INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 86: Summer 2016

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

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, Vietnamese and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at *www.bc.edu/cihe*. The section on internationalization is made possible through a cooperative arrangement between CIHE and the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. Fiona Hunter, Associate Director of CHEI, is editorial advisor for this section.

Subscribe to *IHE*

http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/user/register

Learn more about CIHE's new MA in International Higher Education: http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe/graduate-studies.html

International Issues

Focus on Internationalization

Challenges in China and India

Private Higher Education: A Changing Global Landscape

Africa Themes

Countries and Regions

Departments

Essential Information about Predatory Publishers and Journals

Jeffrey Beall

Jeffrey Beall is associate professor and scholarly communications librarian, Auraria Library, University of Colorado Denver, Denver, Colorado, US. E-mail: jeffrey.beall@ucdenver.edu.

My first experience with predatory publishers was in 2008, when I began to receive strange e-mails—mostly from South Asia—inviting me to submit research manuscripts to journals I had never heard of before. The spam e-mails had headlines like "Call for Paper," which is incorrect English. What surprised me the most was that the journals' Web sites stated that they charged authors to publish in the journals, a radical change from subscription journals, in which authors were not charged to publish.

The e-mails signaled to me the beginning of gold open-access publishing. In gold open access, the publishing costs are covered by fees charged to the authors upon acceptance of their manuscripts for publication. The advantage of this publishing model is that the published articles are free for anyone to access.

Although some non-profit scholarly societies have used "page charges" to subsidize publishing costs, the large-scale practice of requiring authors to cover these costs began with the proliferation of for-profit, gold open-access journals around 2008.

While open access (OA) was initially promising, its weaknesses quickly began to appear. Publishers soon realized that they could make more money from author fees if they accepted more papers. Peer review began to be seen as a threat to a publisher's income, because when it is conducted properly, papers are often rejected for publication. Rejection means the loss of revenue for publishers using the gold OA model.

Accordingly, many gold open-access publishers began to perform only cursory peer reviews, accepting most papers submitted and pocketing the fees paid by the authors. Now, they typically do everything they can to trick authors into submitting papers in order to get the author fees from them. So, by definition, predatory journals and publishers are those that exploit the gold open-access model to profit from scholarly publishing in a dishonest way.

Indeed, predatory publishers are dishonest, they lack transparency, and they do not follow scholarly publishing industry standards. Many of them misrepresent their true headquarters locations, claiming they are based in London or New York when they are really based in Pakistan or India.

I already mentioned their practice of spamming, and this has reached epidemic proportions, with researchers sometimes receiving several spam e-mails from scholarly publishers every hour. Publishers using the gold open-access model especially target researchers with grant money, for these funds can be used to pay article processing charges. Thus, authors in the biomedical sciences, where grants are more common, are frequently targeted by predatory journals.

Why They Are a Problem?

Predatory publishers hurt scientists, science, and the communication of science. As mentioned, they trick scientists, pretending to operate as legitimate publishers, when they are essentially counterfeit and only seeking to earn a quick profit. Busy scientists often lack time to sufficiently investigate a publisher and can mistakenly submit a paper to one of their journals or accept an editorial board invitation.

Low quality journals pollute science with junk science and unvetted research. Some scholarly databases aim to have a broad coverage of journals and include these predatory journals in their indexes. One example is Google Scholar, which indexes articles from hundreds of low-quality and predatory journals.

Researchers preparing literature reviews are faced with databases that include junk journals in them, so they have to carefully select whether a given article should be cited or not. Moreover, students frequently use these databases, but they lack the experience and credentials to sort out the authentic science from the junk science.

Junk science is also called pseudo-science, and it represents theories and conclusions that cannot be supported by science-based research. Many political activists are now using predatory journals to publish their ideas as science. For example, anti-nuclear activists write articles making nuclear energy appear more dangerous that the data really indicates. Also, people creating medical compounds, such as new drugs, now regularly write articles in predatory journals that "find" that the drugs they invented are very effective.

Complicit Authors

Sometimes, scholarly authors take advantage of the easy publishing that predatory journals offer for their own benefit. In many cases, universities base faculty evaluations and promotions only on the number of articles published, and they do not distinguish between high quality and predatory journals. It is pretty easy to write up a scholarly article and get it quickly published in a predatory journal. Here the victims are the honest researchers, those who submit their

work to selective scholarly journals, where it is more difficult to publish and the process is slower. Increasingly, there are predatory publishers that specialize in quick, easy, and cheap publishing.

Approved Scholarly Indexes

Many universities base their evaluation on faculty publications in journals included in prestigious indexes, such as Web of Science or Scopus. This "whitelist" approach is not without its flaws, as the indexes sometimes make mistakes and include easy-acceptance, pay-to-publish journals. In some cases, respected journals cannot resist the temptation to generate much revenue, so they lower their standards, accepting most submitted papers.

Predatory publishers hurt scientists, science, and the communication of science.

Geographic Focus

Predatory publishers have been more successful in some regions of the world than in others. One broad area that has seen many victims of predatory journals is Eastern Europe, the former Soviet republics, and Russia. In these regions, academic evaluation is often based merely on counting the number of papers published. This matches perfectly with predatory journals, who offer quick, easy, and cheap publishing. Many researchers submit papers to predatory journals but fail to realize they are counterfeit journals. Their work is quickly accepted and published, and they soon receive an invoice, usually an unexpected one, from the publisher.

When a few predatory journals invade a region and become successful at attracting articles and payments from researchers, others quickly follow. Then the number of publishers multiplies, and the number of spam e-mails grows also. We are now beginning to see low-quality and predatory open-access publishers being established in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet republics.

Identifying Predatory Journals

The characteristics of predatory journals are becoming well known. As mentioned, predatory journals use spam e-mail to solicit articles, they have a fast and often fake peer review process, and they supply false information about their locations. Many now also make false claims about having impact factors or being included in prestigious academic indexes. Now it is important to verify all claims made by open-access journals, for many are dishonest.

The lists I publish also identify predatory journals and publishers, and many researchers find them useful. These lists are found at <scholarlyoa.com>. Compiled with the help and advice of many active researchers, the lists include publishers and journals that ought to be avoided by honest researchers.

Long-Term View

While publishing one's research in a predatory journal may bring temporary gain, the long-term consequences are likely to damage a researcher's reputation. It is not uncommon for predatory journals to disappear from the Internet after several years. Most are one-man operations, and the published articles have no backups. Researchers may be stigmatized for publishing in easy-acceptance, pay-to-publish journals. Potential employers may reject applicants who have published articles in predatory journals.

For all researchers, the best course of action is to avoid predatory journals. Carry out high-quality research and submit it to the best possible journals. This strategy is more difficult and time-consuming, but it eliminates the risks predatory journals bring and offers researchers better and more secure long-term benefits.

Editor's note: An earlier version of this article was published in the journal *Higher Education in Russia and Beyond*—v. 1, no. 7 (2016), p. 77–79. ■

International Doctoral and Master's Students: What the Data Tell Us

Gabriele Marconi

Gabriele Marconi is analyst at the Directorate for Education and Skills in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). E-mail: gabriele.marconi@oecd.org.

Currently, one in ten students at the master's or equivalent level is an international student in OECD countries, rising to one in four at the doctoral level, according to data from the UNESCO-OECD-Eurostat data collection referring to 2013. In Luxembourg and Switzerland, international students make up more than half of the total doctoral enrollment.

Master's and doctoral programs are the most advanced educational programs, informed by state-of-the-art research or professional practice. The emergence of the knowledge economy and of knowledge communities is turning research and the top professional services into increasingly internationalized activities. Accordingly, many students are seeking opportunities to go abroad for their master's or doctoral studies, particularly to countries that invest substantially in research and development (R&D).

International experience is a valuable asset for researchers and professionals, so much so that the European University Association in 2015 recommended that "doctoral candidates should be able to take part in international research activities." These activities could come through international collaborations or by studying abroad for all or part of a study program. International students bring to their host countries a variety of benefits—for example, their social and business networks from their home countries, but also the fees and other expenses they pay. In addition, particularly at the master's or doctoral or equivalent level, international students can contribute to the host country's R&D, as students but also later on as researchers or highly qualified professionals. Doctoral students, in particular, form an integral part of the research staff of a country.

How Many Master's or Doctoral Students Are Studying Abroad?

International students represent 11 percent of all the students enrolled in master's or equivalent programs in OECD countries, about twice as much as for bachelor's or equivalent programs. Luxembourg has the largest proportion of international students at the master's or equivalent level (67 percent), followed by Australia (38 percent), the United Kingdom (36 percent), and Switzerland (27 percent).

In all OECD countries, with very few exceptions, the proportion of international students is even higher at the doctoral than at the master's or equivalent level. One quarter of all the students enrolled at the doctoral level in OECD countries are international students. Besides the advantages for aspiring top professionals of being trained in an international environment, other factors could help to explain the high proportion of international master's and doctoral students. For example, programs in specific areas of study may not be available in some countries, or they may not have the same reputation as other programs in the same fields available abroad. In addition, students in these programs may belong to a particular subgroup of the student population that is more likely to travel and live abroad, independently of their educational choices.

What Subjects Do International Students Study?

Almost 60 percent of international doctoral students study science, engineering, or agriculture. This is much higher than the proportion of doctoral students enrolled in these fields among national students (around 40 percent), and also higher than the proportion of international students enrolled in these fields at the master's level (about 30 percent). In some countries (Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland, and the United States), more than half of all students enrolled in doctoral programs in science, engineering, or agriculture come from abroad. This reinforces the potential for countries to expand their labor force's skills base, as doctoral students may stay on in their host countries as professionals, technicians, and researchers after their studies, fostering innovation and the successful introduction of new technologies and organizational processes in the economy. According to some estimates, about one quarter of international students stay in the host country after graduating from a tertiary education program in OECD countries.

Which Countries Are Sending and Receiving Master's and Doctoral Students?

The United States hosts 38 percent of all international students enrolled in doctoral or equivalent programs in OECD countries. This is the largest share, followed by the United Kingdom (13 percent), France (8 percent), and Australia and Germany (both 5 percent). At the master's level, the top five countries remain the same but the market is less concentrated: the United States' share is 21 percent, whereas the United Kingdom (16 percent), France and Germany (both 11 percent), and Australia (8 percent) have larger shares.

In terms of countries of origin, 23 percent of international students studying in OECD countries come from China, more than from any other country, followed by India (8 percent), and Germany (4 percent). The majority (53 percent) come from Asia. Intra-European mobility is still important at the master's and doctoral levels (26 percent of international students enrolled in EU21 countries come from another EU21 country), although a bit less than for tertiary education overall (where the proportion is 30 percent). In Canada and the United States, regional mobility accounts for a smaller share of the total, as only about 10 percent of the international students at the master's and doctoral levels come from Northern or Latin America.

What Makes Host Countries Attractive?

Countries investing substantial resources into R&D in tertiary education seem to be particularly attractive destinations for international doctoral students. For example, Switzerland has the highest level of expenditure on R&D per student in tertiary educational institutions among OECD countries (around USD13,600), and also the second highest proportion of international students at the doctoral level

(after Luxembourg). In contrast, Chile, the Russian Federation, and Mexico have less than 5 percent of international students at the doctoral level and spend less than USD2,000 per student on R&D in tertiary educational institutions.

The correlation of expenditure on R&D per student in tertiary educational institutions with the proportion of international doctoral students is 0.69, stronger than with the proportion of international master's students (0.57). It is also interesting that R&D investments are strongly associated to the enrollment of international students to doctoral programs, but not to enrollment in doctoral programs overall: the correlation between expenditure on R&D per student in tertiary educational institutions and the entry rate of national students to doctoral programs is close to 0.

The emergence of the knowledge economy and of knowledge communities is turning research and the top professional services into increasingly internationalized activities.

Tertiary education R&D expenditure could attract international master's and doctoral students by enhancing the quality of research training in a country's universities, as well as their research capacity and visibility. But it could also be a proxy for other factors attracting international students, such as the innovativeness of the economy, or social and cultural factors related to a thriving knowledge society. These other factors could be attractive not only for students enrolled in doctoral or academic master's programs, but also for those enrolled in professional master's or equivalent programs.

To sum up, a large proportion of students at the master's and doctoral levels in OECD countries is international. International students at these levels tend to choose countries investing substantial resources on R&D in tertiary educational institutions. This offers these countries an opportunity to attract future workers with advanced training, particularly in science and technology. Some countries are already doing this: in Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland, and the United States more than half of those enrolled in a doctoral program in science, engineering, or agriculture are international students. ■

Does Research Mobility Have an Effect on Productivity and Impact?

Gali Halevi, Henk F. Moed, and Judit Bar-Ilan

Gali Halevi is chief director, Mount Sinai Health System Libraries, New York, US. E-mail: gali.halevi@mssm.edu. Henk F. Moed is professor in the Department of Computer, Control and Management Engineering Antonio Ruberti, University of Rome "La Sapienza," Italy. E-mail: hf.moed@gmail.com. Judit Bar-Ilan is professor in the Department of Information Science, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel. E-mail: Judit.Bar-Ilan@biu.ac.il.

