

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 and Trends

- 2 The Worldwide Emergence of Liberal Education
Kara A. Godwin
- 4 Financing Education Hubs: Who Invests?
Jane Knight
- 6 What Counts for Academic Productivity in Research Universities?
Philip G. Altbach

Higher Education: The Emergence of a Field of Research and Practice

- 8 The Global Landscape of Higher Education Training and Research
Laura E. Rumbley
- 10 Communicating Higher Education: An Analysis of Journals
Ariane de Gayardon
- 11 International Higher Education and Comparative Analysis
Anna Kosmützky and Georg Krücken

Rankings: Patterns and Themes

- 13 Academic Ranking of World University: Changes?
Ying Cheng
- 15 *Times Higher Education* Rankings and the Rise of Asia?
Alex Usher

Focus on Africa

- 16 Challenges of Graduate Education in Sub-Saharan Africa
Fred M. Hayward and Daniel J. Ncayiyana
- 18 Private Twilight: Private Universities in Kenya
Ishmael I. Munene

Student Mobility

- 20 International Student Enrollment: Evidence-Driven Strategies
Rahul Choudaha
- 21 Kazakhstan's Bolashak Scholarship Program
Aida Sagintayeva and Zakir Jumakulov
- 23 International Students in Indian Universities
Veena Bhalla and Krishnapratap B. Powar

Countries and Regions

- 24 Governance and Regulation: Does UK Policy Have International Relevance?
Robin Middlehurst
- 26 Croatia's New Tuition System
Lucia Brajkovic
- 28 Ukraine: New Reforms and Internationalization
Sonja Knutson and Valentyna Kushnarenko

Departments

- 29 New Publications

The Worldwide Emergence of Liberal Education

KARA A. GODWIN

Kara A. Godwin is a visiting scholar and consultant at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: kara.godwin@gmail.com.

During the last two decades, liberal education—often called liberal arts or general education—has emerged with surprising prevalence in places like Russia, India, Ghana, China, Israel, the Netherlands, Chile, Bangladesh, and Brazil—places where it has rarely existed before. This is not an isolated phenomenon. It is a small, but potentially meaningful, global trend.

For centuries, higher education in most of the world has been organized around professional studies and a utilitarian philosophy. Its purpose has been to create a labor force capable of staffing needed positions in industry, health care, schools, and public services. Students, as a result, participate in curricula focused on their field of study to become attorneys, engineers, doctors, accountants, and teachers, etc.

Conversely, liberal education, despite its Greek roots, has long been considered a distinctly American tradition. It is commonly associated with US liberal arts colleges, though also widely available in some American research universities. Contemporary program developments and reforms in non-US contexts are a phenomenon for two reasons. The number and geographic evolution of programs in recent years is unexpected, and the philosophy of liberal education forms a sharp contrast to traditional postsecondary curriculum outside the United States.

Nonetheless, the global emergence of liberal education has taken place relatively unnoticed. With some surprising results, a new study provides an inaugural profile about where, when, and in what format liberal education is emerging worldwide. Based on analysis of the Global Liberal Education Inventory (GLEI), a new catalogue of 183 non-US liberal education programs, the study raises critical questions about liberal education's presence in new cultural milieus.

A BRIEF DEFINITION

The definition of “liberal education,” along with “liberal arts” and “general education,” has been conflated and contested for centuries. Explained only briefly here, three criteria were used to qualify programs for inclusion in the GLEI. Contrary to the specialized, career-focused curriculum that has been the standard postsecondary norm in most of the

world, liberal education is (1) interdisciplinary providing a broad knowledge base from social science, humanities, and natural/physical science; (2) includes a “general education” protocol, courses or curriculum required for all students in a program; and (3) emphasizes at least two of the following: transferable skills—written and oral communication, analysis and synthesis, problem solving, information and quantitative literacy, reasoning or logic, critical thinking, creativity, etc., citizenship/social responsibility/ethics, global competence, and/or student-centeredness and holistic student development.

“General education” can be a confusing term in an international context, where it is sometimes used in place of the more contentious “liberal education” descriptor. It is possible for a program to offer general education without being liberal. It is also possible for a program to be labeled “general education,” when the curriculum actually includes all three elements of liberal education mentioned above, and qualifies it for inclusion in the GLEI. Hong Kong is a primary example.

WHERE HAS LIBERAL EDUCATION EMERGED GLOBALLY?

Liberal education now exists in at least 58 countries and on every continent with postsecondary institutions, a declaration that could not be made just a few decades ago. Surprisingly, Asia—not Europe—has a stronger presence of liberal education than any region beyond North America. Based on the GLEI, Asia accounts for 37 percent of liberal education programs outside the United States. Three-fourths of the Asian liberal education programs are in China, India,

Conversely, liberal education, despite its Greek roots, has long been considered a distinctly American tradition.

and Japan, while only a few but important initiatives are in lesser developed Bhutan, Afghanistan, and Bangladesh. Central government interest in improving critical thinking and creativity in China is driving liberal education reform that contrasts the country's traditional curriculum. Also in the region, an unprecedented system-wide mandate for liberal education is taking place throughout Hong Kong's public higher education system. General and liberal education initiatives, along with changes to the degree cycles, are being implemented at all public institutions.

In Europe, which accounts for 32 percent of programs outside the United States, liberal education can be loosely

distinguished between developments in the western and eastern subregions. In the west, liberal education reforms are often affiliated with the Bologna process and the need to better define content of first-degree undergraduate education. New programs like those in the Netherlands, for example, were created to diversify higher education and encourage an echelon of excellence in an otherwise egalitarian system. Conversely, liberal education is more closely related to shifts in political power and post-Cold War emerging democracies in eastern states where experiments with new educational philosophies are gaining acceptance.

In the Middle-East and Arab countries, liberal education is commonly called “American-style” education and, from the public’s point of view, often synonymous with quality. Its market success as a naming convention, however, does not reflect the frequent cultural challenges posed by gender segregation and the prominence of religious law. The region only accounts for 9 percent of GLEI initiatives, but it attracts much attention as an unusual destination for education that encourages critical thinking.

Based on the GLEI, liberal education is comparably less prevalent in Latin America (7 programs or 4% of those outside the United States), Africa (4 programs or 2%), and Oceania (7 programs or 4%). Latin America’s liberal education initiatives are often affiliated with the Catholic Church and unlike many of the inventory’s programs, none of them use English as their language of instruction. African programs while small in number, offer unique postsecondary opportunities, where higher education is strained by demand and where founders hope the philosophy will impact economic and social development in Kenya, Morocco, Ghana, and Nigeria. In Oceania, Australia is the only country with liberal education initiatives. Unlike most regions where liberal education plays a less than prominent role across higher education systems, the top-ranked University of Melbourne has developed a liberal undergraduate curriculum now adopted by other world-class institutions.

Finally, because the United States was excluded from this study, Canada was the only representative from the North American region. Canada has 21 programs, more than any other single country. On the whole, however, it seems to have little influence on the dialogue and activity around recent global liberal education developments. Canada has a longer history of liberal education than most countries; only 3 initiatives have emerged since 1990. Two of these, the U4 League, a consortium of four long-standing liberal education institutions, and Quest University, which delivers a unique curriculum in a diverse academic culture, have potential to set new precedents for liberal education in Canada and liberal education more broadly.

WHEN AND HOW HAS LIBERAL EDUCATION EMERGED GLOBALLY?

Analysis of the GLEI illustrates that the chronological evolution of liberal education worldwide is striking. While traces of the education philosophy have existed at universities since the founding of Oxford and Cambridge, 59 percent of the 183 GLEI programs began since 1990. A remarkable 44 percent of all liberal education programs outside the United States were founded since 2000.

Globally, liberal education programs are divided almost evenly between public and private initiatives, although significant differences exist in the number of public/private programs when analyzed by region. Given the rapid growth of private education, it is surprising that since 2000 there have been 20 percent more public liberal education programs than private—due in some part to initiatives in China and Hong Kong.

The global emergence of liberal education has taken place relatively unnoticed.

English is used by 81 percent of the programs globally and by 46 percent of the programs in countries where it is not an official language. Although many programs have institutional affiliations or formal partnerships, 57 percent of liberal education programs operate independently. Of those with an affiliation, the number of domestic partnerships (between two programs in the same country) exceeds cross-border relationships. Unexpectedly, only one-third of all liberal education institutional affiliations are with programs in the United States.

LIBERAL EDUCATION WORLDWIDE: PERCOLATING NOT PROLIFERATING

Increasing interest in liberal education globally is not merely a coincidence; it is a trend but one whose significance remains difficult to discern at this time. With few exceptions—like Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and Melbourne University in Australia—liberal education’s development remains a phenomenon occurring on the periphery without a great deal of influence on—mainstream, world-class education where attention, resources, and research knowledge are concentrated.

The number of programs and the number of students enrolled in liberal education are minute compared to more traditional, professional postsecondary degrees. Only 2 per-

cent of countries (5 total including the United States) have more than 10 liberal education programs. The vast majority of GLEI countries, nearly 80 percent, have just one to three initiatives in their higher education systems. “Crowding at the bottom” of the global distribution dilutes the potential for liberal education to influence its own perceived legitimacy or the mainstream postsecondary sector more generally.

This is an observation, however, not a prescription for developing more liberal education programs. The GLEI study ignited several questions that challenge the positive assumptions often proclaimed by liberal arts enthusiasts. Included among them are the difficulties of designing culturally relevant curricula; required shifts in approaches to learning and teaching; lack of affordability and access to liberal education that perpetuates elitism and inequity; and issues of neoliberalism and cultural hegemony that might result from western influence on education in other parts of the world. ■

Financing of Education Hubs: Who Are the Investors?

JANE KNIGHT

Jane Knight is adjunct professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: janeknight@sym-patico.ca.

International education hubs are the latest development in the international higher education landscape. A country-level education hub is a planned effort to build a critical mass of local and international actors—higher education institutions and providers, students, research and development centers, and knowledge industries—who work collaboratively on education, training, and knowledge production/innovation. To date, six countries—Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Botswana—claim to be education hubs. But how are they financed? Are the investors public or private? Are they local or foreign based? Are the current-funding models sustainable? These are important questions worthy of closer examination.

QATAR

Each country has its own capacity and strategies to fund education hub initiatives. Qatar is an interesting but unique model. All physical infrastructure and facilities are provid-

ed for foreign-branch campuses and companies located in Education City and the Science and Technology Park. Furthermore, 100 percent of the sizable operating costs for the 10 branch campuses and the new graduate-level university, Hamid bin Khalifa University, are covered by the Qatar Foundation. The annual operating costs to support Education City, Science and Technology Park and the extensive array of research programs and grants is the responsibility of the Qatar government and is extremely high. Is this government supported full funding model sustainable and is it optimal? In essence, Qatar is importing and purchasing the majority of education programs, services, and research for the education hub activities. A pivotal question is how long should a country attempt to build and strengthen domestic capacity by purchasing and importing foreign expertise. It has been 17 years since Qatar first started its work on inviting select foreign universities to establish specific programs in Education City. Is this the first phase of Qatar’s long-term plan to develop more domestic human resource capacity as it loosens its reliance on natural gas and foreign expatriate talent, or is this becoming *modus operandi*? If so, is it a sustainable and effective model? If not, what will be the second phase?

