

into the operation. Short-term benefits are few, and, inevitably, it takes many years for an IBC to become established, and to judge its impact.

IBCs are pursued both by elite institutions that see an international campus as a high-status differentiator, and by less well-known institutions that may be freer from tradition and see an international presence as a way to create fresh brand perceptions in new markets.

Institutions that invest in IBCs are playing the long game, betting on a more globalized future where deep international presence is seen to define a university. Today, most IBCs are still reshaping the model, concerned largely with in-country students and seeing little two-way mobility or single-brand enhancement. As has happened in the past, some IBCs may gradually become independent of the parent institution and transform into a domestic university. The added value of an international network of campuses, where the sum is greater than the parts, is still a horizon for institutions engaged with IBCs.

What is certain is that if IBCs do emerge as important indicators of institutional effectiveness and reach, it will be very difficult for other institutions to catch up. A global intercampus network at which all students pursue their studies, or close government and corporate relationships fostered over decades, cannot be replicated overnight. Some universities are banking on smaller international centers as a better balance of risk and reward. Ohio State University's *Global Gateways* model is a good example.

The Observatory and C-BERT will continue to track the IBC phenomenon. Indeed, Part 2 of the IBC report, to be published in 2017, will be based on interviews with institutional leaders at a sample of IBCs in operation for at least a decade. It will investigate motivations and operations of mature IBCs, explore the question of how to judge success from different perspectives, and what combination of conditions breeds success.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9743>



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

Twenty-first Century Mobility: The Role of International Faculty

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND MARIA YUDKEVICH

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Maria Yudkevich is associate professor of economics and vice-rector at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. E-mail: zyudkevich@gmail.com. This article stems from research done for International Faculty in Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives on Recruitment, Integration, and Impact, edited by M. Yudkevich, P. G. Altbach, and L. E. Rumbley. (Routledge 2017).

In the era of globalization, it is not surprising that growing numbers of academics are working outside of their home countries. Universities are themselves increasingly globalized—they are perhaps the most globalized of all prominent institutions in society. Even though the global percentage of international academics is small, this group is quite important. We broadly define international faculty as academics that hold appointments in countries where they were not born and/or where they did not receive their first postsecondary degree. In most cases, they are not citizens of the country in which they hold their academic appointment. They are drivers of international consciousness at universities, they are often top researchers, and, in some countries, they constitute a large percentage of the academic labor force.

International faculty seem to cluster into five broad categories. A small but highly visible group of international faculty hold appointments at top research universities around the world, especially in the major English-speaking countries—Australia, Canada, the United States, and to some extent the United Kingdom. They are the global superstars, and some hold Nobel and other important prizes. A second group is employed by midrange or upper-tier universities in a small number of countries that, as a matter of policy due to their size, geographic location, or specific perceived needs, appoint top-quality international faculty—such as Hong Kong, Singapore, and Switzerland. A third group teaches at universities in countries where there is a shortage of local staff—such as Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries, some African countries, and a few others. Here, international academics are frequently hired to teach lower level courses, often come from Egypt, South Asia, or other regions, and frequently from nonprestigious universities. The fourth category, which overlaps with the first three, consists of diaspora academics that immigrated from

one country to another, often obtained citizenship in that country, and are lured “home.” In some ways, they may be considered “pure” international faculty, while in other ways they are not. A final group includes academics that have obtained their doctorates abroad, perhaps have had a postdoc abroad, and continue on to make their careers abroad as well—they might be labeled “transient academics.” Some international faculty can be found in virtually every country in the world.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL FACULTY

Many countries and institutions see employing non-native academics as a key part of internationalization strategies. Indeed, international faculty are often seen as the spearhead of internationalization. Further, increased numbers of international faculty are seen as a key marker of internationalization by the global rankings, and often by ministries and other policy makers within countries.

It is assumed that international faculty will bring new insights to research, teaching, and perhaps to the ethos of university. But, of course, the effectiveness of the contributions of international faculty depends on the organizational arrangements of the university, the expectations on both sides for contributing to internationalization, and other factors. Often, international faculty are not effectively integrated into the internationalization programs of many universities. They teach in their subject areas, but are asked to do little else for the university. And, in many cases, the lack of familiarity of international faculty with the norms and perhaps the politics of the local academic system and institution may limit their participation in governance and other university functions.

International faculty in non-English speaking environments are often key contributors to increasing the number of English-taught courses and degree programs, and in general essential for boosting the English-language orientation of the university. The use of English for both teaching and research is seen by many as a key factor in internationalization.

NATIONAL AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL FACULTY

Some countries and universities welcome international faculty, and even implement initiatives to attract them. Others are much less welcoming. Universities in Hong Kong, Singapore, and Switzerland have as a goal to hire about half of their faculty on the international market—and, not coincidentally, do well in the rankings. Others, such as China and Russia, have provided extra funds and other incentives to hire internationally.