With the globalization of science and the availability of online resources to help identify potential international collaborations, researchers are seeking opportunities outside their institutions and sometimes outside their country of origin. It is unknown, however, whether these types of scientific mobility have a positive effect on the productivity or impact of their work. On the one hand, mobility can be positive since researchers moving to a new affiliation and/or country might find opportunities to expand their network and further their knowledge and expertise. On the other hand, the period of adjustment and familiarization with a new affiliation and/or country can potentially delay the publication of new studies. In addition, one's affiliation with a new institution might take time to be recognized by the scientific community. By using data depicting researchers output, the affiliations they belonged to, and the overall impact of their work, we sought to discover whether researchers' "productivity" in terms of the number of publications they produce, and the "impact" of these publications in terms of number of total and relative citations they receive, is affected by mobility. In order to examine this question, we collected data on the number of affiliations, countries, number of publications, and citations for 700 researchers from 10 disciplines between 2010 and 2015. We compiled a diverse list of seven disciplines: (1) Neuroscience; (2) Mechanical Engineering; (3) Arts & Humanities; (4) Oncology; (5) Environmental Geology; (6) Business and; (7) Infectious Diseases. Using SciVal™ (Elsevier product) researcher profile, we identified the affiliations and countries where each researcher was assigned based on his/her publications. We found that mobility between at least two affiliations increases both output (number of publications) and impact (number of citations). The disciplines that see the most benefit from affiliation mobility are Mechanical Engineering; Oncology; Arts & Humanities; and Infectious

Diseases. It is interesting that in disciplines such as Oncology and Infectious Diseases, we did not find cases of only one affiliation in the researchers' profiles. Top authors in these disciplines had at least two affiliations associated with their profiles.

Mobility between countries does not seem to have the same impact as affiliation mobility. There are some disciplines such as Environmental Geology, Arts & Humanities, and Business that see more benefits from country mobility than others. This could be because of the more global nature of these disciplines.

The results presented in this study are limited to the top 100 authors in each defined discipline, 700 in total.

Therefore it seems important that researchers move from one affiliation to another during the course of their careers. This can probably be explained in terms of gaining experience and expanding one's networks. The number of affiliations, a researcher moves to (whether two or three) might not make a significant difference. Country mobility does not seem to have a significant impact, except in specific disciplines such as Arts & Humanities, Business, and Environmental Geology.

Looking at the most common trends per discipline, we can summarize them as follows:

- Neuroscience sees the most benefit when researchers move between two affiliations and two countries.
- Mechanical Engineering sees the most benefit when researchers move between three affiliations within one country.
- Oncology sees the most benefit when researchers move between two affiliations in one or two countries.
- Business sees the most benefit when researchers move between two or three affiliations in two countries.
- Arts & Humanities sees the most benefit when researchers move between three affiliations in two countries.
- Environmental Geology sees the most benefit when researchers move between two or three affiliations in two countries.
- Infectious Diseases sees the most benefit when researchers move between two affiliations in one country.

The results presented in this study are limited to the top 100 authors in each defined discipline, 700 in total. Further study should be conducted on authors in each discipline with an average or low production. Comparing authors with a high, average, and low production might reveal more about the effect of mobility on output and impact. Our results also show that the relationship between mobility and productivity and impact cannot be generalized across disciplines. Therefore, there is a need to examine each discipline in more detail, by looking at subdisciplines within it. Aggregating subdisciplinary results from the bottom up might shed more light on the overall trends within the discipline as a whole. In addition, our study was limited to five years only. Further study into year ranges going further back could shed light on the evolution of mobility and its effect on productivity and impact.

The Scholar-Practitioner Debate in International Higher Education

Bernhard Streitwieser and Anthony C. Ogden

Bernhard Streitwieser is an assistant professor of international education at the George Washington University. E-mail: streitwieser@gwu.edu. Anthony C. Ogden is the executive director of Education Abroad and Exchanges at Michigan State University. E-mail: aogden@msu.edu. This article is abbreviated from Higher Education's Scholar-Practitioners: Bridging Research and Practice *(Symposium Books, 2016), edited by the authors.*

Heightened competition between higher education institutions and changes in their traditional structures in recent decades have created new challenges and opportunities for faculty and administrators. In the United States since the 1970s, there has been a gradual decrease in tenured or tenure-line research faculty, but substantial growth of contract faculty, adjuncts, and those straddling academic and administrative responsibilities. Cost-cutting measures and declining public funds have meant fewer openings for traditional faculty-line positions; university priorities and operating procedures have shifted as a result. These changes have had a significant influence on the individuals who work in the broad range of professional categories in today's academy; increasingly, conventional faculty-administrator divisions have become blurred.

Today, many who aspire to work in higher education are no longer classified only as faculty or only as administrators; instead, they function as *blended or third-space professionals*, a term coined by UK researcher Celia Whitechurch. In the United States, a more common label is the *alternative-academic*, or "alt-ac," professional.

New Roles in the Higher Education Landscape

Traditionally, universities comprise four key stakeholders: faculty with tenure, tenure-line, contract, and adjunct status; upper-level administrators in leadership positions such as president, provost, deans, center directors, and department chairs; mid-level staff who carry out the mandates of key decision-makers and assist departments, administrative offices, and programs and projects; and students. Within this arrangement there are two overarching categories of professionals: The faculty scholars who produce research, publish, and teach in their areas of study; and the administrators who manage and facilitate the functions and productivity of the academy writ large.

Today, hyperconsciousness of rankings in particular drives much of the decision-making in international higher education activity. Institutions have sought to keep pace through innovations in study abroad and student exchange, university partnerships and branch campuses, and internationalization at home. Massification of higher education globally, and, in the United States, continued growth in study abroad participation and international student enrollments, has led to the establishment of more specialized offices staffed by highly trained personnel. The demands of fee-paying students also calls for higher-order skills in the managers and staff charged with their academic and psychosocial well–being.

In this climate, universities have had to effectively and efficiently manage all aspects related to comprehensive internationalization. To do so, they have increasingly hired highly trained professionals to fill key leadership posts, who in turn have selected specialized staff to carry out their mandates. Many who now work in this complex environment exemplify a new class of professionals with higher-level academic training at the master's or PhD level, combined with finely tuned administrative skills. This combination exemplifies a hybrid scholarly and administrative profile—the "scholar-practitioner"—who did not exist on the same scale in previous generations.

Training Scholar-Practitioners for the Future

Recent analysis of the scholar-practitioner phenomenon shows how early innovators in international education critically shaped the direction of the profession to its present day form. Meanwhile, training programs for international educators have grown significantly since 2000. Today 277 graduate, degree-granting programs in higher education prepare graduates around the world with competencies in comparative studies, globalization, and internationalization, among other domains. In the United States, scores of graduate-level programs offer specific preparation for careers in student affairs, international education management, and administration.

Prospective employers increasingly seek candidates with specialized graduate education and preparation. In a 2013 Forum on Education Abroad survey of its membership, more than half of respondents held a master's degree and another 27 percent a PhD or EdD. A 2014 survey of senior international officers affiliated with the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) found that 81 percent held a doctoral or professional degree. Given this depth of academic training, scholar-practitioners are ideally situated to identify practical research questions and work in a space between data and decision-making, which gives them exciting potential.

Today, many who aspire to work in higher education are no longer classified only as faculty or only as administrators; instead, they function as *blended or third-space professionals.*

The many activities that fall broadly under internationalization provide a constant stream of quantitative and qualitative data useful for analysis. If this data is shared, it can broadly inform the field. And yet, in a large survey conducted by Mandy Reinig using the social media platforms of several prominent international education professional associations, she found that while 52 percent of respondents held a master's degree and 22 percent a PhD or EdD, only 25 percent conducted research as part of their jobs, citing lack of time as their main impediment.

And yet, through an increasing number of established academic journals, book publishers, and online platforms that now exist, thoughtful professionals facilitating internationalization, education abroad, and international student exchange are well positioned to disseminate their evidence-based insights and advance the enterprise.

Time for a Paradigm Change?

Encouraging nascent scholar-practitioners to engage in greater dissemination of their thinking will require important changes in the current paradigms that dictate

the scope of work for administrators. However, if institutional decision-makers are willing to modify existing reward structures, hiring practices, and budgetary priorities, much can be gained by capitalizing on the unique potential scholar-practitioners bring to bear. The momentum in recent decades toward internationalization has created new opportunities for the scholar-practitioners of international higher education. *Third-space professionals* are increasingly required to have scholarly credentials, conduct research and evaluation, and even engage in various forms of teaching and service. Contemporary higher education should more systematically recognize and value the contributions they can make.

Further studying the place, purpose, and potential of scholar-practitioners in other educational contexts outside of the United States has much to teach us. Indeed, many higher education systems around the world are responding to increased global mobility by offering lower tuition, more flexible and multilingual learning environments, and innovative administrative structures. In the recruitment of faculty and staff, promotion of junior talent, and contract and employment arrangements, new ideas are being tested out. Heightened competition for talent and external prestige worldwide are changing both the demands on the professoriate and the possibilities for the administrative estate. Understanding the pathways of those who enter the academy as faculty, administrators, or in positions straddling both worlds, as more individuals now do, can provide important lessons about the changing nature of higher education throughout the world.

■

The State of Internationalization in Canadian Higher Education

Karen McBride

Karen McBride is president and CEO of the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE), which celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. E-mail: KMcBride@cbie.ca.

In the past decade, internationalization has become a core strategy for most Canadian institutions, supported by robust policies and practices. Over the past 50 years, as the national voice advancing international education on behalf of its 150 member institutions ranging from K-12 to universities, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) has encouraged, assisted, and closely monitored internationalization in Canada. We take a look here at what this success entails and at the prospects for Canada's next 50 years in international education.

Internationalization by the Numbers

CBIE's 2016 membership survey identified the top three internationalization priorities as: international student recruitment (66 percent); increasing the number of students engaged in education abroad (59%); and Internationalization at Home, including internationalization of the curriculum (52%). In a survey conducted by Universities Canada in 2014, 95 percent of Canadian universities indicated that internationalization or global engagement is included as part of strategic planning, with 82 percent identifying internationalization as a top five priority. In addition, 81 percent offer collaborative academic programs with international partners. Moreover, Canada has twice the world average of international coauthorship—43 percent of Canadian papers are coauthored with one or more international collaborators.

Given the value placed by Canadian institutions on internationalization—and the centrality to that effort of hosting international students on campus—it comes as no surprise that there are more students from abroad in Canada than ever before. In 2014, the country hosted 336,000 international students holding study permits (all levels combined: K-12, college, university undergraduate and graduate), an 83 percent increase since 2008 and an increase of 10 percent over 2013. This number does not include short-term students such as exchange or second language students, who do not require a study permit, and therefore significantly underrepresents Canada's international student population.

Unfortunately, the increase in inbound students to Canada is not mirrored in the outbound student population. Canadian students have traditionally not studied abroad in large numbers and Universities Canada reports that annually fewer than 3.1 percent of full-time Canadian students at all levels have an education abroad experience. This is despite reports from Canadian students who have studied abroad, on the transformational nature of the experience, its many contributions to their academic and career achievements, and its value in enhancing their communication skills, self-awareness, and adaptability. Institutions are on board: 78 percent of universities provide funding to support student participation in study abroad programs and both colleges and universities are finding innovative ways to offer more flexible learning abroad options.

It is not only participating students and their institutions who value the career skills they gained. In a 2015 survey by the Leger polling firm, 82 percent of employers who hire recruits with international experience reported that these employees enhance their company's competitiveness. Two-thirds of hiring managers stated that Canada is in danger of being left behind by the growing economies of China, Brazil, and India, unless young Canadians learn to think more globally. The economic implications for Canada are significant, given that we are a country heavily dependent on international trade, accounting for 3.3 million jobs. We need to develop our talent to ensure that we are competitive.

Internationalization for All

Increasingly, internationalization is a central pillar in the quest for excellence of Canadian educational institutions. Recently, CBIE's Internationalization Leaders' Network released a Statement of Principles in Internationalization for Canadian Education Institutions designed "to serve as a guidepost in their demanding, fast-paced and complex work."

Unfortunately, the increase in inbound students to Canada is not mirrored in the outbound student population.

It could be said that consensus on the need to reinforce fundamental principles—what we have called ethical internationalization—is the most important recent trend in internationalization. The next stems from this, and it is making internationalization pervasive throughout our educational institutions, including bringing significant reform to curriculum, teaching practices, research, and campus life.

In 2015, we saw a greater focus on Internationalization at Home—that is, internationalization infused in the ethos of the institution and that leads to positive learning outcomes for all students. Given the vast benefits of internationalization, and recognizing that mobility is not possible for every student, providing an avenue to prepare every student for the global context is imperative. Canada must take a proactive, inclusive approach and make the full spectrum of international education a priority, as other countries have done.

The Global Engagement Challenge

Canada faces the challenge of getting more of its students outbound for educational experiences in other countries and preparing them to become global citizens in all the ways that the term implies. Beyond economic imperatives, educational institutions play a critical role in developing Canadians who are prepared to participate and lead in the global village, the leaders of tomorrow who can negotiate, analyze, connect, and engage in meaningful ways at the international level.

CBIE endorses the recommendation of the government's Advisory Panel on Canada's International Education Strategy, seeking 50,000 study abroad awards annually for Canadian students. With its emphasis on youth engagement in international cooperation activities, and Prime Minister Justin Trudeau's personal interest (he is in fact also minister of youth), CBIE is urging the new government to establish a signature program in time for Canada's 150th Anniversary in 2017. We are also urging the private sector to step up to the challenge and pledge its support to such an effort.