International education hubs are the latest development in the international higher education landscape.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) offers a completely different set of circumstances in terms of funding, investments, and revenue generation. Each emirate has developed its own approach to making UAE an education hub. Abu Dhabi has invited world renowned institutions, such as New York University and the Sorbonne, to set up branch campuses in customized facilities provided by Abu Dhabi Government. In addition, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was invited to help develop and advise on the development of Masdar Institute of Technology and Masdar City, the first carbon free zone in the world. Masdar City hosts world-class research facilities, scientists, and graduate programs—all of which are supported by the Abu Dhabi government. This represents an enormous domestic public investment.

Dubai is a different story. Dubai’s Strategic Plan called for the establishment of several theme-based economic free zones. Two of these are education focused—Knowledge

Village and Dubai International Academic City. The investment arm of the Dubai government (TECOM) is mandated to build the physical infrastructure and facilities for these zones and recruit reputable foreign institutions and training companies. The tenants in these zones enjoy attractive tax and regulatory incentives to offer their education and training programs. Unlike the situation in Qatar and Abu Dhabi, the foreign institutions and providers do not have their operating costs subsidized, and they pay rent for the use of their facilities. It is estimated that in Dubai's two economic free education zones, the public domestic investment is about 80 percent in terms of land, infrastructure, services, and private foreign investment from the tenants is about 20 percent. The amount of revenue generated from facility rentals for TECOM and from tuition fees for branch campuses/private training companies is not available; but given that these zones are relatively stable and operating at full capacity the funding formula seems to be working; and increased education opportunities are being offered to primarily expatriate students living in UAE (60% of enrollments), international offshore students (32%), and some UAE citizens (8%).

HONG KONG, BOTSWANA, AND SINGAPORE

Hong Kong presents yet another scenario. The government has made limited public investment into hub development, since its first announcement in 2004. The primary public investment by Hong Kong has been in the form of scholarships to attract international students, most of who come from China. Recently, a plot of land was made available to attract branch campuses of local or international universities; but there is not information as to whether facilities will be built and available for rent or whether the institution has to invest in building their own infrastructure. Similarly, the public investment of the Botswana government, beyond engaging in a sophisticated planning and consultation process for hub development, appears to be limited. Botswana hub plans are still on track but have been negatively impacted by the 2008 and 2012 economic crisis. Their investment to date has been scholarships for international students and the establishment of a new university—Botswana International University of Science and Technology.

The financial investments in Singapore's hub building activities since 1998 are impossible to track, due to the lack of any published information on public/private or domestic/foreign funding sources. No conclusions can be drawn but worth noting is that the Singapore government has been referred to as the "venture capitalist" in terms of its significant and generous role in bank rolling the education hub efforts.

MALAYSIA

The situation in Malaysia is complex, given the number of different components to the hub strategy. Malaysia is home to seven branch campuses and more are planned. Both private foreign and domestic funds were used to fund these initiatives. Yet, with the establishment of an economic free zone in the form of Educuity@Iskandar, there has been major financing provided by the public investment arm of the government, Khazanah Nasional. It has funded the building of infrastructure and education facilities to attract international institutions. Overall in Malaysia, it is estimated that public domestic investment represents 50 percent of the funding for education hub activities, complemented by 40 percent of domestic private investment. The remaining 10 percent is made up of foreign private investment and other sources.

Each country has its own capacity and strategies to fund education hub initiatives. Qatar is an interesting but unique model.

CONCLUSION

These case studies demonstrate that public domestic investment is critical to the development of education hubs. While, hub building also requires private investment from domestic and foreign sources, the importance of local government support to kick start and leverage other sources of financing should not be underestimated. The UAE and Malaysia are examples where initial public investment has paid off and attracted other streams of private funding. Singapore and Qatar present other models where financing of education hub activities has been done primarily by the government (or ruling family) and over the last 15 years much has been accomplished. However, the sustainability of such funding and the ability to replicate this model in other nations remain as two unanswered questions.

For further information see Knight, J. 2014. *International Education Hubs: Student, Talent, Knowledge Models*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Publishers. ■

What Counts for Academic Productivity in Research Universities?

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is Research Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. Email: altbach@bc.edu.

Publication in high status refereed journals has become a major criterion of academic success in the competitive environment of global higher education. Appearing in internationally circulated journals published in English is especially prestigious. Universities are engaged in a global arms race of publication; and the academics are the shock troops of the struggle. At stake is placement in the global rankings, the allocation of budgets from governments, national prestige, ability to attract the best students and professors, and a preferred place in the pecking order of academe.

It is also useful to keep in mind that the publications and rankings games are limited to a very small part of the academic system in any country. Most universities are largely teaching institutions and have a limited, if any, research mission or profile. Only a thousand or so out of the world's 18,000 universities appear anywhere in the international rankings. In fact, there needs to be recognition that most universities are teaching institutions and their emphasis should be on teaching and learning—not on improving their research and publication profile. Productivity for most of any academic system should be the measurement of effective teaching and a careful understanding of what students learn, as well as ensuring that the students who enter higher education complete their studies. Thus, this discussion is limited to a small but important minority of academic institutions.

MEASURING RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

For research-intensive universities and the academics working in them, the measurement of academic productivity is neither straightforward nor easy. The key function of teaching quality is seldom measured adequately—in part because the assessment of teaching effectiveness is not easy and there are not widely accepted parameters. The standard metric of asking students for their opinions in each course is widely recognized as inadequate. Further, current debates emphasize learning as much as teaching—what “value added” has a student gained as a result of his or her studies. There is little agreement about how to measure either

teaching or learning.

Research universities focus mainly on research accomplishment: this is their core mission and what is key to the rankings and the achievement of high global status. Research productivity is easier to measure than other kinds of academic work—teaching has been mentioned, and community engagement and such important functions as university-industry linkages are also difficult to define and quantify. Thus, research is not only the gold standard, but almost the only semi reliable variable.

But even measuring research productivity is problematic. The global rankings count journals that are indexed in main global indices—such as the Science Citation Index, Web of Science, or Scopus, or their equivalents for other disciplines. These indices list only a small number of journals and tend to favor publications in English—the global scientific language. The rankings and other national evaluations also count research grants and other awards. Again, this may be appropriate for the hard sciences, but not necessarily for other disciplines. The rankings also do not take into account the vast differences among countries and academic systems in the amounts of funding available. Neither the indices nor most universities recognize a range of other measures of productivity as well as significant changes in knowledge distribution that have taken place in recent years.

It is also useful to keep in mind that the publications and rankings games are limited to a very small part of the academic system in any country.

THE STRAITJACKET OF THE INDICES

The Science Citation Index (SCI) and similar indices measure only one kind of academic productivity—that which is most common in the natural and biomedical sciences. In these fields, scientific work is in general reported in peer-reviewed journal articles that are later cited by other scientists. For example, an up and coming African research university, which annually rates each professor according to productivity measures, counts a journal article in a “top” international journal as double the “points” granted for a successful book. A professor is expected to “produce” a specified number of points annually, and refereed journal articles yield the most points.

Many universities and academic systems provide payments to faculty members in recognition for research productivity. Often, the maximum payments are for articles published in peer-reviewed SCI-approved journals. Such payments may be the equivalent of a month's salary or more—this is the case in some top Chinese universities. In some cases, these payments are added to the “base” salary. A well-known Russian university provides bonuses that can more than double the rather low-base salaries—the bonuses for Russian language publications are less than half of those provided for publication in internationally recognized journals. Books or book chapters are not eligible for these bonuses.

A professor is expected to “produce” a specified number of points annually, and refereed journal articles yield the most points.

Other disciplines may report research results in different ways. In the humanities and some social sciences, for example, books are important tools for imparting knowledge and reporting research. But it is difficult to easily calculate the impact factors or intellectual influence of books, and so they are typically not counted at all. Excluding books disadvantages those academic fields in which books remain a central element of knowledge communication—and scholars who write or edit books. The fact is books remain an important means of communicating knowledge.

ANARCHY AND REVOLUTION IN COMMUNICATION

Mass higher education and information technology have both contributed to anarchy and revolution, in the ways that academic knowledge is communicated. Less than a half-century ago, the bulk of the world's research findings and academic knowledge was communicated by a relatively small number of refereed journals and academic and commercial publishers that were widely recognized by the academic community. Most knowledge was produced and consumed in a small number of countries and universities in Europe and North America.

Although the traditional knowledge centers remain dominant, many more universities and researchers in different parts of the world are now producing quality science and scholarship—academics in China, Brazil, Russia, and other countries are engaged in the global knowledge net-

work as producers as well as consumers. Top journals are increasingly selective and remain dominated by the main academic centers—providing limited access to others. Further, many are controlled by large multinational publishers which charge high prices for access.

Taking advantage of the Internet, new “open access” journals have emerged—although their quality and rigor are questionable. “Fake” journals that will “publish” anything, if a fee is paid, have proliferated—as have a growing number of vanity publishers that will publish books for a fee. In short, there is much confusion and considerable anarchy in today's knowledge communication business.

DILEMMAS OF RESEARCH FUNDING

Academic institution and systems—and, of course, many of the rankings—take research funding into account when assessing academic productivity in research universities. Obtaining funding is a valid measure of accomplishment and in some scientific fields almost a necessity for conducting research. Yet, in many, perhaps most, disciplines funding is difficult to obtain and the resources available are generally quite limited. In such fields, including the humanities and most social sciences, good research can be accomplished with little external funding. Further, funding even in the sciences and biomedical areas tends to be more available to scientists in the top-ranking universities in countries with well-developed research infrastructures. Thus, when using funding as a metric for assessing academic productivity, considerable care and sophistication are required.

HOW TO ASSESS ACADEMIC RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY?

The problems are clear, although usually ignored by those eager to “measure” and “reward” research productivity, but solutions are not. One size certainly does not fit all when it comes to assessing research productivity in particular and academic work, in general. Measures necessarily vary by discipline. Some things are easier to measure than others—articles published in mainstream scientific journals are easier to evaluate than books or various kinds of online and “open access” publications. It is probably too much to ask that care, discretion, and sophistication be used when making judgments that often affect the salaries and academic futures of professors in an age of hyperaccountability. ■

The Skewed Global Landscape of Higher Education Training and Research

LAURA E. RUMBLEY

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu.

Higher education systems and institutions across the globe increasingly require more and better information, on which to base sound decisions and meaningful strategic planning. To operate efficiently, effectively, and creatively in contexts of uncertainty and change, the higher education sector worldwide also needs a growing corps of academic and administrative staff, with training and education specifically in this field. The need for deeper understanding of the higher education enterprise, beyond personal experience in academia, is crucial for the current (and rising) generation of institutional leaders, managers, and policymakers.

The needs in these areas raise important questions about where research and analysis of—as well as training for careers in—higher education take place. What do we know about the global landscape of research centers and academic programs offering graduate-level degrees in the study of higher education? And, in light of what we know about the size and shape of this research and training community, is there room for optimism or pessimism when it comes to meeting the tremendous need for information and talent development?

A “GROWTH INDUSTRY”

Since 2000, the Boston College Center for International Higher Education has produced three global inventories of higher education research centers/institutes and academic programs, focused on the study of higher education. In each instance, the numbers of centers and programs identified have expanded notably. For example, when compared to the 2006 iteration of the inventory, 293 more centers and programs were found in the 2013/2014 data collection exercise; and 26 more countries were found to host centers and programs, than in 2006. And while these findings may point to more energetic data collection efforts, there are clear signs that the higher numbers are reflective of real (and dramatic) growth.

