based on institutional context, should apply for university executives. During the recent industrial fracas, vice-chancellors were reported to have illegally awarded themselves a 100 percent salary hike. Why should vice chancellors at nascent institutions—like Karatina, Kisii, and Chuka—with student population barely crossing the 2,000 mark command the same pay as leaders in complex urban universities like Kenyatta and Nairobi with student populations of 60,000 and 54,000 respectively? The dexterity and mental energies required to run the latter far outweighs the former. Policy guidance from the Commission on University Education and the state education office on vice-chancellor compensation will be invaluable in this regard.

In all, permanent ceasefire will not be possible without a democratization of budget making in the state universities. Union allegations of high-level corruption at the uni-

versities coupled with student strikes over fee increments show how opaque the university budgets have become. If universities can publicize mundane activities—like cultural shows, high profile visits, and gate openings—they can at least share budget information with their constituents as national and county governments do. They could do well to borrow from American institutions, where budgets are posted online and university presidents give annual state of the university address. Further, proposals for fee increase need to be exhaustively discussed with students before implementation. ■

Be Careful What You Wish For: Pending Privatization of Australian Higher Education

ANTHONY WELCH

Anthony Welch is professor of education at the University of Sydney, Australia. E-mail: Anthony.Welch@sydney.edu.au.

The Australian government's recent national spending audit, commissioned by the incoming federal government in advance of the mid-May Budget, opened a Pandora's box of proposals—not least in higher education. Now that the federal budget has been proclaimed, it is clear how well these ideas accord with the relevant minister's own views. While not all ideas were taken up, at least three repay closer attention: public funding of higher education, privatization, and regulation.

Minister Pyne's recent speech in London professed shock that more Australian universities were not in the top 50 worldwide, as one reason supporting a shake up in higher education. This is the kind of statement we expect from ministers of education anywhere—the Malaysian minister, among many others, has made similar noises in recent years. But in Pyne's case, the reference to the *Times Higher Education World Reputation Rankings* can only be explained as either the expression of a minister—either not familiar with the details of his portfolio or as a way of making a political point. The *Times Higher Education* rankings, of course, give substantial weight to reputation, rather than actual performance. The much more robust, reliable Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Rankings of World Universities (ARWU) shows that, while Australia has no entry in the top 50 for 2013, five universities (Melbourne, Australian Na-

tional University, Queensland, University of Western Australia, and Sydney) are all listed in the top 100. Considering the relatively small size of the system, that is a respectable result: Canada, in many ways comparable but substantially larger, only has four universities in the ARWU top 100.

AN AUSTRALIAN HARVARD?

But both the minister and treasurer want even better rankings. So what would it take to get even one of Australia's universities into the upper echelons of this illustrious list? Harvard University, for example, always first in global rankings, luxuriates in an endowment fund that peaked at US\$36 billion before the recent recession and is well on the way to reattaining it. So, it would take the combined total assets of two of Australia's wealthiest mining magnates (Gina Rinehardt, around \$18 billion) or six of its wealthiest casino moguls (James Packer, \$6 billion), for even one Australian university to compete in that league. But perhaps Australia should not hold its breath. Harvard of course is exceptionally wealthy, but other leading US institutions are not that far behind—Yale's endowment fund is valued at US\$22 billion and Princeton's at US\$17 billion. In Australia, the University of Sydney's 2013 campaign, that set a target of AU\$600 million, was Australia's largest but compares with University of Pennsylvania's US\$4.3 billion, Columbia's US\$5 billion, and Northwestern's US\$3.75 billion targets. So, if Minister Pyne's claim that he wants several Australian universities to be in the world's top 50 is to be believed, he should have recommended a vast increase in federal funding to higher education, in the recent budget.

OTHER FUNDING SOURCES

Sadly, just the opposite was true—as proposed to shift the cost burden even further onto students. The government's share of funding is scheduled to fall by 20 percent, while students will pay substantially more in fees. This is despite the fact the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) data show that Australian higher education already rates poorly, relative to other member countries, in terms of public support for higher education. Australian students already bear a higher proportion of the costs of their university education than most OECD countries, and the current proposals to remove the current cap on fees would exacerbate the situation. Worse, funding per student has been declining for some time, most notably during the Howard years (1996–2006), when funding actually declined by 4 percent, in contrast with the OECD average rise of 49 percent. Students currently contribute 41 percent of the costs of their studies; the Audit Commission proposed raising this proportion to 55 percent. In addition, the proposed reduced threshold for student loans repayment would mean that students should have to commence

repayments much earlier and substantially reduce their lifetime earnings—since repayments would be pegged to the full cost of the loan, rather than the current consumer price index.