What About the Next 50 Years?

As we move forward in making international education achievable for all students, we will need to expand the conversation to answer these important questions:

- How do we increase the scale and scope of international experiences for students, thereby ensuring that they have the knowledge, skills, and competencies they need in a globalized world?
- How do we enlist the support of the professoriate broadly, in order to ensure that all students benefit from global perspectives in their studies?
- How do we ensure that both government and the private sector are seized with the issue?
- And how do we raise public awareness of the long-term benefits of global engagement and the richness that stems from our interdependence?

While celebrating past successes, there is much work yet to do. ■

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

China Calls for Smarter Standards for Its World-Class Universities

Qiang Zha

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

China has launched a new stage of its world-class university campaign. On October 24, 2015, China's State Council officially promulgated a blueprint that explicitly and exclusively spells out details as to China's world-class university ambition, including a timetable. Among other things, this document aims to break the boundaries that fragment existing "excellence" schemes (e.g., Projects 985, 211 and 2011), and reconcile and consolidate resources in order to boost this effort.

Top the Global Rankings by the mid-2000s

For this goal, the document sets the following timetable: by 2020, a number of Chinese universities and subject areas are to achieve world-class standing; by 2030, more universities and subject areas will enjoy world-class status, and some of them will top league tables of the global rankings; by 2050, China will excel as a system in terms of leading universities and fields of study in the whole world.

The central and local governments pledge to support this endeavor by concentrating resources on selected universities. Starting in 2016, there will be a new cycle for competitive funding every five years, which is significantly longer than the current funding cycle of Project 985 (three years), and may allow the winning universities more flexibility and freedom to use the granted resources. Resources will flow to those universities that excel in the competition in terms of performance, strengths, and distinction. At the outset of this new effort, the ministries of finance and education announced on November 17, 2015 the establishment of a world-class university and field incentive funding scheme for the centrally affiliated universities. This fund consolidates funding previously scattered among programs established for comparable purposes, and is explicitly mandated to foster excellence measured by world standards among those universities.

Compared to previous exercises, this policy initiative emphasizes transparency and requires competition for resources, in an effort to improve funding efficiency and results. It places equal importance on world-class institutions and subject areas, which potentially includes a lot more universities than those previously selected on excellence schemes (especially under Project 985). This new initiative serves to challenge the prestigious status held by those universities, and hence evokes a rigorous competition toward fulfilling the goal in an efficient manner.

What Distinguishes Chinese Universities as World-class Players?

Yet, this endeavor will not be easy to accomplish. Arguably, the debate about which criteria define a world-class university remains unresolved. Albeit, the global rankings remain the most powerful illustration of who can claim world-class standing—those institutions in the top 50 or 100 spots in the league tables. Those global rankings rely heavily on research inputs and outputs to sort universities into a "world order," and this seems to be the logic and strategy behind China's robust venture to be a country hosting a concentration of world-class universities.

The past decade has already witnessed resources being poured into China's top universities to reinforce research infrastructure and capacity. In 2014, the richest 30 Chinese universities recorded an average of total expenditure of US$1 billion, which is only outmatched by the United States at the system level, but probably unmatched elsewhere, if one takes into account the short time frame during which the university funding reached this level. Only five years ago, the group that enjoyed this level of funding comprised no more than five Chinese universities. A big chunk of the spending directly benefited research or research-related endeavors, given that Chinese universities generally spend less for staff compensations and student services, relative to their peers in the west.

The newly-released *UNESCO Science Report: Towards 2030* demonstrates that China has moved to the second place in global R&D expenditure, with a global share of 20 percent, following the United States (28%), but ahead of the European Union (19%) and Japan (10%). Additionally, China has enjoyed a surge in the generation of knowledge. Chinese publications now represent 20 percent of the world total, compared to 5 percent only 10 years ago. The Nature Index (a database that tracks contributions to articles published in a group of highly selective science journals) records that the recent growth of China's output in the index has overshadowed that of any other nation, a 37 percent rise of high-quality research papers between 2012 and 2014 (vs. a 4% drop for the United States over the same period). Needless to say, China's leading universities were the force behind this leap in the country's R&D performance. As early as in 2007, Chinese university researchers were reported placing 85 percent of the country's publications in international journals.

China Needs Its Own Standards to Measure University Success

All this may reflect significant improvement at individual universities, but not necessarily for the system as a whole. In other words, a number of individual Chinese universities climbing to top ranking positions is one story, and the Chinese system as a global leader is another. Put explicitly, individual universities can hardly make a game changer, but a university model may. It is important to note that the success of Western systems in global comparisons leveraged not only the performance of individual universities, but also (and more importantly) the strength of a normative model. The British university model featured the notion of liberal education; the German model advanced the idea of research for the sake of creating knowledge; and the US model combined both of these and highlighted the university's role of social service.

...China's State Council officially promulgated a blueprint that explicitly and exclusively spells out details as to China's world-class university ambition, including a timetable.

Then, how might a new Chinese higher education system be defined? The new blueprint requires top universities to pursue world-class standing, while developing "Chinese characteristics." With this added ambiguity, China will need to develop its own standards for the world-class university endeavor, which support both a global role for Chinese universities and cultural distinctiveness. Whether there is a Chinese or Confucian model of the university now is debatable, but Chinese universities, with unprecedented support from a strong state, indeed reflect a distinctiveness that is different from their Western peers. For instance, Chinese universities seek to articulate strategic planning with national and local development agendas, and address national and local needs. This type of politicized social engagement often absorbs considerable resources, be they human or material. The current global rankings are not able to measure these contributions and, as a result, the contributions of Chinese universities to social and economic development are systematically underestimated and undervalued. Furthermore, since lifting the restrictions on study abroad and (literally) encouraging it some 30 years ago, China has suffered from a huge brain drain, which now hovers at an estimate of over three million Chinese knowledge workers residing abroad. Yet in recent years, Chinese universities began to benefit from the process of brain circulation.

Arguably, there is no other system with such an ambitious national agenda for academic development and competitiveness, especially over such an extended time span. There is essentially no international indicator that captures the significance of this agenda or timeline. China's success may be significant, but not necessarily in the way that will move its universities into more competitive positions in the current global rankings. The government's intentions reflect quite different agendas at the same time, and would benefit from explicit "Chinese standards" to help establish a clearer direction for higher education development in the country. ■

Chinese Higher Education: "Glass Ceiling" and "Feet of Clay"

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

China's impressive higher education accomplishments have masked some significant barriers to the ascent of Chinese universities to the top rungs of global academe, as well as some significant problems at the bottom of the system. Key structural problems create a "glass ceiling" that may affect further improvements in the international rankings. This discussion follows Rui Yang's "Toxic Academic Culture in East Asia," an insightful analysis in the Winter (2016) issue of *International Higher Education*, that emphasized some deep challenges facing universities in the region, from corruption to influence peddling in academic appointments.

The focus in China has been on a small but important number of research universities, mainly the institutions that are part of the well-known 985 and 211 programs, that pumped billions of US dollars into a limited number of top Chinese universities. Without any doubt, this investment has created significant research capacity and world-class infrastructure at these top universities, and will probably yield impressive results in the coming decades. Yet, mainland China has only two universities in the top 200 of the *Times Higher Education* global rankings—compared to three for

tiny Hong Kong, technically part of China but with a quite different academic culture.

"Glass Ceiling" and "Feet of Clay"

What do we mean by "glass ceiling" and "feet of clay"? A "glass ceiling" refers to a set of conditions that may inhibit Chinese universities from reaching the top of the global rankings, and more importantly, from achieving their full potential for excellence in research and teaching.

By "feet of clay" we mean that China has developed an unbalanced higher education system. The top universities have been generously funded and many can now compete with the best global institutions. The same cannot be said for the many smaller universities, applied (polytechnic) universities, or colleges that have absorbed the huge numbers of students that have entered the system in the past two decades. (China now has the largest enrollments in the world.) Most of the "demand-absorbing" public, and a growing number of private institutions at the bottom of the system, are underfunded and generally offer rather poor quality. Many have criticized this situation, and have pointed out that many of the graduates of these institutions are ill-prepared for the labor force and, subsequently, cannot find jobs.

While China's top 100 universities have made significant progress, the pressures of massification continue to affect the institutions at the bottom of the system.

It is not enough to have a small number of high-quality, elite universities. Successful higher education systems offer reasonable quality at all levels, and ensure that all students receive the preparation necessary to successfully enter the labor force. China needs a system that incorporates diversity to accommodate a range of students and institutional missions with adequate support for all. China is not alone in its discrepancies between the different levels of higher education, but the "feet of clay" at the bottom of the academic hierarchy in China creates serious problems for the system as a whole.

Over-bureaucratization and Narrow Thinking

Several telling examples illustrate Chinese thinking about higher education. Government regulations require that an area of study should be defined as a traditional discipline if it is to obtain legitimacy within a university and receive appropriate support. Of course, in the 21st century, interdisciplinary pursuit is increasingly important and it makes no sense to define academic study narrowly. This will only serve to limit innovation and scientific creativity. The following example illustrates the contortions required of Chinese scholars to make things fit into "appropriate" structures and bureaucratic ways of thinking. One well-known Chinese university must defend "higher education studies" as a "discipline," so that its institute of higher education can achieve recognition, hire faculty, and offer academic degrees. In fact, higher education is an interdisciplinary field incorporating insights and methodologies from a range of social science disciplines, and is not, in any way, a traditional discipline. Research and teaching on higher education is conducted at that institute, but some flexibility and "21st century thinking" would make life easier and open better opportunities for scholarship. Of late, Chinese authorities have begun to support some interdisciplinary initiatives at some top universities, so perhaps this bodes well for the future.

Another less than useful policy stipulates that in order for a university department or institute to make tenured (permanent) appointments to faculty, the academic unit must teach undergraduates. Internationally, it is not uncommon for departments or other academic units not to teach undergraduates in order to pursue a mission focused on graduate education or research—yet they retain the authority to make faculty appointments and offer promotions. In China, where the tenure system is slowly evolving at some top universities, rigid and, often, counter-productive rules are still being imposed.

Historically, the Chinese system has combined the worst of all worlds—almost all faculty and staff contracts were renewed automatically without a serious evaluation of performance, while at the same time, without guarantees of academic freedom or other protections. While rigorous evaluation of faculty is increasingly common at the top of the system, in general there is little, if any, measurement of research or teaching productivity elsewhere, allowing mediocrity to flourish in the rest of the system.

Future Trends

Many Western, and Chinese, observers insist that Chinese universities are poised to join the very top ranks of global universities very soon. The realities noted here, as well as other challenges such as the ongoing impediments to academic freedom, difficulties in developing an academic culture free of plagiarism, and boosting academic salaries, will hinder China's climb to the top. Further, and just as important, the deep and generally overlooked problems at the bottom of China's academic system have created significant

inequalities, with universities at the bottom suffering from underfunding and producing questionable quality. Many of these universities are being converted into polytechnic institutes ("applied universities"), which may contribute to the creation of a more rational system of higher education in China. While China's top 100 universities have made significant progress, the pressures of massification continue to affect the institutions at the bottom of the system.

When predicting the future of Chinese higher education, it is important to recognize the reality of the system as a whole and not be mesmerized by the rapid and impressive achievements of China's top universities. Lurking within the system are deep problems that have yet to be addressed—let alone solved—and that are fundamental to the health of the higher education system in the long run. ■

Managing Markets and Massification of Higher Education in India

N.V. Varghese

N.V. Varghese is director, Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi 110016, India. E-mail: nv.varghese@nuepa.org.

The higher education system in India is at a stage of revival. The sector experienced an unprecedented expansion in this century. The double-digit annual growth rate in the previous decade helped the higher education sector enter a stage of massification. With more than 700 universities, nearly 37,000 colleges, 1.4 million teachers, and 31 million students, Indian higher education is a massive system, the second largest in the world after China.

Market-friendly Reforms

The massification of the sector reflects a change in public policy, from a state controlled, publicly funded system that experienced slow growth and provided limited access, to a system led by market principles of operation. Liberalization policies in the economic sector in the 1990s encouraged a permeation of market forces and market-friendly reforms into the higher education sector, which led to a proliferation of private institutions and the explosion of student enrollments in India.

It may seem strange that while mature market economies relied on public institutions to absorb the massive demand for higher education, less developed market economies such as India relied on the market. At present, more than three-fifths of the enrollment is accounted for by private higher education institutions.

Market-led massification promoted a faster growth of market-friendly study programs in technical, professional, and management domains, leading to disciplinary distortions.

Initially, private sector involvement in higher education was in the form of sharing costs with the government. The next phase saw the emergence of self-financing and capitation (special feels that student pay at some colleges prior to entry) fee colleges, followed by private institutions attaining the status of deemed-to-be universities (a special status that state authorities can give to universities not otherwise officially recognized), and finally the status of private universities in this century.

Massification and its Characteristics

Market-led massification promoted a faster growth of market-friendly study programs in technical, professional, and management domains, leading to disciplinary distortions. This resulted also in an increase in the unemployment of graduates from these streams, leading to a decline in the demand for these study programs and the closure of some private institutions.

Massification promoted the expansion of non-university institutions and study programs awarding diploma level certifications. The non-university segment has been the fastest growing segment in higher education—the enrollment increased by 23 times, and its share in total enrollment by eight times, between 2005 and 2012.

