the article involved collaboration among scientists in many countries. This seems to be a world record for co-authors, although there are an increasing number of published articles with 1,000 or more coauthors.

While it is certainly true that science has become more collaborative, there seems to be little justification for listing such a large number of authors. Could they have all contributed substantively? Just as there was no rationale for listing as first author the senior scientist in a laboratory, even if he or she had done little or no work on the specific article, as was common and remains a practice in some laboratories and departments, it seems at least some of these many hundreds of coauthors are getting a courtesy listing. It is not appropriate to provide authorship credit to people who have had a remote relationship to the writing and preparation of the actual article.

This issue is important for a number of reasons, among them that citation counts are used for university rankings as well as for national policymaking in some countries and often for the evaluations of individual professors when promotions or salary increases hang in the balance.

While it is certainly true that science has become more collaborative, there seems to be little justification for listing such a large number of authors.

What Does It All Mean?
Globalization, academic competition, misplaced nationalism, the obsession with rankings, ever increasing demands for accountability by governments, and significant changes in how science is carried out all contribute to our contemporary “credit problem.” Although the examples cited here may seem to border on trivial, they are actually important. Scientific productivity is increasingly an international phenomenon, with top researchers educated in one country, working in another, and frequently developing and sharing research with colleagues around the world.

Thus, science is global and it is increasingly irrelevant to credit Nobel research to a country or university. Yet, support for basic research is dwindling everywhere—and it is on the basis of basic research that Nobel-level discoveries are made. Countries that provide funding and autonomy for basic research will inevitably scoop up the best scholars and scientists.

At the same time, the scientific community itself must be reasonable about distributing authorship credit for academic articles. These articles, especially those published in the top refereed print and electronic journals, remain the gold standard of science and are a central means of knowledge and dissemination. The number of authors should be limited to those who have actually been involved in the writing of the article, even if a much wider community contributed insights or data to it. Others can be mentioned in relevant credits or references.

As in so many aspects of contemporary science and higher education, we are in the midst of an “academic revolution” in scientific recognition and research support and evaluation. A rational approach is needed to restore sanity to a system that is increasingly out of control, from the Nobels to articles “authored” by thousands.

Higher Education Research Goes Global

Hans de Wit
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Until recently the study of higher education and its international dimensions was the field of a small group of research centers and scholars, primarily in the developed world, and even there, funding and resources were scarce. There are two new initiatives, though, which indicate a more positive and global development of research in international higher education. These initiatives can be seen as a product of the “Shanghai Statement: The Future of Higher Education: The Need for Research and Training for the Higher Education Enterprise” in 2013. Reflecting the thinking of 33 research and policy professionals concerning the future development of the field of higher education research, policy, and training, the statement noted: “This developing field is so far limited to a fairly small group of countries.” The statement made an appeal for more research and the development of research centers at universities around the world, for doctoral studies in international higher education, and adequate funding.

The Centre for Global Higher Education

The official launch of the ESRC/HEFCE Centre for Global Higher Education, or CGHE, took place on 2–3 February 2016 in London. CGHE is the largest research center in the world specifically focused on higher education and its future development. It has more than £6 million (US$8.7
tion) in funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) in the United Kingdom for work over 2016–2020, and is a partnership of three UK universities and several universities from around the world.

CGHE is a partnership led by the Institute of Education at University College London, with Lancaster University, the University of Sheffield and international universities—including Australian National University (Australia), Dublin Institute of Technology (Ireland), Hiroshima University (Japan), Leiden University (the Netherlands), Lingnan University (Hong Kong), Shanghai Jiao Tong University (China), and the University of Cape Town (South Africa).

A core focus of CGHE is maximizing the impact of its work on policy and practice. The center is headed by Professor Simon Marginson and includes several other key scholars in the field of higher education, such as professors Peter Scott and Ellen Hazelkorn.

Global Centers for International Higher Education Studies

In the same vein, on 14–15 January, the first meeting of the Group of “Global Centers for International Higher Education Studies” (GCIHES) took place in Santiago, Chile. This group was established as a result of an initiative of the Centro de Estudios de Políticas y Prácticas en Educación (CEPPE) at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile and the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), at Boston College, United States.

The group includes four other partners: The Centre for International Studies, Higher School of Economics, National Research University, Russia; the School of Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China; the Centre for Higher Education Development, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa; and the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy. The group is coordinated by CEPPE in Chile.

The launch meeting of the GCIHES group took place in the context of the XII Higher Education Summit, a conference organized by CEPPE every year. The group has decided to focus on joint research and professional development, as well as dissemination. Among the projects that the group will start are a comparative study of doctoral education in the world, with a specific focus on emerging and developing countries; research on Catholic universities, identity and internationalization; a summer institute in 2017, planned to take place in Shanghai; and a conference called “Higher Education Forum on Africa, Latin America and Asia” to be organized by Professor Damtew Teferra, director of the Centre for Higher Education Development, in Durban, on 19–20 August 2016.