Many of the research centers (100 of the 217) have been established since the year 2000, with significant expansion seen in Europe and Asia. China stands out as a particularly active developer of higher education research centers in re-

cent years—despite being underrepresented for a number of reasons in the most recent Boston College inventory exercise, the data still show that 20 new research centers/institutes have been established in China from 2000 to 2012.

Similarly, the Center for International Higher Education inventory has determined that at least 60 of the identified degree-granting programs in higher education worldwide were launched since 2000, and 33 of these have been established even more recently, since 2006.

EXPANSION WITHOUT EQUITY

The robust growth in the number of centers and programs, focused on higher education research and training, makes sense in light of the importance of the field in national and international policy spheres. It also clearly reflects the rising need for deeper understanding of the many complex processes unfolding (or actively being undertaken) at institutional and systemic levels. An apparent commitment—through the establishment of research centers/institutes and programs—to expand research activities and develop human resource capacity is a reason for celebration among those concerned with the many issues facing the academic enterprise the world over. At the same time, when viewed from the perspective of specific national needs and resources, there is cause for concern.

The need for deeper understanding of the higher education enterprise, beyond personal experience in academia, is crucial for the current (and rising) generation of institutional leaders, managers, and policymakers.

The global population of higher education research centers/institutes and programs is highly concentrated in just a small number of countries. Indeed, nearly 44 percent of centers/institutes are located in just two countries (the United States and China). If we add in the next five countries hosting the largest numbers of centers (the United Kingdom, Japan, Germany, Canada, and Australia), these nations together host just over 66 percent of the global total of such centers. Overall, Latin America and Africa are home to just 3 percent each of identified higher education research centers, and the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) a mere 2 percent.

The situation is even more skewed for academic programs focused on producing graduate degree holders in

the field of higher education. Although the United States is admittedly overrepresented in the inventory and China is underrepresented, together these two countries are home to 81 percent of the 277 identified academic programs in the field. Only 6 programs across the whole of Africa were identified, 3 in all of Latin America, and just 1 in the Middle East and North Africa region.

Many of the research centers (100 of the 217) have been established since the year 2000, with significant expansion seen in Europe and Asia.

NEEDED: MORE INFORMATION AND URGENT SUPPORT FOR THE UNDERRESOURCED

Mapping the global landscape of capacity for, and attention devoted to, research and training in the field of higher education is surprisingly complex work. Gathering the necessary data to document where these efforts are being undertaken and, perhaps more importantly, the specific content and quality of these activities, are detailed and labor-intensive work. It also requires a good understanding of many diverse national contexts, in order to accurately reflect the scope and impact of the research and educational efforts underway in particular countries.

In China, for example, a significant number of programs and centers operating at a very local level were not included in our inventory. It would be useful if qualified China experts undertook a detailed examination of the higher education research and training sector there and produced a more detailed picture of how this work is unfolding in the Chinese context. The range of centers and programs is clearly immense, but much remains unclear, and undocumented, about the scope of activity and the impact of the large number of higher education centers and programs in China.

At a more global level, while the quantitative picture produced by an inventory exercise is important and illuminating, many fundamental questions remain. For example, what are the specific focus areas of these centers and degree-granting programs? What kinds of analysis are produced by the centers, how is this information disseminated and used, and what impact does it have? In what ways are the academic (degree-granting) programs exerting an influence on the health and performance of institutions and national systems?

Most urgent of all, of course, is the recognition that the patterns of privilege and wealth that categorize so many other social, political, and economic dynamics around the world are also in evidence when it comes to research and training in the field of higher education. If the sheer number of centers and programs is any indication, a small subset of the world's wealthiest countries and regions clearly occupies a position of significant privilege in regard to access to higher education research, analysis, and trained human capital; and all of the benefits that flow from such access. It is particularly striking, and disturbing, that large (and expanding) higher education systems—such as those of Brazil, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Nigeria—have comparatively miniscule homegrown research and training apparatuses upon which to draw, as these countries move to address many complex and evolving challenges.

With awareness comes responsibility. As higher education research centers and academic programs around the world mature into their roles and expand their understanding of their place in a wider global network of similar entities, supporting and engaging with one another, and particularly under-resourced colleagues around the world deserves increasing attention.

Note: For more information on the current edition of the global inventory referenced in this article please see Laura E. Rumbley, et al. (2014). *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, and Journals and Publications* (3rd Edition). Bonn and New York: Lemmens Media. The publication is available as an e-book on Amazon.com, or as an abridged version available in both digital and hard copy formats directly from Lemmens Media (info@lemmens.de). ■



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider “following” us on Twitter!

Communicating Higher Education: An Analysis of Journals in the Field of Higher Education

ARIANE DE GAYARDON

Ariane de Gayardon is a graduate assistant at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: ariane.de.gayardon@gmail.com.

In the year 2013–2014, the Center for International Higher Education conducted an exhaustive project to gather information about higher education research and training around the world (*Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, and Journals and Publications* by Laura E. Rumbley, Philip G. Altbach, David Stanfield, Yukiko Shimmi, Ariane de Gayardon, and Roy Y. Chan). It includes a list of 280 journals and publications, primarily concerning higher education. This inventory provides a basis for highlighting trends in the higher education publishing sector, as well as identifying necessary development to ensure equal sharing of knowledge in the field. It is also a useful guide to the trends in research and analysis in the rapidly expanding field of higher education studies in the 21st century.

DATA COLLECTION

The work on this project began with a list of publication titles generated by the Center for International Higher Education in 2006. This list was updated and substantially expanded with the help of national and regional experts. Further information on the titles—including country, focus, language(s), frequency, publisher, and Web site—was mostly obtained from the journal Web sites. When such data collection was impossible due to language barriers or the absence of a Web site, the help of experts from the country of publication was sought again.

Some compromises had to be made as we proceeded with the data collection and redefined the project. In China, we chose, with the assistance of Chinese experts, to include slightly fewer than 30 journals circulated nationally, excluding publications that are mainly distributed at the local university level. Additionally, in countries that did not have journals specific to higher education, we opted to include a few publications with a broader focus but that constitutes a reliable source for higher education researchers.

The large majority of the publications included in the inventory publish research and analysis on higher educa-

tion. Newspapers and magazines concerning higher education also appear as they are of great importance to the field. Some of the publications included are only available in electronic version, but we limited ourselves to actual publication or news Web sites, thus excluding some electronic resources that publish analysis or comments on higher education.

KEY FINDINGS

The inventory provides information on 280 journals written in 22 different languages and published in 35 countries. The English language dominates with 190 journals. Twenty of these journals are multilingual—being published in English and at least one other language. Other major languages of publication include Chinese (27 journals), Japanese (26), Spanish (15), French (8), and German (7).

The countries of publication are dominated by the United States with 101 journals (36%), and the United Kingdom (12%). These two Anglophone countries are followed by Japan, China, Canada, and Australia. The clear domination of the United States could be due to choices made to limit the number of publications from some countries, but more certainly stems from the long history of higher education as an academic discipline in the United States and the strength of its publishing sector.

Most journals in higher education seem to be targeted to a domestic audience, thus emphasizing the diversity of national systems. However, we found that 53 journals/publications (19%) have an international focus. Somewhat fewer publications are aimed at a regional audience: 3 in Africa, 2 in Asia, 7 in Europe, 5 in Latin America, and 1 in the Middle East and North Africa region.

For more than 80 percent of the publications, we were able to provide information that explains the main focus of the journals. Unsurprisingly, one quarter of the journals in the inventory are very generally focused and claim to publish all types of research and analysis on higher education. The rest are extremely varied, and only a few focuses are shared by more than 10 journals in the world. The most prevalent focus area is that of teaching and learning: 27 publications cite it as one of their main focuses. Policy, reform, and changes are also at the heart of conversation, with 18 journals making these topics their priority. The third most common focus areas are management, organization, and governance, as well as student affairs—the latter mostly thanks to the dominance of this topic in the United States (13 journals out of 15). Other focus areas worth noting in terms of prevalence include continuing and adult education; internationalization, globalization, and cross-border education; and distance education. The rest of the publications indicate a main focus on areas ranging from evaluation or quality to specific student populations—such as

African American or Hispanic.

WHAT DID WE LEARN?

The publication landscape is dominated by the English-speaking world, as evidenced by the languages and the countries of publication. This is worrying, as most of the research therefore follows the orientations of a small subset of the global population, emphasizing characteristics of a higher education system that might not be valid for all. More importantly, this domination prevents knowledge from spreading in remote places where English language is seldom used or where publications are not available. Efforts have to be made to disseminate research in higher education more widely, by encouraging open source publications as well as appropriate translations.

It includes a list of 280 journals and publications, primarily concerning higher education.

The number of publications also show that a few countries are clearly leading the higher education research landscape—the United States, the United Kingdom, China, and Japan. In many countries around the world, higher education has not emerged as an important area for academic inquiry, and many countries are lacking the appropriate and reliable knowledge that can inform policymaking. Regionally, Latin America, Africa, Middle East and North Africa are highly underrepresented, as well as Asia, except for China and Japan. Efforts should be made to help researchers in these regions and enhance regional collaboration to strengthen the knowledge base in higher education.

The regional distribution of publications in the field of higher education also parallels the National Science Foundation's 2009 estimate of global research and development expenditures. North America and Asia are the leading research and development investors, the latter being heavily driven by China and Japan, while regions like Africa and the Middle East lag behind. Unsurprisingly, this suggests that the availability of funds is correlated with the output of research in higher education, as in other fields.

Finally, the range of publication focus areas reflects well the diversity of higher education stakeholders around the world. It is encouraging to see that so many issues are rising to the attention of researchers and the public, showing the complexity of the higher education field. This emphasizes the need to prioritize issues at the policy level.

The absence of any publication emphasizing the funding of higher education as a main focus struck us as unique, especially when considering the importance of the issue today for students, parents, institutions, and policymakers. However, there is no lack of research on this subject, and we can only assume that publications with a broader focus publish extensively on the subject of funding and finance. Overall, the aim of publications with specific focus areas might be to drive interest on an underresearched topic, thus leaving prominent issues to the broadly focused publications.

CONCLUSION

The higher education publication sector is quite uneven worldwide, as some countries can count on numerous publications with diverse focuses, while others do not even enjoy a single publication focused solely on higher education. The need to make sure that knowledge is shared more equally around the world is pressing, an effort that should be undertaken by researchers, publishers, and policymakers

Note: Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, and Journals and Publications is published by Lemmens Media. It is available under three formats: an e-book, a downloadable PDF, or a printed book.

International Higher Education Research and Comparative Analysis

ANNA KOSMÜTZKY AND GEORG KRÜCKEN

Anna Kosmützky is a researcher and Georg Krücken is director of the International Center for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel, Germany. E-mail: kosmuetzky@incher.uni-kassel.de. E-mail: kruecken@incher-kassel.de.

International comparative higher education research has been a popular and valuable field of research. International and global trends and developments in higher education have stimulated higher education research on a worldwide scale in recent years. Simultaneously, international higher education research has increased in volume and even more in popularity. Furthermore, international collaboration in research in general has intensified and proliferated rapidly in the last two decades. This trend has also been en-

couraged by political institutions, particularly in Europe, through specific research funding. The European Union's Seventh Framework Program, for instance, requires at least three different EU member states for transnational partnerships; and national funding agencies all across Europe have opened their national funding programs and offer cross-border funding to facilitate researcher mobility and cross-border research projects.