The proposal to uncap fees has proved divisive in at least two senses. Vice Chancellors of the top-tier Australian Group of Eight (Go8) research universities, who have most to gain, have tended to support a lift on the current fee cap. Even though they, too, will lose government funding—one estimated that its Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences would lose \$10 million per year, while public funds to Engineering, Environmental Sciences, Communications, and Science would be cut by AU\$5,000 per student. Other vice chancellors, with less to gain and a greater concern with equity, have been more critical—arguing that, if fees rise, poorer students will be deterred from studying, particularly from the more expensive programs. Greg Craven, for example, vice chancellor of the Australian Catholic University, warned of the divisive potential: “you don't want to have one Rolls Royce, and twelve clapped out Commodores.” The proposal also pits students, who are understandably resistant to even higher costs for their university education, against (at least the Go8) universities.

Minister Pyne's recent speech in London professed shock that more Australian universities were not in the top 50 worldwide, as one reason supporting a shake up in higher education.

FUNDING THE PRIVATE SECTOR

A second key reform plank would see government funding opened to the private sector, a major change in a system that has been very largely public. At a time when, as part of an overall austerity drive, the current national government is proposing to rid itself of thousands of federal public servants; this would seem to be at odds with current rhetoric about preserving quality. In particular, a major expansion of providers would likely outstrip the capacity of the current national agency charged with regulating the sector—Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA). Here, Australia's recent history of opening the vocational education and training sector to private providers is instructive. In that instance, state government regulators were overwhelmed by a dramatic increase in the number of provid-

ers—some of which were genuine and some much more concerned with generating income than providing quality educational programs, facilities, or staff. As a result, regulators in many states could not maintain quality across the sector, with calamitous results. Headlines appeared of fly-by-night providers and of international students—particularly from India, who were being misled by the institutions themselves, or duped by unscrupulous agents. When the press in India got wind of such incidents, sensational stories of Indian students being abandoned, duped, or attacked spread rapidly across newspapers and other media. Vocational student numbers from the subcontinent plummeted, and the reputation of the entire education sector suffered. The promised cuts of 50 percent to TEQSA funding clearly flies in the face of such precedent and raises the prospect of a similar outcome in higher education.

If not all the implications of how far and how fast the new federal government wishes to deregulate and privatize higher education are yet clear, there are worrying signs that ideology has trumped sober policy analysis. If so, there are real risks for the higher education sector, including reputational risks that could imperil international higher education enrollments. Be careful what you wish for. ■

Chile's Universities: Reasons for Success

JUAN UGARTE

Juan Ugarte, a Luksic Visiting Scholar at Harvard University, is professor at Catholic University of Chile, and former head of Higher Education at the Secretariat of Education in Chile's government (2010–2013). E-mail: jugarte@uc.cl.

Chile became the first South American nation to achieve membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Across a broad spectrum of socioeconomic and political measurements, including higher education performance, Chile tops the rankings across the Latin American region. That is because Chile's enrollment rates approach 60 percent, and almost 30 percent of Chile's population of 25–34 year-olds has attained tertiary education, well above the average for the region. Scientific productivity and impact, in proportion to the size of population, also positions Chile at the front of the Latin American region. A review of 2013 rankings like *QS Latin American University Rankings*, and *Shanghai Academic Ranking of*

World Universities permit us to conclude that Chile has the highest density of “high-quality institutions” in the region.

Two factors help explain Chile's exceptional performance in Latin America. The first is the nature of its system: state and nonstate universities compete in the same academic arena, and both enjoy public financial support. The second is the contribution that US universities have made to the development and modernization of Chilean universities.

STATE AND NONSTATE UNIVERSITIES

Since its birth as an independent republic, Chile has established a constitutional right to “freedom in education.” In essence, this is the state obligation to ensure universal access and the right of citizens to choose their preferred institution. In higher education, this principle first materialized through the creation of the state university: the University of Chile in 1842 and then a nonstate university—the Catholic University in 1888. With this base, Chile's higher education system expanded its capacities through efforts of state and private foundations. Later, in 1923, Parliament approved public financing support for all of these institutions. Other national organizations, like the President's Council of Chilean Universities and the National Commission for Sciences and Technology, were created to support general university activities. Parents and students now enjoyed the option of selecting the best university to realize their academic ambitions, knowing they would receive the same benefits (such as scholarships) in any of them. Playing the same field, both state and nonstate institutions competed with strong incentives to attract students, faculty, and resources. Developing under these conditions, it is clear that the mixed nature of Chile's higher education system—the only one in Latin America using this model—helped explain its success, at least in part.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF US UNIVERSITIES

Even though earlier contributions exist, the middle of the 20th century saw Chile and the United States sign two agreements that marked a turning point in modernizing the Chilean higher education system.

