

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 offer commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, and Russian. Links to all editions can be found at www.bc.edu/cihe.

The Middle East

- 2 Reforming Higher Education in the Middle East—and Elsewhere
Philip G. Altbach
- 3 Oman's Academic Dreams
Philip G. Altbach
- 4 Saudi Arabian Developments
Philip G. Altbach

Internationalization Issues

- 6 Internationalization Misconceptions
Hans de Wit
- 8 Korean Students in the United States
Hanna Kim
- 9 The Decline of Japanese International Students
Yukiko Shimmi

Responses to Crises

- 11 Where Is Japan Heading After the Earthquake?
Kazuko Suematsu
- 12 Building a World-Class System in Ireland's Financial Crisis
Ellen Hazelkorn

Africa Focus

- 14 The Availability of Academic Journals in Africa
Jonathan Harle
- 16 Closing the Digital Gap in Africa
Anna Bon
- 17 Student Activism and the "Global University" in Tanzania
Ross Benbow

Private Higher Education

- 19 Politics and Demographics in Poland
Marek Kwiek
- 21 Private Higher Education in Pakistan
Nelofer Halai

Quality-Assurance Issues

- 22 Internationalizing Quality Assessment in Central Asia
Martha C. Merrill, Shakhnoza Yakubova and Zhazira Turlanbekova
- 24 Quality Assurance in China: The Changing Context
Kathryn Mohrman

Countries and Regions

- 26 The Road to Differentiation in Slovenia
Manja Klemencic and Janja Komljenovic
- 27 Afghanistan: On the Razor's Edge
Fred M. Hayward

Report

- 29 The Riyadh Statement on World-Class University System

Departments

- 30 CIHE Online: A Plethora of Resources
- 31 News of the Center

Reforming Higher Education in the Middle East—and Elsewhere

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

Among the rallying cries of the youthful revolutionary movements in the Middle East is a demand to reform higher education. The complaints are numerous and well founded. They include political interference at many levels, overcrowded classrooms, an inefficient and unresponsive administration, a decline in quality at all levels, an irrelevant curriculum, underqualified professors, and perhaps most significantly—degrees that do not lead to jobs.

PROBLEMS

The problem is that most of these demands cannot easily be met, regardless of the goodwill of new government and academic authorities or of a strong commitment to academic change. The crisis of Middle East higher education is systemic and requires an entire reconsideration of national higher education strategy. Resources, human and financial, are needed to a scale that is not practical to provide, at least in the short and probably the medium term.

At play are several fundamental issues that are not unique to the Middle East. The first is the inevitable massification of higher education. In the past several decades, every Middle Eastern country has not only experienced an explosion of the youth population but also an expansion in the numbers of young people attending universities. An additional phenomenon, common to many developing countries including the Middle East, is that higher education expansion has outstripped the ability of the economy to absorb university graduates. It is simply easier to expand enrollments than it is to provide jobs. Also, governments have the further incentive to “park” young people in universities for a while, rather than have them immediately join the ranks of the unemployed. A final issue is the deterioration of the average quality of higher education in the mass systems. Again, it is not surprising that, in the context of a mass system generally unaccompanied by concomitant increases in funding, greatly expanded enrollments result in diminished quality. Not only are students literally unable to find room in classes, but also their teachers often have no more than bachelor’s degrees themselves.

WHAT CAN BE DONE NOW?

There are few “quick fixes” to deeply flawed higher education systems. One of these already being carried out in Egypt is depoliticizing the universities. Students demanded the removal of political appointments of administrators, controls over student elections, surveillance of students, and the other elements of the police state that pervaded Egyptian campuses; and to a considerable extent this trend has been accomplished.

It may be possible to enhance administrative efficiency by emphasizing sound academic values and installing officials committed to the improvement of the universities. Corruption can be rooted out. Publicly emphasizing that the universities are now committed to academic values, excellence, and quality improvement may help boost morale, although this plan is not enough.

The crisis of Middle East higher education is systemic and requires an entire reconsideration of national higher education strategy.

THE LONG ROAD AHEAD

Unfortunately, real change is harder and requires both resources, as well, as a roadmap. Neither of these policies are easy to mobilize. Resources without policy produce waste. Creating practical higher education policy for any Middle East country is difficult to accomplish.

The reality of mass higher education is universal. As Egypt has shown, it is not enough to expand existing universities to enrollments of 200,000 or more students and to create new mass universities without clear missions or any semblance of appropriate resources. Parts of a program for reform and improvement include an appropriate mix of higher education institutions with differentiated missions, perhaps dismantling some of the mega-universities into smaller institutions, harnessing the growing but inadequately regulated private higher education to serve the public interest, and encouraging academics to obtain higher qualifications and paying them adequately.

Egypt, because of its large population and dependence on human resources for its future, also needs to have at least one world-class research university that can compete internationally, produce relevant research, and provide educated PhDs for the local market.

Other Middle East countries will have somewhat different circumstances and needs, but all face rather similar challenges.

THE DILEMMAS

Implementing reform is a challenge. One of the main problems concerns funding. For countries like Egypt and Tunisia, which have traditions of free or low-cost public higher education, charging meaningful tuition at the public universities is tremendously controversial and perhaps politically impossible in the atmosphere. Yet, this strategy is, perhaps unfortunately necessary, for it is impossible, except perhaps in Saudi Arabia and a few oil-rich Gulf countries, to have free-public higher education. Thus, ways will need to be found to introduce tuition fees, perhaps combined with appropriate loan and grant funds. There are simply insufficient public resources to support a quality mass higher education system.

The improvement of higher education in the Middle East includes upgrading the academic profession and providing an academic culture that promotes productivity. With a few notable exceptions, the quality of both teaching and research in the region is not high. Relatively few aca-

The improvement of higher education in the Middle East includes upgrading the academic profession and providing an academic culture that promotes productivity.

demics hold doctorates. With the exception of Saudi Arabia and a few Gulf countries, academic salaries are quite low. Academics have been kept down by the bureaucratic rules of the civil service, inadequate salaries, high teaching loads, and political repression—a powerful combination of negative forces. Ways will need to be found to build a creative academic culture and provide an academic environment so that the “best and brightest” will be attracted to teach and do research. Part of the problem will necessitate creating an academic system that rewards teaching and service in the majority of universities that accomplish little research.

Good governance also forms a necessary ingredient for any effective university. Academics must not only be well educated and reasonably paid, but they must have a role in the governance of the university. This process will be especially difficult to implement in the Middle East, where a combination of political control and a bureaucratic culture have stifled universities for decades. The demands of stu-

dents to fully participate in governance are strong in the current environment, and students do have an appropriate role as members of the academic community. Experience shows, however, that the most successful universities are largely governed by the professoriate. Universities also need management, and professional administrators play an indispensable role. Thus, the most-effective universities are complex institutions that require significant autonomy in a broader context of accountability to the public.

The final dilemma is one of the most difficult ones—the relationship between the university to the employment market. Even well-qualified graduates cannot be guaranteed jobs if the economy is stagnating. Unemployed university graduates are a potent political force in many countries, and it is difficult to match the output of graduates to the available employment opportunities. The best reforms the educational system can do is to ensure the education of well-qualified graduates.

No doubt, the deficiencies of the higher education system contribute to political instability in the Middle East. Clearly, a significant reform is mandatory. Achieving needed reform in difficult political, social, and economic circumstances constitutes a daunting challenge. First, a roadmap for change is needed. Then, a social consensus must emerge to implement it. ■

Oman’s Academic Dreams

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

Oman, a small country of 3 million at the tip of the Persian Gulf, seeks to upgrade its main university so that it can join the ranks of world-class institutions. It is now engaged in a planning process to make this possible. The Sultan Qaboos University, with an enrollment of 14,700 students—almost half female—and a state-of-the-art campus on the outskirts of the capital, Muscat, has performed remarkably well since its founding in 1980. The university feels that it can now “go to the next level” and is developing a master plan for that purpose.

Oman itself is a remarkable place. The current ruler, Sultan Qaboos bin Said—whose name is not only on the university but also on the main mosque, a key highway, and many other things—is celebrating his 40th year on the throne in November. He literally brought the country out of

the Middle Ages in 40 years. When he deposed his father, there were exactly three schools in the entire country, symbolic of the previous ruler's distrust of anything modern. Now, Oman has a reasonable literacy, generally good infrastructure, a growing higher education system, and enlightened policies concerning women.

Sultan Qaboos University is the only public university in the country. The rest of the public higher education sector consists of vocational colleges. The country has chosen to permit the private sector to develop the rest of the higher

Sultan Qaboos University faces some significant challenges in its path to world-class status. The university has engaged in a fairly successful effort to “Omanize” the faculty. Now, almost half are Omanis, most of whom have been educated abroad, largely in the United States and United Kingdom.

education sector. New private universities, which are given significant government support to get started—including free land and government scholarships for students once they are established—seem to be somewhere between non-profit and for-profit. Most are backed by major business enterprises, and it is unclear whether the universities will make money once fully functioning. The country has a few foreign transplants offering specialized degrees in engineering and some other fields. These institutions do not seem to be top-class institutions in their home countries.

Sultan Qaboos University faces some significant challenges in its path to world-class status. The university has engaged in a fairly successful effort to “Omanize” the faculty. Now, almost half are Omanis, most of whom have been educated abroad, largely in the United States and United Kingdom. The university's policy consists of having about a quarter of its faculty as international members once localization is complete. Local staff are offered permanent appointments when hired, making it impossible to fire any Omani from the faculty and problematical in terms of ensuring productivity. Expatriate staff receive renewable three-year contracts but can never achieve permanent status. Building an academic culture based on research and teaching productivity is not an easy task, and the combination of permanent appointments and little accountability and limited term contracts for foreigners make the job

more difficult. Yet it is of central importance if the university is to become a research-intensive institution.

Location is also a challenge. While Oman is a stable and peaceful place with well-functioning infrastructure of all kinds, it is not exactly at the center of the academic firmament. Further, Oman faces competition from the glitzier academic enterprises elsewhere in the Gulf area, including the highly publicized branch campuses in Qatar and elsewhere. Among the Gulf's indigenous public universities outside of Saudi Arabia, Sultan Qaboos University may be the best of the lot. But attracting top scholars from abroad will be hard to accomplish. The university is starting to build meaningful linkages with overseas universities—probably a better strategy than simply subsidizing branch campuses which have little impact on local development and may siphon off many of the best students and faculty.

The university is in the midst of goal setting and planning for the coming decade or so. Some lack of clarity exists about the goals—should Sultan Qaboos University make the major effort required to be a full-fledged research university, or should it have more modest aims? The answers to this basic question will shape the future of the institution in the coming decade or more.

(This article appeared in *Times Higher Education*, London) ■

Things Under Way in Saudi Arabia's Universities

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

Saudi Arabia's higher education leaders are obsessed at the same time with rankings and aware that their universities neither compete well nor that the rankings serve to measure the most effective standards in their universities. The country has invested heavily in higher education and currently is engaged in a massive expansion and upgrading of the higher education establishment. Twenty-eight percent of the national budget is devoted to education. With 24 public and 9 private universities and in the country, quite a few in provincial cities have been upgraded from teachers colleges and other specialized institutions to university status.

Princess Nora Bint Abdulrahman University is the country's first women's university. Located in Riyadh, it has 52,000 students—the largest women's university in the world. The new state-of-the-art campus, now under construction at lightning speed, will be internally connected by the country's first elevated railway. (Women are not permitted to drive cars and thus a transportation alternative is necessary.) Women constitute 60 percent of total enrollments in the country—despite a general agreement that their institutions are in many cases not as good as those serving males. Strict gender segregation exists in higher education as in all areas of public life.

The city's two major public institutions, King Saud University and Imam Mohammed Bin Saud University, are also undergoing significant upgrading of their already impressive campuses. The science, technology, and business facilities are already close to world class, although the social sciences and humanities fare somewhat less well. Each of these institutions serves more than 35,000 students, with a full array of master's and doctoral courses. Many of the science, medical, and business faculties function entirely in English.

Expansion has created serious problems for the system—especially for the new and upgraded institutions in the provinces and for women's higher education. Riyadh's upgraded women's university will significantly improve the quality of higher education currently available to women.

This higher education system faces a severe shortage of qualified professors. The Saudi government, through the King Abdullah Scholarship Program, provides 100,000 scholarships for overseas study, mainly at the master's and doctoral levels, and almost all Saudi students return home. Many of the scholarships are given to able graduate students who are promised academic jobs upon degree completion. Yet, it will take time to fill staff shortages. Incentives have been provided for professors at urban universities to take jobs in the provinces—including significant salary increases—but there are not many takers.