In light of these developments, one would also expect a growing amount of international comparative higher education research, partially due to an intersection of both international collaborative and international higher education research.

International and global trends and developments in higher education have stimulated higher education research on a worldwide scale in recent years.

WHAT BIBLIOMETRIC DATA SHOW

In a recent study we explored the patterns of international comparative higher education research presented in articles in eight leading international higher education journals, both from Europe and the United States. Among other questions, we asked: What share does international comparative research have in higher education research in general, and how does it develop quantitatively over the years? Where do the authors come from? And how many countries are compared? To answer these questions, a specific definition was adopted of international comparative research in higher education: the comparison of issues and developments of higher education within different national higher education systems. Hence, journal articles were defined as *internationally comparative*, if they refer to research that compares mainly at two countries. This criterion served to distinguish international comparative research from higher education research that focuses on international or global topics, without being genuinely internationally comparative. Methodologically, a bibliometric approach was analyzing international journal data with a quantitative content analysis of abstracts of articles on the basis of a coding of countries. The overall data set covers 4,095 publications from the Web of Science for the period 1992–2012.

A SMALL, BUT STEADY FIELD

Surprisingly, the patterns we found do not reflect the general trend of a growing internationality in higher education

research. In contrast, the results of our publication analysis of international journal data reveal a relatively steady state of international comparative higher education research over the past 20 years (1992–2012): over the years, a share of 11 percent of articles present results from international comparative research—with a slight increase in recent years: From 2009 onwards, the mean percentage is 15 percent. It remains an open question whether this indicates a stable trend of growth, stabilization on a higher level or a short-term increase, which might be reversed. Nevertheless, in general our analysis indicates that international comparative research can be described as a small but steady branch of international higher education research.

INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION AND SMALL COMPARATIVE CLUSTERS

We found twice as much international collaborative publications (measured as coauthorships) in international comparative research compared to noncomparative research. Our results show 46 percent international coauthored publications (coauthors from at least two different countries) for our data set on international comparative journal articles, compared to 24 percent in noncomparative journal articles. Furthermore, our analysis shows that small-size comparisons are most popular in international comparative higher education research; they have by far the greatest share among all articles compared: 85 percent of the articles compare two countries or three countries. Articles comparing four, five, or even six and more countries exist but are quite rare. Nevertheless, from 2009 onwards, there is also a tendency to include more than three countries.

RESULTS

Results from bibliometric analysis always have to be interpreted with caution, and they definitely do not tell the whole story about international comparative research in higher education but provide interesting initial insights. The insights gained from our study indicate specific characteristics of international comparative higher education research. Although higher education research focusing on international or global topics might increase in international journals in the field, genuine international comparative higher education research only has a small share in the international journal literature. Hence, it can be described as a small but steady branch of international higher education research, which is basically engaged with small cluster comparisons of countries and is to a large extent internationally collaborative. How can these characteristics be explained? We basically see two rationales:

Higher education research is to a large extent nationally and locally based. Due to its interdisciplinary and applied character it often contributes knowledge at the intersection

of national higher education politics, institutional governance, and practitioners. Building on this characteristic, considerations on locals (individuals with deep experience in their own country) and cosmopolitans (individuals with a broad experience in and a focus on different countries), as introduced by Alvin W. Gouldner in the late 1950s, are revealing. Applying his considerations to higher education research illuminates two latent types of research orientations of academics and institutes, within national research environments. Whereas the cosmopolitans immediately pick up and implement international trends in higher education into their research agenda and initiate international comparative research, the locals usually devote their research to the national context. They also pick up international trends in higher education but are more likely to translate them into national research designs and projects.

The overall data set covers 4,095 publications from the Web of Science for the period 1992–2012.

International comparative research is genuinely more complex in its nature than nationally based research—it has multifaceted national angles, which constitute specifically complex research objects. Furthermore, as we have shown, international comparative articles are often outcomes of international collaborative research teams. Due to the more complex research team dynamics within teams located in different countries, international comparative research often implicates a more time-consuming coordination and costly communication. Hence, it might be difficult for international research teams to publish journal articles within the usual three-year time span of research projects. It might be even more difficult to maintain a research network beyond the project duration and to continue the joint international work. Thus, it seems likely that international research teams may favor anthologies, conference proceedings, and monographs as publication formats.

Although these two rationales point to inherent characteristics of international comparative higher education research, which seem to limit its growth, we also found both a recent increase in international comparisons and a tendency toward the comparison of larger country clusters since 2009. Further research is necessary, which explores whether this growth and the tendency toward larger comparative clusters are affected by political institutions through specific research funding schemes. Furthermore, studies on the communication and publication practices and research

team dynamics of international research teams in interdisciplinary research settings would be desirable.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Both rationales refer to institutional and funding structures of higher education research. Thus, we draw the following policy relevant implications from our analysis: in order to strengthen and promote—and eventually increase—international comparative research projects, longer project periods, or projects with flexible modular options for extensions appear as first-choice means. Beyond that, it is worth considering establishing more systematic capacity building, regarding research designs and steering of international collaborative research projects—e.g., through the exchange with other interdisciplinary and disciplinary research fields, as well as through specific training for early career researchers in higher education research. Moreover, international exchange of higher education researchers should be stimulated (and promoted) from the very beginning of research careers. This—reciprocally—would facilitate the internationalization of higher education research and eventually might facilitate international comparative projects. ■

Academic Ranking of World Universities: Changes in World Higher Education?

YING CHENG

Ying Cheng is executive director of the Center for World-Class Universities and associate professor in the Graduate School of Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China. E-mail: ycheng@sjtu.edu.cn.

In order to find out the gap between top Chinese universities and World-Class Universities, a team led by Professor Nian Cai Liu at the Center for World-Class Universities (CWCU) of Shanghai Jiao Tong University started a project on the benchmarking of top Chinese universities with US research universities, which eventually evolved into the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU)—first published in June 2003 and then updated on an annual basis. ARWU is distinguished from other global rankings, for it only uses objective indicators. Its methodology has been kept unchanged since 2004, therefore only substantial progress in academic excellence can help universities

to climb up on the ARWU list. In August 2014, CWCU released the 12th edition. The 12-years of effort provides a unique opportunity to observe the changes of performance of universities and countries over the past decade.

NUMBER OF COUNTRIES HOSTING TOP 500 UNIVERSITIES

The number of countries represented in the 2004 ARWU top 500 rankings was 35. By 2014, this number increased to 42. Four out of seven emerging countries are from the Middle East—including Saudi Arabia, Iran, Turkey, and Egypt. Saudi universities began to enter into ARWU in 2009, and now this leading country of the Arab world has four universities ranked among the top 500, and two of them even get into top 200. University of Teheran in Iran first entered into top 500 in 2009 and then broke into top 400 two years after. Istanbul University in Turkey and Cairo University in Egypt had been in and out of the ARWU list since 2004; and in 2014 both of them were ranked in the range of 401–500. The three other countries that became hosting countries of the top 500 universities are Slovenia, Malaysia, and Serbia; their universities had been visible in ARWU since 2007, mainly in 2011 and 2012. While it is hard to explain the expansion of countries that have top 500 universities, however, nowadays a lot of countries in the world are keen on having one or several of their universities to appear on global-ranking lists.

It is not surprising that Chinese universities, with strong financial support from the central government of China, have made remarkable progress in ARWU.

THE RISE OF CHINESE UNIVERSITIES

ARWU was started in the context of China's efforts on building world-class universities. Therefore, it is not surprising that Chinese universities, with strong financial support from the central government of China, have made remarkable progress in ARWU. The number of mainland China's universities in the top 500 increased from 8 in 2004 to 32 in 2014. In addition, Tsinghua University, Peking University, and four other mainland Chinese universities are now listed among the top 200, while in 2004 these two universities were in the range of 201–300 and the four others were after the top 300. Taiwan's government launched a similar project for world-class universities (called "Five Year Fifty Billion Plan") in 2005, and its number of top 500 universi-

ties increased to 7 in 2014 from 3 in 2004. As a result, the total number of ARWU top 500 universities from mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan reaches 44, second only to the United States. However, none of the Chinese universities have been ranked among the world-top 100 yet.

THE PREPONDERANCE OF THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN HAS DECLINED

University ranking has been criticized for many reasons, one cause is that ranking is a zero-sum game, because the number of top positions is fixed and a new face always comes at the cost of the disappearance of an old one. When more and more universities from China, the Middle East, and eastern European countries entered into ARWU, the United States lost 14 percent (24 in number) of its top 500 universities during 2004–2014, but its number of top 100 universities remained almost unchanged. Japan might be the country with the greatest regression in ARWU between 2004 and 2014. Japan universities occupied 5 position in ARWU the top 100 and 36 positions in the top 500 in 2004, but in 2014 there were only 3 in the top 100 and 19 in the top 500. Such a result would become more difficult to understand when considering the fact that Japan also introduced programs for supporting its research universities—such as "21st Century COE Program" and "Global 30 Project" in that period.

CHANGES OF WORLD-CLASS UNIVERSITIES

We once defined those universities ranked among world-top 100 as world-class universities. According to this definition, there were 13 new universities attaining the title of world class in 2014. Switzerland, Netherlands, Belgium, and Australia all got 2 more world-class universities in 2014 than they had in 2004. On the other hand, both Italy and Austria lost the country's only the top 100 university in the same period. The Sapienza University of Rome dropped out of the top 100 in 2007. University of Vienna fell out of top the 100 in 2006, after its medical section became an independent university. Among those that had been already among the top 100, the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom made the most significant progress over the past decade and moved up from 78 to 53 in 2005—as a result of the merger with the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology—and further to 41 in 2014. The University of Melbourne, in Australia, steadily improved its position from 83 to 44 during 2004–2014.

REFLECTION

Few people would disagree that a top ranking position itself should not be the ultimate goal of any universities or countries. However, with the faith in the role of world-class universities to their home countries and the enormous in-

fluence of global rankings, it is not rare to hear national leaders explicitly stated that the country should have certain number of top universities by a particular time. In 2012, Vladimir Putin, the president of Russia, announced that at least 5 of Russian universities should break into the world-top 100 by 2020. Japan's Prime Minister Abe said in 2013 that the country's aim was to have 10 universities in the world-top 100. While the high expectation from the national leaders would usually lead to extra and concentrated investment to selected universities, and some good results must come; the pursuit of higher ranking or more top-ranked universities should not be encouraged until the rankings are based on what a university or a country really wants. ■

The *Times Higher Education* Rankings and the Mysterious “Rise of Asia”

ALEX USHER

Alex Usher is President of Higher Education Strategy Associates, Toronto, Canada. His daily blog on higher education issues can be found at www.higheredstrategy.com/blog.

There are, broadly speaking, three types of rankings in higher education. There are those that are put out by independent agencies which are not connected to a media outlet, such as the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU—also known as the Shanghai rankings) or the new annual rankings from the Middle East Technical University in Turkey. These groups simply post their data on a Web site and leave it to others to interpret. There are also rankings published by media outlets for which the rankings are simply a hook to hang an annual bout of coverage of higher education issues that are largely unconnected to the data itself. Canada's *Maclean's* rankings have always used this format as—to a significant extent—has *US News and World Report*. Finally, there are media rankings, for which the rankings are the story. And here, the *Times Higher Education* rankings lead the way.