In 1955, under the auspices of the United States Agency for International Development, the University of Chicago signed an agreement with the School of Economy of Catholic University of Chile, permitting a generation of economists to do their graduate studies in Chicago and creating the very influential group called “Chicago Boys.” Professors Arnold C. Harberger and Milton Friedman played crucial roles in this effort. Friedman authored the expression “the miracle of Chile,” to denote the impact of this new generation of scholars on national economic and institutional policy. Under the military government and influence

of the “Chicago Boys,” a new institutional order was created, based on privatization and reducing the state’s role. In higher education this new order resulted in the dominance of private institutions as seen today.

During the next decade, the 1960s, as part of the “Alliance for Progress” efforts, Presidents John F. Kennedy and Eduardo Frei signed a “Chile-California Plan” to help Chile develop key areas like education and agriculture. Since 1965, with the support of the Ford Foundation, the University of Chile has enjoyed important interchanges with the University of California-Davis, allowing a new generation of faculty to obtain graduate degrees there (known as the “UC-Davis Boys”). These graduates have since made great impact in two key Chilean agriculture areas, fruit, and wine.

Under the military government and influence of the “Chicago Boys,” a new institutional order was created, based on privatization and reducing the state’s role.

At the same time, Catholic University’s School of Engineering, headed by Dean Raúl Devés and Director Arnoldo Hax, began a profound set of academic reforms. For this effort, they had the support of the University of California-Berkeley, with additional grants from Ford Foundation and Inter-American Development Bank. A significant number of Chilean academics did their PhD studies at the University of California-Berkeley, while several Berkeley professors came to Chile and stayed for months teaching, doing collaborative research and helping the new authorities to develop a new curriculum. These events had three significant impacts. They launched a new concept of engineering curricula. They also initiated full-time academic positions inside Catholic University and created a “university campus,” a common space for different schools and disciplines. Obviously, such tremendous changes had a significant impact at Catholic University, and they spread to modernize the entire Chilean university system in time.

After those first cross-cultural agreements, the relations between US and Chilean institutions continued and deepened. The large numbers of Chilean students in US universities and the quantity of shared scientific papers published by faculty of both countries are evidence of that. Most recently, a renewed “Chile-California Plan” was signed in 2009, and the first agreement between Chile and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was launched in 2011.

This last initiative has two important partners: MISTI-Chile (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) commenced 24 shared research projects; and the Harvard-Chile Innovation Initiative, chose 12 projects to be part of 2013–2014 activities. The Secretary of Economy of Chilean Government proclaimed these efforts 2012’s most successful program for technological transfer. The full impact of Chile-Massachusetts agreement will be appreciated over time; the work is just beginning.

In conclusion, the unique mixed nature of Chile’s system and its alliances with North American universities help explain the prominent performance of Chile’s universities. Today, with a student movement seeking cost-free access to university education, we have a great effervescence inside the system, bringing new questions about the future of Chile’s universities. ■

A Quiet Revolution in Chinese Universities: Experimental Colleges

QIANG ZHA AND QIUBO YANG

Qiang Zha is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca. Qiubo Yang is a lecturer at the College of Education, Tianjin University, Tianjin, China. E-mail: yqb@tju.edu.cn.

In the upcoming decade, changes with respect to governance of Chinese universities can be expected, as they are now planned in many domains and at all levels: external and internal, macro and micro. At policy level, the *National Outline for Medium- and Long-Term Educational Reform and Development (2010–2020)* or the 2020 Blueprint calls for building a modern university system on Chinese soil, which centers on granting and securing university autonomy and academic freedom. At institutional level, Chinese universities are now encouraged to draw up their charters that are supposed to define the boundaries within which they should have jurisdictions and autonomy. While many remain curious and doubtful about whether the government will voluntarily take its hands off, and whether universities will enjoy true autonomy over their own operations, a quiet revolution might now be observed internally at the college/school level, along with emergence of a group of experimental colleges/schools in 17 universities across the

country—one such experimental unit designated in each university.