The partners of GCIHES have already been collaborating bilaterally, for instance, on studies of the academic profession by CIHE in the United States and the Higher School of Economics in Russia. They will now go one step further to undertake joint research and professional development. The fact that the group is formed by six research centers from different continents and with a strong presence from the emerging and developing world breaks the dominance of European and Anglo-Saxon research in higher education.

The group does not have the same generous funding sources as CGHE, but builds on its own funding and smaller grants, for instance from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the Higher Education Forum on Africa, Latin America, and Asia conference, and the Luksic fund for the Catholic universities project.

The three Catholic universities in GCIHES held a first seminar in Santiago about the latter project, presenting three institutional case studies on how these Catholic universities deal with internationalization as part of their mission. They intend to develop this study with a larger number of case studies from different countries around the world.

Until recently the study of higher education and its international dimensions was the field of a small group of research centers and scholars, primarily in the developed world, and even there, funding and resources were scarce.

Expansion of International Higher Education

CIHE’s publication, International Higher Education, is also expanding globally. In addition to the English version and its translations in Chinese, Russian, and Spanish by three of our partners in GCIHES, the publication is also translated in Portuguese and will soon be available in Vietnamese, translated by FPT University. You can have free access to the online version of the publication in all these different languages at http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihed.

Two spin-off publications focusing on regional higher education issues have also been established. Now in its third year, the publication Higher Education in Russia and Beyond is published by our partner, the Higher School of Economics in Russia. In 2016, another publication will start, Higher Education in Singapore and Beyond, an initiative of the HEAD Foundation in Singapore, in cooperation with CIHE.

Another new initiative is relevant to mention in this context, as well. In the fall 2016 Boston College will launch
a 12-month Master of Arts in International Higher Education, an initiative of CIHE to provide a strong international program combining education, research, and field experience, using blended learning with on-site faculty and scholars from around the world, including our partners in GCIHES.

The Shanghai Statement of 2013

The Shanghai statement of 2013 was a product of a roundtable initiated by CIHE. As a follow-up, the center made an inventory of research centers in higher education around the world, published under the title Worldwide Higher Education Inventory, and now available as an interactive map on the CIHE website.

The creation of the two global networks in higher education research, the new Master in International Higher Education and the expansion of “International Higher Education” illustrate the growing importance of higher education research and dissemination in a global context. Where higher education research was in the past limited and mainly focused on national and regional aspects, like the sector itself, the shift is now towards international higher education. This is an important development.

National Policies for Internationalization—Do They Work?
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In response to the demands and opportunities of an ever-globalizing world, governments in a wide range of countries are introducing policies and programs to promote higher education internationalization. These initiatives are underpinned by a variety of academic, economic, political, social, and cultural motivations; sometimes higher education internationalization is an explicit goal, while in other cases, the focus is more specifically on a discrete activity, or on broader national policy goals.

A recent study by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) took a close look at the content of such policies—an overview, including a wide assortment of specific examples, is the basis for our recent report, Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs. Our analysis revealed five main categories of policies in place around the world, based on their primary focus:

Type 1: Student mobility. Policies designed to encourage and facilitate student mobility stand out as the most common focal point for policymaking related to internationalization of higher education. A broad array of nationally funded student mobility scholarship programs—from Saudi Arabia to Chile, Kazakhstan to Brazil, among many others—are the prime manifestations of this policy focus.

Type 2: Scholar mobility and research collaboration. Policy activity in this area is being undertaken by many countries around the world, as well as by key regions—notably Europe, where the European Union is investing heavily in this area under the Horizon 2020 initiative, and specifically through such mechanisms as the Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions. Common types of initiatives in this category include support for visiting scholars, programs, and grants to send faculty abroad, policies to repatriate faculty living in other countries, and project-based research grants.

Type 3: Cross-border education. Whether involving branch campuses and other kinds of physical “outposts,” or virtual (or hybrid) forms—such as MOOCs—national policy and program activity in this realm include initiatives to foster partnerships for capacity building, create educational “hubs,” encourage domestic institutions to establish campuses and programs abroad, and more effectively regulate cross-border activity in practice.

Type 4: Internationalization at home (IaH). IaH is a nascent but rapidly emerging critical focal point for internationalization. Few policy documents currently address it overtly. The European Commission’s 2013 strategy for internationalization, European Higher Education in the World, is a notable exception. But this is surely an important space to watch for future policy developments.

Type 5: “Comprehensive internationalization” policies. We see a small number of initiatives that present a rather sweeping set of rationales, action lines, focus areas, and/or geographic orientations, rather than being singularly focused on specific action lines. Again, the European Com-