The problem with making the ranking the story is that there is a need for a narrative. But good rankings—i.e., rankings that reflect the reality that quality in higher education is something built over decades, not years—simply do not provide a lot of movement from year to year. In the past, for instance, *US News* was (not always fairly) accused of changing its methodology every year, to change the out-

comes in order to create new narratives. *THE* has avoided this kind of chicanery over the past few years, and by and large their rankings have been characterized by a significant level of stability. This puts the paper in something of a quandary: how can rankings drive a narrative when very little changes from year-to-year?

THE RESULTS FOR EAST ASIA

Fortunately for the *THE*, the research-concentration policies of many East Asian governments—such as Project 985 in China, Brain 21 in Korea, and others—have resulted in ever-increasing publication and citation counts for about 20 or so universities in the region. As a result, these institutions have over the years seen a steady rise in their ranking position, which has allowed the *THE* to run a steady series of “The Rise of Asia” stories. Asian universities appreciated the coverage and reciprocated by giving the *THE* a fair amount of business in advertising sales and conference traffic. But when the *THE* ran stories on “The Rise of Asia” in its 2014 rankings, it was acting out of force of habit, rather than a sober analysis of the data.

The evidence for a rise of Asia in the actual rankings table clearly does not lie in the top 50. Tokyo University and the University of Hong Kong were unchanged in their position this year from last. Peking University rose one place and National University of Singapore rose three; but Tsinghua University in China fell one place, and Seoul National University fell six. All told, this is a “no change” for the continent.

Going down from positions 50 to 200 in the rankings, we see a mix of good and bad, at least among East Asian universities. Nearly all the Japanese universities saw double-digit falls in places, as did National Taiwan University and Chinese University of Hong Kong. In Korea, Postech fell six places from 60th to 66th, while Yonsei University fell out of the top 200 altogether. Among East Asian universities that in the previous year ranked between 50 and 200, only two (Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology) rose in the rankings. Offsetting this poor performance to some degree somewhat were the rise into the top 200 of City University of Hong Kong (192nd), Fudan University in China (193rd) and Korea's Sungkyunkwan University (148th). So, while there was a net gain of 2 institutions in the top 200, the average position of East Asian universities fell somewhat. By any sensible measure, this is a mixed picture and not an unequivocal “rise.”

TURKEY RESCUES ASIA

So how then did the *THE* come up with a claim of a “rise of Asia”? Well, the paper does not say so directly in its news coverage, but it was mostly because of Turkey. The

only Turkish institution that was previously in the top 200, Bogazici University, jumped 60 places to 139th. Istanbul Technical University rose from the 201–225 band (below 200, *Times* does not offer specific ranks but rather sensibly places institutions in bands) to 165th. Middle East Technical University rose from the same band to 85th, while Sabanci University went from being unranked to 182nd position.

So why are Turkish universities suddenly hot? Richard Holmes, who runs the University Ranking blog, provides a cogent answer. He has pointed out that a single paper (the widely cited “Observation of a new boson...” in *Physics Letters B*, which announced the confirmation of the Higgs Boson) was responsible for most of the movement in this year’s

But good rankings—i.e., rankings that reflect the reality that quality in higher education is something built over decades, not years—simply do not provide a lot of movement from year to year.

rankings. This paper had over 2,800 coauthors, including from those suddenly big Turkish universities. Because the *THE* does not fractionally count multiple-authored articles, each institution which has a coauthor on the paper gets to count all of the citations. And since the *THE*’s methodology on citations is structured to in effect give many “bonus points” to universities located in countries where scientific publications are low, this blew some schools’ numbers into the stratosphere and not just in Turkey. Other examples of this are Scuola Normale di Pisa in Italy, which came from literally out of nowhere to be ranked 65th in the world, or Federica Santa Maria Technical University in Chile, which managed this year to become the 4th ranked university in Latin America.

A TREND OR A FLUKE?

So basically, the entire factual basis for this year’s “rise of Asia” story was based almost entirely on the fact that a few of the 2,800 coauthors on the “Observation of a new boson...” paper happened to work in Turkey. That makes it a statistical quirk and nothing whatsoever to do with the long-term rise of universities in rising economies in China and the rest of East Asia. Indeed, many of these institutions seem to have gone into reverse, leading one to question if there are any circumstances under which the *THE* would choose not to run a “rise of Asia” headline.

The *THE*, commendably, has recently begun public

consultations to review its methodologies. Clearly, its policies on counting citations are badly in need of an overhaul. But, perhaps some thought should be given, too, to its editorial policies: the obsession with portraying a rampant Asia is not doing the paper any favors. ■

Confronting the Challenges of Graduate Education in Sub-Saharan Africa

FRED M. HAYWARD AND DANIEL J. NCAYIYANA

Fred M. Hayward is a senior higher education consultant at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. E-mail: haywardfred@hotmail.com. Daniel J. Ncayiyana is former vice chancellor of the Durban University of Technology in South Africa and deputy vice chancellor of the University of Cape Town and a higher education consultant. E-mail: profdijn@gmail.com.

The colonial origins of most of African higher education resulted in graduate education being ignored at their origin. The view was that, if graduate education was needed, students could travel to the colonial motherland. Thus, the current state of graduate education in sub-Saharan Africa can rightly be described as a consequence of the deleterious impact of the past and challenges that have faced higher education since the 1970s.

CHALLENGES FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION

By the mid-1970s both the environment for higher education and its status were in decline. The effects on most graduate education programs were devastating. The economy was in crisis in most African countries, some governments had come to regard universities as bastions of unwelcome criticism and centers of opposition, costs seemed too high, faculty and student life-styles questionable, and the utility of universities and graduate programs in particular, suddenly seemed limited.

The decline in international development assistance to higher education and the shift in focus to primary education with an emphasis on “education for all” contributed to the problems. The decline in state and donor funding is starkly illustrated by the reduction in per capita public spending for higher education, which fell from US\$6,800 in 1980, to US\$1,200 in 2002, and by 2009 averaged just US\$981 in 33 African countries. This is a staggering decrease of 82 percent.

Teaching too generally declined in quality because of the rapid expansion of admissions, the overall increases in class size, elimination of tutorials in many universities, a shortage of faculty members, and the low level of qualifications of many new teachers. Enrollments grew from fewer than 200,000 in the 1970s to about 6 million today. As other developed and developing nations invested heavily in information technology, African leaders were not able to do so and thus the information technology gap between Africa and the rest of the world grew. These conditions impacted on both the ability to offer graduate training and, where it existed, limited its quality.

The overall economic news for sub-Saharan Africa recently has become somewhat brighter. The growth rate of the economy in sub-Saharan Africa rose to 6.1 percent in 2013 and is predicted to grow to 6.8 percent in 2014. After years of decline in donor funding, there are a few encouraging examples—including a recent World Bank US\$200 million project *Strengthening Tertiary Education in Africa* through African Centers of Excellence. It focuses on several critical areas of higher education—including science technology, engineering, mathematics, health, and agriculture. The Carnegie Corporation has provided substantial funding for higher education in its multimillion dollar programs—focusing on graduate training, increasing the quality and number of faculty with PhDs, and fostering research and publications.

The data we have on enrollment growth of graduate education in recent years are spotty. Graduate enrollments between 1997 and 2007 show a total of 169,275 graduate students studying for master's degrees and PhDs, or 6.9 percent of the total enrollment. Data from 2010–2013 shows an increase to a total of 294,339 now 9.3 percent of the total enrollment at these institutions, an increase of 73.9 percent. While this is a quite substantial increase over approximately five years, slightly more than half of it is reflected in the increase in graduate students in South Africa. Of this total, approximately 20 percent were studying at the PhD level, 80 percent at the master's level.

Graduate programs have in general suffered from faculty shortages. The average age of faculty members is growing due to lack of recruitment, increasing losses as older faculty members retire. The shortage of faculty members with PhDs is worsening. Five years ago 50 percent of academic staff had PhDs. The total today is lower with our data showing an average of 38 percent PhDs; a recent World Bank estimate was less than 20 percent. This has resulted in lack of adequate supervision of graduate students in many programs.

HIGH-QUALITY GRADUATE EDUCATION TO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Research has shown that no nation moves into the realm of developing economies without a high-quality higher education system, and that includes graduate education. Development comes in many forms ranging from research into critical national problems to contributions to knowledge. Universities are the only national institutions with the self-renewing knowledge producing capacity essential to sustain and expand growth.

Graduate enrollments between 1997 and 2007 show a total of 169,275 graduate students studying for master's degrees and PhDs, or 6.9 percent of the total enrollment.

South Africa and Ghana are exceptions to the general decline in graduate education. New enrollments in South African master's programs have grown from 9 percent in 2000, to 16 percent in 2005, with 70 percent coming from other African countries. Half of these were from the Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries. That growth reflects South Africa's generosity to its SADC neighbors by allowing them to pay the same tuition as South African students. Master's graduates in public institutions increased by 56 percent from 2000 to 2009. At the doctoral level, graduates grew from 2000 to 2009 by 67 percent.

The clearest measure of the low level of research in sub-Saharan Africa can be seen in the limited number of publications by its scholars. Even in relative terms the numbers of publications for sub-Saharan Africa are low with the exception of South Africa.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The most critical tasks are to reestablish the culture of teaching, learning, and research at African universities. At the best universities it is important to improve or establish first-rate graduate programs. Also essential is the recruitment of more well-trained PhD faculty members, a reduction in the teaching load, and adequate remunerations so that faculty members do not need second jobs to survive financially.

New sources of funding must be found for graduate education. With improvement generally in the economies of sub-Saharan Africa, there are opportunities for increased

government support. Additional donor support is also essential. Fees, too, may need to be increased in those cases where they are low or nonexistent.

Regional graduate centers need to be encouraged. South Africa has become a major regional center for graduate education. Hopefully, the new Pan-African University, established by the African Union, will fill part of that need. It is designed to focus on graduate education in targeted areas, beginning with five regional campuses. Other possibilities for regional centers might be Senegal with its long history of regional activity and Ghana that has greatly improved graduate programs.

A major effort needs to be made to expand faculty PhD training, because the number of PhDs in sub-Saharan African universities has declined markedly. We applaud the efforts of the Carnegie Corporation in that area and encourage other donors to join in that effort.

THE FUTURE

A key goal for the future is to maintain and expand high-quality graduate education. Successes will not come without major new investments in graduate education by those governments that recognize the benefits of high-quality graduate programs, from faculty members who make a commitment to high-quality research and teaching, from students who have the intellectual capacity for intensive study, and from contributions from foreign governments, donors, and international organizations. Such commitments will help revive stalled national development in much of sub-Saharan Africa and create the conditions for a revival of contributions by African graduate education to national development and knowledge production. ■

Private Twilight: Wither Private Universities in Kenya

ISHMAEL I. MUNENE

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

In the latest sign all is not well in Kenya's private university sector. The International University of Professional Studies (IUPS) is on the auction block as auctioneers have seized the main campus and other assets over a Ksh. 280 million (US\$3.1 million) debt. Strangely, another private university, Mount Kenya University has offered to purchase

IUPS assets as part of its aggressive expansion strategy. These improbable events point to two contradictory dilemmas in Kenya's private university sector: while the sector is on a downward trend, there are pockets of silver linings in the looming dark clouds.