A “SPECIAL ZONE” IN CHINESE UNIVERSITIES

This initiative at national level started in 2011, aiming to establish a sort of special zone in the realm of higher education, which targets specifically at experimenting with more faculty authority over academic affairs and latitude for innovation. It embarked on a broad idea and did not have an explicit guideline until one year later. In November 2012, China’s Ministry of Education officially promulgated guidance on the work of experimental colleges. The document spells out specific objectives of this experimentation, including implementation of democratic governance, autonomy over program development, new faculty hiring, student recruitment and resource allocations, and pedagogical reform along the lines of innovative education. A charter and a board will comprise the core of institutionalized arrangements for democratic governance in each experimental unit. In operations, a professorial committee is to be formed to nominate candidates for deanship and represent the faculty in decision making—related to affairs of teaching, research, and administration within the unit. An academic committee is to be set to oversee disciplinary field development and academic performance assessment, to offset interference of administrative power in academic sphere. Explicitly, the experimental units are prompted to build internal capacity to manage their own development, including the establishment of incentive and regulatory mechanisms, in order to secure a proper and a healthy development. Meanwhile, they are required to take the responsibility—and, understandably, the risk accordingly.

HOW DO EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGES OPERATE?

In a sense, this experimentation in academic sphere reminds us of a similar economic domain in the 1980s—i.e., the establishment of a number of economic special zones in China—which spearheaded the opening up of the country’s economy. Precisely because of this nature, the experimental colleges have come up with different and sometimes unique practices, along the broad lines set out by this initiative. For instance, in Tianjin University, the College of Precision Instrument & Opto-Electronics Engineering is the university’s experimental unit and has adopted a unique approach to placing academics at the core of decision making and optimizing their academic power: abolishing the traditional administrative unit of department, as an effort aiming to cut down and curb administrative power in the operations of teaching and research. Now a system consisting of Principal Investigator (PI) led groups is put in place to operate major research activities, which are executed by project

teams within the group. In such a system, an academic PI has the full power to decide new hires and resource allocations. The PI and the project leaders under him/her are supposed to be recruited globally. In terms of organization of teaching, a system based on a Chair Professor is created, whereby a Chair Professor is in charge of program and curriculum development, educational standards and teaching content/material, student evaluation and assessment in a specific field, as well as appointment of course instructors and evaluation of teaching outcome.

At institutional level, Chinese universities are now encouraged to draw up their charters that are supposed to define the boundaries within which they should have jurisdictions and autonomy.

Similarly, the experimental unit in the University of Science and Technology of China, the School of Physical Sciences adopts a system in which a “Project Principal Professor” is in full charge, while all the works in association with teaching and research (including international cooperation) are designed and operated as projects. In contrast to the “flat management” approach in aforementioned examples, Beijing Jiaotong University’s School of Economics and Management installs a new layer of academic unit between the school and its departments, three subschools, which correspond respectively to the three disciplinary fields that the school’s programs cover. With the school delegating most academic power to three subschools, this approach aims to explore the pattern of somehow separating academic and administrative power and leveraging dynamics of academic field development to absorb administrative power. This approach is also expected to form a critical mass in terms of faculty participation in academic management, driven by their shared visions, expertise and training in a particular field.

EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGES USHER IN A QUIET REVOLUTION

Given the absence and insufficiency of democratic governance in Chinese universities for decades, the universities often suffer from inertia in exercising their autonomy—even if they are provided with such an opportunity, let alone pushing for more autonomy. To facilitate the progress, dynamism and initiatives need to be brought into play from the bottom. While the 2020 Blueprint expresses the policy

design from the top, the exercise of granting university charter exhibits a top-down approach as well, whereby Chinese universities are required to work their charters out of a pattern/model preset by the government. In contrast, the experience of experimental colleges/schools showcases a bottom-up approach, whereby many grassroots initiatives could be identified and implemented. Compared with those top-down moves, the experimental units are more likely to tap autonomous practices into existing operations, often in a genuine and innovative way. Arguably, in the world of nature, microorganisms play a more significant role in shaping climate, than lions and elephants. In this sense, this experimentation has been ushering in a quiet revolution that might transform the climate of Chinese higher education.

Nonetheless, this view does not rule out the challenges and risks that might stand in the way of these experimental colleges/schools. From the perspective of path dependence behavior patterns of organizations, it is a challenge to keep the current innovative practices (e.g., the PI-led research groups and Chair Professor-led teaching platforms in the case of Tianjin University) from sliding back onto the old path (becoming another kind of administrative or bureaucratic mechanism). However, this is not going to happen; it is still tricky to prevent too much power from following to and concentrating in the hands of a few PIs and Chair Professors on one hand and to ensure a wide participation of the faculty in decision making on the other. ■

Access to Higher Education: The Israeli Case

IRIS BEN-DAVID AND YAAKOV IRAM

Iris Ben-David and Yaakov Iram teach in the School of Education at Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel. E-mail: iris.bendavidhadar@gmail.com and Iram@biu.ac.il.