The structure of academic careers creates additional problems. Most academics are given permanent appointments upon being hired, and salary increases are largely unrelated to productivity. This practice leaves few incentives for high performance. Further, teaching loads tend to be high, even in universities seeking to improve their research profile, leaving little time for research. Considerable “inbreeding” appears in Saudi universities, with many of a university's brightest graduates being hired, offered overseas scholarship, and then promoted up the ranks.

Saudi rectors and other policymakers recently met in Riyadh to consider all of these issues in the context of a desire to become “world class.” Saudis are not pleased with

their lack of visibility in the international rankings but understand that their universities are mostly new and serve many national needs. They have had problems grappling with the idea that not all of the country's public universities can aspire to be research universities and the attempt to develop ways of recognizing teaching, social involvement, and other functions as central to the missions of the universities. The idea that Saudi universities can be “world class” in areas other than research is attractive, although it is the case that only research can be fairly easily measured. The rectors discussed the idea of a “world-class university system” in which institutions would have differentiated missions but at the same time be respected and rewarded for these roles. Specific universities would have defined missions and would be expected to excel at them. Not all of the universities would be expected to be research intensive.

Princess Nora Bint Abdulrahman University is the country's first women's university. Located in Riyadh, it has 52,000 students—the largest women's university in the world.

There would be less emphasis on the international rankings—probably a good thing given the complex needs of Saudi society. Universities could define for themselves what is most needed for their regions, and the all-powerful Ministry of Higher Education could help to ensure a rational mission for each of the country's universities.

Saudi academic and governmental leaders are seriously considering strategies for academic development. Thus, how Saudi universities might compete globally while at the same time serve national and regional needs is an indication of a maturing academic system.

(This article appeared in *Times Higher Education*, London) ■



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

Internationalization of Higher Education: Nine Misconceptions

HANS DE WIT

Hans de Wit is professor of internationalization at the School of Economics and Management, Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands. This is an abridged version of his public lecture in Amsterdam, April 6, 2011. E-mail: j.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl.

Internationalization in European higher education has developed over the last 20 years, from a marginal point of interest to a central factor—also called a mainstreaming of internationalization. Indisputably, globalization of our societies and economies has expanded the influence of competition and market processes on the manner in which internationalization is implemented. Internationalization distinguishes many motives and approaches. The mainstreaming of internationalization assumes a more integral process-based approach, aimed at a better quality of higher education and competencies of staff and students. Reality is less promising, however, although the international dimension takes an increasingly central role in higher education. Still, there is a predominantly activity-oriented or even instrumental approach toward internationalization, which leads to major misconceptions about the nature of this development. Nine misconceptions will be described (two of them coinciding with a myth as described in *IHE* by Jane Knight in “Five Myths About Internationalization,” no. 62, winter 2011), whereby internationalization is regarded as synonymous with a specific programmatic or organizational strategy to promote internationalization—in other words, where the means appear to have become the goal.

EDUCATION IN THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE

The influence of the English language as a medium of communication in research has been dominant for a long period of time. Also, over the past 20 years the tendency in higher education has been to teach in English, as an alternative for teaching in one’s mother tongue. There are several unintended negative effects. Increasingly, education offered in the English language is regarded as the equivalent of internationalization, which results in a decreasing focus on other foreign languages; in an insufficient focus on the quality of the English spoken by students and teachers for whom English is not their native language; and thus leading to a decline in the quality of education.

STUDYING OR STAYING ABROAD

A study or internship abroad as part of your home studies is often regarded as the equivalent of internationalization. In particular, the European Commission’s policy to stimulate this manner of mobility has contributed to that instrumental approach over the last 25 years. It is questionable, however, whether the imbalanced and oversimplified approach to mobility matches internationalization. As well, it can be said that mobility is merely an instrument for promoting internationalization and not a goal in itself. Mobility needs to be finely embedded in the internationalization of education. It should be determined whether these added values are developed among students; and more innovative reflection is required on alternative ways of achieving these added values, for instance by the use of distance education and virtual mobility.

AN INTERNATIONAL SUBJECT

A third misconception that continues to surface persistently is that internationalization is synonymous with providing training based on international content or connotation: European studies, international business, or universal music. Within the institutions and schools offering these pro-

Still, there is a predominantly activity-oriented or even instrumental approach toward internationalization, which leads to major misconceptions about the nature of this development.

grams, the prevailing opinion seems to imply that, in this way, internationalization has been properly implemented. Without meaning to ignore the valuable contribution of such programs, again, it is too simplistic and instrumental an argument to declare regional studies as synonymous with internationalization.

HAVING MANY INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

A fourth misconception of internationalization is the assumption that having many international students equals that trend. Without denying that the combination of local and international students in the lecture room can make a significant contribution to internationalization, simply having international students is not sufficient. Unfortunately, countless examples can be given of programs that are oriented exclusively toward international students or where international students are being added as an isolated group.

FEW INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS GUARANTEE SUCCESS

The other side of the preceding misconception occurs as well. In particular, many international programs have developed a distorted proportion between the number of local and international students. Partly as a result of the increasing national and international competition for international students, the proportion between local and international students becomes more and more unequal. Thus, one can hardly speak of an international classroom setting. Conversely, this development has a negative effect on the internationalization of mainstream, non-English-language programs. Local students with a certain, whether or not motivated, international interest preferably enroll in the international programs—which means the interest of mainstream education in the local language dwindles. Also, in these programs, the presence of a small number of international students creates tensions. Should the courses be

Increasingly, education offered in the English language is regarded as the equivalent of internationalization, which results in a decreasing focus on other foreign languages.

taught in English if there are only one or two international students in the lecture room? How can the integration of international students be realized in such distorted proportions?

NO NEED TO TEST INTERCULTURAL AND INTERNATIONAL COMPETENCIES

A sixth misconception assumes that students normally acquire intercultural and international competencies if they study or serve their internship abroad or take part in an international class. This misconception is closely related to the previous ones about mobility, education in English, and the presence of international students. If these kinds of activities and instruments are considered synonymous with internationalization, then it is obvious to assume that intercultural and international competences will therefore also be acquired. Once again, reality is more complicated. It is not guaranteed from the outset that these activities will actually lead to that result. After all, students can completely seclude themselves from sharing experiences with other students and other sections of the population in the countries they visit.

THE MORE PARTNERSHIPS, THE MORE INTERNATIONAL

A seventh misconception on internationalization is the focus on partnerships: the more partnerships, the more success of internationalization. Globalization, competition, and market processes have reinforced the development toward strategic partnerships. This tendency toward strategic partnerships often implicates intentions, however. The majority of partnerships remain bilateral, and in several institutions and schools the number far exceeds the number of students and teachers being exchanged.

HIGHER EDUCATION—INTERNATIONAL BY NATURE

At universities and among their researchers, the general opinion identified a truly international characteristic, and thus there is no need to stimulate and guide internationalization. Thereby, references are made to the Renaissance, the time of the philosopher Erasmus (ca. 1467–1536), whom the European exchange program is named after. This historic reference ignores the fact that universities, mostly originated in the 18th and 19th century, had a clear national orientation and function. Internationalization does not arrive naturally in general universities and universities of applied sciences, but needs to be introduced. That is why the rather widely accepted definition of internationalization by Jane Knight refers to an integration process.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AS A PRECISE GOAL

Most of the mentioned misconceptions conceive an activity or instrument as synonymous with internationalization. The last, also fairly prevailing, misconception regards internationalization as a main goal, and therefore it is in line with the misconceptions mentioned earlier. Internationalization is a process to introduce intercultural, international, and global dimensions in higher education; to improve the goals, functions, and delivery of higher education; and thus to upgrade the quality of education and research. If internationalization is regarded as a specific goal, then it remains ad hoc and marginal.

To comprehend the challenges and opportunities for the internationalization of higher education it is compelling to recognize that these misconceptions are still fairly common. ■



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

Korean Students in the United States

HANNA KIM

Hanna Kim is in the master of arts in the higher education program, Boston College. E-mail: hana2617@gmail.com.

Korea has an international reputation for sending undergraduate students overseas for their education. In fact, Korean international students comprise the third-largest group in the United States. Because numerous US universities rank among the world's best, Koreans generally place high value on a US degree. This emphasis on the educational background provides significant advantages to US-educated job applicants during the hiring process. Therefore, parents encourage their children to set, as their primary goal, graduation from an Ivy League school. Indeed, large corporations in Korea employ specific hiring methods for Ivy League students; they use tailored on-site recruitment and hiring strategies. Also, certain characteristics of Korean society, such as sensitivity to trends and preferential treatment for foreign-degree holders, result in the notion that studying abroad is compulsory.

To be examined are the driving forces behind Korean students' choice to study abroad, the effects of the increasing number of returning international students in Korea, and how US institutions can facilitate the educational experience of international students. Another analysis focuses on the success of students who returned to Korea after completing their undergraduate degree in the United States. (This analysis is based in part on original interviews.)

THE KOREAN CONTEXT

Korean students choose to study in America because they want to study English, private education costs in Korea are rising, and enhanced job opportunities are available to US degree holders. In a survey asking 1,055 Koreans to name the country where they would prefer to study, the United States ranked first. This ranking can be explained by the tendency of Koreans to follow trends, the rising importance of fluency in English, and the privileged status of Korean students who study in the United States.

Korean society is sensitive to trends, which Koreans are motivated to follow. From 1994 through 2006, the period referred to as "the boom of youths studying abroad," thousands of Korean students went to America to study English. Also, many Korean companies considered proficiency in English a requirement for employment. In addition, in 1993, President Yong Sam Kim proposed globalization as a national priority; and in 2000, the government removed re-

strictions on students studying abroad. The result was that the number of Korean international students rose by 36.6 percent, from 45,685 in 2000, to 75,321 in 2010. About 40 percent of classmates from Korean middle schools studied in the United States.

In the early 1990s, only a few from upper-income families in Korea studied abroad, and the status associated with having been an international student in America nearly assured these students a job at the Korean company of their choice. Observing these outcomes, middle-class parents began to view a US degree as an investment, confident that American higher education would guarantee their children's success in Korea. However, due to the increasing number of Korean international students, returning students are losing their market competitiveness, impairing their chances for employment in Korea.

WHAT US HIGHER EDUCATION OFFERS

Earning a degree in the United States allows Korean students to interact with people from all over the world. Because the population in Korea is primarily homogenous and more Korean corporations are becoming globalized, a multicultural background is highly valued in the Korean job market. For Korean companies, the greatest strengths

Korean students choose to study in America because they want to study English, private education costs in Korea are rising, and enhanced job opportunities are available to US degree holders.

of international students are their facility with the English language, global outlook, acceptance of multicultural experience, creativity, and flexible thought processes. Ms. Yang, a recent graduate of Emory University, said, "Koreans perceive that US education fosters creativity and confidence because the classroom environment allows open discussions and use of flexible thinking on assignments."

As Korean corporations continue to expand their businesses into other countries, experience working with foreigners is valued more highly than any other qualification. Mr. Kim, whose undergraduate degree is from Northwestern University, said, "Companies [in Korea] value the experience of interacting with foreigners in the workplace the most, which is considered as a specialty for US international students." Therefore, students seek out universities that offer employment experience to international students.

The majority of interviewees who studied abroad regretted socializing mostly with Korean friends and choosing classes and majors that did not require presentations, in-class essay exams, and class discussion. Most were also unaware that a university's career centers provide information and support in finding jobs abroad and choosing majors. Moreover, students found it difficult to leave their comfort zone and interact with American students. Therefore, focusing institutional resources to help students gain the most out of their US higher education is critical. Students should be encouraged to participate in classroom discussions to facilitate critical thinking, interact more with American students, and seek development services from career centers. This process would help Korean international students to take full advantage of their US education and, ultimately, provide them with increased job opportunities in Korea.

Today, Korea faces high unemployment among young adults, and the increasing number of foreign graduates makes it difficult for them to find a job. Moreover, domestic students are becoming more competitive. Thus, Korean students studying in the United States must spend their time more productively, and institutions must implement programs to help international students move closer to their career goals. The top jobs in Korea still mostly recruit people who have taken full advantage of their US higher education. Therefore, parents will continue to send their children to the United States with the hope that US education will generate significant personal and professional opportunities for them. ■

The Problematic Decline of Japanese International Students

YUKIKO SHIMMI

Yukiko Shimmi is a research assistant at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: shimmi@bc.edu.

Where have Japanese international students gone? The number of Japanese students who study in the United States has decreased by 15.1 percent to 29,264 in 2009/10, according to the Open Doors Report of the Institute of International Education. This decline has attracted considerable attention in Japan. While various Japanese media have expressed concerns about this phenomenon,

several professionals at Japanese universities and educational institutions observe a stable desire to study abroad among young Japanese people.