In the 1990s, private universities were promoted as the antidote to the comatose university public sector. With decreasing state subventions, the institutions were bursting at the seams: overcrowding, dilapidated facilities, poorly resourced libraries, and a critical shortage of academic staff. Neoliberal policies of privatization and commercialization, it was expected, would simultaneously generate additional revenues to the system, while continuing to meet demand through overall system growth. The 1990s and early 2000 represented the golden age of private university growth in Kenya, as numerous private universities were established to provide an alternative avenue for higher education. Two decades later, there has been a reversal of fortunes; private universities are in dire straits, while public universities have registered a robust resurgent.

Kenya's university enrollment reached 324,560 students in 2014. Around 244,560 (75%) are enrolled in public institutions while 80,000 (25%) are in private ones. The total number of universities stands at 67, of which 31 (46%) are public institutions (22 chartered and 9 affiliate university colleges) while 36 (54%) are private (17 chartered, 6 affiliated university colleges, and 13 with Letters of Interim Authority to operate). The major surge in public universities occurred in 2012, when 22 universities and university colleges (71%) were established. Though the number of private universities supersedes the public ones, in absolute enrollment they are a distant second. The conundrum besetting private universities is a trilogy of three interrelated factors namely, the loss of distinct identity, shift in government policy on higher education, and the resurgence of the public university sector.

WE ARE ALL THE SAME: IDENTITY CRISIS

The growth in private universities in the 1990s was driven by Christian churches. This first wave of private university growth saw all the major Christian denominations establish private universities, with the denominational nomenclature proudly declaring the religious affiliation of the institutions—Catholics, Methodists, Nazarene, Presbyterians, Pentecostals, Seventh Day Adventists, and other protestant groups. These religious universities have marketed themselves as providing a distinct brand of higher education, one with religious fervor. At 58 percent, Christian universities today make up the bulk of private universities. The only major religious group that has not established a university is the Muslim community.

In recent years the distinction between religious and public universities has waned. As competition for students between universities has intensified, religious universities have deemphasized the religious fervor of their education. Deep affiliation with religion or denomination is no longer the linchpin of the universities, and it is less the reason to attend them. Religious privateness has faded; there is less reason to attend the universities if religious enrichment was the objective.

NEW LEASE OF LIFE: GOVERNMENT POLICY

State policy has contributed in denting private university growth. Government is viewed in terms of how it promotes public sector growth with cascading effect on the private sector. Delayed regulation has been used by the Kenyan government to address quality concerns in public universities. In 2012, the Kenyan government repealed the individual laws establishing each state university and replaced them with one common statute that would guide the development and operations of all state universities. Furthermore, the state has mandated the accreditation of state universities, just like their private counterparts. Even though large classes and the large number of contingent faculty in branch campuses pose threats to quality, these symbolic acts have demonstrated the government's concern with quality in the public sector and dented criticism of neglect.

Another macrolevel policy has been public system expansion. Alarmed at the low enrollment in private universities in the face of growing demand, the government has moved with haste to expand the public sector through the creation of demand-absorbing public universities, with the accompanying state-subsidized low tuition fees. In 2012 alone, the government established 22 public universities, by upgrading colleges. The establishment of new public universities has occurred simultaneously with expansion of capacity in existing ones, further boosting public sector market share.

The government's actions point to the preponderant role of the state as a funder and influencer of the public sector roles. The state's expansionary policies have been geared toward public system growth, to the detriment of the private sector.

THE RISE OF THE PHOENIX: PUBLIC SECTOR REVITALIZATION

Private decline is also tied to public sector revitalization through privatization. Following the privatization of public universities, sectorial distinctions with private ones have become blurred. State policy has promoted the internal revenue generation by public universities; universities have responded by privatizing and commercializing both academic and nonacademic functions to shore up their bottom lines.

Through module II programs, public universities are

able to admit privately sponsored students who pay higher tuition than state-sponsored students but lower than what private universities charge. This has proved popular in market-oriented programs—such as engineering, information technology, medical sciences, and pharmacy. Given the prestige historically attached to public universities, module II programs have become the “first second choice” for those unable to attain the coveted state-sponsored option. In two of Kenya's largest public universities, Kenyatta University and the University of Nairobi, privately sponsored students outnumber government-sponsored ones.

The establishment of new public universities has occurred simultaneously with expansion of capacity in existing ones, further boosting public sector market share.

Further, public universities have engaged in commercial activities in degrees unimaginable in private institutions. They have established industrial parks, formed joint ventures with private corporations, commercialized their residential and catering services, and leased their facilities at market rates. Revenues generated from tuition fees and commercial activities have been utilized in repair and maintenance of existing facilities and construction of new ones.

Privatization and commercialization have seen the resurgence of the public fiefdom. It has become a magnet for those seeking university education at a moderate cost. This model of public university with robust privatization can only coexist with a dwindling private sector. Nearly all private universities are struggling to raise sufficient students for optimal use of their existing facilities.

THE QUALITY CONUNDRUM

With market-share decline, most private universities have suboptimal enrollment, thus threatening their financial well-being and academic quality. Quality instruction is threatened by staff departure, to the better remunerated unionized ranks in public universities and the presence of large numbers of adjunct faculty who also do not engage in reputation enhancing academic work. In addition, their libraries remain small and underresourced. All these quality-related variables have further undermined the private university sector. ■

International Student Enrollment: Evidence-Driven Strategies

RAHUL CHOUDAHA

Rahul Choudaha is chief knowledge officer and Senior Director of Strategic Development at World Education Services in New York (wes.org/ras). He is an international higher education strategist and blogs as DrEducation.com. E-mail: rahul@wes.org.

Interest in recruiting international students is growing among many institutions, for reasons ranging from reputational to financial. However, strategies translating intent into action are often devoid of research and insights. This lack of thorough examination before designing strategies often results in inefficient, expensive, and unsustainable enrollment strategies.

Consider the case of the United States, which is the world's leading destination for international students. However, these students are concentrated in a small number of institutions; only 200 out of nearly 4,500 American postsecondary institutions enroll approximately 70 percent of all international students.

This concentration of students shows that most of the institutions outside these 200 would face significant difficulties in attracting international students. The situation is further accentuated by the issues of resource constraints, location disadvantages, and rankings.

While these challenges are difficult, they are not insurmountable. Often, institutions underestimate the importance of research in facilitating the understanding of international student decision-making processes in informing their strategies. The key is to know more about international students throughout their enrollment—who they are, how they choose institution, and how are their experiences.

Every year, there are numerous updates from various sources on how the number of international students is changing; however, little is discussed about the specific drivers of change, or about how student needs, experiences, and profiles are shifting. Most importantly, there has been little focus on how these changes apply at the campus level.

Some institutions make the mistake of extrapolating national or regional trends, which may or may not apply in the context of their campuses. In other cases, school allows anecdotal evidence and stereotypical views on international students' needs and behavior to drive the strategies. Finally, the strategy sometimes boils down to "outsourcing" to a third-party commission-based recruiter.

All of these approaches to strategy formulation are not only likely to be misaligned with the institutional strengths, resources, and capacities, but they also may result in enrollment of an international student body lacking in the diversity and academic quality to which the institution aspires.

RESEARCH TO BRIDGE THE GAP

Institutions can better inform their strategies if each one intentionally assesses needs, behaviors, and profiles of international students in its unique context. While there is national data on student enrollment available, there has been little research available on applying it to campus contexts.

For example, while the number of undergraduate international students in the United States increased between 2008/2009 to 2012/2013 bringing issues challenges and complexities for enrollment management professionals, however, the research has not kept pace with this. A search of the keyword "international" in the *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice*, which has been in publication for the last 15 years, yields only four articles.

A recent research report—*Bridging the Gap: Recruitment and Retention to Improve Student Experiences*—produced by World Educational Services and released by NAFSA, aimed at addressing this need. It investigated an increasingly important yet complex issue for practitioners in an evidence-driven manner (nafsa.org/retentionresearch).

However, these students are concentrated in a small number of institutions; only 200 out of nearly 4,500 American postsecondary institutions enroll approximately 70 percent of all international students.

The report also illustrated the gap between students and institutions. For example, according to the report, international education professionals reported academic difficulties and inadequate English-language skills as the third and fourth most important reasons why international students may leave institutions, but they were not among the top five for students.

Likewise, an upcoming report from World Education Services, *Bridge the Digital Divide: Segmenting and Recruiting International Millennial Students*, shows a similar disconnect. Based on the segmentation framework of different types of international students, the report analyzes nearly 5,000 17-to-36-year-old international Millennial students'

penchant for technology and the psychographic characteristics that fundamentally influence their information-seeking behavior.

It shows that universities may be underutilizing technology and some of their other most important assets in recruiting international students. For example, more than two-fifths of the respondents (42%) stated that either one of the university network (community members)—including faculty, admission officers, current students, and alumni—had the largest influence on their application decisions. In contrast, only 11 percent of the respondents indicated that “educational consultants” had an impact.

Another challenge is due to the limited national data on international students. The available data is not only outdated but also suffers from definitional issues, making it difficult to project forecasts for new source countries in the next three to five years. This is especially detrimental, as it takes several years of developing and building relationships to recruit international students from new source countries.

In my previous article in *IHE*, *Preparing for Emerging Markets*, I argued that instead of intentionally looking into key source countries to engage within the next several years, institutions are responding to short-term student demand, and are missing the opportunity to cultivate the best-fit opportunities (<http://bit.ly/EmergingRecruit>).

CONCLUSION

Expanding international student populations on university campuses while maintaining the goals of cost, quality, and diversity is a complex optimization problem. It requires assessment of institutional goals, priorities, and capacities; investigation of student needs, profiles, and experiences; and, finally, mapping institutional and individual needs through a comprehensive strategy.

In a postrecession environment, an increasing number of higher education institutions are interested in attracting the next wave of international students. However, institutions must recognize the complexity and volatility of international student decision-making processes, and should invest in developing evidence-driven enrollment strategies. The quick-fix international student enrollment strategies are neither informed nor sustainable. In sum, it is important to “zoom-out” to look into big picture megatrends, but then to “zoom-in” as well, to see the applicability and relevance of these trends at the institutional level. ■

Kazakhstan’s Bolashak Scholarship Program

AIDA SAGINTAYEVA AND ZAKIR JUMAKULOV

Aida Sagintayeva is Chief Executive Director, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Astana, Kazakhstan. E-mail: asagintayeva@nu.edu.kz. Zakir Jumakulov is a junior researcher, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, in Astana, Kazakhstan. E-mail: zakir.jumakulov@nu.edu.kz.

Emerging economies have increasingly realized the connection between human capital investment and economic prosperity. They are looking at more advanced countries for best practices to reform the tertiary education system at home. Among the approaches is sending students to study abroad on government-sponsored scholarships. This practice, which often entails a considerable financial investment by the home nation, is expected to accelerate the development of human capital.

Kazakhstan’s Bolashak Scholarship is one example of a long-standing government-sponsored international scholarship program. In 1993, the Kazakhstan government launched Bolashak (Kazakh for “future”) Scholarships to send students to attend colleges and universities abroad. About 100 students received the scholarships annually until 2005, when the number increased over time to average 800 per year.