Higher education in India is mainly undergraduate education, which accounts for nearly 80 percent of the enrollment. The share of enrollment in graduate study programs is low and that in research programs is declining. This trend may have implications on the availability of teachers, constraining the sector even further.

Massification and Inequalities

The massification of higher education in India is accompanied by persisting, if not widening, inequalities. While

all regions and social groups, and both sexes, improved their status, the rate of growth varied, leading to widening inequalities. For example, between 2002–2003 and 2011–2012, the gross enrollment ratio (GER) increased by three times in some states, two times in others, but was much slower yet in others. The gains in GER are the highest among states where private institutions are dominant which contributes to the widening of inequalities.

The disparities in enrollment among different social groups continue to be significant. However, the benefits of massification are more equally shared between the sexes. Although inequalities still persist, the disparities in the share of enrollment of men and women are narrowing down. In fact, in some of the states where the GER is relatively high, the gender parity index is greater than 1.

Massification and Quality

Massification has contributed to a deterioration in quality. The reckless growth of self-financing private colleges has resulted in a proliferation of institutions with poor infrastructure, less qualified teachers, and no research facilities. After performing site visits, one of the recent evaluation Committees recommended closure of 41 deemed universities because of poor quality.

The disparities in enrollment among different social groups continue to be significant.

India has established mechanisms for external and internal quality assurance mechanisms. Since accreditation is voluntary, a major share of the institutions is not yet accredited. In a majority of institutions, the internal quality assurance units are not operational. This trend may change since the University Grant Commission has now made accreditation a necessary condition to obtain grant funding.

A new trend is that quality is affecting quantity in higher education in India. The enrollment in many private colleges—in particular technical and professional colleges—is declining due to the questionable quality of the education provided and the considerable unemployment rate of their graduates.

Challenges of Governance and Management

The existence of multiple regulatory bodies and funding arrangements makes it difficult to govern and manage the system and the institutions that are part of it. The system of affiliated colleges makes the situation worse. Universities are responsible for developing curriculum, overseeing academic standards, conducting examinations, and awarding degrees to all those enrolled in university departments and affiliated colleges. The number of colleges affiliated to some of the universities is too large to allow any meaningful academic guidance. India needs to plan for a larger number of small-size universities and autonomous colleges, and restrict the number of colleges to be affiliated.

Institutional autonomy is essential for effective management. Except for selected institutions such as the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) and the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), universities in India enjoy autonomy in theory only. State universities continue to be over-regulated and controlled by the government. Many institutions are starving for funds and are at the mercy of the government. At times, institutions complain that they receive more directives than funds from public authorities.

Undoubtedly, the level of autonomy depends on the institutional head. It is felt that the erosion of institutional authority and autonomy is a result of political influence in the selection of institutional heads. Most institutions have their own governing bodies. However, the process of nomination of the members of the governing boards is not always free from interference.

At times, granting autonomy is seen as an excuse for not extending financial support. While autonomy gives better scope for institutions to engage in resource mobilization, core funding from the government would make them less vulnerable and more effective.

Conclusion

The compulsion to expand higher education in India will continue. The low gross enrollment ratio, an expanding secondary school system, and an increasing number of youth provide fertile ground for further expansion. In the 2020s, India will have one of the youngest populations, and the largest tertiary-age population in the world. A majority of young people will live in urban areas and come from middle class families with good capacity to pay. This implies that the era of decision-making constrained by scarcity of public resources may come to an end. We may expect more market-friendly reforms in higher education in India.

The future challenge lies in expanding the system while containing inequalities and improving quality. The Indian experience shows that while market forces may be helpful to expand higher education, especially among those who have the ability to pay, the market may not be the most reliable ally to reduce inqualities and promote quality. Therefore, strategies for the future need to focus on regulating the system effectively for quality, and targeting backward

regions and deprived groups for ensuring equity in access to higher education.

(This article is based on: Varghese, N.V. 2015. *Challenges of massification of higher education in India*, CPRHE Research Papers 1, New Delhi.)

■

Academic Freedom in the World's Largest Democracy

William G. Tierney and Nidhi S. Sabharwal

William G. Tierney is university professor, Wilbur-Kieffer professor of higher education, and co-director of the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California. He currently has a Fulbright Fellowship to India. E-mail: wgtiern@usc.edu. Nidhi S. Sabharwal is associate professor in the Center for Policy Research in Higher Education at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration in New Delhi, India. E-mail: nidhis@nuepa.org.

On February 9, 2016, a cultural program was held on the campus of Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) in the heart of New Delhi, India. JNU, largely a graduate institution with 8,000 students, is thought of as one of India's best universities. The faculty and students have the reputation of being from the left and vocal in opposition to the current government of Narendra Modi. There is also a vocal minority of students who are members of *Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad* (ABVP), a conservative organization closely allied with the *Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangh* (RSS), another ultra-conservative Hindu nationalist group.

The event was organized by the Democratic Student Union and initially approved by the administration. The ABVP protested, however, and the administration cancelled the event. The students nevertheless went ahead with what they defined as a cultural program. The program's purpose was to commemorate through poetry, music, and art—the death of Afzal Guru, the terrorist convicted of bombing Parliament in 2001. The organizers also talked about the ongoing struggles in Kashmir, the rights of the people in the region, and the importance of self-determination. Kanhaiya Kumar, the president of the Student Union, attended the event in support.

Three days after the event, the vice chancellor let the police enter the campus and arrest Kanhaiya Kumar for sedition. Many in the country believed that speakers crossed a line by talking about Kashmir in a manner that suggested independence.

Attacking the Country or Attacking Academic Freedom?

The actions on and off campus have been front page news for two months. Those on the right have condemned the protest. The Home Minister of India stated, "If anyone raises anti-India slogans, tries to raise questions on the country's unity and integrity, they will not be spared." Some have argued for violence against anyone who would speak against the country; others have said the university should be shut down—that such events should never be allowed at a public university. The High Court judge who granted bail to Kanhaiya said that "the entire JNU campus suffers from some unpatriotic and anti-national infestation that requires cleansing through pro-active policing."

Others have suggested that Kanhaiya's arrest and the ensuing outcry is yet another attack on academic freedom. Since the Modi government came to power in 2014, over 50 intellectuals have returned their medals and awards in part to protest a crackdown on academic freedom at India's universities. Others allege that a stifling of academic freedom has been behind the government's multiple forced resignations from academic and intellectual committees and organizations. Recent appointments of the Chair of the National Book Trust, the Central Advisory Board of Education, and the Indian Council of Historical Research, are examples of individuals and bodies who fall in line with the current government's policies; those who were purged from those positions were respected academics who did not necessarily agree with one or another policy of the government. Many argue that such actions have not been uncommon in the past as well.

Framing Academic Freedom

Such issues underscore the tensions of academic freedom. Except for ideologues, academic freedom is an elusive concept whose meanings and interpretations require thoughtful consideration. India is a democracy, but its definitions, for example, of what counts as sedition differs from another democracy such as the United States. The sorts of movies and books that get censored in India reflect an environment that is more conservative than in the United States. A new movie, *Aligarh*, depicts a relationship between a male professor and a (male) rickshaw driver. Largely based on the true story of an academic who committed suicide, the movie cannot find a broad outlet in India; numerous groups have tried to ban the movie from being seen on the campus where the professor worked. Is academic freedom a cultural term that requires a common understanding, or does the locale of the university circumscribe its meaning? The curricula in India's postsecondary classrooms are largely prescribed. Is the Indian historian and public intellectual, Romila Tharpar, correct that standardized syllabi that are

centrally controlled are an infringement on academic freedom and an example of a "totalitarian society"?

Academic Freedom Inside and Outside of the Classroom

Generally, discussions of academic freedom divide in two. On the one hand, what the academic says in the classroom and pertains to his or her specific research helps us understand what one can say, because the individual speaks and writes from a particular knowledge base. On the other hand, extramural speech defines what a professor might say outside of the classroom, where he or she claims no disciplinary expertise. Both areas have become points of contention.

Communicating an idea in a classroom that others disagree with, may lead to the termination of one's services and the elimination of a text. Rohinton Mistry's Booker Prize shortlisted novel, *Such a Long Journey*, for example, was eliminated from a syllabus when a student objected to certain passages. The novel tells the story of a bank clerk who belongs to Mumbai's Parsee community. A few pages in the novel negatively portray Indian politics and a specific political party. As an act of self-censorship, Mumbai University removed the book from its reading lists. Similarly, a professor at Banaras Hindu University was fired when he tried to screen in his Development Studies class the currently banned *India's Daughter*, a movie about a rape that occurred in New Delhi.

Rightly framed, these sorts of discussions can be useful in helping academics to think through thorny issues that go to the heart of what a nation wants of its universities.

The kind of events that transpired at JNU is what has provoked heated discussions about academic freedom. The challenge of what should be taught in the classroom extends to the sorts of seminars, clubs, and activities that occur outside of the classroom. The JNU Centre for Sanskrit Studies invited, for example, a well-known Yoga Guru for a keynote address in an academic seminar. The individual is looked on as supportive of the conservative government. A group of students opposed the invitation, terming it as a "silent right-wing onslaught." The speaker felt obliged to cancel his keynote.

Conclusion

Some will suggest that to critique academic freedom in India today requires an understanding of academic freedom in India a generation ago. In essence, they are asking if today's concerns about academic freedom are simply a way to criticize the Modi government and portray its members as conservative ideologues. History, to be sure, always helps us understand complex issues such as academic freedom. One also needs to ask, however, if a 28 year old student should be put in prison for 21 days because he attended an event where controversial statements were made that some define as seditious. Rightly framed, these sorts of discussions can be useful in helping academics to think through thorny issues that go to the heart of what a nation wants of its universities. ■

The "New" Private Higher Education Sector in the United Kingdom

Claire Callender

Claire Callender is professor of higher education at Birkbeck, University of London and at University College London's Institute of Education, where she is deputy director and coinvestigator at the Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE). E-mail: c.callender@bbk.ac.uk.

Developing a private higher education sector in England—euphemistically called "alternative providers"—is central to the UK government's policies. The government already allows students enrolled on approved courses at private providers to claim government-subsidized financial aid. Since 2010, it has made it easier for private colleges to enter the higher education undergraduate market through liberalization. It plans to do much more. The government's 2015 higher education Green Paper, shortly to be turned into legislation, wants to remove barriers to entry and growth. In return for more regulation and potentially much more money, it proposes speeding up the processes whereby new entrants can gain degree awarding powers and access a university title, while simultaneously lowering the entry bar. Why is the government pushing this policy agenda? Does England need a private higher education sector?

To date, there is absolutely no evidence that UK private providers are really challenger institutions or disruptive innovators who will reshape the higher education undergraduate market, improve quality, widen participation, and drive down prices. Rather they are costly to the public purse, divert resources away from existing public provision, absorb an inordinate amount of public officials' time, en-

ergy, and focus, are of questionable quality, and are likely to perpetuate, rather than eradicate, existing inequalities in higher education participation and outcomes. Ultimately, they are a reputational risk to the United Kingdom's higher education system.

The Drivers of Private Higher Education Expansion

Looking across the globe, the key drivers for the recent development and expansion of private higher education have been: to meet rising unmet demand, especially among young people; to help widen participation; and to fill niche provision. Do these apply to England? In 2015, the government lifted the cap on undergraduate student numbers in the public sector specifically to meet pent up demand. Applications and acceptances to English universities increased and reached the highest ever entry rates (which take account of demographic changes) recorded for 18 and 19 year olds. Now 42 percent of English young people enter full-time higher education by age 19, and are over a quarter more likely to do so than in 2006. So enrollments among young people are largely holding up, despite the threefold increase in full-time undergraduate tuition in 2012/2013 (unlike enrollments for mature and part-time undergraduates). But the growth has been unequal, with public higher education institutions at the bottom of England's hierarchical and stratified system seeing the smallest enrollment increases. Some institutions are struggling to fill their places, bringing into question the extent of unmet demand.

What about entry rates in England for students from poorer and disadvantaged backgrounds? Is the public sector widening participation? In 2015, entry rates for disadvantaged 18 year olds also were the highest ever recorded at 18.5 percent, but the rate of growth has slowed down recently. Even so, disadvantaged young people in England are 30 percent more likely to enter university in 2015 than five years ago, and 65 percent more likely than in 2006. Yet, there has been limited progress in these young people's access to the most prestigious universities, those demanding high entry grades. In 2015, only 3.3 percent of the most disadvantaged entered such universities compared with 20.7 percent of the most advantaged. Disadvantaged students and students of color remain concentrated in the least prestigious universities. Significantly, however, this expansion has been achieved without any apparent deleterious effects on drop-out. Noncompletion rates are falling in England. In 2013/2014, only 7 percent of all full-time degree students and 8 percent of similar disadvantaged young students dropped out of higher education after their first year of study.

Finally, niche and innovative provision is well serviced by government-funded further education colleges. These colleges have seen some increase in their undergraduate student numbers following earlier reforms. They are particularly well attuned to the needs of local students and local employers, and their tuition fees are lower than universities. Yet colleges have been the target of government funding cuts.