The Israeli academic system is well-developed and exhibits a high level of academic achievement (e.g., high citation rate, Nobel Prize Laureates per capita and high-technology start-ups). Israel economy is highly dependent on its academic level and its high-tech industry, which has led the state of Israel to its remarkable economic growth over the past decade. Furthermore, Israel's high academic level is perceived as an infrastructure for its very existence.

Nonetheless, along with the excellent achievement of the Israeli academia, in recent years it is facing substan-

tial challenges as a result of fundamental economic, demographics, and cultural trends that are changing the social composition of Israel. These trends challenge the ability of Israel's academia to sustain its highly ranked achievement.

Economic trends burden the ability to access higher education. The knowledge-based economy indeed contributes to the economic growth, yet it has an adverse effect of growing inequality. The incremental income inequality and the rising tide in child poverty (among Israeli children currently every third child is poor) actually change the background characteristics of the potential Israeli student.

In addition, demographic trends in Israel have been reaching the point that challenges the status quo of the Israeli society. Among the first graders in the Israeli school system, more than 50 percent are either Arabs or Ultra-Orthodox Jewish. Demography is not the only challenge. The cultural barriers pose a further challenge. Within Israel population more than 20 percent are Ultra-Orthodox Jewish people, most of them uninterested in institutions of higher education.

Indeed, Israeli decision makers aspire to diminish the impact of these trends, by designing and enacting various policy reforms. Hitherto, political considerations of redistribution (e.g., allocating from "rich" to the "poor") hinder the achievement of an effective defacto policy.

This article focuses on trends in access and stratification within Israeli higher education. Israel serves as an interesting case given the sociocultural and ethnic diversity of its population, the majority-minority balance of power, its incremental trend in inequality, and its crucial rising percentage of child poverty.

ACCESS

The incremental trend of access to Israel's higher education institutions is reflected in the increasing percentage of students enrolled in a relevant age group in undergraduate programs, ranging from 6 percent in 2004 to 7.4 percent in 2012. As of 2014, 194,129 students in Israel are enrolled in undergraduate programs. A less prominent trend is evident in the graduate programs, where student enrollment was 1.8 percent in 2004 and is currently similar: some 52,698 and 10,615 students are enrolled in graduate and PhD programs, respectively.

This incremental trend of access to Israeli higher education is more prominent among Arab students than their Jewish counterparts. Specifically, Arab students' access has increased by 53 percent (from 2.8 percent in 2004 to 4.3 percent in 2012). The Jewish sector exhibits a more modest incremental trend of 18 percent (from 7.1 percent in 2004 to 8.4 percent in 2012).

STRATIFICATION

In spite of this incremental trend of access, stratification is still evident. The gap between ethnic groups, though decreasing, is still notably wide. Specifically, the gap between Jewish and Arab students enrolled in undergraduate programs was reduced from more than 2.5-fold to less than 2-fold (between 2004 and 2012).

A gender gap does not exist within the general student population. Furthermore, according to Israel's Central Bureau of Statistics Annual Report (2013), there was a reversal in the trend among the recipients of higher degrees from universities. For example, in 1992 the gender gap of graduate students favored men—graduate: 56 percent (44 percent, for women); and PhD: 67 percent (33 percent, for women). Indeed, two decades later (2010), the gap favored women—graduate: 56 percent (44 percent, for men); and PhD: 50 percent (50 percent, for men). At the undergraduate level the gender gap of favored women is widening—in 1992: 52 percent (48 percent, for men); and in 2010: 57 percent (43 percent, for men). However, Arab women are less likely to acquire higher education than are Arab men or Jewish women.

Stratification already exists in lower schooling levels. The achievement distributions of Israeli students—as measured by the international examinations of the Program for International Student Assessment in 2006, 2009, and 2012—are all characterized by an average achievement level and a wide achievement gap. In fact, Israeli high-school students exhibit the widest achievement gap among Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries.

Apparently, achievement in high school (e.g., achieving a high-school matriculation certificate) is not the only gatekeeper to access to higher education. Moreover, there are numerous obstacles that nurture the stratification of Israeli higher education. In Hebrew-speaking high schools, about 70 percent of those eligible for the matriculation certificate

have access to higher education. In comparison, in Arabic-speaking high schools, less than 50 percent of those eligible for the matriculation certificate have access to higher education.