In an effort to maximize program effectiveness, program administrators have made various changes in the design over the past 20 years. Based on our review of program characteristics and outcomes, we identify five lessons for how this government-sponsored scholarship program has accomplished its goal for promoting human capital development.

SPECIFYING STRATEGIC PRIORITY AREAS

Wise investment of limited government funds for maximum return has always been a challenge in scholarship design. One approach is to match the educational priorities of the sending country, with the academic programs available overseas. A recent examination of international scholarship programs shows that 45 percent of 183 government sponsored scholarship programs in 196 countries with specific academic priority areas.

Prior to 1997, when Bolashak had no guidelines on the areas of study, scholarship recipients were concentrated in humanities and social sciences, and the number of recipients in science and engineering remained extremely low.

The Kazakhstan government responded by creating a list of priority areas of study in 1997, giving weight to applicants in the majors identified as highly relevant to the

strategic development of the country. To further encourage applicants in science and engineering majors, the government also had lowered language requirements and offered applicants English-language courses. These alterations were designed to produce qualified specialists in line with the government's overall priorities for diversification and industrial development of the economy.

IDENTIFYING DESIRED INSTITUTIONS

A second lesson learned pertains to the types of institutions that students attend and the ways to recognize the asymmetric education provision between home and overseas institutions. Studying abroad allows students to enroll in programs that are not available or are of lower quality than in the home institutions. Funding bodies seek to support students enrolled in leading institutions abroad, in hope of providing greater access to high-quality higher education. In accordance with this rationale, the Bolashak program, as well as 85 percent of government-sponsored study-abroad programs offered worldwide, limit students' destination institutions.

Prior to 1997, when Bolashak had no guidelines on the areas of study, scholarship recipients were concentrated in humanities and social sciences, and the number of recipients in science and engineering remained extremely low.

The initial design of the Bolashak program did not restrict the choices of institutions by recipients, and thus it could not prevent them from studying at dubious institutions. The need for the Kazakhstan government to carefully appraise the quality of overseas institutions was exacerbated during the recent global financial crises, when many institutions worldwide lowered their entrance requirements to recruit more fee-paying students.

To better meet the aims of the program, the program's administration developed a list of recommended higher education institutions, compiled from the *Times Higher Education* Rankings and QS World University Rankings, to ensure that scholarship recipients would study at universities approved by the program. With these changes, the number of universities recommended for Bolashak students decreased from 630 in 2007 to the current number of 200.

ENSURING TRANSPARENCY

To be perceived as prestigious and available to top students, a program like Bolashak must ensure that the limited scholarships are awarded to recipients in accordance with its merit-based principles.

A third lesson learned by the Kazakhstan government was the need for transparency. Between 1993 and 1997, there were no concrete rules governing the award of the Bolashak Scholarship. The lack of information and publicity, coupled with the limited number of awarded scholarships, generated a negative image of the program and triggered wide criticism, regarding the fairness of the selection process. The general public believed the program was tailored specifically for the offspring of the political elites. It was not until 1997, when the requirements for awarding scholarships were announced, that the Bolashak Scholarship gained acceptance by the public. Recent interviews with stakeholders show that transparency is in place.

RESTRUCTURING SUPPORT FOR THE LEVEL OF STUDY

Given the limited funds available, the level of study to support is a fourth lesson. In 2011, the eligible degree levels went through restructuring: scholarships to undergraduate students ended but scholarships for research and teaching staff were added. The latter initiative has already produced benefits related to the internationalization of curriculum, academic publishing, and joint research projects.

Several factors prompted this change. The age of undergraduate scholarship recipients (between 17 and 19) was perceived by policymakers as psychologically immature for studying abroad. In addition, employers provided conflicting feedback on preferred levels of study: some believed that undergraduates' longer stay in host countries would benefit their language skills, while others preferred more advanced skills of master's degree graduates. The total cost of supporting one undergraduate student significantly exceeded that of a postgraduate student. The opening of Nazarbayev University, an English-language university with international faculty offering high-quality fully funded undergraduate education in Kazakhstan, also contributed to the elimination of funding for undergraduate education.

REQUIRING THE RETURN OF SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

A fifth lesson pertains to incentivizing the scholarship recipients to return to the home country after they graduate. There has always been anxiety over losing government-sponsored scholarship recipients to their hosting countries, since the rationale to the scholarships is the recipients' future contributions to the home countries.

The Bolashak program addresses this concern by only awarding scholarships to individuals who can provide collateral immovable property equivalent in value to the schol-

arship or provide up to four guarantors who will assume financial liability for the government's investment, should the recipient not return to Kazakhstan. To fulfill their obligations, upon completion of their degrees, recipients are required to work in Kazakhstan in the field of their degree specialization for five years. After that, the contract is considered fully executed, and the Bolashak administration releases the collateral.

As drastic as it may seem, this approach has succeeded to guarantee the return of the scholarship recipients. Only 1 percent of scholarship recipients has not returned to Kazakhstan since the Bolashak Scholarship program began.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the Kazakhstan government's Bolashak Scholarship is to invest in human capital development and ensure that this investment creates a long-lasting impact on the country's development. The program has gone through significant changes in the past two decades. The heart of the changes relates to the alignment of personal choice, industrial needs, and the country's strategic development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is part of a research project entitled, "Internationalization as a strategic factor in the development of education and science in the Republic of Kazakhstan in the environment of socio-economic globalization." The research was supported in part by Nazarbayev University with funds from the Republic of Kazakhstan Ministry of Education and Science. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the views of the funder. ■

International Students in Indian Universities

VEENA BHALLA AND KRISHNAPRATAP B. POWAR

Veena Bhalla is joint secretary, International Division, Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi, India. E-mail: vbhallazoo6@gmail.com. Krishnapratap B. Powar is chancellor, Dr. D. Y. Patil University, Pune, India. E-mail: kbpowar@gmail.com.

In the new millennium, Indian higher education has shown noteworthy growth, with the number of universities increasing from 266 in 2000–2001 to 700 in 2013–2014 and the student strength going up from 8.4 million to about 20 million. At the same time, the international student population has increased globally from 2.1 million

in 2001 to 4.3 million in 2013. The growth in the number of international students in India, from about 7,000 in 2000–2001 to a little over 20,000 in 2012–2013, is, in comparison, anaemic, and not commensurate with either the growth of the Indian higher education system or with the global growth in international student mobility.

DATA FROM THE ASSOCIATION OF INDIAN UNIVERSITIES

The Association of Indian Universities has been collecting information on international students in India since 1994. However, there has always been a significant shortfall in returns. Hence, the association, in its periodic reviews, has placed emphasis on evaluating trends in terms of percentages and has downplayed the absolute numbers. For the latest survey on international students, covering the academic year of 2012–2013 requests for information were sent out in August 2013 and the responses received from 121 universities till the end of May, 2014, were evaluated.

During the academic year 2012–2013, in the 121 institutions covered by the survey, 20,176 international students were pursuing diploma, degree, and research programs. A liberal guesstimate is that the figure could rise by 10–15 percent when returns from all institutions having international students are received. The number is small, compared to the 200,000 Indian students presently studying abroad, and minuscule, compared to the total Indian student population of 20 million.

WHERE STUDENTS ARE COMING FROM

Traditionally, the source for international students in India has largely been the countries from Asia and Africa, and this continues to be the case. However, over the last two decades there has been considerable change in the relative contributions of these two regions. Compared to the mid-1990s the share of Asia has increased, in 2012–2013, from about 45 percent to 73 percent, while that of Africa declined from 48 percent to about 24 percent. Significantly, South Asia and the Gulf Region continue to be the most important providers, but new areas have emerged in Central Asia and East Asia. There is very low representation from the Americas, Europe, and Australasia. It can be argued that, in the case of India, international student mobility is more an example of regionalization than of internationalization.

PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

In 2012–2013 seven Indian universities had more than 1,000 students with the largest number, 2,742, coming from Manipal University—a private institution. Out of these universities, three are self-financing (private) universities, and the other four are public, affiliating-type universities. Significantly, in the case of the latter group the international students are largely in the affiliated self-financing

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

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

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

2012–2013 DATA

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

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

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

Governance and Regulation: Do UK Messages Have International Relevance?

ROBIN MIDDLEHURST

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

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

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

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

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

IDEOLOGICAL DEBATES AND OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LUCIA BRAJKOVIC

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

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

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

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

DEMAND FOR FREE EDUCATION

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

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

INNOVATIVE TUITION MODEL WITHIN THE BOLOGNA FRAMEWORK

Following the student protests, the Croatian government enacted a major change, regarding university tuition. Beginning with the 2010/2011 academic year all admitted undergraduate and graduate (master's) students will pay no tuition during their first year of studies. After the first year, students will be charged tuition depending on performance against merit-based criteria, according to a linear model based on the accumulated European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) credits measuring student progress. Under this approach the state would continue to pay institutions a subsidy of €487 (per student per year), after the first year for those students who have accumulated a minimum of 55 ECTS credits in the previous year of study, with 60 credits being the standard full-time annual course load. Students who meet this criterion will continue to study tuition-free; and those who do not meet this criterion will be charged different tuition amounts, proportionally to the number of ECTS they are missing below the 55 credit target.

While there is no state regulation for maximum tuition levels across different institutions, the subsidy that the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports pays to the public higher education institutions for each student is fixed, regardless of the field of study. The prediction is that around 70,000 students per year would benefit from this appropriation of €34,090,000 (70,000 students x €487). The amount is secured within the state budget until 2015. The Ministry of Science, Education and Sports will allow for an increase in the subsidies up to 10 percent yearly per institution, but the increase of enrollment quotas beyond 5 percent per year will not be allowed.

The government's rationale for this new system is that more students would be able to study without paying tuition. However, the real impact of this policy decision is yet to be seen, as €487 for student per year paid by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports is significantly lower than the €1,174 of average yearly tuition charged by Croatian universities before the implementation of this linear model. Concerns have been raised across the academic community regarding the possibility that, within this new system, universities might increase tuition rates for students who do not meet the 55 credit criterion to make up for the substantial loss in tuition money. If such a scenario happens, the total financial burden on students could prove to be even greater than before the new system was introduced.

MERIT-BASED VS. NEED-BASED SUPPORT SYSTEM

This entirely meritocratic system does not take into account the fact that students coming from lower socioeconomic backgrounds might not have the same academic prepara-

tion, when entering college, and thus have greater difficulty obtaining the number of ECTS credits necessary for the tuition waiver after the first year of study. Another major problem for these students is the fact that there is no need-based student aid available, nor does a student loan system exist in Croatia. Many studies have found that grants and loans are crucial for offsetting the negative consequences of tuition and fees, especially for vulnerable and under-represented social groups. Furthermore, even if these students meet the merit criteria and are not charged tuition, they would still have other out-of-pocket expenses—such as books, housing, dining and other living expenses, which might deter them from enrolling in college if there is no financial support available to offset these costs.

Many studies have found that grants and loans are crucial for offsetting the negative consequences of tuition and fees, especially for vulnerable and under-represented social groups.