Several structural issues effecting the current declines are explored—a demographic shift, an increased capacity at domestic universities, an economic stagnation, the season of job hunting for Japanese college students, and academic requirements. Then, new trends and approaches for the increase are discussed.

Several structural issues effecting the current declines are explored—a demographic shift, an increased capacity at domestic universities, an economic stagnation, the season of job hunting for Japanese college students, and academic requirements.

PATTERNS OF DECLINE

The demographic shift in Japanese society is often referred to as a cause for the decline in the number of Japanese international students. According to the Japanese government, the number of people in the 20-to-29 age group peaked at 19 million in 1996, and decreased to 14 million in 2010. The Japanese government analyzes multiple factors of the decline of birthrate in Japan—such as, the financial burden to raise children; Japanese working styles that often require overtime work, which reduces time for the family; and an increase of young workers who have less financial stability. This demographic shift is in fact underlying the current decline in the number of internationally mobile Japanese students.

The expansion of the enrollment capacity of Japanese higher education has provided additional local capacity and has contributed to the decline of Japanese students going abroad. Since the late 1980s, the capacity has increased mainly at four-year undergraduate institutions and graduate schools in Japan. Attending domestic institutions is less costly, economically. As a result, the country accommodates a relatively larger number of college-age Japanese students; in turn, fewer potential students study abroad for degrees.

Economic factors have also effected the recent decrease of Japanese international students. Japanese students seem to avoid the United States because of the high tuition fees and expenses. Further oncoming attractions are the emergence of English programs in non-English-speaking countries and an increase in the programs in nontraditional des-

tinations. These non-US programs are often offered for a shorter and less expensive period.

The job-hunting system and timing for Japanese undergraduate students seems to be another factor contributing to this trend. Traditionally, the job-search process for Japanese college students starts in the fall of the junior year. Many study-abroad students hope to start their job-search process no later than domestic students' schedule. Study-abroad experiences or a degree from the United States have not always given advantages for Japanese students in the domestic job market in Japan. Rather, the experience could

The number of international students who study in the United States as non-degree students has been increasing in the current overall declining trend.

be considered negatively by potential employers if returning students cannot readjust to the norms of Japanese society, though this perception has been changing.

Academic requirements also issue an obstacle for Japanese students who hope to study at a prestigious institution. In particular, the new system of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (Internet-based test), which includes a speaking section, seems to be a challenge for Japanese students. According to the Educational Testing Service, the score of this test for Japanese students in 2009 rated only 27th among 30 Asian nationalities.

NEW TRENDS

With these trends, Japanese international educators also see a stable desire for studying abroad among young Japanese people. Several study-abroad advisers at universities and educational institutions observe that current college students are oriented in the same way as the older generation. However, they are more concerned about the costs, risks, and outcomes of studying in a foreign country.

Actually, the number of international students who study in the United States as nondegree students has been increasing in the current overall declining trend. The Japanese government reported a stable increase (yet, with a moderate decrease in 2008) in the number of Japanese students who studied in the United States, based on university-exchange agreements from 4,513 in 2001 to 6,403 in 2008. Participating in short-term or study-abroad exchange programs might be a realistic way to relieve students' concerns about studying abroad.

To support this new trend, the Japanese government has created scholarships for exchange programs, covering under three months. Leading institutions have started to develop predeparture support for short-term, study-abroad programs. Japanese educators expect that the participants of these short-term programs might later participate in a longer study-abroad program.

Moreover, providing information at an early stage for students is another approach for support. Some information providers have started to reach out to high school students as well as to parents and teachers. Some universities emphasize orientations for freshmen, after their enrollment. These efforts are targeted for students to start their study-abroad planning ahead of normal patterns—considering the process of job hunting, as well as preparation for the Test of English as a Foreign Language and academic qualifications.

Recent changes in companies' recruitment policies might seriously affect Japanese students' study-abroad attitudes. Several Japanese companies have announced that they value international experiences, as well as foreign-language abilities, to respond to changes in Japanese society and labor markets—due to globalization. Some companies also focus on the recruitment of non-Japanese students with those abilities. Since one of the concerns of Japanese college students is job hunting, this change in the recruitment policy might have more impact on encouraging Japanese students to study abroad.

Recent changes in companies' recruitment policies might seriously affect Japanese students' study-abroad attitudes.

The recent decline in the number of Japanese students in the United States has provoked a discussion in Japan. While many government and industry leaders hope more students gain international experiences for a proactive presence in the globalized world, Japanese students tend to look more realistically at costs and opportunities for education and job opportunities. Though many factors are contributing to the trend of decline, the change of the recruitment policies among Japanese companies as well as support for short-term, study-abroad programs might increase the numbers of students who actively consider studying abroad. ■

Where Is Japan Headed After the Earthquake?

KAZUKO SUEMATSU

YKazuko Suematsu is with the Division of International Education and Exchange, Graduate School of Economics and Management, Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan. E-mail: suematsu@econ.tohoku.ac.jp.

The devastating 9.0-magnitude earthquake on March 11, 2011 put Japan into chaos. It claimed the lives of 15,000 citizens, with an additional 10,000 still missing, and 120,000 in evacuation centers as their homes were lost or destroyed. The estimated economic loss is said to be between US\$200–300 billion and will have a serious effect on the developing northeast region of Japan. Countless aftershocks, in addition to the fear of the potentially catastrophic Fukushima Nuclear Plant, cause further worry and distress for the people in the affected area.

The earthquake also inflicted immense damage to higher education in Japan, especially in the area of internationalization. Supported by the Plan for 300,000 International Students by 2020, the higher education sector was in the process of internationalizing. The first project of the plan was Global 30, in which the government invested ¥4.1 billion to enable 13 core universities to lead the internationalization of higher education. Prior to Global 30, another five-year project, the Career Development Program for Foreign Students in Japan, had commenced and provided full scholarships, comprehensive business training, internships, and placement opportunities for international students. Japan's universities might have been behind their rapidly internationalizing neighboring countries but was catching up step-by-step until March 11 this year.

NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF THE EARTHQUAKE

The immediate impact was a decrease in the number of current and prospective international students. At Tohoku University, the largest institution in the northeast region, 34 degree-seeking students withdrew after the earthquake. Forty-four out of 81 undergraduate exchange students discontinued their studies, 33 out of 43 scheduled to start in April, and one-third of the fall-semester applicants cancelled their study-abroad plan at Tohoku University.

The loss of students is only about 10 percent of the total international student population. Yet, the number is likely to continue to fall as the earthquake incident has even affected international student enrollment at universities as far as Kyoto, located 350 miles south of the Fukushima Nuclear Plant. The continued decrease of international students is a serious challenge for the Global 30 Project and Tohoku University,

which planned to have 3,000 international students at the university by 2015.

THE LESSON WE LEARNED

Ironically, the earthquake is an opportunity for Japan to evaluate its level of internationalization. During these past few months after the earthquake, a series of events have caused a question concerning Tohoku University's internationalization achievements. First, risk management standards could have been higher. The Tohoku region had been expecting a large earthquake for more than 10 years; and with a large number of international students from nonearthquake countries, the university should have included earthquake information during student orientation or handed out an earthquake booklet prepared by the local government.

Furthermore, after gathering at the designated evacuation area on campus, the university dismissed students without clear instructions on what to do next. International students had to find their way to the evacuation centers all by themselves.

Second, the university should have taken a more active role in collecting accurate information and sending out timely messages to international students. The students, alone in unfamiliar evacuation centers without updates on the earthquake and the nuclear-plant accident, were vulnerable to information from inaccurate sources. Their worried parents and friends, whose interpretations of the incidents were largely influenced by the media in their countries, urged the students to leave Japan immediately.

The earthquake also inflicted immense damage to higher education in Japan, especially in the area of internationalization.

In addition, a chain mail has been encouraging students to do so. One e-mail, claiming to be from the Chinese government, instructed Chinese students to gather at the Niigata Airport, 200 miles away from Sendai where Tohoku University is located, to catch a government-chartered flight. Over 100 students rushed to Niigata Airport, with many standing in long lines to buy a bus ticket; some even took a taxi in a group and shared the US\$800 fare. Yet, no such flight existed. Those who could not afford full-fare tickets checked themselves into an evacuation center near the airport until representatives of the Chinese Consulate came to their rescue.

Likewise, a clear difference has occurred between international students and domestic students, as well as Japanese citizens, in response to the incident. International students rushed from Japan with unfounded fears, which could have been prevented if the university immediately provided information to assist international students to make a competent decision.

COPING WITH THE CHALLENGES

While the university was not fully prepared for this mega-earthquake, it quickly overcame this mistake. The international office modified an online application system for exchange students to create a safety confirmation Web page, where international students could report their safety, status, and even plan for their studies. At Tohoku University, as of March 28, it was known that close to 1,000 students, two-third of international students, had been safely evacuated. By April 25, 86 percent reported their willingness to return before the new academic year would commence.

This earthquake provided us with an opportunity to find strength in ourselves to recuperate.

The Japanese government also came to provide support, by offering free airline tickets for government-sponsored scholarship students, who had gone home, to return to Japan and scholarships for self-funded international student at universities located in affected areas.

Partner institutions all over the globe have extended their support by increasing quota and accepting our students to their exchange programs, raising money for the victims, or sending us encouraging messages. The alumni have sent us donations so that we can repair damaged buildings. This earthquake provided us with an opportunity to find strength in ourselves to recuperate, and we discovered the helping hands of our friends from all over the world.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The internationalization of Japanese universities might have been set back by this disaster for some years. We, however, should not be deterred. We should face up to the challenges and change the crisis into an opportunity. By reviewing and reevaluating Japan as a destination for quality higher education, we can identify our advantages as well as our shortcomings—including the effect of the earthquake—

and rebuild our strategy from the ground up, in order to meet the increasing level of competition in higher education.

These strategies, however, should not be developed independently by institutions. There are many stakeholders whom we can involve—such as policymakers, industries, local communities, nonprofit organizations, and even members of the international community. Constructing a network or creating a consortium, where ideas and insights can be shared, will lead to building better strategies. Universities in the effected area, including Tohoku University, can act as a liaison for these diverse stakeholders. This is the first step toward restoration and a new era of internationalization. ■

Building a World-Class System in Ireland's Financial Crisis

ELLEN HAZELKORN

Ellen Hazelkorn is vice president for research and enterprise and head of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit, Dublin Institute of Technology. E-mail: Ellen.Hazelkorn@dit.ie.

Ireland is not the sole country to experience prolonged economic difficulties, based on the global financial crisis of 2008. Nor is it the only country whose higher education system has been rocked by structural change, aligned with or precipitated by public financial cutbacks. According to the European University Association, which is monitoring the situation, major reductions in public funding to higher education have occurred in Latvia (48% in 2009 and a further 18% in 2010), Italy (anticipated reduction of 20% by 2013), Greece (target reduction of 30%), and most recently the United Kingdom (40% reduction until 2014/2015). Iceland anticipates reductions of 6–7 percent in 2011, atop 5 percent in 2010, while Estonia has faced cuts of 17 percent since 2009. In contrast, Scandinavian countries, France, and Germany are experiencing minor reductions due to increased student numbers or more funding.

Ireland's February 2011 general election threw out the Fianna Fáil party, which dominated government for 61 of the last 79 years and was blamed for mismanaging the economy. There are high hopes the new coalition of Christian and social democratic parties will be more sympathetic to higher education, which has become another victim of the country's difficulties.

The “Celtic Tiger” years, 1998–2008, benefited higher education, pushing it higher up the policy agenda. The core budget increased, and over 3 billion euros was invested in higher education research and infrastructure. Participation rates rose from 44 percent a decade ago to 55 percent today, and the target is 72 percent by 2020. Yet, Ireland spends only 1.2 percent of gross the domestic product (public and private) on higher education, well below the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development average. Exchequer funding accounts for 85 percent of higher education funding compared with an OECD average of 73 percent. Expenditure per student is 15.5 percent below the top OECD quartile, if research funding is not included, or 28 percent below including research funding.

Since 2008, higher education will have experienced an overall 17 percent reduction in core funding. Because budget and student numbers are going in opposite directions, resources per student are declining more precipitously than headline cuts suggest, from a high of almost 10,000 euros to less than 3,000 euros per student. Employment levels are required to fall by 7 percent by 2014, while salaries have already been reduced by 5 to 8 percent; all new appointments have 10 percent–lower starting salaries. Accordingly, there is some evidence of talent flight by those attracted to Ireland by good salaries and well-endowed grants.

