

are numerous and diverse but so are the problems. Different regulatory systems, academic calendars, credit systems, tuition and scholarship schemes, teaching languages and approaches, and examination requirements create only some of the technical requirements to be met by the participating institutions.

National and university regulations and customs differ among countries and present challenges for the design and implementation of international collaborative programs—regulations preventing students from enrolling in more than one university at a time, laws requiring students to spend their last year or semester at the home university, or practices mandating the recruitment and selection of students. Nonrecognition and limitations on the number of courses or credits taken at a partner university raise additional barriers. Dissimilar academic years can create problems for student mobility but may provide more opportunities for faculty exchange. Evaluation requirements and procedures often present obstacles to double-degree programs.

Much of the concern rests with the double counting of the same course credits and workload for two or more qualifications

Quality assurance and accreditation constitute fundamental factors, but national accreditation systems do not exist in all countries or may differ enormously. Some bodies focus on the program and others on the institutional level; many concentrate on inputs, and others look at process or outputs. Currently, the best-case scenario involves the completion of accreditation by each partner institution in the double-, joint-, or combined-degree program. Certain professional programs are evaluated by international accreditation agencies like ABET or EQUIS, but currently institutions are more likely to have their home programs accredited than the double- or joint-degree programs. A relevant issue concerns whether national, regional, or international accreditation is the best route for international collaborative programs.

Recognition of the qualifications from the various collaborative programs forms the most vexing issue. Only a few countries, although the numbers are rising, allow a domestic university legally to confer a joint qualification in partnership with a foreign institution. The student would get a formal diploma from one university and an unofficial certificate from the other, or others, indicating that it was a joint collaborative program. For some students, the international nature, rather than the qualification, of the academic program composed the most significant aspect. For many though, this is not the case as credentialism is increasingly relevant for students and their careers.

Employers, academic institutions, and credential evaluation agencies must be aware of the granting and recognition of double or multiple qualifications. Some double, multiple and combined degrees are perceived as more “legitimate” than others,

but this impression is difficult to prove. Much of the concern rests with the double counting of the same course credits and workload for two or more qualifications. This has led to the “two for the cost of one” label for double degrees. Cost in this case is not only measured in monetary terms but also student workload.

The diversity of models used to determine the completion requirements for double- and multiple-degree programs is problematic. No clarity exists on whether requirements are based on (1) the number of completed courses and credits, (2) the student workload, or (3) required outcome and competency. These three approaches lead to different explanations and arguments to support the legitimacy of the double and multiple degrees awarded. Many would argue that attributing the same course workload toward two or more degrees from two or more institutions in different countries devalues the validity of a qualification. Others believe that if students meet the stated learning outcomes and competencies required for a qualification the credential is legitimate. This logic infers that double and multiple degrees, based on a set of core courses or competencies, are academically legitimate; and it is the process for recognizing these qualifications that requires more attention not the completion requirements per se. Both arguments have validity, but the variety of program models prevents a clear resolution to the question of perceived and actual legitimacy.

The higher education sector must work out a common understanding of joint, double, and combined programs and iron out the academic issues concerning working in different national regulatory frameworks, cultures, and practices. A rigorous debate on the vexing questions of accreditation, recognition, and legitimacy of the qualifications needs to take place to ensure that international collaborative programs and their awards are respected and recognized by students, higher education institutions, and employers around the world. ■

International Students in the United States: *Open Doors* Survey

PATRICIA CHOW AND RACHEL MARCUS

Patricia Chow is senior program officer and Rachel Marcus is research officer at the Institute of International Education. E-mail: iieresearch@iie.org. Open Doors Web site: <http://opendoors.iietnetwork.org>.

During the 2007/08 academic year, the number of international students in the United States reached a record high of 623,805, a 7 percent increase over the prior year and the first significant increase since 2001/02. Students enrolling for the

first time at a US campus often represents a more sensitive measure of growth than total enrollment, and these new enrollments increased 10 percent this year, to 173,121 students. The Institute of International Education annually surveys approximately 3,000 accredited US higher education institutions on various aspects of international educational exchange and has collected data on international students in US higher education in the form of the *Open Doors* project since 1954.

For the eighth consecutive year, India was the leading place of origin of international students in the United States, with 94,563 Indian students in 2007/08.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ORIGINS—2007/08

For the eighth consecutive year, India was the leading place of origin of international students in the United States, with 94,563 Indian students in 2007/08. The People's Republic of China remained in second place this year, with 81,127 students, and the Republic of (South) Korea remained in third place, with 69,124 students. All three countries experienced large increases this year, as did two other top-sending countries in Asia: Vietnam and Nepal. The number of international students from Asia increased by 10 percent overall this year and accounted for 61 percent of all international students. The number of students from the Middle East also increased this year (11 percent), driven by a large increase (25 percent) from Saudi Arabia, the result of a Saudi Arabian government scholarship program launched in 2005. Enrollments from Latin America saw a slight decline (less than 1 percent), despite a 7 percent increase from Mexico. Africa also saw a slight decline of less than 1 percent. Both Europe and Oceania saw small increases this year, following declines the previous year. This year marks the first increase from Europe since 9/11, although the current total still remains far below the peak of 95,697 students in 2001/02.

STUDENT PROFILE—2007/08

As has been the case since 2001/02, international graduate students outnumbered international undergraduate students in 2007/08. Forty-nine percent of enrolled international students were graduate-degree students, 43 percent were undergraduate-degree students, and 8 percent were nondegree students. The number of nondegree students grew 12 percent over the past year, driven by large increases from China, India, and Vietnam.

