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

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

Conclusion
The aim of the Kazakhstan government’s Bolashak Scholarship is to invest in human capital development and ensure that this investment creates a long-lasting impact on the country’s development. The program has gone through significant changes in the past two decades. The heart of the changes relates to the alignment of personal choice, industrial needs, and the country’s strategic development.
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In the new millennium, Indian higher education has shown noteworthy growth, with the number of universities increasing from 266 in 2000–2001 to 700 in 2013–2014 and the student strength going up from 8.4 million to about 20 million. At the same time, the international student population has increased globally from 2.1 million in 2001 to 4.3 million in 2013. The growth in the number of international students in India, from about 7,000 in 2000–2001 to a little over 20,000 in 2012–2013, is, in comparison, anaemic, and not commensurate with either the growth of the Indian higher education system or with the global growth in international student mobility.

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

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

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

Public vs. Private Universities
In 2012–2013 seven Indian universities had more than 1,000 students with the largest number, 2,742, coming from Manipal University—a private institution. Out of these universities, three are self-financing (private) universities, and the other four are public, affiliating-type universities. Significantly, in the case of the latter group the international students are largely in the affiliated self-financing
colleges and not on the central campus. In India, most undergraduate and some postbaccalaureate colleges are affiliated to a public university.

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

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

2012–2013 Data
As a part of this study, data from 28 university-level institutions falling in three regions were evaluated. These are Western India extending on the West Coast from Pune to Bengaluru (9 institutions); the North East from Amritsar to Kolkata (10 institutions); and the South East running parallel to the Eastern Coast from Bhubaneswar to Coimbatore (9 institutions). These respectively have 9,578, 4,478, and 2,812 international students. They are predominantly from Asia (71.23%) and Africa (24.25%) with minor contributions from the Americas (3.29%), Europe (0.85%) and Australasia (0.41%).

The Western region includes three large public universities (Pune, Mysore, Bangalore), each with many affiliated colleges covering diverse disciplines; a public professional university (Visveswaraya); four private deemed universities (Manipal, Symbiosis, Bharati Vidyapeeth, and Dr. D. Y. Patil); and a public deemed university specializing in arts and social science (Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute). These nine institutions together have almost half (9,578) of the number of international students (20,176) in 121 institutions. Pune city, with five institutions, alone has 4,298 students, which is one-fifth of all international students in India. This makes Pune the International Students’ Capital of India.

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

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

Governance and Regulation: Do UK Messages Have International Relevance?
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The four countries of the United Kingdom have witnessed considerable debate over the last three years, about both system-level governance (the balance between autonomy and accountability in the relationship of the state’s funding bodies to higher education institutions) and board-level governance (the appropriate balance between external lay members and internal faculty and student membership at corporate level). Governance reviews have been initiated in Wales (2011) and Scotland (2012); and in
England, there has been work done and reports written by key stakeholders, policy commentators, and academics on system-level regulation. In England, debates have followed rather than preceded—as one might have expected—significant changes to the funding of undergraduate education introduced in 2012 by the ruling Coalition Government.

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

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

**Ideological Debates and Operational Implications**

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

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

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

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

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

Croatia’s New Linear Tuition System: Students’ Friend or Foe?
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Croatia’s higher education system (in Southeast Europe) is nationally regulated and has been undergoing intense reforms since 2003, driven by the Bologna process. The vast majority of students study in seven Croatian public universities; one of these is the University of Zagreb, which offers the widest range of study programs and enrolls around 50 percent of the total student population. Up until the academic year in 2010/2011, there were two categories of students in Croatia, based on tuition-paying status. Full-time undergraduate students were either enrolled within the state-subsidized quota, and were not charged tuition, or were enrolled above the subsidized quota and therefore charged tuition. Under this system, universities typically secured a certain number of spots for tuition-paying students, according to their capacities: whether a student would enroll within or above the state-subsidized quota (i.e., would be charged tuition or not) primarily depended on merit-based criteria, such as the student’s high school grades and entrance examination scores. Students were informed whether they “made the cut” for the state-subsidized quota upon admission. When compared to other European countries, this tuition system was most similar to that in Hungary.