The government has sought to preserve research and development funding, likely to form a key part of its new employment strategy. After an initial reduction of almost 30 percent between 2009 and 2010, funding was increased again in 2011—albeit this varies across funding agencies and programs. The main change has been toward application-focused research, granted a 12.5 percent increase in 2011, with an emphasis on commercialization and job creation. A parallel research prioritization exercise is likely to enforce these trends.

CHANGES AT THE SYSTEM LEVEL

The National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 was launched in January 2011, written with the new environment clearly in mind. Rationalization and efficiency were identified as objectives, not simply outcomes of system restructuring. Hopefully, by pooling resources, the current crisis can be used to reconfigure the system to be more competitive. Maintaining quality with reducing resources remains, however, a challenge.

Irish higher education is generally described as a binary system, with 7 universities, 14 institutes of technology, 9 colleges of education, the National College of Art and Design, 2 non-state-aided private colleges, and a few other smaller national institutions for a population of 4 million people. In this context, not surprisingly, institutional alliances or mergers received considerable attention. Yet, de-

spite a small but vocal chorus arguing for the preferential treatment and designation for both Trinity College Dublin and University College Dublin as world-class universities, the report resisted any such language. In fact, remarkably, there is only passing reference to global rankings and the words “world-class university” do not appear anywhere. Instead, focus is on the quality of the system, with recommendations placing considerable emphasis on the need for system coherence and consolidation and institutional diversity.

The intention is to both rationalize the number of individual institutions and improve overall efficiency. Some institutes of technology are encouraged to merge, in order to be designated technological universities. In the future, the system is likely to have three broad components: a small number of highly research-intensive universities, a middle group of regionally focused universities and one or two universities of technology with research capacity concen-

The “Celtic Tiger” years, 1998–2008, benefited higher education, pushing it higher up the policy agenda.

trated in specialist fields, and a broader base of teaching institutions comprised of the majority of institutes of technology. At the same time, all higher education institutions are urged to form themselves into “regional clusters of collaborating institutions (universities, institutes of technology, and other providers) to deliver on jointly agreed strategic objectives,” including sharing backroom services (procurement, information technology support, and e-library facilities).

To ensure all higher education institutions remain true to their mission and the system is sufficiently differentiated, a process of strategic dialogues will ensue between the Higher Education Authority (the government buffer agency) and individual institutions. Through this process, appropriate metrics for performance will be agreed, to which the government grant will be pegged.

The other major talking point is tuition fees. Abolished in the mid-1990s as means to widen access, the budget deficit has put the issue firmly back on the table. The national strategy favored increasing the student contribution, albeit it stressed this could only ever be a modest percentage of the overall cost of higher education. So far, the former and incoming governments have balked at the proposal—not

least because any proviso for a graduate-tax or income-contingent loan scheme would be unworkable in the current economic environment and when almost 25 percent of graduates emigrate.

IMPACT AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

Changes at the institutional level were inevitable even before the recession—albeit the context and speed with which institutions have had to adapt has severely tested institutional decision making and implementation capacity. Departments have been merged, programs altered, and specific courses discontinued. Many widening-participation and other “noncore” initiatives, funded from strategic or targeted finances, are now under threat. The institutes of technology are experiencing the double whammy of a deteriorating financial situation, coupled with the implementation of a new-funding model, announced several years ago but being introduced now.

The other major talking point is tuition fees. Abolished in the mid-1990s as means to widen access, the budget deficit has put the issue firmly back on the table.

Under a national accord, faculty in the institutes of technology, but not the universities, have agreed to some workload changes. Institutions, however, have little ability to make fundamental changes (e.g., abolishing whole departments or programs) because all faculty are tenured. This means those on part-time or short-term contracts and the nonpay element of the budget have been most affected.

CHALLENGES FOR SMALL COUNTRIES

Ireland faces particular difficulties given the severity of the economic crisis and the prolonged recession. Many of the changes are broadly in line with what other countries have promoted—such as, significant system restructuring, coupled with increased regulation or managed-policy direction. Where Ireland does differ is in its emphasis on a “whole of country strategy,” rather than seeking to create a few world-class universities. It wants to adopt a single-quality brand to enhance global competitiveness (e.g., “brand Ireland”). The national strategy sees all higher education institutions engaged in teaching, research, and engagement—with each institution seeking to achieve some form of unique global leadership.

The Availability of Academic Journals in Africa

JONATHAN HARLE

Jonathan Harle is program officer (Research), at Association of Commonwealth Universities, London, UK. E-mail: j.harle@acu.ac.uk. The full ACU report by the author is available at: www.acu.ac.uk/growing_knowledge.

Research requires a good flow of the latest scholarly information—books, journals, data—and sub-Saharan universities have long faced particular challenges in Africa. Academics frequently comment that a major impediment to their own work, including their ability to publish, is the lack of access to the work of their peers elsewhere. Anecdotes of researchers working hard to complete a paper for submission, only to find something similar was published the previous year or that they have failed to acknowledge important new debates or data, are not uncommon. But the past decade has shown considerable efforts to address this information gap. In fact, a study published by the Association of Commonwealth Universities last year suggests that the picture may actually be much brighter than is often assumed.

EMPTY SHELVES BUT BULGING DATABASES

Many accounts lament the empty shelves of university libraries, but they tend to miss the huge volume of information that academics and students can now access online. The shift to electronic publishing—and the associated reductions in the costs of printing and shipping—has given rise to a number of initiatives for low-income countries: notably, the United Nations’ managed schemes for health, agricultural, and environmental journals—Health Inter-Net Network Access to Research Initiative (HINARI), Access to Global Online Research in Agriculture (AGORA), and Online Access to Research in the Environment (OARE); and the International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications’ Program for the Enhancement of Information (PERii), in addition to the work of Electronic Information from Libraries; and a whole host of other smaller programs.

The scale of what is now available online is impressive. PERii alone has negotiated access to over 23,000 full-text journals in all fields, while HINARI counts over 7,500, AGORA 1,900, and OARE over 2,990. Additional features are the growing number of open-access journals: the Directory of Open Access Journals lists some 6,317. Librarians have worked hard to secure this content, too. Books are still a major gap, and their expense accounts for many empty shelves. However, as e-books come online, print on

demand develops, and local publishers can grow—which may support hopeful prognoses.

JOURNAL AVAILABILITY

Comparing journal collections at the universities of Nairobi, Dar es Salaam, Malawi, and Rwanda revealed that the availability of some of the top Thomson Reuters (Institute for Scientific Information)–ranked journals was remarkably good. In fact, 79 percent of the top 20 journals, across 15 subject areas, were readily available. Perhaps unsurprisingly, in some fields the status quo was stronger than others—in agriculture, biology, materials science, anthropology, and politics availability was over 90 percent, while in mathematics it was just 25 percent.

The Thomson Reuters measure is far from perfect, of course. It overrepresents titles with Euro-American origins and excludes many regionally or nationally published titles (which may contain work of particular relevance to Africa). Similarly, taking just 20 journals in each area provides only a snapshot. Yet, availability, assuming of course that it is sustained, is no longer the primary problem. African universities are not so far behind their peers elsewhere, either. Two European institutions had 95 percent availability overall, but it is still a favorable comparison.

Many accounts lament the empty shelves of university libraries, but they tend to miss the huge volume of information that academics and students can now access online.

CONNECTIVITY

Technology is commonly singled out as the principal barrier to access. African universities do not enjoy the same access to the Internet and to good computing facilities, as their peers elsewhere, and still pay considerably more than northern institutions for what they do get. But there have been significant improvements. New undersea cables have brought a high-speed broadband to the east African coast, with new west coast cables also being laid. National research and education networks have begun to deliver this across the region, investing in the terrestrial infrastructure and driving down costs.

Computing facilities are also improving, although demand easily outstrips the gains. Most academics, in the four universities taking part in this study, had a PC (personal computer) on their desk. Student facilities are a bigger issue. Having thousands of journals available means little to a student who queues (and, in some cases, pays)

to use a crowded computer lab. But infrastructure aside, “e-readiness” appears to be the greater challenge—the need for universities to change attitudes and approaches to technology.

AWARENESS AND SKILLS

If availability is good and technology is steadily improving, what else accounts for an academic’s inability to get the needed research? A major obstacle appears to be basic awareness. Academics and postgraduates gave lists of titles that were essential but unavailable; yet, 72 percent of these publications turned out to be already within current subscriptions. While librarians work hard to communicate with their users, the messages clearly do not always connect. Partly, this is down to the complexity of routes in—different databases, collections, archives, back files—and insufficiently targeted support where libraries profile their wares by discipline or research theme. The disassociation of articles from their parent publications in online collections means that some academics have relatively little awareness of major journals in their field.

A critical facet of any contemporary researcher is online search skills—more than just an ability to tap words in Google. Screen recordings revealed simplistic search strategies that left much-high-quality, peer reviewed content and subscriptions undiscovered.

ORGANIZATIONAL BARRIERS

While a great deal depends on technology and individual skills, wider organization dynamics account for a lot, as well. Many of the departments, whose staff we spoke to, engaged in relatively little research. The demands of teaching—and in some cases the ability to earn an additional salary through evening teaching—and the lure of better-paid consultancies not only takes academics’ time but also erodes research cultures. Likewise, not much use of scholarly journals is required for that matter.

Further organizational challenges exist within and outside of libraries. The delinking of libraries and academic departments and the resultant low status of librarians, underdeveloped relationships between libraries and information technology departments—which now have evermore converging mandates—all seemed to play a role.

Libraries, too, need to increase the skills, confidence, and motivation of their staff and to take a more proactive approach. Information skills ought to be a greater part of research-methods courses, for example, and librarians may have a role to play here. The strength of libraries depends on their links to academic faculties, but the strengths of research and teaching depend on the quality of their libraries, as well. ■

Closing the Digital Gap in African Higher Education

ANNA BON

Anna Bon is at the Center for International Cooperation, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands. E-mail: a.bon@cis.vu.nl.

In the past decades, information and communications technologies (ICTs) have fundamentally changed higher education and research, with the emergence of the World Wide Web—the greatest human-information construct in history—and the introduction of ICTs in teaching and learning, which spurred new interactive dynamic-learning methodologies and enabled cross-cultural and flexible collaborative interactions. ICTs have become essential for higher education, as an infrastructure, a channel for information and communications, and a tool that helps drive innovation.

FOR BOTTLENECKS IN THE ICT INFRASTRUCTURE

Currently, many sub-Saharan African universities are lagging behind in the deployment of ICTs, compared to peer institutes on other continents. A variety of technical weaknesses in the basic physical ICT infrastructure can often be observed at many sub-Saharan African universities—where Internet capacity (bandwidth) is usually insufficient, shortages of computer equipment and software are widespread, energy supplies are unreliable, information is poorly secured, and technical end-user support is often absent. It is evident that this state of ICT infrastructures has to improve.

Over the past few years, African universities made great efforts to close the digital gap by building physical ICT infrastructures and implementing information systems. Often with support of externally funded projects, computers were acquired and campus networks were built. Student-information systems were installed and connections to the Internet put in place. Yet, the main challenges relate to teaching and learning, creating an adequate research infrastructure, and delivering high-level experts for African society.

OPPORTUNITIES OF ICTS

African universities need a good ICT infrastructure—first, as a channel for distance education—which is considered of highest importance for Africa. ICT-enabled distance education in Africa is believed to increase educational coverage. Moreover, distance education can reduce enrollment costs and facilitate access, as an example, for women and geographically isolated people.

ICTs are necessary to improve research capacity. Although research is encouraged through higher education policies, academic publishing at African universities remains in poor state, and research infrastructures are still inadequate. ICT networks can provide a channel toward participation in international research communities, enabling publishing and joint-knowledge creation.

Africa needs good education programs to deliver high-level ICT experts for the labor market. Currently, many private ICT academies exist in Africa, delivering network specialists and system administrators—important experts at the vocational level. However, Africa also needs ICT expertise at the master of science and PhD level, to fill the high-level positions in industry and society, and to enable ICT research in the local context of Africa. The latter is indispensable, because the existing problems of the “digital gap” can only be solved with knowledge of the local context.

Many sub-Saharan African universities are lagging behind in the deployment of ICTs, compared to peer institutes on other continents.

CHALLENGES

The technical shortcomings in the ICT infrastructure at many African universities are often attributed to external factors. Indeed, high costs of ICT equipment and maintenance represent challenges for African universities that are permanently short of the budget. Another external factor hampering the proper deployment of ICTs in higher education is “brain drain” of ICT staff, because universities are unable to offer competitive salaries.

Donor-funded ICT projects, with investment budgets for ICT infrastructure, only solve the equipment shortage temporarily but often fail to establish sustainable solutions for institutional ICT management. Often, more emphasis is put on the technical implementation of information systems and virtual learning environments, than on the use of these ICT tools within the local context.