Almost two-thirds (62 percent) of all international students are self-funded, with 82.5 percent of undergraduates and 77 percent of nondegree students paying for their education with personal and family funds. At the graduate level, about half (46

percent) are self-funded.

One-fifth of all enrolled international students in the United States are studying business and management, the most popular field of study for international students. The science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields are also very popular, and together account for 40 percent of all enrolled international students.

CHANGES SINCE 2001/02

After 9/11, the number of enrolled international students in US higher education experienced its first decline after nearly 50 years of increases. While the overall enrollment numbers have now rebounded, substantial shifts have appeared in the composition of the international student body. With some exceptions, the general trend has been extended largely toward the top countries of origin (now exceeding pre-9/11 levels), accompanied by declines from many predominantly Muslim countries and places outside of Asia.

While the total number of international students in the United States has advanced 7 percent since 2001/02, the number of students from Asia rose 17 percent during the same period. This movement is attributable to large increases from India, China, South Korea, Nepal, and Vietnam, and these increases have completely overshadowed substantial declines from other major Asian countries of origin—including Japan, Indonesia, Thailand, Pakistan, and Malaysia.

While undergraduate enrollments increased 25 percent, graduate enrollments rose 160.5 percent

The picture from the Islamic world is similarly nuanced. There was an average decline of 15.5 percent in the number of students from predominantly Muslim countries studying in the United States in 2007/08 compared to 2001/02. However, this drop raises the number of students coming to the United States from several countries in the Muslim world, most notably Saudi Arabia, which saw a 77 percent increase during this period, despite seeing a loss of 46 percent between 2001/02 and 2004/05. A similar trend was seen for North Africa: although there was a 31 percent loss between 2001/02 and 2007/08, this past year the number of students from North Africa grew by 4 percent, the first increase since 2001/02.

Other world regions saw mostly moderate declines of students in the United States between 2001/02 and 2007/08: from Africa a 5.5 percent decline; from Europe 12 percent (despite an increase of 1.5 percent this year); and from Latin America 6 percent. North America (comprised of Canada and Bermuda) and Oceania saw increases during this period of 9 percent and 3 percent, respectively.

CHANGES SINCE 1981/82

The number of international students in the United States nearly doubled between 1981/82 and 2007/08 (from 326,299 to 623,805). But while undergraduate enrollments increased 25 percent, graduate enrollments rose 160.5 percent during the same period, and as a consequence, the proportion of undergraduate students has declined.

Among the top places of origin, students from Iran in 1981/82 comprised the largest cohort of international students in the United States, followed by students from Taiwan and Nigeria. These top three places of origin accounted for 23 percent of all international students in the United States in 1981/82. Since then, not only have the top places of origin shifted, a clear trend has appeared of greater concentration from the top places of origin, with the current top three places accounting for 39 percent of all international students in 2007/08.

CONCLUSION

While there has been enormous growth in the number of international students in the United States since 1981/82, it is also clear that the students come from different countries and are enrolled at different academic programs than their peers from the past, as changing economies and political situations at home, as well as the changing landscape of higher education around the world, have created both new opportunities and barriers for internationally mobile students.

Authors' Note: *Open Doors* has received support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the US Department of State since 1972. The opinions expressed in this article are entirely those of the authors. ■

It's the Faculty, Stupid! The Centrality of the Academic Profession

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is Monan University Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

In 1992, Bill Clinton was elected president of the United States in considerable part by emphasizing the importance of the economy. His mantra—"It's the economy, stupid!"—

focused this point. For higher education, the mantra should be "it's the faculty, stupid." In fact, no university can achieve success without a well-qualified, committed academic profession. Neither an impressive campus nor an innovative curriculum will produce good results without great professors. Higher education worldwide focuses on the "hardware"—buildings, laboratories, and the like—at the expense of "software"—the people who make any academic institutions successful. Look at the often-criticized rankings. What do they measure? Numbers of Nobel prizewinners, the research productivity of professors, grants obtained by faculty, and the quality of the students are central. Budgets and facilities are less important in the rankings.

Almost everywhere, the faculty is forgotten in the rush to cope with ever increasing enrollments and in the midst of deepening financial problems. If higher education is to succeed, "It's the faculty, stupid!" must be a central rallying cry for universities worldwide.

It is depressing, but quite essential, to examine the status of the academic profession worldwide. A few examples will illustrate global realities. One issue involves the fact that the academic profession is aging in many countries. In much of the world, half or more of the professoriate is getting close to retirement. In many countries, too few new PhDs are being produced to replace those leaving the profession, and many new doctorates prefer to work outside of academe. Too few incentives for advanced doctoral study and an uncertain employment market for new PhDs, along with inadequate financial support in many fields, deter enrollment and ensure that many students drop out of doctoral programs. Countries with rapidly growing higher education systems are especially hard hit. Vietnam, for example, requires 12,000 more academics each year to meet expansion goals, and only 10 percent of the academic profession currently hold doctoral degrees.

Global examples of the current state of the academic profession will illustrate contemporary deteriorating. These examples are chosen to highlight widespread realities.

THE RISE OF THE PART-TIME PROFESSION

To be most effective, professors need to be truly engaged in teaching and research. They must have full-time academic appointments and devote attention exclusively to academic responsibilities and to the universities and colleges that employ them. The full-time professoriate is a dying breed. Latin America is the homeland of the part time "taxicab" professor, rushing between teaching jobs or between class and another profession. Except for Brazil, in almost all Latin American countries up to 80 percent of the professoriate is employed part time. Paid a pittance, they have little commitment to the university or to students. It is not surprising that there are almost no Latin American universities among the top 500 and little research productivity. In the United States, only half of newly hired academics are full time on the "tenure