Public sector higher education seems to be doing pretty well in terms of meeting demand, widening participation, and fulfilling niche provision. It could certainly do better. To understand the government's love affair with private higher education, we have to look elsewhere—to its ideology. Neo-liberalism with its idealized notion of the market is a hallmark of this, and the previous, governments' public service policies, including higher education. The government's vision is of a higher education sector whose purpose, role, and operation are driven and defined by the market. Provider competition and consumer choice supposedly leading to increases in efficiency and innovation are driving higher education reforms. To this end, in 2012/2013, the government withdrew most of the money it gave England's public universities for teaching, and raised the cap on tuition to £9,000 per annum (making it the most expensive higher education system among OECD countries), which

Applications and acceptances to English universities increased and reached the highest ever entry rates (which take account of demographic changes) recorded for 18 and 19 year olds.

students repay via subsidized loans. It sought to put students "at the heart of the system." Consequently, the culture of many public higher education institutions is changing. Many have become far more managerial and "customer" orientated. Increasingly, we are seeing privatization in education with the involvement of the private sector through a variety of arrangements that fall short of outright privatized provision, such as public-private partnerships, contracting services, and financing. Currently there are proposals to privatize quality assurance.

Now, the government wants the privatization of education to stimulate yet more competition and innovation, more choice for students, and better value for money, purely for ideological reasons.

But is this privatization really necessary, given the reach of marketization within the public sector and its record on meeting unmet demand, widening participation, and niche provision? From the limited data on the emerging private higher education sector in England, it is not. What we know

about private providers from research and official reports is not flattering, leaving civil servants and other government agencies preoccupied with unravelling the mess that characterizes this inadequately regulated evolving sector and the risks it poses, and taking a series of rearguard actions, often behind closed doors.

Private Providers in the United Kingdom

Of the estimated 670 private providers in the United Kingdom today, the majority operate as for-profits and are newly established. Just seven have degree awarding powers and four have university status. Compared with the public sector, most are cheaper, small, concentrated in London, highly specialized, offering a limited range of courses and a limited number of qualifications—mostly at sub-degree level, and have lower entry requirements. Government research estimates that there are now between 245,000 and 295,000 students in the private sector. Most study full-time and about half are international.

The number of private sector students claiming government-subsidized financial support has increased tenfold since 2010/2011, to around 60,000. The taxpayer costs of this aid has soared from £30 million in 2010 to £723.6 million in 2013–2014, before falling to £533.6 million in 2014/2015 after the government introduced a cap on student numbers at private colleges because of concerns about quality and rocketing public funding. A damning report on financial support for students attending private colleges by the National Audit Office, which scrutinizes public spending for Parliament and helps Parliament hold government to account, showed: students claiming support for which they were ineligible; providers recruiting students who do not have the capacity or motivation to complete their course; drop-out rates five times higher than the public sector; providers enrolling students accessing support onto unapproved courses; and providers supplying inaccurate information about student attendance.

All are clear examples of the waste and abuse of public money for the private gain of providers. They, together with the public costs, bring into question the supposed attractiveness of private providers as cheap alternatives to public universities, as well as what their students and taxpayers are getting in return. Why not invest and concentrate on public higher education instead of expanding private provision? ■

Changing Public-Private Dynamics in Polish Higher Education

Marek Kwiek

Marek Kwiek is director of the Centre for Public Policy Studies and a chair holder of the UNESCO Chair in Institutional Research and Higher Education Policy, University of Poznan, Poland. E-mail: kwiekm@amu.edu.pl.

Poland provides an interesting example of the impact of rapidly declining demographics on the public-private dynamics in higher education. From an international perspective, the Polish case shows how fragile private higher education is, when its dominating, demand-absorbing subsector is confronted with changing demographics and massive public financing in the public sector; it also shows how interdependent the two sectors are. The Polish case provides a good policy lesson for all systems in which the public sector is funded by taxes and the private sector is fee-based, and in which demographic projections show that ever-growing pools of prospective students in the future are not guaranteed.

To describe the last decade in a nutshell: the number of public sector students has been increasing, compared with the number of private sector students, and the amount of public revenues to higher education, compared with private revenues, has also been increasing. In the public sector, the share of "tax-based" students has been increasing and that of fee-paying students has been decreasing. The number of private providers has also been shrinking. Consequently, Poland moved from a *fully public* system under the communist regime (1945–1989), to a *dual* or *mixed public-private* system in the expansion period of 1990–2005, to a *deprivatizing* system in which both the private sector and private funding are playing a decreasing role (2006–2016, and beyond); and, presumably, to a *deprivatized* system, with a marginal role of the private sector and a dominant role of both the public sector and public funding (from about 2025 and beyond).

Educational Expansion

The history of Polish higher education after 1989 can be divided into two contrasting periods: an expansion period during 1990–2005 and a contraction period since 2006. While the expansion period was characterized by privatization (private sector growth and increasing role of fees in financing public universities), the current contraction period is characterized by deprivatization. Deprivatization has both

external and internal dimensions: the decade-long decline in private sector enrollments is combined with a decreasing role of fees in financing public universities. The fall in national enrollment levels, due to falling demographics, is projected to be one of the highest in Europe, and comparable only to that in other post-communist countries such as Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia, Lithuania, and Latvia.

The private sector was booming in the expansion period, as Poland was catching up with Western Europe in terms of enrollment rates: the enrollment rate grew by a factor of five in a much shorter period of time than anywhere else in Western Europe. It has been gradually declining since the Polish system entered—in Martin Trow's terms—the age of "universalization." It reached 51.1 percent in 2007, compared to 10 percent in 1989.

Educational Contraction

The first impact of the current powerful reversed demographic trend is seen through the falling share of fee-paying students in both sectors combined, beginning in 2006. In contrast, the total number of "tax-based" students has been increasing throughout the last decade, and in 2009–2014 their share increased from 43.6 percent to 57.9 percent. Under declining demographics, the speed of change in student composition by sources of funding and by sector has been amazing. It has been a zero-sum game so far: in student numbers, public sector gains have meant private sector losses.

The share of fee-paying students (all students in the private sector and part-time students in the public sector) in the expansion period was high from a European comparative perspective: it increased from 46.6 percent in 1995 to 58.6 percent in 2006. In the current contraction period, against global trends of increasing cost-sharing, this share has been steadily declining, to 42.1 percent in 2014, or from 1.137 million to 0.618 million students, with powerful financial implications. The ministry predicts it to be only about 20 percent in 2022. The changing public-private dynamics puts the question of cost-sharing in a different context: equitable access looks different when six in ten students pay fees, and when only four (and ultimately two) in ten do in the coming decade.

The expansion in 1990–2006 was financially supported by both public and private sources of funding. The inflow of public funding to the public sector was significant, but equally significant was the inflow of private funding from fees to both sectors. The private sector has always been overwhelmingly reliant on tuition fees—but during the peak of expansion the public sector was also heavily reliant on tuition fees from part-timers, who provided about 16–20 percent of its operating budget. Income from fees decreased by 17.8 percent (or $97 million) in the public sector, and by 28.8 percent (or $171 million) in the private sector in 2010–2014.

Privatization in Retreat

Thus the process of privatization is currently in retreat: the number of fee-paying students in the public sector decreased dramatically by almost half (47.9 percent) in the period 2006–2014, as did the share of income from fee-paying students in the public sector (from 16.2 percent to 9.4 percent). The number of private institutions decreased by 12.6 percent (or from 318 to 278), and the number of mergers and acquisitions in the private sector is on the rise. Finally, private sector enrollments have been shrinking systematically, by 43.9 percent in the period 2006–2014 (or from 640,000 to 359,000 students).

The history of Polish higher education after 1989 can be divided into two contrasting periods: an expansion period during 1990–2005 and a contraction period since 2006.

The decline of the fee-based private sector can hardly be reversed, as declining demographics are accompanied by an expanding pool of tuition-free places in the public sector. The increasingly privatized higher education of the expansion period is becoming increasingly public today, with stronger reliance on public funding. The dual public–private system is redirecting itself toward public institutions and their "tax-based" students. What matters, apart from the choice between studying for free vs. studying for fees, is also academic prestige and social legitimacy: predominantly demand-absorbing private higher education still lacks both.

Together with several other post-communist European countries, Poland is exceptional from a global perspective: both private shares in enrollments, and absolute enrollments in the private sector, have been decreasing for a decade. Private higher education, comprising 278 institutions, may expect to enroll still fewer students every year.

Poland is not politically prepared to the introduction of universal fees in the public sector or to the introduction of public subsidies in the private sector—which might help the private sector to survive. The introduction of fees is politically difficult in a much-felt climate of economic crisis in Europe today.

Conclusion

The public–private dynamics are rapidly changing in a system which still has the highest enrollments in the private sector in the European Union today. In the global context of expanding higher education systems, there are several systems in Central and Eastern Europe, with Poland in the forefront, which are actually contracting. Their contraction is fundamental and rooted in declining demographics. In a global context of increasing reliance on cost-sharing mechanisms and private sector growth, the Polish system seems to be moving in the opposite direction. Interestingly, the Polish trend of higher education deprivatization goes against the global trend of privatization, with uncertain financial implications for the future.

■

Private Participation in Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Ghana's Experience

Henry Fram Akplu

Henry Fram Akplu is a retired senior lecturer at the University of Cape Coast (a public university), and a former president of a private university college in Ghana. E-mail: hakplu@gmail.com.

Over the past quarter century, higher education in Sub-Saharan Africa has recorded phenomenal increases in the number of institutions and student enrollments, due largely to the deregulation of provision. For example, Ghana's higher education system has grown from just two institutions and less than 3,000 students in 1957 to 133 institutions and approximately 290,000 students in 2013, with most of the expansion occurring from the mid-1990s. Ghana's experience illustrates the push factors, policy responses, transformation of higher education, quality challenges of private participation, and the deepening of the internationalization of higher education institutions (HEIs) on the continent.

Remote and Immediate Pressures for Private Participation

The expansion of the higher education sector in Ghana from independence in 1957 to the early 1990s was constrained by a number of factors, resulting in excess demand relative to supply. Until polytechnics and other post-secondary institutions were "upgraded" to tertiary status from the 1990s, higher education was conceived narrowly as university education. The perceived low status of other post-secondary institutions made them less attractive than universities. Thus one reason for the phenomenal increase in number of HEIs and enrollments in Ghana was the inclusion of previously excluded institutions. Other factors which contributed to the building up of excess demand for HEI included rapidly growing population; the restriction of access to higher education through selective examinations such as the Common Entrance Examination; high unit costs; unsustainable subsidization of higher education; a socialist ideology that prevented private participation; and the lack of an attractive vocational education pathway as an alternative to higher education. Under these constraints, the demand for higher education outstripped supply to such an extent that, at some point, 51 percent of qualified applicants could not be offered admission. Between 1966 and 1990, the higher education system, consisting of just three universities, was characterized by frequent student protests, strikes, closure of institutions, and disruptions in the academic calendar. Policy changes were inevitable.

A combination of global forces pushed Ghana to move toward private participation in higher education in the early 1990s. These forces included increasing democratization and massification of education, the collapse of the socialist ideology, the spread of free market economics, and the emergence of public-private-partnership thinking. Anxious to absorb the excess demand for higher education were not-for-profit religious bodies and for-profit private individuals and organizations that had for decades been active in the provision of basic and secondary education.

Policy Response: Private Participation

As part of sweeping education reforms that began in 1987, higher education provision was opened up to the private sector, while public higher education was gradually deregulated. A legally mandated quality assurance body, the National Accreditation Board (NAB), was established in 1993 to regulate and guide the deregulation process. Before 2000, there were less than 15 private HEIs, but by 2015 their number had grown to 106, compared to 83 public HEIs. There are also numerous unaccredited institutions, 55 of which have been identified and published in the media by the NAB for the information of the general public.

Transformation

Private participation and economic liberalization have changed Ghana's higher education landscape since the mid-1990s. Private HEIs outnumber public institutions but account for less than 25 percent of total enrollments, now approaching 340,000 students annually. Private insti-

tutions have brought dynamism and competition into the sector and made higher education provision more market-oriented than it was under public monopoly. For example, higher education no longer caters only for the traditional full-time student. Private institutions admit students twice a year and have flexible delivery schedules such as weekend and evening classes, targeting working professionals. They also actively recruit students from outside Ghana and offer innovative programs to carve niches for themselves. However, only a few private HEIs offer science and technology programs, most focusing on less capital-intensive programs, particularly management and business administration. Public HEIs have also responded to the liberalization policies by adopting market-oriented practices. For example, they introduced special fee-paying programs and fee-paying admission quotas for applicants whose grades do not put them among tuition-free offers. One of the most remarkable transformations in the public sector was the conversion of the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA) from a public funded HEI to a self-financing institution. In general, liberalization policies have made higher education provision in Ghana more stable, vibrant, and responsive to market conditions over the past two decades.

Quality Challenges of Private Participation

Private participation in higher education has raised concerns about quality. Topmost among these concerns is whether private HEIs would have the requisite human and physical resources for delivering quality education. A few for-profit and faith-based institutions have met or exceeded expectations, but the majority of for-profit HEIs are struggling to meet expectations. Wide variations in the quality of faculty in private HEIs is a major concern. Overall, only 23 percent of the faculty in private HEIs have terminal degrees (all at least have second degrees), but some institutions do not have any terminal degree holders at all. Most private HEIs have a long way to go in meeting the terminal degree requirement set by NAB. In the short and medium term, the supply of qualified faculty cannot increase to match demand, and most private HEIs must depend on part-time faculty, some of whom combine multiple part-time appointments.