Despite many external factors hampering ICTs, higher education institutes in Africa can take measures to raise the quality of ICTs within the institutional walls, by improving on ICT governance, and creating organizational culture and climate that allows innovation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION

Definitely, ICT governance must be improved at the organizational level. Top managers need to understand the role of ICTs in their organization and focus on service delivery, project management, and organizational culture. They must be aware that introduction of ICTs always causes changes in organizational culture. An open dialogue between end users, the ICT service unit, and higher management is essential, in the process of organizational change and the adoption of innovations.

From the point of view of research, studies on how to adapt ICTs within the local African context are crucial for African higher education. One example of a specific African condition, related to ICTs, is the recent spread of mobile telephony within African society. This phenomenon creates opportunities for new methods of (mobile) learning and knowledge sharing among people with low-reading skills and low incomes. Research topics—such as, development of “Web 2.0” tools for rural development, mobile learning, and knowledge sharing in rural communities—are a few examples of ICT-related research topics, which can be relevant in the African context.

African universities need a good ICT infrastructure—first, as a channel for distance education—which is considered of highest importance for Africa.

A useful example of a research methodology in the African context is the Living Labs concept, which applies a systematic approach of user co-creation in the development of new products and ICT services. The concept is user centered, makes use of collective intelligence and community activities, and may result in reinvention and adoption of “travelling ideas.” In South Africa, Living Labs are now being used, for example, in the Meraka Institute. This concept may soon spread to other research groups in Africa.

If African universities are to succeed in their role as innovators for society, an innovative climate is needed for research and education to flourish. Opinion leaders play an important role in the spread of innovations. Nevertheless, innovation processes take time and never occur overnight. African universities need to convert themselves into learning organizations, in which knowledge is not static but rather dynamically linked to action and creating favorable conditions for knowledge transfer and co-creation of knowledge. In such an environment the mind-set of the opinion

leaders, be it managers or researchers, is of greater significance than the availability of technical solutions. ■

Student Activism and the “Global University” in Tanzania

ROSS BENBOW

Ross Benbow is a doctoral candidate in International and Comparative Education at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. E-mail: rjbenbow@wisc.edu.

In late 2010, university students at the Tanzanian University of Dar es Salaam, the country’s oldest and most prestigious university, were threatening to call boycotts—protesting the government management of its cost-sharing scheme. By February of this year, student fee-related troubles engulfed the university as students walked out of classes and marched into the city, only to be beaten back by the infamous government-deployed riot police, of the Field Force Unit, who used batons and tear gas to disperse the crowd. Two students were shot, and dozens were arrested. Student leaders eventually negotiated an end to hostilities with administration officials for a temporary stipend increase, though no long-term solutions were found.

RECENT DEMONSTRATIONS

The student rationales for protest in late 2010 and early 2011 were similar to those that drove student strikes at the University of Dar es Salaam in November 2008, when thousands of undergraduates boycotted classes and marched through campus, carrying placards. The 2008 protests became a political football in the country and led to a two-month university shut down, though they were not marred by the violence usually associated with Field Force Unit deployment. They also led to no discernible change in policy.

This issue all followed recent university student demonstrations across much of sub-Saharan Africa—in countries including Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and South Africa. These actions, like university protests around the globe, were responses to pocketbook issues: University budgets have been tightening, fees increasing, and students squeezed for more resources—as the state retreats ever further from education funding. Tanzania’s demonstrations,

in a way, are not different. There, students have been incensed at one government practice, in particular: “means testing” for student loans, an outgrowth of Tanzania’s cost-sharing policies.

MEANS TESTING AND INEQUITY IN LOANS

Structural-adjustment pressures and economic liberalization through the 1980s had led to the increased privatization of education in Tanzania, first at the basic and secondary levels and then at the university level. While the government had allowed for the provision of higher education among institutions under private ownership, as part of this policy shift, the introduction of cost-sharing measures in public universities was also integral to the initiative. To ameliorate the difficulties that many Tanzanian students would face in paying increased fees, the cost-sharing policy was coupled with government-funded loans—first, for public-university students in the early 1990s and, then, for the country’s private-university student population in 2004. To gauge each student’s ability to meet the financial obligations of higher education, the Higher Education Student Loan Board developed a means-testing application, on which university students would report their parents’ backgrounds and economic activities—information that would then be corroborated by local leaders. In theory, the system was designed to ensure that students from economically disadvantaged families received government loans to fully cover the cost of higher education. Students from more-privileged backgrounds, then, would receive lower levels of loan assistance or none at all.

Structural-adjustment pressures and economic liberalization through the 1980s had led to the increased privatization of education in Tanzania.

The means-testing system, however, had not been working according to plan. Even if the student loan board had access to all the necessary financial information on applicants and their families (difficult in a country without widespread electronic-banking records), the board was reportedly underfunded, understaffed, and besieged by the tens of thousands of applications. The reporting difficulties, and the board’s inability to thoroughly investigate applicant claims, led to inequities in the way loan money was distributed. Coupled with continuing allocation problems and the scattered stories of rich students receiving 100 percent loan

coverage, as poor students skipped meals or were unable to even reach campus at all, the University of Dar es Salaam student leaders called for the elimination of the means-testing system, under threat of boycott.

STUDENT PROTEST AND UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

To be sure, student activism has been common at the University of Dar es Salaam, not only in the last decade but throughout its history, and has played an important role in the institution’s development. As the country’s flagship university, the institution that would become this university was a key part of Tanzania’s larger developmental strategy. Yet, the university and its students presented Julius Nyerere—the country’s founding father, first president, and creator of “African socialism”—with a conundrum. In

Nyerere, like other rulers in sub-Saharan Africa, had frequently violent run-ins with university students through the late 1960s and 1970s.

the 1960s, the newly independent Tanzania desperately needed the skilled manpower and highly trained workers that only a university could provide. However, in the view of President Nyerere and others, investments in elite students and their institution were made “on the backs” of the country’s peasantry and were only reinforcing a system that was exacerbating inequalities. Nyerere, like other rulers in sub-Saharan Africa, had frequently violent run-ins with university students through the late 1960s and 1970s, as the government increasingly drew the University of Dar es Salaam into central-planning initiatives. Student protests would only intensify with democratization and privatization measures through the 1980s and 1990s.

UNIVERSITY RESPONSES TO GLOBALIZATION

The case of Tanzanian student protests—and their links to wider university unrest in the era of neoliberalization—can inform wider discussions in many ways. Despite the failure of many scholars to include sub-Saharan countries, like Tanzania, in “global” education models, there are strong similarities between the experiences of Tanzanian students and those of other countries in sub-Saharan Africa with students around the world. Education policies have grown out of Tanzania’s economic liberalization, structural adjustment, and increasing involvement in marketized aspects of the global economy in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, in-

cluding cost-sharing and educational privatization. These policies have confronted Tanzanian students with different financial and philosophical expectations, just as they have confronted students around the world. Tanzania's community-minded, and state-centered, educational history under President Julius Nyerere might put recent neoliberal policies in starker relief. For Tanzanian students, nevertheless, the state's retreat from large-scale public employment, the increasing competition for regional white-collar jobs from other educated East Africans, and the rhetorical emphasis on the "entrepreneurial" creativity only serve to reinforce the new economic realities within the global "market."

At the same time, lest one is lulled into too strong a sense of institutional isomorphism, it can be seen that student activism in the country is also a product of the economic, social, and cultural history of Tanzania—not to mention the specific and sometimes competing political projects of the various iterations of the Tanzanian state from independence to contemporary times. The oft-mentioned idea of the "Global University"—a supposedly universal model characterized by cross-border competition for graduate students, the proliferation of collegiate-ranking systems, and the race to build state-of-the-art research programs in science and technology—simply does not describe the reality of Tanzanian higher education, where administrators and policymakers struggle to expand an undergraduate-focused system, research output is negligible, and gifted doctoral students and the resources they represent primarily flow *out* of the country. Tanzanian universities and university students—like those in Chile, Spain, Germany, and the United States, among others—represent only one in an endless number of responses to globalization. ■

Polish Private Higher Education, Politics, and Demographics

MAREK KWIEK

Marek Kwiek is a professor and director at the Center for Public Policy Studies, Poznan University, Poznan, Poland. E-mail: kwiekm@amu.edu.pl.

The global growth of private higher education included the last two decades of the sector's demand-absorbing growth in Poland. Poland is the 6th-largest higher education system in the European Union (1.9 million students),

with the highest enrollments in the private sector in Europe (633,000 students and 33.3%, in 2009). After almost 20 years of continuous growth, the sector suffered a 10 percent decline in enrollments in 2009 and a further decline in 2010. Under new demographic pressures, expected to cut the number of candidates for studies in both public and private higher education by almost half in the next 10 years, political intervention may be necessary to ensure academic survival; and public subsidies may be used for this purpose.

DEMAND-ABSORBING GROWTH

In the 1990s, when the first private institutions appeared throughout central and eastern Europe, higher education policy was focused mostly on educational expansion. Private (called "nonpublic") institutions in Poland and elsewhere in the region were mushrooming; there were limited quality-assurance mechanisms and accreditation procedures in place at the time. Between 1990 and 2009, 330 private institutions materialized in Poland and about 700 in central and eastern Europe. The expansion was closely linked to the economic policy that encouraged external privatization (the emergence of new private providers) and internal privatization (the emergence of fee-based, part-time studies in the nominally free, or tax-based, public sector). Student numbers in Poland were skyrocketing. In 1990 there were 400,000 students; in 1995 their number already doubled (795,000); and by the end of the decade, the number quadrupled (1.6 million in 2000). In the 2000s, the expansion was considerably slower, although the number of new private providers was still substantially increasing (to 330 in 2009). During times of educational expansion, political noninterference and relaxed academic and infrastructural requirements were key issues. There were evermore students in the private sector, and an estimated 30 to 40 percent of academics from the public sector held parallel employment in the private sector, mostly able to maintain middle-class standards of living, while university salaries were falling behind salaries of other professionals in the postcommunist transition period.

CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS

Today demographics seem to be transforming everything, and politics may be called to intervene. The expansion of the private sector seems to be over. Consequently, private higher education is desperately looking for survival strategies, in the face of declining student numbers in the next 10 years. Current Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-based demographic projections for Poland show that in 2022 the number of students will constitute 55 to 60 percent of the 2008 level. The annual number of all candidates for studies will drop from about 490,000 in 2008 to about 260,000 in 2022. What is going to happen

to the fee-based private sector if all candidates could potentially be accommodated by the tax-funded public sector? How can students be recruited to a sector with a relatively low social legitimacy and in which studies have to be paid for—rather than to the traditionally free (tax-based) and more prestigious public sector?

In the 1990s, when the first private institutions appeared throughout central and eastern Europe, higher education policy was focused mostly on educational expansion.

NEW SURVIVAL STRATEGIES

The solution could be in high-quality education that matches education and labor-market needs and achieves high-social recognition. But the past policy of noninterference and loose governmental control contributed to low competitiveness of the private sector, vis-à-vis the public sector. A handful of exceptions (between 5% and 10% of all private institutions) does not make a big difference but needs to be noted. Therefore, currently, the private sector is seeking political interference and expecting state subsidies. Private institutions in central Europe (called “independent private” institutions by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, as opposed to “government-dependent private” institutions) are generally reliant on fees and do not receive public subsidies. Until now, the private sector in Poland was nearly fully financed by fees, and in 2009 their income formed 93.1 percent from fees and only 1.8 percent from research.

How do institutions respond when their public legitimacy is low, the number of their students in the next decade is expected to plummet by 50 to 80 percent, their only mission is teaching, and their access to public research funding is marginal? They try to turn to politicians for public support and seek new survival strategies. Since demographics cannot be altered, the private sector is seeking to redefine national policy. In good times of ever-increasing student numbers, the independence of the private sector from the state was key. Diploma mills were proliferating throughout the country, full-time staff in the private sector were almost nonexistent, and many institutions did not really care much about the quality of education—as long as there were students willing to pay for it.

The public response to the possibility of the introduction of fees for full-time students in the public sector re-

mains unequivocally negative. The political response to the possibility of subsidization of education in the private sector is still unclear, but recently (February 2011), the ministry expressed willingness to open the door for public funding to private institutions. The idea was that all full-time students in the sector—110,000 (or 17% of the private sector enrollment)—might be subsidized by the state. That would be a small step with long-term consequences and a radical redefinition of national educational policy.