Stratification in higher education can only partially be explained by low socioeconomic strata. Specifically, within those Jewish households having low socioeconomic strata, one out of three persons has access to higher education, in comparison with two out of three among Jewish households having high socioeconomic strata. However, within the Arab households, less than one out of three has access to higher education regardless of their socioeconomic strata.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The longitudinal examination is encouraging, since access to Israeli higher education has had an incremental trend. However, it is still stratified for ethnic minority groups and for students from low socioeconomic strata. This might challenge the fragile cohesion within Israel. The trend is for improvement—for increased access and reduced stratification—but the rate of improvement is currently too slow. Other OECD countries have higher access rates or larger improvement rates, which challenges Israel competitiveness—a highly important asset for Israel.

In fact, it is likely that any reform in higher education is doomed to be less effective, unless it is a part of a more holistic view of the education system at all levels. An equitable school finance policy is necessary. Obviously, more work is required in order to better understand the actual gatekeepers (beyond the obvious factor of socioeconomic strata). Also, although decision makers might recognize that such a reform would have a positive effect on decreasing stratification in Israeli higher education, they have to deal with the political issues of redistribution. The issues illustrated in Israel might be relevant for other multicultural countries that are facing the challenge of reducing inequality.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roksa. *Aspiring Adults Adrift: Tentative Transitions of College Graduates*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014. 239 pp. \$18 (pb). ISBN 978-0-226-19728-9. Web site: www.press.uchicago.edu.

The authors of an earlier book, *Academically Adrift*—an influential critique of the impact of American undergraduate education—focus in this volume on the final years

of undergraduate study and the transition to work. Using data from the Collegiate Learning Assessment, the authors find that graduates have a difficult time transitioning to work and establishing stable relationships, although they are optimistic about the future. The data and focus of this book are on the United States.

Bassett, Roberta Malee, and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, eds. *Organiamos Internacionales y Políticas en Educación Superior:*

Pensando globalmente, actuando localmente. México, DF: ANUIES, 2014. 423 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-607-451-089-8.

This book is an analytical perspective concerning how international and regional organizations relate to higher education—globally and in individual countries. Chapters focus on key international groups such as UNESCO, the World Bank, and others as well as regional associations in Africa, Latin America, and elsewhere.

Fish, Stanley. *Versions of Academic Freedom: From Professionalism to Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014. 155 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-226-06431-4. Web site: www.press.uchicago.edu.

A series of essays by eminent humanities scholar Fish are concerning aspects of academic freedom in the United States. Issues relating into the definition of academic freedom, its relevance in political debates and research, and related themes are discussed.

Gerber, Larry G. *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalization and the Modern American University*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. 264 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1463-8. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Historian Gerber traces the rise of shared governance and the increasing power of the academic profession in the late 19th century. He argues that the increased complexity, financial problems, and managerial authority in contemporary higher education in the United States are greatly weakening shared governance and that this has significant implications for a decline in the quality of higher education.

Gross, Neil, and Solon Simmons, eds. *Professors and Their Politics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. 364 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1334-1. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Focusing on the political attitudes and values, mainly of American professors, this volume discusses a range of themes. Among them are the comparative politics of professors, political liberalism, graduate schools attendance, the social and political views of American professors, think tanks, the role of activism in the development of ethnic studies programs, and others. The chapters provide data-based cases of the relationship of politics and the academic profession.

Losh, Elizabeth. *The War on Learning: Gaining Ground in the Digital University*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014. 302 pp. \$29.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-262-02738-0. Web site: www.mitpress.mit.edu.

The argument in this book is that the often uncoordinated use of technology in the classroom in American universities is counterproductive and does not contribute to student learning. The author is critical of MOOCs (the massive open online courses), the use of iPads, and other technological aids because they treat learning as consumption rather than as process.

Musselin, Christine, and Pedro N. Teixeira, eds. *Reforming Higher Education: Public Policy Design and Implementation*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 231 pp. \$120 (hb). ISBN: 978-94-007-7027-0. Web site: www.springer.com.

Focusing broadly on how national higher education policies, many of which were aimed at reforming higher education systems to cope with massification and other pressures, this book discusses a range of developed countries and themes. Among them are the UK research excellence framework, patterns of reform in Italy, policy pressures and university research, reforming faculty careers in Switzerland, and others.

Nerad, Maresi, and Barbara Evans, eds. *Globalization and Its Impacts on the Quality of PhD Education: Forces and Forms in Doctoral Education Worldwide*. Rotterdam, Netherlands, Sense Publishers, 2014. 234 pp. \$54 (pb). ISBN 978-94-6209-567-0. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

Focusing on the rapidly developing field of doctoral education, this volume provides both chapters focusing on key broad themes such as the role of doctoral education in economic development and the evolution or research universities, and chapters that discuss themes in geographical context. Among these chapters are discussions of doctoral enrollments in Canada, Australia, the Czech Republic, and other countries, doctoral education and globalization in India, Iceland, and South Africa, and others.