More than a few countries, including some that officially welcome international academics, place various obstacles

in the way of hiring international faculty. Many have extremely complicated and bureaucratic procedures relating to obtaining work permits, procedures concerning security and other issues, and visa regulations, which are sometimes combined with numerical quotas relating to specific job categories, sometimes including academic and research positions. In some cases, bureaucratic and other procedural and legal barriers at the national level are a serious detriment to appointing international academics, and may restrict the number and also the kinds of appointments available.

There are also examples of national policies that are aimed against international academic appointments. India, until quite recently, had national regulations that prevented offering permanent academic appointments to non-citizens, and even now only a handful of foreigners can be found in Indian universities. Canada, from time to time, has imposed “Canada first” hiring policies, under which universities have had to painstakingly prove that each individual international appointment was not taking the place of a comparably qualified Canadian. However, in general, Canada has been welcoming to international faculty—and it is relatively easy to obtain citizenship. While the United States is quite open to hiring international academics, the bureaucratic hurdles of work permits and immigration are often problematical and sometimes insurmountable. Saudi Arabia offers only term contracts to international academics.

It is assumed that international faculty will bring new insights to research, teaching, and perhaps to the ethos of university.

Despite the fact that many countries have opened their borders to highly qualified professionals, including professors, in recognition of the realities of globalization, the practical challenges of rules and regulations remain. The current wave of nationalism, and in some cases xenophobia, may in the coming period create further problems for international academic mobility.

PART OF A COMMUNITY, OR AN ISOLATED GHETTO?

There are many important trade-offs for universities that consider attracting international faculty. Should these faculty be hired to teach or to do research? Should their salaries differ from the remuneration received by their local colleagues? Should requirements for their promotion and contract extension be different than those of domestic aca-

demics? Should they be required to learn the national/local language or are they allowed to teach in English? Should they be offered the same contractual arrangements as local staff?

Among such important questions, there is one that is of primary importance for academic life: should international faculty be deeply integrated into the general university environment (bearing all related costs and enjoying all associated benefits), or should they be placed in a kind of “international ghetto,” with special conditions where competitive “international standards” are maintained? In some countries (such as Australia, Canada, or the United States), this question does not arise. In many others, however—such as China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia—this question is of great importance and does not have an obvious answer. Deep integration of international faculty into “ordinary” university life should contribute toward improving the research and teaching culture, exposing the host institution and local academic community to new perspectives, and generally increasing diversity. At the same time, there may also be risks associated with this process, including the possibility of social tensions between international and local faculty, and low levels of satisfaction among international scholars, due, for example, to nontransparent bureaucratic rules that dominate in many academic systems.

CONCLUSION

International faculty are an increasingly important part of the global academic environment of the twenty-first century. Part of both the symbolic and practical aspects of internationalization, international academics constitute a diverse subset of the global academic labor force. At the top, distinguished senior professors are recruited by highly ranked research universities worldwide. Elsewhere, many international faculty are a necessary part of the teaching staff in countries with shortages of local academics. The motivations for institutions—and countries—to recruit international academics vary, as do the reasons why individuals seek positions outside of their home countries. One thing is clear: international faculty are a growing and increasingly important part of the global academic labor force, bringing diversity, new perspectives, and skills wherever they go. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2017.90.9760>

Reframing Global Engagement

MARIJK VAN DER WENDE

Marijk van der Wende is professor of higher education at Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands. E-mail: m.c.vanderwende@uu.nl.

REVIEWING ASSUMPTIONS AND SCENARIOS

At a time when walls are being built up and borders closed down, higher education is facing new challenges in its role towards the realization of an open, democratic, and equitable society. Recent geopolitical events and intensified populist tendencies are promoting a rejection of internationalism. Support for open borders, multilateral trade, and cooperation are weakened, globalization is criticized, and nationalism is looming. Brexit, the prospect of a disintegrating European Union, and of the United States turning its back on the world create waves of uncertainty in higher education regarding international cooperation and the free movement of students, academics, scientific knowledge, and ideas. At the same time, China is launching new global initiatives such as the “One Belt One Road” (or “New Silk Road”) project, which could potentially span and integrate major parts of the world across Eurasia, but likely on new and different conditions, also for higher education.

These changes require a critical review of our assumptions regarding globalization and the international development of higher education. Could we have imagined, a decade ago, the possibility of a less interconnected and integrated world? Definitions of globalization were inherently progressive; they referred to the widening, deepening, and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness, with growing interdependence and convergence between countries and regions. But serious warnings have been given along the way, signaling notably the risks of inequality and of globalization generating not only winners, but also losers.

In fact, a decade ago, in the OECD publication *Four Future Scenarios for Higher Education*, the one entitled “Serving Local Communities” mentioned as key drivers of change “a backlash against globalisation. [...] growing skepticism in regard to internationalisation in the general population for a variety of reasons, including recent terror attacks and wars, concerns about the growth in immigration, frustration about outsourcing and the feeling that national identity is threatened by globalisation and foreign influence.” Further, it mentioned ambitious new military research programmes launched by governments for geo-strategic reasons, and security classification given to an increasing number of research topics in natural sciences, life sciences, and engineering (OECD, 2006, <https://www.oecd.org/>