ASSESSMENT OF THE NEEDED PRIVATE SECTOR

But before channeling public funding (other than competitive research grants, open to both sectors) to private institutions, a fair assessment of 20 years of their operation should be undertaken. What is the added value of their contribution—to society, the economy, and the higher education system as a whole? How are their graduates welcomed in the labor market? The private sector’s contribution to increasing equitable access to higher education is undeniable: Studies in private institutions, as well as fee-based, part-time studies in public institutions, opened up higher education to lower socioeconomic strata to an unprecedented extent. Consequently, the labor force in Poland has been increasingly better educated (there was an increase in the number of people with higher education credentials active in the labor market from 2.56 million in 2003 to 4.31

Today demographics seem to be transforming everything, and politics may be called to intervene. The expansion of the private sector seems to be over.

million in 2009—or from 15.35% to almost one quarter or 24.7% in the share of labor force). But what can also be shown is the gradual denigration of the research mission of public universities, from which the private-sector staff are recruited. Low research intensity and low international visibility in central Europe (in particular in Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Latvia, and Estonia), although caused by multiple factors, may also be related to redefined academic norms that allowed “academic moonlighting” in the private sector.

CONCLUSION

What will probably happen, next? The potentially shrinking private sector, to be able to survive, may be increasingly turning to politicians to get increased access to state subsi-

dies. Vague notions of the “intersectoral” competition and “public remonopolization” of higher education may be increasingly evoked in public debates. State subsidies for full-time students in the private sector, if introduced, may be the first step in private institutions’ long march for public funding.

Recent Polish higher education reforms are most welcome, radically changing the rules of the game. They should not lead to the state-funded survival of private institutions before the two decades of their history have not been adequately evaluated. Polish private-sector growth, followed by its possible decline or its survival based on future public subsidies, may be showing possible patterns of development during hard times in other parts of the globe, where declining demographics are expected and the private sector is funded almost exclusively by fees. Its future is still open: Both demographics and politics will play their substantial roles in the next decade. The role of demographics is predictable, but the role of politics is not. ■

Private Higher Education in Pakistan

NELOFER HALAI

Nelofer Halai is associate professor at the Institute for Educational Development, Aga Khan University, Karachi-75950, Pakistan. E-mail: nelofer.halai@aku.edu.

The demand for higher education all over the world, especially in the developing world, has fueled a tremendous growth of private universities. Countries such as India and China, for example, possess increasing space for private universities to flourish either independently or through private-public or private-international partnerships. However, almost without exception the private universities being established in developing countries are of poor quality, and in this case Pakistan is no exception.

PROMOTION BY THE STATE

Private university education constitutes a relatively recent development in Pakistan. The Aga Khan University was the first private university chartered in 1983, followed by Lahore University of Management Sciences in 1985. The growth of private universities was slow to start, but by 2000 the number had jumped to 10. This sector has now mushroomed to 60, as compared to more than 70 in the public sector, and enrolls roughly a quarter of the student population. The

private sector can play a major role in human-resource development in Pakistan if, together with enhancing access, the institutions can provide high-quality education. At this point, the focus is on increasing access to larger numbers of students but not sufficiently on quality of education.

INCREASE IN ACCESS

The growth in the number of both private and public universities has contributed to increased access for students. The Higher Education Commission, established in 2002 for improvement and promotion of higher education, has maintained accurate records of this growth. Enrollment of all students from 2002–2009 has tripled from 275,000 to 800,000. This number includes 115,000 students in private universities. Access to students in the 18-to-23-year-age range has more than doubled—from 2.2 percent to 4.7 percent in the last five years. This is close to the projected increase to 5 percent by 2010, and the long-term goal is to drive this to at least 10 percent. Hence, even this expansion is not sufficient to reach this goal and to keep pace with the demand as student enrollments grow sharply. By 2010, it is estimated, Pakistan will need to accommodate 1.3 million students at the tertiary level.

Private university education constitutes a relatively recent development in Pakistan.

QUALITY ISSUES

The Higher Education Commission ranking of universities in Pakistan, conducted in 2006, illustrates that the quality of higher education offered by the private sector is of low status. Lahore University of Management Sciences and the Aga Khan University—two private-sector universities at the top in the category of business, information technology, and health sciences—are the exception rather than the norm. Private universities are dogged with problems in all of the five elements, assessed by the Higher Education Commission, that contribute toward a low quality of educational experience. In particular, the paucity of qualified faculty and limited research and research output are two areas that need a great deal of attention. The lack of these two key qualities allow private universities to be seen as institutions that encourage rote memorization to pass an examination to obtain degrees rather than providing intellectual growth for students. In part, the proliferation is motivated by the

relatively easy process to establish a university in the private sector, as Higher Education Commission's criteria are not very stringent or even rigorously implemented.

MARKET ORIENTATION

Unsurprisingly, private-sector investment is focused in areas that are in high demand but do not require large investments. While they are agile institutions able to respond to market needs in professional education, private universities have been less responsive to the needs of the country in other areas. For instance, considering the abysmal level of social sciences, Pakistan needs strong social science education. However, there appears to be little focus on this topic.

PRIVATE EDUCATION IS EXPENSIVE

Private higher education is also quite expensive. The average per capita income in Pakistan is US\$370 per year, while the average fees for a master's-degree program is estimated as at least US\$1,000–1,500 per year. Obviously these costs are beyond the capacity of an average Pakistani to afford. To bring into fold the student population that lacks the ability to pay, the private sector needs to put into place a transparent but vigorous program of financial support.

Unsurprisingly, private-sector investment is focused in areas that are in high demand but do not require large investments.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Supporters of private higher education consider government institutions as wasteful and inefficient by hiring incompetent faculty who are not held accountable for their performance. Private universities are more efficient and can offer high-quality education at a lower cost than government institutions and can and will eventually start competing with international universities. The private school sector is portrayed as a system where private investment has enhanced both access and quality. However, this sector has also created "educational apartheid," where those who can afford the costs obtain access to quality education; but those who cannot are forced to study in low-quality government schools.

An exception has been demonstrated by private schools that have been funded by philanthropic agencies or educational trusts. Such schools have been able to provide high-

quality schooling at a reasonable cost to students. In the same way, universities established on an altruistic basis rather than as business ventures have been able to uphold standards. Hence, encouraging the establishment of private universities by similar family trusts or philanthropic organizations might help to enhance access and maintain quality.

A WAY FORWARD

Thus, private university education in Pakistan, barring a few exceptions, is of low quality. If the situation is to change, active government engagement and involvement—by putting in place tough quality-assurance measures that are stringently implemented—are essential. The private universities can deliver both quality and access if the government policies encourage them to do so. ■

Internationalizing Quality Assessment in Central Asia

MARTHA C. MERRILL, SHAKHNOZA YAKUBOVA, AND ZHAZIRA TURLANBEKOVA

Martha C. Merrill, who worked in Kyrgyzstan from 1996–2001, is an associate professor of higher education at Kent State University in Ohio. E-mail: mmerril@kent.edu. Shakhnoza Yakubova is the registrar at the Kazakhstan Institute for Management and Strategic Research. E-mail: syakubov@kent.edu. Zhazira Turlanbekova is a graduate student in higher education administration at Kent State University. E-mail: zturlanb@kent.edu.

Higher education institutions in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan have started internationalizing quality-assessment procedures, while those in Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan have not. The differences concern politics (the willingness of national leadership to be transparent, internally and externally) and economics (the nation's ability to finance educational reform and to resist inappropriate "educational exports" of donor nations) more than educational quality. Quality assessment refers to evaluation, whereas assurance implies an audience: Who needs to be assured of quality? The implementation of transparent assessment processes is a first step in assuring students, funders, and potential partners of an institution's quality.

TURKMENISTAN, UZBEKISTAN, TAJIKISTAN: RESISTANCE

Turkmenistan's president, Gurganbuly Berdymukhammedov, prefers that Turkmen students and professors avoid

external influences. In 2009 and 2010, Turkmenistan refused exit to students planning to study abroad, even at the American University in Central Asia. In February 2011, the government imposed new restrictions on students and faculty, although in March it recognized foreign degrees. However, in April 2011, reports circulated that students returning from abroad for the summer would not be allowed to leave. Educational content and processes are highly politicized; candid assessment by external reviewers is unthinkable.

Uzbekistan participates in a broader range of European Union–funded education programs, than does Turkmenistan, and hosts three international universities.

Uzbekistan participates in a broader range of European Union–funded education programs, than does Turkmenistan, and hosts three international universities. It claims intentions to adopt Bologna process reforms on its TEMPUS (Trans-European Mobility Scheme for University Studies) Uzbekistan Web page. However, higher education remains under strict government control, and Uzbekistan is unlikely to establish a nongovernmental assessment agency, as the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area require. Even less likely is evaluation by international specialized accrediting agencies or agencies in the European Quality Assurance Register that are certified to conduct audits outside their home countries.

Tajikistan is the poorest of the former-Soviet republics, with a gross domestic product per capita of US\$2,000. Political leaders discourage alternative ideas; even before the current Middle East unrest, parents were asked to bring students home from foreign Islamic schools; and Tajikistan's only private university regularly is threatened with closure. Both Tajikistan's ability to support higher education reform financially and its willingness to insert external critiques into its unsteady political balance are limited.

KYRGYZSTAN: COMPLICATIONS AND “KASHA”

Kyrgyzstan's picture is complex. With 40 percent of its population in poverty, yet the only central Asian member of the World Trade Organization, it has made commitments in four of the five education sectors of the General Agreement on Trade in Services and therefore could be open to providers from WTO members who see education as a “service.”

Both the most politically unstable and the most internationally open nation in central Asia, Kyrgyzstan hosts universities established by Russia, Turkey, Kuwait, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Aga Khan Foundation, and a Turkish Sufi order, plus the American University in Central Asia, which gives dual degrees with Bard College; branches of seven Russian universities, and two medical schools that teach in English, to attract South Asian students. Kyrgyzstani universities have programs based on contact hours and credit hours (sometimes both in the same institution); Soviet-style diplomas, candidates of sciences (*kandidat nauks*), and doctor of sciences (*doktor nauks*), three-year European-style bachelor's degrees; four-year US-style bachelor's degrees and one- and two-year master's degrees. Local educators call the system *kasha*—literally, porridge, but in slang, “a mess.” Kyrgyzstan actively participates in Soros-funded, European Union–funded, and US Agency for International Development–funded programs, has a nationwide network of Bologna process centers, and, with TEMPUS funding, developed “Tuning Project” learning outcomes in 11 disciplines in 13 institutions.

The European Tuning Project, however, is based on different assumptions than those operating in Kyrgyzstan, including institutions' ability to change curricula in response to employer and alumni perceptions. Similarly, the assumptions of the Manual for Organizing an Internal System to Guarantee the Quality in Higher Education Insti-

Kyrgyzstan hosts universities established by Russia, Turkey, Kuwait, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Aga Khan Foundation, and a Turkish Sufi order, plus the American University in Central Asia, which gives dual degrees with Bard College.

tutions in the Kyrgyz Republic—produced in 2007 by the Ministry of Education, Soros Foundation, and the Educational Association “EdNet”—also raise concerns. Whereas the Tuning Project focuses on the design and fulfillment of learning objectives, the European Foundation for Quality Management model emphasizes business functions, with minimal attention to assessing learning. Another externally funded project, the TEMPUS-supported Central Asian Network for Quality Assurance and Accreditation—involving Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Tajikistan—holds useful conferences but has limited influence.

In August 2009, the Ministry of Education signaled intentions to implement Bologna process reforms, and Kyrgyzstan attended the First Bologna Policy Forum in Louvain-la-Neuve in April 2009. Yet, a 2008 report on accreditation (by Amy Kirle Lezberg, a US Agency for International Development contractor) seems more widely known in Bishkek than the European quality-assessment processes; and in March 2011, the US agency sponsored a conference on accreditation and assessment at Issyk-Kul.

KAZAKHSTAN: BOLOGNA REFORMS AND EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Kazakhstan began internationalizing higher education soon after independence. Between 1991 and 2000, universities with ties to Turkey, Russia, the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Aga Khan Foundation were established; and the Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics, and Strategic Research—which, like half a dozen others, teaches in English—opened in 1992. Nazarbayev University, named after Kazakhstan's president and aiming to be a “world-class” university, was inaugurated on June 28, 2010.