IMPACT AND POTENTIAL FOR ADOPTION BY OTHER COUNTRIES

This tuition-charging model based on the accumulation of ECTS credits certainly presents an interesting and innovative approach within the Bologna system, and it seems that no other country has implemented a similar model. However, the lack of comparative perspective and the general difficulty of obtaining institutional level student data in Croatia make the assessment of the potential impacts of this policy on both students and higher education institutions rather problematic. Nonetheless, this example may be worth considering by other countries where student aid and loan systems are inadequate or nonexistent, which is notably the case in the posttransition countries of central and eastern Europe. This model does provide incentives for student performance (i.e., addresses issues of merit), and if a country is able to establish at least a basic need-based grant system for its most vulnerable and at-risk student populations, this approach could have the potential to greatly improve student access and lead to a more equitable higher education. ■

Ukraine: The New Reforms and Internationalization

SONJA KNUTSON AND VALENTYNA KUSHNARENKO

Sonja Knutson is director, International Centre Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada. E-mail: sknutson@mun.ca. Valentyna Kushnarenko is research associate, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: val.kushnarenko@utoronto.ca.

The internationalization of higher education in Ukraine continues to be vulnerable to the tensions of the region's geopolitics. Since our previous analysis of the Ukrainian context of internationalization (*IHE* #75, Spring 2014), serious hostilities have arisen with Russia over eastern Ukraine. Despite the distraction of war, on July 31, 2014 Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko signed the Law on Higher Education, significant because it is the first such law developed through consultation with the Ukrainian public. The process of consultation with educators, experts, community members, journalists, students, parents, and non-governmental organizations was not without controversy, but the result demonstrates the perseverance and vision of the stakeholders. The new law sets the stage for Ukrainian higher education to act with greater autonomy, accountability, and transparency, enabling more nimble responses to international opportunities. A number of the new law articles are discussed.

GREATER AUTONOMY

Under the new law, universities are able to act with greater autonomy to maximize their own interests, expertise, and potential. The reforms promote decentralized decision making and a forum for faculty, students, and other stakeholders to voice opinions on university management and curriculum development. University staff traditionally defer "upstairs" for direction, thereby stalling important decisions and avoiding responsibility. The reforms will create significant shifts in the usual business of the university, requiring a new approach to leadership by charging administrators with staff engagement, decentralized decision making, and responsibility for reputation. If successfully implemented, reforms have the potential to usher in a new age of creativity and innovation, both critical components of globalization, in the Ukrainian higher education system.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

The implementation of quality-assurance processes is a significant step forward in improving the transparency of university accreditation in Ukraine. The new processes

are supported by the creation of the "National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance in Higher Education." The former highly bureaucratized Ministry of Education Quality Verification Unit was criticized for being ineffective and slow. According to Minister of Education, Serhiy Kvit, tackling quality assurance will allow Ukrainian universities to engage internationally and aim for higher international university ratings. Article #19 of the new law specifies the composition of the new independent body: university and professional representatives, specialists from the Academy of Sciences, employers and elected students representatives. The public monitoring of the law's implementation should improve overall credibility, signifying the beginning of the end of corruption schemes in the Ukrainian academic sector. An independent agency has been formed to administer tests for undergraduate admissions, while article #41 encourages student government to be active in cases of corruption, expulsion, appointments of senior administration, and unfair administrative decisions at university family housing and dormitories. The transparency of university budgets is legislated in the law's article #80, with reports on university spending available for public scrutiny. Such measures should make it difficult to sustain under-the-radar accounting practices, opening the door to corruption reduction by making leaders accountable to public stakeholders.

Global rankings, though increasingly under fire for overly limiting the definition of higher education excellence, remain an important component of the public face of a university.

BOLOGNA COMPLIANCE

The creation of favorable conditions for global mobility of people and knowledge is an important component of internationalization. Ukrainian students should be able to study abroad without suffering academically, and international students at Ukrainian universities will only benefit if academic credit transfer is standardized with clearly defined processes. Under the Bologna Declaration in 2005, then Minister of Education and Science Stanislav Nikolayenko committed Ukraine to serious legislative changes in order to transition the higher education system to the three cycles of bachelor, master's and PhD degrees, to introduce the European Credit Transfer System and to reduce classroom

hour loads for students and faculty. Yet today, Bologna terminology is rarely used in official documents or on university campuses. The law's article #1 of the new legislation defines an academic credit and the number of credits in a full-time academic year, creating norms that will facilitate international academic collaboration and enhance student mobility. Furthermore, the introduction of a PhD degree at Ukrainian universities significantly benefits global mobility of Ukrainian scholars, whose home status of "candidates of sciences" is not well-understood abroad. Global awareness of the "candidates of sciences" degree has been further muddled by a lack of clarity around the role of the Ukrainian Academy of Science, which had the exclusive right to grant these degrees. The process now will more closely mirror norms in other countries, including required courses, research, and dissertation defense in the presence of a university committee comprised of research field specialists.

RESEARCH INTENSITY

Global rankings, though increasingly under fire for overly limiting the definition of higher education excellence, remain an important component of the public face of a university. Those universities with good rankings and a strong reputation attract the best talent, whether in faculty, staff, or students. Thus, the quality of research and number of publications in reputable peer reviewed journals is increasingly important to the viability of an institution. Under the new law, Ukrainian universities are expected to intensify research capacity and production. Faculty, traditionally overloaded with more than 900–950 hours/year of classroom teaching, will see a decrease in their load to 600 hours/year. This is a significant change to free up academic staff for other scholarly pursuits, which can support the overall institutional goals, in particular for research and travel related to international research collaborations. These transformations pose a major shift to the status quo, and those that are slow to respond may find themselves quickly on the periphery and unable to access resources that are increasingly tied to international engagement.

IMPACT OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

Universities around the world struggle to respond to the demands and opportunities of globalization, thus the need for skilled change management is by no means a uniquely

Ukrainian problem. Universities tend toward hierarchical and bureaucratic self-organization and are notoriously resistant to change. The Ukrainian higher education system is perhaps starting at an earlier place than other countries where universities are freer to choose program content, make financial decisions, create degree granting and credit transfer policies, and hire faculty via open and transparent competition. In Ukraine, such innovations could be jeopardized if opposition causes delays to change, creating uncertainty, and lowering morale. On the positive side, there is much work already done on best practice for change management in higher education that could support Ukrainian universities to move through stages of change more quickly. The more accessible Ukrainian higher education can make itself to the world through internationalization, the more easily change will take root.

CONCLUSION

Successful implementation of these new reforms will prepare universities in Ukraine with tools to benefit from international opportunities. The effect of ongoing hostilities in the east of the country is challenging and may have unpredictable effects on the implementation and timing of specific reforms. A critical factor is the development of robust policies and processes, to manage the reforms in a fair and transparent manner to avoid backlash and further destabilization. Capacity building by those who have developed expertise in more decentralized systems—such as Ukrainian alumni who studied abroad, or other international experts will need to be engaged, to participate in the development of new processes—support new roles in educational administration and prepare a new cadre of education leaders with a progressive approach to education. Campus communities will need to be resilient, energetic, and optimistic to maintain the levels of motivation to impel change forward. Perhaps the motivation for Ukrainian higher education's commitment to educational reform is best summed up by Mykhaylo Zhurovskyi, Rector of the Kyiv National Technical University, and one of the authors of the new law who stated publicly that Ukraine has no other alternative but to begin to change its mentality and work hard to create a new country.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Cantwell, Brendan, and Ilkka Kauppinen, eds. *Academic Capitalism in the Age of Globalization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. 277 pp. \$34.95 (pb).

ISBN 978-1-4214-1538-3. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

The idea of academic capitalism, which in general links neoliberal ideas with the growing marketization and privatization of higher education, was developed over the

past two decades by Sheila Slaughter and her colleagues. This volume is based on the concepts of academic capitalism and provides case studies that used these concepts to analyze such themes as the historical development of universities, patents in the knowl-

edge economy, the academic profession, international student markets, and others.

Cheng, Ying, Qi Wang, and Nian Cai Liu, eds. *How World-Class Universities Affect Global Higher Education: Influences and Responses*. Rotterdam, Netherlands, Sense, 2014. 197 pp. \$54 (pb). ISBN 978-94-6209-819-0. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

A collection of essays concerning the development of world-class universities globally, the focus of some of the chapters is on how these institutions affect the higher education system at large. Among the themes discussed are top-down excellence pressures in Russia, French efforts to improve the research universities, the excellence initiative in Germany, privatization and the transformation of world-class research universities, the dilemmas of middle-income countries, and others.

Eggins, Heather, ed. *Divers and Barriers to Achieving Quality in Higher Education*. Rotterdam, Netherlands, Sense, 2014. 181 pp. \$54 (pb). ISBN 978-94-6209-492-5. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

A series of 13 essays are broadly organized around themes of quality in higher education in a European context. Among the themes are the role of governance in influencing European standards for quality assurance, academic values and procedures of quality assurance, quality management concepts, the development of a quality culture in

Latvia, and others.

Fish, Stanley. *Visions of Academic Freedom: From Professionalism to Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2014. 164 pp. \$24 (hb). ISBN 978-0-266-06431-4. Web site: www.press.uchicago.edu.

Fish, a well-known analyst of American society, posits five key approaches to academic freedom in the American context, and discusses these as ways of defining and defending academic freedom.

Kehm, Barbara M., and Ulrich Teichler, eds. *The Academic Profession in Europe: New Tasks and New Challenges*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2013. 200 pp. \$129 (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-4613-8. Web site: www.springer.com.

A volume in the Changing Academic Profession series, this book focuses on the European countries included in the CAP surveys. All of the chapters are comparative in nature. Among the themes discussed are professional identity, the changing role of the academic profession in the context of managerialism, the view of academics concerning governance, relevance, and satisfaction, academic markets and careers, views about the “third mission” of universities, and others.

Lane, Jason, ed. *Building a Smarter University: Big Data, Innovation, and Analytics*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2014. 317 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4384-

5452-8. Web site: www.sunypress.edu.

The idea of the “Big Data” movement in American higher education is to use data from many sources to solve key academic problems and make the best possible academic decisions. The movement also encourages universities to collect data with the goal of using it to solve problems. This volume includes discussions of such themes as legal issues related to big data, college admissions strategies, data-driven innovations to assist in student success, human capital development, and others.

Menon, Maria Eliophotou, Dawn Geronimo Terkla, and Paul Gibbs, eds. *Using Data to Improve Higher Education*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense, 2014. 256 pp. \$54 (pb). ISBN 978-94-6209-792-6. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

This book is based on the idea that the collection of careful and useful data will be valuable in decision making for higher education institutions and systems. Internal data are typically collected by institutional research departments in universities, but are often not effectively used. The chapters in this book focus on such themes as student feedback data, the evaluation of student academic life, the returns to investment in higher education, and others. Chapters also deal with several case studies relating to the use of data, and also to the ethical and quality issues relating to data usage.

NEW BOOKS FROM CIHE

In cooperation with the American Council on Education (ACE), *Global Opportunities and Challenges for Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes*, has recently been released. This volume is part of CIHE’s ongoing collaboration with ACE on a series of essays and webinars concerning key higher education themes. Further information concerning this book can be obtained from Sense Publishers (www.sensepublishers.com).

We have also just published (with Lemmens Media) *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers,*

Academic Programs, and Journals and Publications (3rd Edition). Two versions of the book are available—full-length (358 pages) and abridged (80 pages). The full-length e-book is available for purchase (€12) from Amazon.com. A full-length version of the book is also available in PDF format (€18) directly from Lemmens (info@lemmens.de). Finally, the abridged version of the book may be purchased as a hard copy, plus a free PDF (€28); again, see info@lemmens.de.

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.



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