Perna, Laura W., and Joni E. Finney. *The Attainment Agenda: State Policy Leadership in Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. 308 pp. \$49.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1406-5. Web

site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Attainment—access and the completion of degree studies in timely way—is a key issue for debate in the United States. Attainment rates have been dropping in the United States, despite major expenditures on student financial aid from the federal government and the states. This volume examines five US states in depth to understand how state policies affect attainment. This well-researched volume may be relevant to other countries faced with similar challenges.

Stiasny, Mary, and Tim Gore, eds. *Going Global: Global Education: Knowledge-Based Economies for the 21st Century*, Volume 3. Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2014. 229 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-78441-003-2.

A series of papers prepared for the British Council's annual Going Global international conference, the theme of the book is international collaboration in higher education. Among the specific foci are how collaboration has contributed to research and innovation, how it has contributed to an increase in skilled knowledge workers, and how collaboration has contributed to internationalization.

Tiessen, Rebecca, and Robert Huish, eds. *Globetrotting or Global Citizenship: Perils and Potential of International Experiential Learning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014. 296 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-4426-2611-9. Web site: www.utpublishing.com.

International experiential learning—student experience abroad that goes beyond classroom learning and includes volunteerism, travel programs and others—is the theme of this volume. The topic is considered in part in a Canadian context and includes such specific themes as secondary school international experiential programs, lessons from programs in Rwanda, the ethical imperative in experiential learning, volunteer programs, and others.

CRITICAL INTERNATIONAL NEWS AT A GLANCE ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER

Do you have time to read more than 20 electronic bulletins weekly in order to stay up to date with international initiatives and trends? We thought not! So, as a service, the CIHE research team posts items from a broad range of international media to our Facebook and Twitter page.

You will find news items from the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Education*, *University World News*, *Times Higher Education*, the *Guardian Higher Education network UK*, the *Times of India*, the *Korea Times*, just to name a few. We also include pertinent items from blogs and other online resources. We will also announce international and comparative reports and relevant new publications.

Unlike most Facebook and Twitter sites, our pages are not about us, but rather “newsfeeds” updated daily with

notices most relevant to international educators and practitioners, policymakers, and decision makers. Think “news marquis” in Times Square in New York City. Here, at a glance, you can take in the information and perspective you need in a few minutes every morning.

To follow the news, press “Like” on our Facebook page at: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-International-Higher-Education-CIHE/197777476903716>. “Follow” us on Twitter at: https://twitter.com/#!/BC_CIHE.

We hope you’ll also consider clicking “Like” on Facebook items you find most useful to help boost our presence in this arena. Please post your comments to encourage on-line discussion.

IMPROVEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

This issue of *International Higher Education* marks a significant change in our publication arrangements. We have joined the “Open Journal System,” a publication network of the Boston College library. This new arrangement provides easier access to, and searchability of, *IHE* and more effective archiving of our issues. It also provides significantly improved visibility on Internet-search engines. While there may be an adjustment period for some of our readers, this new system greatly improves our reach.

We invite you to explore our new *IHE* homepage (<http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe>), which currently features this issue of *IHE*, as well as the previous two issues. All back issues of *IHE* will eventually migrate to the new site, and we will inform subscribers of this development at the appropriate time. For now, all back issues of *IHE* can be found

in their more familiar location on the CIHE Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/research/cihe/ihe/issues.html>.

A NEW INITIATIVE: HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION THEME ISSUE

Beginning at the end of 2014, *IHE* will add a fifth issue each year, specifically focusing on internationalization issues. This issue will be edited by Hans de Wit, director of the Center for Higher Education Internationalization at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. This issue will bring *IHE*'s analytic perspective to the broad issues of internationalization. For further information, please contact Hans de Wit. His e-mail address is: j.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl.