The accreditation authority has been implementing an increasingly rigorous quality assurance regime to allay public concerns. New private institutions must be mentored by chartered institutions for at least 10 years before they are granted the charter to award their own certificates. So far, only three private HEIs (all faith-based) have been granted charters. Accredited private HEIs undergo intensive external quality audits at least once every four years, and their accreditation may be renewed or revoked depending on the audit results. During the past 15 years, NAB has revoked four accreditation licenses and temporarily suspended more than five others from admitting students until they rectified certain deficiencies. However, the sudden closure of a financially strapped private HEI by its owners in 2014 pointed to loopholes in the regulatory system. To forestall such occurrences, NAB now requires bank guarantees equivalent to $500,000 for new accreditations. Quality is nevertheless being threatened by the establishment of unaccredited private institutions that exploit unmet demand for higher education. For now, NAB does not have the legal capacity to close down unaccredited institutions.

Deepening Internationalization

Private participation and liberalization of provision have contributed to the deepening of internalization of Ghana's higher education. Internationalization has deepened in areas such as diversity of student enrollments; offering of foreign curricula and awards through collaborations; locating offshore campuses of foreign HEIs in Ghana; and the adoption of institutional governance systems of foreign HEIs. In the 2012–2013 academic year, international students in private HEIs constituted 12.6 percent of total enrollments, while in public universities the proportion was 2 percent (relatively low but unthinkable two decades ago). Some private higher education institutions have established partnerships with institutions in countries—such as Germany, Sweden, Denmark, the United States, and the United Kingdom—to deliver their programs and have their students receive foreign awards while studying in Ghana. Tightened visa requirements for studies in Europe and North America are likely to promote further collaboration between local and foreign HEIs, thereby deepening the internationalization of higher education in Ghana.

Some private higher education institutions have established partnerships with institutions in countries such as Germany, Sweden, Denmark, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

The Future of Private HEIs

At this stage, private higher education is mainly absorbing excess demand from the tuition-free public education system. However, elite private HEIs are emerging that target applicants from wealthy families locally and globally. Pre-

dictably, the growth in number of private HEIs will slow down, as more stringent quality requirements are enforced. ■

University Branch Campuses 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.

On January 19, 2016, in an unprecedented demonstration of clout, the Kenya Commission for University Education (CUE) ordered Kisii University, a state institution, to close 10 of its 13 branch campuses, and relocate the 15,000 students affected to the main campus. This move brings to 20 the number of campuses ordered closed by the authorities. These actions are the culmination of concerted efforts by regulatory authorities to recalibrate university growth, from an array of low-quality, demand-absorbing campuses back to a traditional system of specialized, high-quality campuses. It is also a response to stakeholders concerns over the decline in quality, as a result of the commercialization of the university sector. The existence of campus networks in major universities has a long history. However, its surge in Kenya in the last decade has been explosive.

Kenya's university landscape, especially the public sector, is now a collection of campuses strewn all over the country and competing for the same student clientele. Whereas a decade ago the campus model was regarded as the panacea to the challenges of university demand and revenue diversification in the neo-liberal era, the model is now viewed with suspicion. It epitomizes the worst tendencies of university growth catalyzed by both social demand and commercialization, in the context of weak regulatory authorities.

Impetus for Campus Growth

Given the rapid growth of branch campuses in the public sector in the last decade, it is important to highlight budgetary constraints, access, and equity as the key factors motivating this development.

Of the main drivers of the multicampus systems in Kenya's state universities, none ranks higher than institutional revenue diversification. Acute state revenue constraints beginning in the late 1990s, and the subsequent reduction of state funding of universities, have forced the institutions to seek additional revenues from the marketplace. The universities have adopted a low-cost revenue enhancement model around inexpensive branch campuses targeting self-sponsored students (high school graduates without government scholarships) and working adults. Most of these campuses are in small rural towns and offer easy-to-mount courses in humanities, education, and business, taught by poorly qualitied part-time faculty. The target students pay market-based tuition charges and fees, which contributes a large percentage of the universities' additional revenues. Since the campuses are inexpensive to establish and generate high financial returns, universities have a strong incentive to establish numerous branch campuses.

Though the number of universities in Kenya has grown from one public university to the current 43 accredited universities (33 public and 10 private), the challenge of access remains, as the current enrollment of around 324,000 represents only 30 percent of the eligible population. The number of students graduating from high school far exceeds the available number of university places, while the number of working adults seeking university education grows. University authorities have viewed leasing facilities for the establishment of campuses as the most practical approach to expand access in the context of reduced state subventions, for construction of capital facilities at the main campuses.

Most public and private universities are located in major metropolitan areas and in rich agricultural regions of central and western Kenya, leaving large swaths of the country without universities. These disadvantaged areas also experience greater levels of poverty. National educational authorities have, therefore, viewed low-cost campuses in marginal areas as a solution to the twin challenges of equity of access and economic disadvantage. It is not surprising that many campuses have been established in the low-income coastal, eastern, and north-eastern regions of the country.

These social goals have been the reason why regulatory authorities have overlooked the pitfalls of a university system characterized by low-quality branch campuses. The campuses have been a double-edged sword, providing access and equity while simultaneously compromising quality and equity.

Quality and Equity Challenge

Questionable educational quality in branch campuses is the utmost concern expressed by stakeholders. From academic facilities to academic staff, many branch campuses offer a grim contrast to the main campuses of the universities. In most rural urban centers, branch campuses share buildings with business establishments like pubs, restaurants, supermarkets, brothels, and bus terminals. They lack libraries, internet facilities, student services, as well as recreational

amenities. Other than a full-time campus director, the academic staff consists of adjunct faculty who hold master's degrees, sometimes of dubious credibility. Rarely are academic conferences, seminars, and research symposiums hosted in the campuses. Not only does this environment impede excellent teaching and learning, but it also perpetuates teaching-research divorce, even in premier national universities. Surprisingly, most of these campuses purport to offer research-oriented master's degrees.

It epitomizes the worst tendencies of university growth catalyzed by both social demand and commercialization, in the context of weak regulatory authorities.

All branch campuses exhibit a common characteristic: a restrictive academic narrowness. Commercially oriented programs dominate academic offerings, with business studies, economics, and project management as the most popular. Other dominant fields include education, humanities, and social sciences. Engineering, the natural sciences, and the medical sciences are rarely offered at the branch campuses. Because branch campuses are peripheral appendages created to generate revenue and absorb demand, the central university administrators are reluctant to offer programs that could evolve into potential competitors to the main campuses for government-sponsored student numbers and state financial resources.

In as much as campuses have enhanced access, they also reveal the dark side of the intersection between social class membership and university access in Kenya. Rural campuses largely attract self-sponsored students who, as a result of their lower socioeconomic status, could not perform well enough in high school examinations to secure competitive government scholarships. With students from more privileged backgrounds taking the larger share of government scholarships and, therefore, places in the well-resourced main university campuses, the branch model of university development has contributed to the bifurcation of state universities: students from more privileged backgrounds dominate the well-resourced main campuses, while those from underprivileged classes are overrepresented in branch campuses. Branch campuses, therefore, contribute to the failure to address issues of substantive equity in higher education.

Recalibrating the Branch Campus Model

The Kenyan multibranch campus model of higher education is there to stay, granted its benefits in the commercialized higher education climate. While ensuring that campus resources meet minimum acceptable standards, as CUE is currently doing, is an appropriate short-term measure, the long-term solution lies in reconfiguring the university campus system. The state needs to support the development of branch campuses that not only provide access, but also address the socioeconomic and cultural problems in the regions where they are located. This will promote the hiring of qualified faculty, diverse academic programs congruent with local challenges, engagement in research and scholarship, and the mentoring of graduate students. Granting such campuses administrative autonomy in certain areas of finance and academic programing will enhance decision-making on critical issues. Elements of this model of branch organization are already evident in the organizational model of the University of Nairobi colleges. ■

Chilean Universities: Not So Tuition-free After All

Ariane de Gayardon and Andrés Bernasconi

Ariane de Gayardon is a PhD candidate in higher education at the Boston College Lynch School of Education as well as a graduate assistant at the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), US. E-mail: ariane.degayardon@bc.edu. Andrés Bernasconi is associate professor and vice-dean at the School of Education of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile. E-mail: abernasconi@uc.cl.

The dictatorship of General Pinochet in Chile (1973–1990) expanded private higher education and introduced tuition fees in the higher education public sector. Three decades later, Chile is the OECD country with the smallest share of public expenditure in the overall tertiary education spending. It also has the second highest level of tuition fees after US private universities, when adjusted to the per capita gross national product.

In 2011, Chilean students demonstrated massively against the marketization of the higher education system, making free higher education for all one of their key demands. The president at the time, Sebastián Piñera (a conservative), did not accede to this, but greatly expanded student aid as a response to the students' expectations. However, the issue did not go away, and by the 2013 electoral campaign, free higher education became a central pledge

in the plan of the current president Michelle Bachelet (a socialist). Since her election, Michelle Bachelet and her government have been working to fulfill this promise. At the end of 2015, a law intended to open the way to free higher education in Chile was passed by congress.

The "Short Tuition Free Act" of December 2015

The government lacked the necessary legislative space in the congress' docket for 2015 and the technical wherewithal to design and negotiate with the universities an acceptable mechanism to replace tuition fees with public funding. Therefore, it chose to add to the education budget law for 2016 a rider that would create an initial form of tuition free status for some students and some institutions. This legislative strategy was controversial in congress and was resisted by the opposition on constitutional grounds, but was nonetheless passed in December 2015.

The budget act for 2016 provides funding to enable free higher education for enrolled students whose families belong to the 50 percent poorest among higher education students in Chile.

The budget act for 2016 provides funding to enable free higher education for enrolled students whose families belong to the 50% poorest among higher education students in Chile—i.e., families who earn less than US$250 per person per month. But to be eligible, students must be enrolled in state universities or in private universities that choose to take part in the program. Only non-profit universities with at least four years of accreditation are invited to join the program.

In 2016, 30 universities (50% of the total number of universities in Chile) will participate in the program for free higher education. As a result, some 30,000 first year students will have access to higher education free of charge, as well as 80,000 students in higher courses. With additional students whose status is currently pending, the ministry of education hopes to reach a total of 160,000 students in 2016. But this adds up to only 15 percent of the total student population, far from the "free higher education for all" target. The 2016 program is indeed publicized by the government as the first step of a gradual process that should end with free tertiary education for everyone in 2020, if the general state of the public budget makes it possible.

Improving Access?

Demonstrating students in 2011 advocated for free tertiary education for all as a tool to improve access to higher education. But the "Gratuidad 2016" law is unlikely to foster access. There is no evidence that students accessing free tertiary higher education in 2016 would not have gone to university if they had to pay tuition fees with the pre-2016 combination of scholarships and loans. In fact, according to Chile's major household socioeconomic survey (CASEN), only 17 percent of young people in the 10 percent poorest households state that they do not participate in higher education for financial reasons. The most cited reason is that they did not finish high school or pass the qualifying examinations. Therefore, universal access to Chilean higher education seems to depend mostly on an improvement of the secondary school system, or on a change in university admissions criteria.

Additionally, the law currently targets only universities, while students from low socioeconomic backgrounds go predominantly to vocational and technical education. The benefit should be extended to professional institutes and technical training centers as soon as 2017, thus making it more inclusive for the most disadvantaged populations. However, it is not yet clear how this will be implemented (if at all), given budgetary restrictions.

For the government, however, this policy is not about increasing access, but that means to realize a question of principle: if education is a human right, it should be free of charge for the student.

The Universities' Choice

Private universities are given the choice to participate in the program or not. While all 16 state universities participate, only 14 private universities chose to do so in 2016. Thirteen opted out, while the remainder is not eligible. The way government subsidies for students benefiting from free higher education are calculated does mean that some universities will lose revenue previously obtained through tuition charges. The government is not paying full tuition for every "free" student; instead, the per capita allocation is a per-program average of the tuition fees charged by all universities with the same number of years of accreditation, plus a maximum 20 percent increase for universities getting less per student than their tuition fees level. In effect, the most expensive universities —the best private ones—will not receive full compensation for their students on the free track and will have to self-generate the missing revenue, or cut costs. While top-ranked universities might have leverage to secure other revenues from the government or private sources, most will experience a dent in their budget if they choose to participate in the program.

This is also somewhat problematic for diversity and inclusion. Students with the best scores in the university entrance test, who tend to be the most affluent, will have the option to select universities that choose to participate in the free program. The rest, often from less privileged backgrounds, will only find available slots in the less selective, for-profit, or poorly accredited, tuition-charging institutions. Equity could become a serious issue in Chilean higher education, as it is currently in the Brazilian free public system.

Free for All

With financial and access issues entangled in the current version of the law, there is reason to doubt whether the 2020 free-for-all plan will ever become a reality. The funding for this watered-down version of tuition free higher education came from an increase in taxes on Chilean firms. This increase came at a time of general slowing down of the Chilean economy, mostly because of the steep decrease in the price of copper. Currently, the low price of Chilean exports and the anemic growth rate of the nation's economy are not in line with the increase in the educational budget needed to expand free tuition and fund other educational reforms in progress.

Indeed, the 2015 tax hike generated just enough extra revenue in 2016 to pay for the tuition of some 200,000 students. The target of eligible students in 2016 had to be lowered from 60 percent to 50 percent of the poorest students. And the future looks grim. Fiscal adjustments are already in the forecast for 2017, with education predicted to take the biggest blow. How this will square with the will to open free tuition to vocational higher education is uncertain.