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

Demand for Free Education

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

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

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

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

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

Merit-Based vs. Need-Based Support System

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

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

Impact and Potential for Adoption by Other Countries

This tuition-charging model based on the accumulation of ECTS credits certainly presents an interesting and innovative approach within the Bologna system, and it seems that no other country has implemented a similar model. However, the lack of comparative perspective and the general difficulty of obtaining institutional level student data in Croatia make the assessment of the potential impacts of this policy on both students and higher education institutions rather problematic. Nonetheless, this example may be worth considering by other countries where student aid and loan systems are inadequate or nonexisting, which is notably the case in the posttransition countries of central and eastern Europe. This model does provide incentives for student performance (i.e., addresses issues of merit), and if a country is able to establish at least a basic need-based grant system for its most vulnerable and at-risk student populations, this approach could have the potential to greatly improve student access and lead to a more equitable higher education.
Ukraine: The New Reforms and Internationalization
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The internationalization of higher education in Ukraine continues to be vulnerable to the tensions of the region’s geopolitics. Since our previous analysis of the Ukrainian context of internationalization (IHE #75, Spring 2014), serious hostilities have arisen with Russia over eastern Ukraine. Despite the distraction of war, on July 31, 2014 Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko signed the Law on Higher Education, significant because it is the first such law developed through consultation with the Ukrainian public.

The process of consultation with educators, experts, community members, journalists, students, parents, and nongovernmental organizations was not without controversy, but the result demonstrates the perseverance and vision of the stakeholders. The new law sets the stage for Ukrainian higher education to act with greater autonomy, accountability, and transparency, enabling more nimble responses to international opportunities. A number of the new law articles are discussed.

Greater Autonomy

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

Quality Assurance

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

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

Bologna Compliance

The creation of favorable conditions for global mobility of people and knowledge is an important component of internationalization. Ukrainian students should be able to study abroad without suffering academically, and international students at Ukrainian universities will only benefit if academic credit transfer is standardized with clearly defined processes. Under the Bologna Declaration in 2005, then Minister of Education and Science Stanislav Nikolyaenko committed Ukraine to serious legislative changes in order to transition the higher education system to the three cycles of bachelor, master’s and PhD degrees, to introduce the European Credit Transfer System and to reduce classroom
hour loads for students and faculty. Yet today, Bologna terminology is rarely used in official documents or on university campuses. The law’s article #1 of the new legislation defines an academic credit and the number of credits in a full-time academic year, creating norms that will facilitate international academic collaboration and enhance student mobility. Furthermore, the introduction of a PhD degree at Ukrainian universities significantly benefits global mobility of Ukrainian scholars, whose home status of “candidates of sciences” is not well-understood abroad. Global awareness of the “candidates of sciences” degree has been further muddied by a lack of clarity around the role of the Ukrainian Academy of Science, which had the exclusive right to grant these degrees. The process now will more closely mirror norms in other countries, including required courses, research, and dissertation defense in the presence of a university committee comprised of research field specialists.

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

Impact of Internationalization
Universities around the world struggle to respond to the demands and opportunities of globalization, thus the need for skilled change management is by no means a uniquely Ukrainian problem. Universities tend toward hierarchical and bureaucratic self-organization and are notoriously resistant to change. The Ukrainian higher education system is perhaps starting at an earlier place than other countries where universities are freer to choose program content, make financial decisions, create degree granting and credit transfer policies, and hire faculty via open and transparent competition. In Ukraine, such innovations could be jeopardized if opposition causes delays to change, creating uncertainty, and lowering morale. On the positive side, there is much work already done on best practice for change management in higher education that could support Ukrainian universities to move through stages of change more quickly. The more accessible Ukrainian higher education can make itself to the world through internationalization, the more easily change will take root.

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


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


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


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


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


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


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

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

We have also just published (with Lemmens Media) Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, and Journals and Publications (3rd Edition). Two versions of the book are available—full-length (358 pages) and abridged (80 pages). The full-length e-book is available for purchase (£12) from Amazon.com. A full-length version of the book is also available in PDF format (£18) directly from Lemmens (info@lemmens.de). Finally, the abridged version of the book may be purchased as a hard copy, plus a free PDF (£28); again, see info@lemmens.de.
**Critical International News at a Glance on Facebook and Twitter**

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

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

Unlike most Facebook and Twitter sites, our pages are not about us, but rather “newsfeeds” updated daily with notices most relevant to international educators and practitioners, policymakers, and decision makers. Think “news marquis” in Times Square in New York City. Here, at a glance, you can take in the information and perspective you need in a few minutes every morning.

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

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

**IMPROVEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION**

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

We invite you to explore our new *IHE* homepage (http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe), which currently features this issue of *IHE*, as well as the previous two issues. All back issues of *IHE* will eventually migrate to the new site, and we will inform subscribers of this development at the appropriate time. For now, all back issues of *IHE* can be found in their more familiar location on the CIHE Web site: http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/research/cihe/ihe/issues.html.

**A NEW INITIATIVE: HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION THEME ISSUE**

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

**Altbach Festschrift Published**


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


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

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

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