Kazakhstan introduced bachelor's, master's and PhD degrees in 2004; in 2007, the Law on Education confirmed this structure. Universities seek dual-degree partners in Europe and the United States. The former minister of education, Zhanseit Tuimenbayev, frequently called international-program accreditation an important goal. However, a national accreditation process began only in 2005, with the creation of the National Accreditation Agency, followed in 2008 by the independent International Quality Assurance Agency. Kazakhstan's initial Bologna Process National Report says the National Accreditation Agency approved 10 institutions, in 2009. The International Quality Assurance Agency ranked 60 institutions in 2008 but accredited only 6. Nevertheless, many Kazakhstani universities seek program accreditation through international agencies such as ASIIN (the German science and engineering accrediting agency), ACQUIN (the Accreditation, Certification and Quality Assurance Institute from Bayreuth, Germany), ABET (the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology), AACSB (the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business), and others. Staff member Magdalena Lieb says ACQUIN has reviewed six universities in Kazakhstan. ABET accredited the Kazakh National Technical University's Metallurgical Engineering program in 2008.

Although Kazakhstan was accepted into the Bologna process in March 2010, many educators may not thoroughly understand the requirements. For example, the National Qualifications Frameworks, described in the State Plan for the Development of Education 2011–2020, sound more like

Soviet-era classifiers than the Bologna definition of broad skills all degree holders at each level require.

UNEVEN PROGRESS

Internationalized quality assessment is progressing unevenly throughout central Asia, due to political choices and finances, not educational needs. Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan do not desire external scrutiny. Tajikistan is too poor and too unstable to finance and accept the disruptions that reform might cause. Kyrgyzstan, equally poor and unstable, seems willing to accept whatever donors are willing to fund. Kazakhstan, economically stable and a Bologna process signatory, boasts the most internationalized quality-assessment processes in the region. However, since its president, Nursultan Nazarbayev, was re-elected in April 2011 with 95 percent of the vote, observers might question the determinants of institutional rankings and national assessments. Transparent assessment processes are not yet the norm, even in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. ■

Quality Assurance in China: The Changing Context

KATHRYN MOHRMAN

Kathryn Mohrman is professor, at the School of Public Affairs, Arizona State University. E-mail: kmohrman@asu.edu. Special thanks to Wang Yingjie and Li Xu of Beijing Normal University for their contributions to the longer article from which this is adapted.

In the last 30 years, virtually every aspect of higher education in China has been altered. Rather than an educational system run from Beijing, China has moved toward a more market-oriented system, in which the government focuses on quality—through a combination of American accreditation processes and European “steering at a distance.”

THE CONTEXT

The system developed within the context of five major factors, and the key is massification. But since increases in funding have not kept pace with enrollment growth, the support per student declined—along with reduced quality. Undergraduate teaching was neglected; a new faculty assessment process focuses on research productivity, encouraging professors to devote more of their energies to publications. The regulatory burden was placed on colleges and universities by early evaluation schemes. The changing relationship between government and higher education

institutions has signified greater autonomy for colleges and universities.

Finally, in the context of internationalization, China chose to align its quality-assurance system with comparable programs in Europe and the United States, although the stakes are higher (in terms of funding levels and enrollment quotas, for example) than is the case in many Western countries.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Starting in 2003, the Chinese Ministry of Education announced a series of indicators to be used in assessment of undergraduate education—including mission, academic resources, instructional development, and learning outcomes. Almost 600 universities were evaluated by the ministry on a five-year cycle of undergraduate instructional assessment.

The process is a combination of European and American systems of assessment and evaluation. Institutions begin with a self-study—comparing their instructional conditions, administrative practices, strengths, and weaknesses with the indicators published by the ministry. Course evaluations, filled out by undergraduates every semester, are now required components of institutional self-assessment. However, the information is not always used for continuous improvement purposes, as much as satisfying the evaluation requirements.

Next is a site visit by a visiting team of experts, followed by a team report to the relevant ministry office. Unlike the American system, the self-study, team reports, and final report are not necessarily confidential; the ministry plans to post such documents on its Web site in the future.

The development of a quality-assurance system has been a positive example of communication between the Ministry of Education and institutions, with changes in policy and procedures, based on the experience of the first five-year cycle. For example, all institutions of higher education were initially evaluated on the same criteria, but it became clear that large research universities and small technical colleges should not be held to the same standards. As a result, the ministry created a differentiated system, in which mission and unique factors were taken into account.

Similarly, critics focused on inappropriate or vague indicators. In response to these concerns, the ministry sharpened its definitions, provided greater detail, and shifted toward qualitative reporting rather than the initial highly quantitative approach. In addition, the ministry now offers examples of good plans for educational improvement, faculty development, campus construction, and so on, to provide guidance to institutions undergoing evaluation.

A significant problem with the system has been fraud

and corruption. Because of the high stakes involved in the quality-assurance process, institutions falsified data to avoid reduced funding and lower enrollment quotas. The Ministry of Education has instructed its examiners to be alert to suspicious statistics; in addition it plans to collect its own set of basic statistics to mitigate the reliance on institutional data. Also, some universities provided lavish gifts, stipends, and accommodations to the visiting team; the ministry has issued strict regulations against luxuries and bribes.

People also question the surprisingly high proportion of institutions receiving “excellent” ratings, exceeding 80 percent, in 2007. Critics also worry that institutions have not woven quality assurance into the fabric of the institution but rather devote all their energies to the site-visit process, once every five years.

People also question the surprisingly high proportion of institutions receiving “excellent” ratings, exceeding 80 percent, in 2007.

Overall, the quality-assurance process has had positive effects on Chinese higher education. Colleges and universities are paying more attention to undergraduate education; in fact, full professors are now expected to teach undergraduates regularly. Institutions are also investing more of their own resources in libraries, laboratories, classrooms, faculty development, and other educational enhancements. In addition, universities have also engaged more seriously in strategic planning around the undergraduate programs; the most successful institutions were granted greater autonomy, as a result. Many of the current issues in Chinese higher education—innovative pedagogy, developing creativity in students, more interdisciplinary work—have come about in part because of greater attention to the quality of the undergraduate programs. Based on current successes, the quality-assurance process is being extended to the graduate level as well.

In November 2010, the Ministry of Education announced the creation of the National Higher Education Quality Assurance and Evaluation Institutions Coordination Association. Including more than 200-member institutions, the association is an organization comparable to the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation in the United States.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

China has been clearly moving from the state as education provider to the state as regulator, facilitator, and coordinator. Critics of the system believe, however, that the ministry's control is still too strong. The quality-assurance system requires that institutions themselves implement reforms, yet their autonomy is still limited. Scholars such as Ka-ho Mok describe it as "centralized decentralization," in which operational decentralization is combined with recentralization of strategic command; Mok believes that the government's role has been strengthened rather than diminished by current policy changes.

Some interesting counterexamples do exist. In 2010, three separate groups of universities announced unilaterally that they would administer their own entrance examinations, alongside the national higher education entrance (*GaoKao*) test. The universities will consider both scores in deciding which applicants to admit. Although it appears to be a competition among universities for students, it is also considered as the universities' direct action for autonomy in quality assurance—without waiting for the Ministry of Education's directives.

The system will continue to evolve in China. Recent policy pronouncements, such as the National Mid-long Term Plan for Education Reform and Development (2010–2020), highlight the importance of quality assurance, if China hopes to achieve its goals of economic and social development. Marketlike structures will continue to encourage nonstate investment in higher education—by families, students, and private enterprises, alike—to meet a seemingly insatiable demand for higher education. ■

The Road to Differentiation in Slovenia

MANJA KLEMENCIC AND JANJA KOMLJENOVIC

Manja Klemencic is a visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, and an independent researcher in Slovenia. E-mail: manja.klemencic@gmail.com. Janja Komljenovic is a PhD student in education policy and works as a part-time researcher at the University of Ljubljana. She is currently employed at Slovenian Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology. E-mail: janja.komljenovic@guest.arnes.si.

The nondifferentiation of higher education institutions is being viewed as one of the key weaknesses of European higher education. Institutional diversification within

national higher education systems is believed necessary to achieve two main goals: increased equity in terms of access to a wider variety of students and greater excellence through institutional specialization. The argument asserts that a single European country, even a large one, cannot sustain several world-class universities similar in function and scope. Furthermore, every country requires a variety of higher education institutions that meet the needs of not only an expanding but also an increasingly diversified body of students. Thus, differences in institutional provision of higher education should address programs, modes of delivery, public service, and other factors. While the diversity of higher education institutions is in principle almost unanimously viewed as a favorable condition, the mechanisms to achieve it are the source for much contention. Governments that call for changes toward differentiation have to back up the rhetoric by a "carrots and sticks" strategy through public-funding mechanisms. Positive financial incentives ("carrots") are proving to be more politically palatable and hence easier to implement than negative financial measures ("sticks"). The case of Slovenia, described in this article, is a case in point.

LACK OF DIFFERENTIATION

A country that became independent from Yugoslavia in 1991 with two million people and covering an area of 20,273 km (equal to the size of Wales or New Jersey) is a home to 3 universities established by the state: University of Ljubljana in central Slovenia, University of Maribor in the northeast, and University of Primorska in the southwest; 2 other universities—University of Nova Gorica and Euro-Mediterranean University—which are a consortium of universities with a seat in Slovenia; and 30 other higher education institutions.

Some obvious differences exist between the three state universities; Ljubljana is significantly older with an enrollment double in size than the other two and is the only university with arts academy. However, regardless of the differences in size and age, the functional differentiation between the three is negligible. They all strive toward offering a complete program of a research university, and in recruitment they target the same group of students—albeit with some regional focus. The objective of each is to be a comprehensive, world-class research university. Nonuniversity higher education institutions—self-standing faculties (a peculiar type of institution found in the former Yugoslav region), higher education colleges, and higher professional schools also—seek upgrades in status ultimately, in order to become universities. Furthermore, higher education institutions within the same disciplines usually offer similar or the same study programs with the same modes of delivery

and target the whole student body without addressing specific student groups or requirements. Finally, Slovenia also lacks a binary higher education system. Both universities and self-standing faculties offer academic and professional programs at the undergraduate level, and they tend to do so also through establishing several regional branches.

Thus, the differentiation of Slovenian higher education so far has been primarily in direction of the emergence of new institutions—including some not established by the state—and new branches of existing institutions both as a response to a booming demand for higher education services. In other words, differentiation so far has been predominantly expansionist and not reductionist.

DIFFERENTIATION AS A POLITICAL PRIORITY

The newly released (but not yet adopted) draft of the Higher Education Strategy 2011–2020 by the Slovenian Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology puts a clear emphasis on institutional diversification next to internationalization, quality, and social dimension—considered the main pillars of the national system’s development. In the area of differentiation it makes two key proposals. First, it proposes to consolidate institutional binarity with a clear “division of labor” between research-oriented universities and professional higher education institutions. Thus, new polytechnics will be established and/or existing professional schools will be prompted to merge.

Second, it calls for institutional profiling—essentially study programs offered by different institutions to become significantly varied by their content and orientation. To achieve this, the strategy proposes a revised system of funding that would allow the institutions to negotiate with the government for substantial additional funding for diversification. On the top of the basic lump sum, the institutions should be able to apply for funding for development and competitiveness, foreseen as 20 percent of the basic funding. The strategy stipulates that these funds will be distributed, based on quality assessments, qualitative measures, and international peer review, as well as via negotiation between universities and government. The exact criteria for distribution of the development funds are still unclear, as they need to be developed in the forthcoming regulation. From the overall strategy it is assumed, however, that the criteria will be based on the four main development pillars (i.e., diversification, internationalization, quality, and social dimensions). The expectation is that institutions will define their strengths and weaknesses and accordingly sharpen their focus toward developing distinct institutional priorities and thus a specific profile of education. An important role is foreseen for the newly established Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency, which serves as the accreditation body for all higher education institutions and study programs.

During cyclical reaccreditation the agency will be able, among other issues, to monitor also the institutions following its diversification strategy.

Finally, the proposal includes granting more freedom to higher education institutions in admissions procedures, to achieve a better overlap between the orientation of the study programs and the candidates enrolling in these programs. Currently, admissions to the undergraduate programs are based on the national testing. Institutions did not and could not develop their own entry requirements. The strategy highlights that new selection procedures must enable fair access and at the same time offer more freedom to higher education institutions to select the most suitable and motivated students for the profile of study programs they offer.

WILL IT WORK?

The “carrots” strategy taken by some other European governments to fight egalitarianism among higher education institutions, most notably Germany’s Excellence Initiative (see article by Daniel Fallon in *IHE*, no. 52, summer 2008), is showing some positive signals toward differentiation. The similar mechanism of competition could also work in Slovenia. However, taking into consideration the smallness of the country and the combination of the aims of the strategy, the funding mechanisms are likely to favor equally the logic of expansionism—such as, awarding excellence, the logic of reductionism, and profiling through cutting down weaker functions. ■

Afghanistan: On the Razor’s Edge

FRED M. HAYWARD

Fred M. Hayward is an independent higher education consultant who has worked in Afghanistan for long periods, starting in 2003. E-mail: haywardfred@hotmail.com.