In the longer term, how the government will ultimately manage to fund free higher education for 1.2 million students in the public and private sectors remains unclear. This pertains to feasibility. Whether it is also advisable to make higher education free for all is another question. ■

The Effects of Saudization on the Universities: Localization in Saudi Arabia

Manail Anis Ahmed

Manail Anis Ahmed was head of global resource development at Habib University in Karachi, Pakistan. E-mail: manailahmed@gmail.com.

The first university in Saudi Arabia was established in 1957. Since then, the country has witnessed fast-paced growth in the development of the academy—and the majority of faculty and staff members recruited to help set up and run it have been foreign workers. Now, however, with increasing numbers of young Saudis coming of age and acquiring advanced degrees, there is an urgent labor market need to absorb these citizens into all sectors of the economy, including higher education. This workforce localization has had various consequences on the way universities are staffed and managed, research is produced and supported, and students are educated in Saudi Arabia.

Saudization: Background, Pressures, and Problems

Saudi Arabia's policy of replacing foreign workers with its own citizens is known as *Saudization*. Until very recently, the oil rich Saudi kingdom has depended heavily on expatriates to fill jobs. Currently, however, the country is faced with a burgeoning young population that needs to find gainful employment. Unprecedented numbers of young Saudis are also returning to the country after benefiting from the King Abdullah Scholarship Program (KASP) overseas. The Saudi state has been working hard to absorb these qualified citizens into the workforce. As with all economic sectors, this has had an obvious effect on the substantial higher education industry in the country.

The Saudi ministry of labor has in recent years worked quickly to ensure the implementation of new Saudization laws within higher education, and both public and private universities have been quick to comply. Workforce localization at such a rapid pace has been unprecedented in this country—however, academia, for various reasons, has been ill prepared to deal with such a sudden paradigm shift.

How University Business Has Been Affected

Whereas teaching and research faculty in Saudi universities continue to be a more or less even mix of Saudi and foreign citizens, the administrative positions have overwhelmingly been Saudized. Until recently, the vast majority of university administrators—the departmental administrative assistants, curriculum developers, research center directors, international engagement managers, quality assurance personnel, and so on, have overwhelmingly been foreign citizens. These have been the people tasked with establishing, developing, running, and maintaining, as well as growing academic departments and administrative units within universities. In contrast, it has been easier for the human resource divisions of universities to justify the recruitment and retention of non-Saudi teaching faculty, as Saudi applicants with the required terminal degrees and higher-level teaching and research credentials have been somewhat more difficult to find. Therefore, as opposed to teaching po-

sitions, university administrative positions have been relatively more quickly Saudized.

This has had an immediate effect on university business. For the most part, inevitably, things have slowed down. This is as much a result of Saudi professional culture as of the lack of previous institutional exposure and relevant professional training received by Saudi administrators. The leadership in Saudi universities must be given credit for having moved quickly and earnestly to meet this challenge. Administrators have been provided with the best available professional development opportunities. Consultants—predominantly from Western, English-speaking countries—have been called in to provide training and development for Saudi professional staff. In addition, many Saudi staff members have been sent to prestigious venues abroad for multiple weeks of residential and immersive training. However, on the flip side, this has added to the administrative, bureaucratic, and financial burden of universities.

Saudi Arabia's policy of replacing foreign workers with its own citizens is known as *Saudization*.

Problems with Research Production and Support

According to the country's changing employment laws, key administrative functions such as human resources and finance have been required to become 100 percent Saudi-staffed. This has caused a significant cultural change within universities, especially with regard to developing systems supporting the production of scholarly research. Financial and logistical arrangements for research now have to be handled by administrative offices staffed by Saudis unfamiliar with global norms. For example, conference attendance allowances and research expenditures are, from time to time, curtailed. These are very often understood by Saudi staff to mean special privileges to be bestowed as favors, not standard allowances for research production to be made available to all eligible scholars.

In "How Saudi Arabia Can Create an Academic Oasis" (*Times Higher Education*, May 22, 2014), Philip G. Altbach points out that Saudi academics are awarded immediate tenure in public universities without preconditions regarding academic and/or research productivity. On the other hand, foreign faculty, who still make up 42 percent of the teaching staff in Saudi universities, cannot become eligible for tenured positions, regardless of their performance. These arrangements do not encourage the ideal outcomes of institutional loyalty or top performance in either group. Quality assurance mechanisms, recently implemented under the guidance of the Saudi NCAAA (National Commission for Academic Accreditation and Assessment), also set a high academic and research standard—but not enough incoming Saudi faculty or staff are yet familiar or comfortable with these expectations.

Inadequate Academic Preparation of University Students

Universities in Saudi Arabia are continuously urged to focus on quality assurance and improvement, with global standards in mind. This is commendable. However, there is a fundamental incompatibility between the academic preparation of incoming Saudi university students and the curricular requirements of university degree programs—most often developed in consultation with non-Saudi advisers. Students are simply not well enough prepared in fundamental areas like writing, quantitative, and analytical skills, to be able to succeed in an undergraduate course. This lack of preparation is simply the result of a disconnect between the very locally oriented public educational system up until high school, and the vastly different, heavily Western-influenced curricula at the university level. To make up for this, all public and some private universities offer foundation programs to incoming students.

Saudi teaching and administrative staff have quickly pointed out that their national universities are simply not ready for the international standards they have been setting for themselves—that quality improvement mechanisms applied to the universities are out of sync with the rest of their national educational system. There is increased pressure on faculty and staff in Saudi universities to facilitate student success, very often at the cost of integrity in teaching, or grading challenging coursework. Dumbing down courses and inflating grades helps institutions graduate more students, but it is not a sustainable practice. Replacing non-Saudi teaching and administrative staff with Saudis has prodded these institutions to begin to find a way to create curricula, teaching and assessment methods, and research expectations that are more in line with their students' and teachers' capabilities.

Possible Solutions

Employment nationalization of the Saudi academy has provided jobs for many qualified young citizens. Graduates of both national and foreign universities, with bachelor's, master's, and even doctoral degrees in hand, have had a challenging time finding suitable employment in various sectors, because the economy was not adequately prepared

to replace the existing (overwhelmingly foreign) workforce, and receive a sudden onslaught of newly minted Saudi human resource. In such a situation, academia has been able to absorb substantial numbers of citizens, mainly into administrative positions, but also as part-time lecturers, lab technicians, research assistants, and other support functions.

As an ongoing phenomenon, Saudization within universities is bound to evolve. The Kingdom continues to devote substantial resources toward the development of a world-class higher education system. However, labor market pressures to urgently localize the workforce must be handled thoughtfully. The ministry of education should formulate its own recommendations for Saudization. One could be a more gradual Saudization of administrative positions in higher education, and, accompanying this, thorough training and exposure to international norms of teaching and research for Saudi administrative staff. More locally suited quality assurance mechanisms for faculty members and senior staff with regard to teaching, research, and service—the three essential aspects of the academic experience—should be introduced. Finally, academic preparation at all levels—from college preparatory years to university curricula themselves—must be made more rigorous. This is essential in order for Saudi universities to be able to do their job well: that of educating the country's young citizens to a relevant and employable standard.

■

Luxembourg's Expanding Higher Education System: Responding to Global Norms

Gangolf Braband and Justin J. W. Powell

Gangolf Braband is research fellow at the University of Luxembourg. E-mail: gangolf.braband@uni.lu. Justin J. W. Powell is professor at the University of Luxembourg. E-mail: justin.powell@uni.lu.

The worldwide expansion of higher education bypassed Luxembourg for some time. In the absence of a national research university, the Grand Duchy lacked capacity for teaching and research. This seemed increasingly anomalous given the rise of the "knowledge economy," especially because Luxembourg, with a population of 543,000, unlike many other small states, is unusually international, ethnically diverse, and prosperous. Luxembourgers seeking to complete a university degree traditionally did so abroad. Initially, this was not perceived as a disadvantage, but was seen as beneficial in forming a distinguished national elite with European networks. Few incentives existed to expand domestic higher education.

The situation shifted toward the end of the 1990s, due to the ongoing expansion of higher education internationally, and Europeanization processes like the Bologna Process and the European Commission's Lisbon Strategy. Indeed, Luxembourg's minister in charge of higher education signed the Bologna declaration in 1999—years prior to the founding of the University of Luxembourg (UL), the first and only state-funded national university.

Establishing the First National University in Luxembourg

Early attempts to establish a university in Luxembourg in the 19th and 20th centuries failed, thereby initiating the study-abroad tradition, with a practice characterized by an initial period of study of two years in Luxembourg prior to going abroad, and close connections between students abroad and political and societal elites at home, creating a well-defined and closed circle of leaders. Given this environment, the drive for change had to come from the outside. The first research framework program of the European Union (1984) provided such an impulse, but ultimately its effects on higher education were limited. Further international developments triggered only incremental changes. No public pressure counteracted this lack of political willingness to innovate: Higher education was simply not a public issue.

The internationalization of higher education, in the meantime, gained more weight and influenced the country's further development. A few powerful political actors in the responsible ministry instrumentalized the tools provided by the Bologna Process and by the Lisbon Strategy (here especially the demand for increasing investments into research and innovation), to counteract the prevailing opposition and raise awareness. The idea was to create a stronger institutional basis for publically funded research, by establishing a university focusing on graduate degree programs in selected fields aligned to national needs. While keeping the study abroad tradition alive, such a university would expand higher education opportunities, simultaneously contributing to the diversification of the country's economic basis and bolstering Luxembourg's "knowledge economy."

Ultimately, the aim of founding a university was successful, yet in a rather controversial manner, through a top-down process par excellence, characterized by a lack of transparency and few attempts to engage the wider society. The outcome of this approach was not as initially anticipated. Existing postsecondary education institutions were

incorporated, expanding the university's teaching dimension with a range of bachelor's and vocational programs. The turnaround was nevertheless remarkable: Within a few years, a national research-oriented university went from being a non-topic to a legal reality.

An (Inter)national Research University

Somewhat paradoxically, at the same time that European borders are becoming more porous and spatial mobility everywhere is supported and glorified, Luxembourg has invested considerable capital and strategic planning in (finally) establishing its national university. It aims to compete globally by concentrating its intellectual and financial resources, and by building on the country's strengths and priorities. It may have taken a leap of faith to establish the university in 2003, but the state—led by a few dedicated actors—took the step to fund this ambitious experiment in scientific capacity-building. In so doing, it also provided a stay-at-home alternative for Luxembourg's youth. UL was founded against considerable resistance, both pecuniary and ideological, due to the long-standing custom of educating elites abroad to establish cosmopolitan networks. But rising international competition and supranational coordination have increased pressure on Luxembourg to grow its higher education system and thus foster scientific innovation. UL provides a means to diversify the economy beyond steelmaking or banking, and to integrate citizens from diverse cultural backgrounds into a polity dominated by local elites. Oriented toward the Grand Duchy's unique context—small size, but simultaneously flourishing center of European governance and international business—UL was founded upon the principles of internationality, multilingualism, and interdisciplinarity.

With courses of study taught in English, German, and French, UL enjoys a rising reputation, as it provides a gauge of the impact of global norms generally, and the principles codified in the Bologna Process specifically. UL exemplifies the most recent institutionalization phase of the European university. Due to its recent establishment, UL has straightforwardly assumed European standards—and with more than half of its 6,287 students (2014–2015) coming from abroad, UL is extraordinarily diverse. Regardless of nationality, each student pays a tuition of just €200 per semester. Thus, state investment in higher education ensures broad access, attracting students from everywhere. In a hyperdiverse society marked by extraordinary migration flows and mobility, internationalization has been key to the establishment and expansion of the university. To develop an institution based on local strengths, regional needs, and global trends, UL aims to achieve excellence by recruiting top faculty members worldwide, and by identifying in advance research areas that reflect Luxembourg's economic and geographic contexts. Focusing on key priorities and excelling in international collaborations, the chosen strategy has shown positive results, with UL now ranked 193th worldwide (*Times Higher Educations* World University Rankings 2015–2016).

Future Challenges

Higher education in Luxembourg has fundamentally changed. Before the founding of the university, issues of higher education were of limited relevance to societal and political discussions. And herein lays a challenge. An institution that was initially disputed, coming to life only through the considerable engagement of a few key actors rather than relying on bottom-up societal processes, needs such support to advance beyond simply meeting national economic needs or being fully legitimated politically. UL requires support to attain greater institutional autonomy, moving beyond the stage of being a political instrument to that of an organization governed by academic principles. UL has managed to rapidly establish a remarkable international reputation and to further advance Luxembourg's internationalization. Yet, this success poses a challenge, as the diversity of its members and the accommodation of different higher education cultures—in the absence of a preexisting national consensus—affect the university's internal organization and its governance.