ALTBACH FESTSCHRIFT PUBLISHED

The Forefront of International Higher Education: A Festschrift in Honor of Philip G. Altbach, edited by Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett, has been published by Springer Publishers—Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 333 pp. \$129 (hb). Web site: www.springer.com. This volume, which was prepared to coincide with a conference to honor Philip G. Altbach on April 5, 2013 at Boston College, features chapters focusing on themes relating to research undertaken by Philip G. Altbach. The authors are either students who worked with Professor Altbach or colleagues involved with the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Colleagues include Ulrich Teichler, Jane Knight, Martin J. Finkelstein, Hans de Wit, Simon Schwartzman,

Jorge Balán, D. Bruce Johnstone, Judith S. Eaton, Akiyoshi Yonezawa, N. Jayaram, Heather Eggins, Frans van Vught, Nian Cai Liu, Jamil Salmi, and others. Former and current students include Patti McGill Peterson, David A. Stanfield, James J.F. Forest, Robin Matross Helms, Sheila Slaughter, Liz Reisberg, Laura E. Rumbley, and the two coeditors of the book: Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett.

Chapters include topics such as higher education innovation in India, center-periphery theory, world-class universities, tuition and cost sharing, quality assurance, the academic profession and academic mobility, and various aspects of internationalization.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

Later this year, the Center expects to see the release of its first-ever true “e-book,” published by Lemmens Media, Bonn, Germany. *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, and Journals*, 3rd Edition presents a comprehensive global picture of higher education research and academic training activities around the world. Also forthcoming, the October special issue of the journal *Studies in Higher Education* will feature the papers presented at the November 2013 Shanghai “International Higher Education Research and Policy Roundtable” meeting, convened by CIHE with the support of the OECD project—Innovation, Research and Higher Education Development—and funded by the Swedish International Development Agency.

The Center’s current collaborative project with the National Research University–Higher School of Economics (HSE) in Moscow concerns global university rankings and their effects on specific universities in selected countries. The research group, from 11 countries, will meet in Moscow in October 2014 to discuss research findings. Last year’s project, on faculty inbreeding, will result in a book to be published by Palgrave-Macmillan. At the same time, an earlier HSE collaborative project on the challenges facing young faculty is currently in production with the State University of New York Press. The Center’s ongoing research collaboration—headed in Moscow by HSE’s vice rector and director of the Laboratory of Institutional Analysis, Maria Yudkevich—has been highly productive and reflects the research interests of both institutions.

The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), jointly hosted by CIHE and Higher Education Training and Development, University of Kwazulu-Natal, has recently launched its new biannual publication, *The International Journal of African Higher Education*. The journal is freely available on the Open Journals System hosted by the Boston College Libraries, and may be accessed here: <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ijahe>.

The Center’s involvement with the European Association for International Education also continues to flourish. Associate director Laura E. Rumbley chairs the EAIE’s publication committee, and will be both co-directing a workshop in research as well as co-presenting in a session at the EAIE conference in Prague in September. Center director Philip G. Altbach will be a featured speaker at that conference. He will also speak at a seminar sponsored by the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. The CHEI and CIHE have a new collaborative arrangement that will result in an annual theme issue of *International Higher Education* on internationalization, edited by Prof. Hans de Wit, director of CHEI.

The Center’s work with the American Council on Education’s (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) also successfully continues. Work is underway on the publication of an occasional paper focused on an analysis of national and regional policies for internationalization around the world. ACE/CIGE and CIHE are also planning to produce in early 2015 a fifth installment in the ongoing series of “International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders.” This edition will examine key issues of concern in relation to international double and joint degrees. The previously produced Briefs #1 through #4 in this series will be compiled in book form and published by SENSE Publishers later this year.

The Center welcomes Georgiana Mihut as our new graduate research assistant, who joins second-year doctoral student Ariane de Gayardon in supporting the work of the Center. David Stanfield, who has been a GA for the past several years, has completed his PhD and has accepted a position as Head of Research and Development for the Council of International Schools, based in Leiden, the Netherlands. Dr. Yukiko Shimmi, who also served as a CIHE graduate assistant and completed her PhD in 2014, has been appointed as a lecturer in international education at Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo.

The Center also welcomes the following visiting scholars for the coming period: Dr. Gladys Beatriz Barreyro, of the University of São Paulo (Brazil), and Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydinli of Bilkent University (Turkey). Dr. Xiong Geng, of Nankai University (China) will soon be wrapping up her year-long visiting scholar experience with us.

Of significant importance in the wake of Philip G. Altbach’s retirement from the faculty, Boston College has initiated a search for a faculty member in international higher education, who will also serve as the full-time director of the Center for International Higher Education. Information about the position and the application process can be obtained here: <http://apply.interfolio.com/25365>.



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

PRESORTED
FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
N. READING MA
PERMIT 258

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the International Higher Education quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE WEB SITE

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of

upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science-based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/>.

OPINIONS EXPRESSED HERE DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina Kopellias

EDITORIAL OFFICE

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

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-mail: highered@bc.edu

<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>

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

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)
©Center for International
Higher Education