However small, no country wishing to become a "knowledge society" can do so without an (inter)national research university. As many larger countries in Europe struggle to maintain their state-funded universities in the Bologna era, Luxembourg has grasped a window of opportunity. The university's extremely high degree of internationalization provides thereby contemporary strength, but this does not in itself facilitate the organization's greater societal and cultural integration within Luxembourg. Without placing the university more solidly in the country's politics, culture, and identity, while enhancing its organizational autonomy, it remains a project vulnerable to the vagaries of policymakers.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Angulo, A. J. *Diploma Mills: How For-Profit Colleges Stiffed Students, Taxpayers, and the American Dream*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016. 224 pp. $29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-2007-3. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

The for-profit higher education industry in the United States, now worth $35 billion, is examined in historical and contemporary perspective in this book. The author is highly critical of the industry, and provides documentation on the range of dishonesty, fraud, and other problems in the industry, from small business colleges to the recent bankruptcy of the giant Corinthian Colleges. The historical discussion, going back to the American Revolution, is enlightening. The analysis of the current situation is thorough and places blame on lax government oversight as well as dishonest corporations and the for-profits themselves.

Axtell, James. *Wisdom's Workshop: The Rise of the Modern University*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016. 416 pp. $35 (hb).ISBN 978-0-691-14959-2. Web site: www.press.princeton.edu.

A comprehensive historical analysis of the rise of universities in the West, with a focus on the emergence and development of the American research universities. Starting in the medieval period and proceeding through Oxbridge and the emergence of the German research university in the 19th century, this volume traces how these trends influenced the United States and then how the United States assumed academic leadership.

Bowen, William G., and Michael S. McPherson. *Lesson Plan: An Agenda for Change in American Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016. 162 pp. $24.95 (hb).ISBN 978-0691172101. Web site: www.press.princeton.edu.

This incisive volume argues that the United States has a serious problem of degree completion and affordable access to higher education. The authors argue that state funding for public higher education, which has declined in recent decades, must be restored, and that financial assistance should be based on need.

Chopp, Rebecca, Susan Frost, and Daniel H. Weiss, eds. *Remaking College: Innovation in the Liberal Arts*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016. 232 pp. $29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1135-4. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

A series of essays by senior academic leaders of American colleges and universities focusing on the liberal arts and undergraduate education. The focus of the book is on reforms in liberal arts institutions. Among the topics discussed are technology in liberal arts education, partnerships, residential communities, governance, and others.

Cole, Jonathan R. *Toward a More Perfect University*. New York: Public Affairs, 2016. 409 pp. $29.99 (hb). ISBN 978-1-61039-265-5. Web site: www.publicaffairs.com.

Cole, former provost at Columbia University and author of *The Great American University*, provides a guide to what he thinks are necessary reforms in American higher education. Among the themes discussed are new standards for admission to undergraduate education, issues of affordability for students, knowledge communities and interdisciplinary work, university-government relations, and others. While the focus is on the United States, many of the issues discussed have international relevance.

Martin, James, and James E. Samels, eds. *The Provost's Handbook: The Role of the Chief Academic Officer*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 320 pp. $34.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1626-7. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

A series of research-based essays concerning the role of the chief academic officer in American universities, this book focuses on many aspects of the position. These include advice in leading faculty, strategic planning, faculty appointments and related issues, student affairs, enrollment management, relations with external communities, and others. While this book is U.S.-based, many of the issues will be relevant to an international audience.

Massy, William F. *Reengineering the University: How to Be Mission Centered, Market Smart, and Margin Conscious*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016. 288 pp. $32.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1899-5.. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

An argument for the reform of American higher education by an economist and former university administrator, this volume features discussion of the role and cost of teaching, how to reengineer academic institutions, financial planning and budgeting, and related themes.

Merkx, Gilbert W., and Riall W. Nolan, eds. *Internationalizing the Academy: Lessons of Leadership in Higher Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2015. 241 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-61250-866-5. Web-site: www.harvardeducationpress.org.

International education is becoming a recognized professional field in many universities. This book focuses on the role of the senior international officer in American universities and discusses the role of this relatively new position. Chapters consider the careers, roles in leadership, and change advocacy of SIOs. The book begins with several chapters discussing international education in the United States and the international landscape. While this book focuses on the United States, it will be relevant for universities elsewhere considering this new academic leadership position.

Michieka, Ratemo Waya. *Trails in Academic and Administrative Leadership in Kenya: A Memoir*. Dakar, Senegal: Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, 2016. 303 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-2-86978-642-4. Web site: www.codesria.org.

This book provides a personal account of the experiences in higher education leadership from a professor of agriculture at the University of Nairobi whose tenure in leadership straddled two eras. The author shares his experiences on the trails he had to navigate as an academic, a vice-chancellor, and a chairperson of university council at a time when universities in Kenya were transiting from extreme government administrative control to a greater degree of operational autonomy. Readers will find in this work thought-provoking insights on how leaders of higher education institutions in Kenya

have had to balance between demands of the political system and the need to safeguard academic traditions in the everyday management of the institutions during a period of unprecedented expansion of the higher education sector in Kenya. (Claudia Frittelli)

Pineda, Pedro. *The Entrepreneurial Research University in Latin America: Global and Local Models in Chile and Colombia, 1950–2015*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. 275 pp. $100 (hb). ISBN 978-1-137-54027-0. Web site: www.palgrave.com.

A detailed analysis of the development of research universities in Colombia and Chile, this book discusses the historical contexts in both countries, and the contemporary local and global trends affecting the university sector. Struggles between global entrepreneurial culture and the local environment of universities have affected their development. A chapter deals with the role of Catholic universities in this context. The book concludes with a discussion of "best practices" that will be relevant for Latin American universities generally.

Shattock, Michael, ed. *International Trends in University Governance: Autonomy, Self-Government, and the Distribution of Authority*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014. 209 pp. $189 (hb). ISBN 978-0-415-8420. Web site: www.routledge.com.

Governance is central to the success of any university or academic system. The editor argues that the advent of massification and the importance of research have led to significant changes in governance of universities and systems. This book features case studies from such key countries as the United States, Japan, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Germany, Norway, and several others.

Stokes, Peter J. *Higher Education and Employability: New Models for Integrating Study and Work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2015. 200 pp. $30 (pb). ISBN 978-1-61250-826-9. Web site: www.harvardeducationpress.org.

The argument in this book is that American higher education institutions, and by implication institutions worldwide, must do a better job of preparing students for the workforce. The author claims that he is not arguing against traditional academic values, but the focus of the book is on education for employability. General themes are discussed along with case studies of three American universities that have focused on innovative approaches to employability.

Streitwieser, Bernhard, and Anthony C. Ogden, eds. *International Higher Education's Scholar-Practitioners: Bridging Research and Practice*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books, 2016. 340 pp. $72 (pb). ISBN 978-1-873927-77-9. Web site: www.symposiumbooks.co.uk.

The focus of this volume is on the professionals who work in the field of international education. Included are essays on the experiences of international education practitioners, and analyses of the broader roles of those involved in the field. The various elements of international education administration are discussed.

Teichler, Ulrich, and William K. Cummings, eds. *Forming, Recruiting, and Managing the Academic Profession*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2015. 328 pp. $129 (hb). ISBN: 978-3-319-16079-5. Web site: www.springer.com.

Part of a series on the changing academic profession in an international comparative perspective, this volume focuses especially on recruiting, remuneration, academic work, and related issues. Among the topics considered are recruitment of academics in Switzerland, remuneration and impact factors of faculty in 18 countries, changing career patterns of academics, academic job satisfaction, and related themes.

Teitelbaum, Michael S. *Falling Behind?: Boom, Bust and the Global Race for Scientific Talent*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014. 261 pp. $29.95 (hb). SBN: 978-0-691-15466-4. Web site: www.press.princeton.edu.

This book, which concerns science and engineering personnel in the United States, argues that continuing booms and busts in science and technology personnel have been stimulated by U.S. government policies. Patterns of government funding have helped produce these booms and busts, as have political decisions concerning immigration, support for scholarships and others. The author argues that there is in fact no shortage of technical personnel in the United States.

Temple, Paul, ed. *The Physical University: Contours of Space and Place in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, 2014. 248 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-66231-4. Web site: www.routledge.com.

The physical space of a university is seldom analyzed in the literature on higher education. This book discusses the various aspects of the physical academic space, including architectural discussion, relations of the campus to the broader environment, and others. Most of the chapters relate to the United Kingdom, but there are considerations of China, the United States, and other countries. Most of the chapters deal with specific case study institutions.

Wellmon, Chad. *Organizing Enlightenment: Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 353 pp. $44.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1615-1. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

The origins of the research university lie in the ideas of the German Enlightenment and von Humboldt's idea of the research university. This book analyzes the development of the German university and philosophical and scientific thought in the 18th and 19th centuries—the seminal period for the development of today's research university and for the disciplines and orientation to scientific thought that accompanied it.

Varghese, N. V., and Garima Malik, eds. *India Higher Education Report, 2015*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2016. 467 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-1-138-12117-1. Web site: www.routledge.com.

A comprehensive reference volume and the first of an annual series, this book includes chapters on key topics relating to contemporary higher education. The topics include higher education policy, trends in higher education expansion, the employability of graduates, trends in research, regulation of higher education, institutional autonomy and leadership, and others.

Walenkamp, J. H. C., ed. T*he World's Mine Oyster: Studies in Support of Internationalization in Higher Education.* The Hague, Netherlands: The Hague University of Applied Sciences, 2015. 203 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-94-6301-022-1. Web site: www.eburon.nl.

A series of essays on broader themes of internationalization, including the implications of English-medium instruction, views of alumni and employers, employability and internationalization, training international competence in the international classroom, and others.

Zakaria, Fareed. *In Defense of a Liberal Education.* New York: W. W. Norton, 2015. 204 pp. $23.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-393-24768-8. Web site: www.wwnorton.com.

A U.S. journalist, Zakaria argues that the present focus on skills for students in higher education is misplaced, and that a liberal arts education is better preparation for jobs in the 21st century. While the argument is aimed at an American audience, the points have global relevance.

Ziguras, Christopher, and Grant McBurnie. *Governing Cross-Border Higher Education.* New York: Routledge, 2015. 189 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-73488-2. Web site: www.routledge.com.

A comprehensive and practical guide to most aspects of cross-border higher education, includes branch campuses, student mobility, quality assurance of foreign providers, managing the outflows of international students, student recruitment, and others. The perspective is global and data is provided for many countries.

News of the Center

CIHE recently launched a new report series, *CIHE Perspectives*. The first number in this series is titled "Sage Advice: International Advisory Councils at Tertiary Education Institutions," and is based on a World Bank-sponsored project undertaken by CIHE. Additional numbers in the series are forthcoming, including an exploratory look at the issue of identity and internationalization among Catholic institutions of higher education, and another reporting on an in-depth survey of faculty's international activities and engagement at the Boston College Lynch School of Education.

Another result of the Center's collaboration with the Higher School of Economics in Russia is a book to be published by Routledge in late 2016 or early 2017, entitled *International Faculty in Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives on Recruitment, Integration and Impact*. The Center has also published the sixth number in its ongoing collaborative series, "International Brief for Higher Education Leaders," with the American Council on Education. The latest installment, co-edited by Laura E. Rumbley and Robin Helms, is titled *Engaging with Europe: Enduring Ties, New Opportunities.*

Hans de Wit co-authored a paper—*The State of the Art of Internationalization of Higher Education in Latin America*—with Jocelyne Gacel-Avila and Marcel Knobel, and presented on this topic at the World-Bank sponsored "Estudios de Contexto, Foro de Expertos Latinoamericanos en Educacion Superior: de las Buenas Ideas a la Acción," held on March 7–9, 2016 in Bogotá, Colombia. On May 2–3, de Wit gave presentations for ARES, the Academy For Research and Higher Education, at the Université Catholique de Louvain and the Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium. On May 5 he presented at the IREG Conference in Lisbon on "Internationalization and Rankings." And on May 17–19 he moderated and presented at the "Seminario de Cooperación Académica," organized in Cancún, Mexico for directors of international relations and academic partnerships for universities in Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. Laura E. Rumbley presented there on May 19, as well, and, on June 9, she moderated a panel on "Promoting Values in International Partnerships" in Montreal, Canada at the Scholars at Risk Network Global Congress. Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit will speak at the University of Guadalajara and later at CINVESTAV in Mexico City.

In August, Hans de Wit and Laura E. Rumbley will participate in the HEFAALA Conference at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in Durban, South Africa, organized by Damtew Teferra, director of the INHEA project, with which CIHE has a close relationship. Hans and Laura will also attend the Global Conference on Internationalization in Kruger Park, South Africa on August 20–24.

Philip G. Altbach will participate in several conferences in Singapore and Malaysia in August as part of the Center's collaboration with the HEAD Foundation, a Singapore-based organization focusing on higher education in Southeast Asia. He will also participate in the fall meeting of the Russian Government's 5–100 Committee in Kazan, Russia in October.

On April 20, CIHE hosted a group of 35 Brazilian university administrators who are developing an innovative consortium to improve the quality of higher education, share experience, and pursue opportunities for collaboration. In June, CIHE will host—with BC's Global leadership Institute—a professional development program for 23 Russian academics and senior policy advisors on internationalization of higher education, in cooperation with the 5–100 Russian Academic Excellence Project. Also in June, CIHE will host a joint seminar with World Education Services on "The Changing Landscape of Global Higher Education and International Student Mobility," and in July the Center will organize a 3-week professional development program on leadership and higher education for the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia.

The enrollment of the first-ever class of students in the new MA program in International Higher Education is currently in process. Applications will continue to be reviewed on an ongoing basis through June and July 2016.

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

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. Specializations are offered in international higher education, administration, and student affairs. For additional information, see: http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/departments/eahe/graduate.html/.

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

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

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

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)