In the context of the ongoing war in Afghanistan it is easy to miss the progress made in higher education over the last few years. Nonetheless, higher education is on a razor’s edge. Significant government and donor support could move it in the direction it is now ready to go—toward quality improvement, thoughtful expansion, and provision of a sound foundation for development. It could also easily

falter amid demands for unlimited growth and lower standards, as well as the near constant pressure of corruption.

Higher education in Afghanistan was once a leader in the region. More than 30 years of war have left it among the region's laggards. Enrollments fell from 24,300 in the 1990s to 7,800 in 2001. At that time there were no women students or women faculty members, since they had been excluded by the Taliban. More than half the faculty members had fled, some killed or imprisoned; several higher education institutions were closed. Every campus suffered damage. Some had neither water nor electricity; most labs were no longer functional. During part of this time Kabul University was a military base with classes taught elsewhere. Quality fell, with many graduates no longer meeting the needs of employers.

Since 2001, the Ministry of Higher Education has worked to repair and improve the infrastructure. Some new laboratories have been established or upgraded in engineering, information and communications technology, pharmacy, agriculture, and several other faculties; new classrooms and dormitories have been built, though many more are needed. About 500 Afghans have been sent abroad for PhD and master's programs and more than 60 have returned and resumed teaching. Nonetheless, by 2010 only 8 percent of staff had PhDs, 32 percent master's, and the rest only bachelor's degrees. Student numbers have increased by more than 40 percent over the last five years to 63,800 today. Only about half the students who take the *Kankor* (admissions examination) are accepted to higher education institutions. Over the last few years former minister of higher education, Dadfar, and deputy minister, Babury, have cleaned up corruption in the admissions process, restoring integrity to the Ministry of Higher Education and reestablishing the legitimacy of the national entrance examination.

The higher education system suffers from overcentralization. Institutions have little incentive to carry out entrepreneurial activities, since all funds earned must be sent to the Treasury and are seldom returned. The Ministry of Higher Education is committed to decentralization of both finances and administration, but the functional legislation has been stalled in the Parliament for the last two years.

Working with university leaders, the ministry has set the stage for major transformation in higher education. Leaders now recognize the need for major upgrading of the curriculum and development of pedagogy, focusing on problem solving and discussion rather than memorization. New regulations emphasize merit-based recruitment and promotions and, for the first time in decades, there is funding for faculty research.

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

During 2009, in consultation with stakeholders, the Ministry of Higher Education developed a National Higher Education Strategic Plan: 2010–2014, which has been well received. The two primary goals are quality improvement and increased access to higher education. Quality improvement focuses on faculty and staff development, infrastructure upgrading and expansion, curriculum revision, and establishment of a quality-assurance procedure for public and private higher education. Increased access is essential to meet the country's needs, given the critical shortages of well-trained professionals and a potential number of 500,000 high school graduates per year, by 2015. The goal is to double enrollment from 62,000 to 115,000 by 2014 and to encourage the expansion of high-quality private higher education.

The Ministry of Higher Education has worked to increase the number of women faculty and students. The percentage of women students increased from zero in 2001 to 19.3 percent this year. Admissions of women is hampered by the limited number of women's dormitories; only 25 percent of high school graduates are women; and strong opposition to women's education exists in parts of the country. One of the major priorities of the ministry is building more women's dormitories. The number of women faculty members has increased from zero women to 15 percent in 2010. The ministry's efforts are hindered by the small number of women in higher education, social conditions that prevent many women from going abroad for graduate study, the limited number of master's programs in Afghanistan (six), and total lack of PhD programs.

MAJOR CHALLENGES

In spite of substantial progress, the challenges are Herculean. To date, only 10 percent of the projected US\$560 million needed for the strategic plan has been provided, most of it by the World Bank. While donors have been supportive in approval of the strategic plan, little funding has been forthcoming. Although the leadership is committed to change, the process of implementation is daunting. Older faculty members, in particular, are fearful of change. Political and other pressures to thwart the merit system in admissions, recruitment, and promotions present an ongoing struggle. The most difficult issue is that higher education is not a priority of the current government. Only a few national leaders recognize its centrality to economic development and to social progress, nationally. Similarly, for many students and parents the primary interest is jobs, with little concern about knowledge. On the other hand, a growing number of students are demanding quality—worried about their lack of access to current findings in their disciplines, up-to-date-texts, and faculty members active in their fields. Most leaders are committed to high quality and to making

higher education relevant to the needs of Afghanistan. They see many jobs in Afghanistan taken by graduates from India, Pakistan, Turkey, and elsewhere because local graduates do not have the needed training.

Higher education is at a critical juncture in Afghanistan, with the stage set for transformation. With a rather small amount of funding, a major long-term contribution could be made to the future of Afghanistan, creating the conditions for economic and social development, a new culture of learning, and the basis for developing the social conditions for a more open, competitive, and democratic society. The question is whether or not the current opening for transformation will be seized by those donors and others who could do so, or whether in their haste to withdraw from Afghanistan, they will miss the opportunity to leave a legacy that will last far into the future for the young people of Afghanistan. ■

The Riyadh Statement on the World-Class University System

The following statement stems from a major international conference on world-class university systems held at Riyadh, Saudi Arabia on April 19 and 20, 2011. The statement was drafted by the conference steering committee with the participation of the Ministry of Higher Education of Saudi Arabia. It is intended to contribute to the continuing global debate about world-class higher education in the 21st century.

Higher education is central to participation in the global knowledge economy. Universities provide the highly trained personnel required by countries for the 21st-century economy. For individuals, higher education is a key to both knowledge and mobility. For society, universities are rich sources of research, analysis, and commentary. Higher education is central to the knowledge ecology of our age; and creating and sustaining higher education systems to serve society's needs, as well individual aspirations, are a central goal of every nation.

The knowledge ecology has to foster the translation of knowledge—traditional and modern, old and new, global and local, artistic and scientific—from research to practice and practice to research. It has to advance knowledge and its application to address the problems of society. It has to maintain continuity with the past, change the present, and

construct the future. It has to conserve, consume, and create knowledge. It has to unleash the power of knowledge.

In this age of ubiquitous information and global competition, a world-class university system is the engine that can drive the indigenous knowledge ecology of a knowledge-based economy. Such a system should permeate all aspects of the knowledge environment: absorbing global knowledge and localizing it; seeking local knowledge and globalizing it; and discovering new knowledge to add to the global-knowledge ecology. Thus, the system should help apply the best global knowledge to solve local problems and present critical local problems for solutions by the best minds around the globe. The goal is to catalyze innovation and entrepreneurship of ideas, products, and services—by letting the winds of knowledge blow from around the world without losing their identity.

A world-class university system should face both outward and inward at the same time. It should provide opportunities to the best and the brightest of the world, as well as to those citizens denied and deprived of opportunities by circumstances of demography, distance, and other differences. The system should include a diverse spectrum of universities—the globally selective and exclusive as well as the locally open and inclusive—providing access to excellence to all, differentiated by their mission but integrated by their motivation into a synergistic system for the well being of the country.

A world-class university system should have a harmonious mix of research, teaching, service, and development. While some universities in the system may emphasize one of these divisions over another, they should engage a unity of vision in their diverse commitments. Excellence in research often claims the highest prestige and is most easily measured. Rankings of universities, generally based on research alone, are misleading in judging the health of a university system. Excellence in teaching, service, and development must be valued equally in the system as a whole, although individual universities may have specific strengths in research or other areas. A university system needs to be judged holistically, based on its contribution to the knowledge ecology, the economy, and to growth and development of the people.

The success of a world-class university system should be measured by the transformation to the knowledge-based economy and not by the global rankings of its universities.

A world-class university system has to embrace the arts and the sciences, the professions, and the vocations—the philosophical and the practical. It has to encapsulate the mind, body, and soul of the knowledge ecology and the knowledge economy. The activities of some disciplines may be quite well known and others less visible; the outcomes of some may be tangible and of others intangible; the effects

of some may be immediate and of others long-term; and, the contributions of some may be explicit and of others tacit.

All of these aspects of fields of study have to be part of a world-class university system: (1) educate the next generation for citizenship, leadership, and participation in the knowledge economy; (2) provide access as broadly as possible to enhance social mobility; (3) conduct research that will contribute to society and the economy; (4) conduct basic research that will contribute to the advancement of knowledge; (5) interpret, critique, and preserve the cultural patrimony of society; and (6) serve as a forum for discussion and analysis.

A world-class university system is, therefore, complex and differentiated. It includes various kinds of academic institutions that all contribute to the knowledge ecology. Typically, a national university system contains a small number of research universities that offer graduate and professional degrees and are highly selective in terms of students at the top, a much-larger sector of teaching-oriented universities that may conduct limited research and mainly offer undergraduate degrees, and a sector of vocationally oriented post-secondary institutions at the bottom that typically do not offer bachelor's degrees. All of these segments require coordination and articulation in order to serve diverse needs.

CIHE ONLINE: A PLETHORA OF RESOURCES

LIZ REISBERG

Liz Reisberg is research associate at the Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: reisberg@bc.edu.

The Center for International Higher Education has dramatically expanded its presence on the Internet. If you have not visited the CIHE Web site recently, you may now want to. The site has been redesigned to make it more attractive and functional for scholars and practitioners in our field. Sixteen years ago, CIHE's Web site was a pioneer on the Internet, as the first site dedicated to international higher education. CIHE has continued to add new contents since 1995, but this year introduced new technology to support an online database and a search tool that allows customized browsing of the extensive content. In addition, the online presence to additional sites, described below, has been expanded.

The growing presence on the Web reflects CIHE's mission as a research center committed to the free dissemination of research, commentary, and other relevant information about a range of issues relevant to the center's field.

CIHE WEB SITE: WWW.BC.EDU/CIHE

The CIHE Web site hosts several key resources. First, among them, is *International Higher Education*, the quarterly journal. On the Web site, *IHE* can be read online, subscribed

Building a world-class higher education system requires careful coordination of resources and a focus on the entire spectrum of higher education institutions and goals—the big picture rather than just rankings and league tables. This development requires a universal vision, unity of purpose, and a unique identity to build a sustainable knowledge ecology, which in turn can transform the country into a knowledge-based economy. It requires also the capacity to evaluate the effectiveness of academic systems through appropriate benchmarking and quality-assurance arrangements, to ensure that the several levels of the system are functioning successfully. Quality assurance is difficult because of the varied academic responsibilities that need to be measured. In addition, many key aspects of academic work are not easily measured, such as the quality of teaching or the impact of learning on students.

We are committed to a differentiated world-class higher education system that serves the needs of people and society and links higher education institutions globally. ■

(or its subscription updated) to the electronic or print versions, the archive searched, or issues or articles downloaded.

In addition, the Web site includes two departments focused on specific dimensions of international higher education. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA) provides information about trends and developments, new publications, and an editorial series on key issues in the region. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor (HECM) provides information about corruption and fraud, an unfortunate but important area of concern and research.

Searchable database. Finally, the CIHE database has been created, a virtual library hosting a wide range of resources. A sophisticated interface allows visitors to customize their search on a range of criteria that can be as simple as a country or as complex as the combination of author, country, and topic.

In addition to the *IHE* archives, scholars have been included in different areas of expertise in the "Experts database," a catalog of journals in the field, international conferences and events, recent articles from the professional press on a range of topics, information about graduate programs and professional development opportunities, and much more.

Automated subscriber and expert registration. If you have not updated your subscriber information recently, you are en-

couraged to submit a subscriber form at: <http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe/ihe/subscribe.html>.

The “expert database” is a network of scholars who are resources on specific topics that they either research or teach. Hopefully, this database helps connect scholars with similar interests who will share knowledge, experience, and bibliographies. This network can be searched from CIHE’s main search page, or you may register as an expert at: <https://htmldbprod.bc.edu/pls/htmldb/f?p=2290:1000:3617855871033017>.

SOCIAL MEDIA

Taking full advantage of what the age of social media offers, CIHE is now on Twitter and Facebook. You can “follow” or “like” CIHE.

Twitter: http://twitter.com/#!/BC_CIHE. Twitter allows the posting of items and commentary in response to news from a wide range of sources. The CIHE team regularly reads the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Education*, the *Times Higher Education*, the *New York Times*, the *Economist*, the *Wall Street Journal*, *Business Week*, the *Times of India*, *University World News*, newsletters from IAU, GUNI, and much more. Based on a review of the professional press, items and comments relevant to trends in international higher education are posted. If you do not have time to read all of these media outlets, you might want to follow the CIHE team on Twitter. In addition, information is posted about CIHE activities, initiatives, and travels.

Facebook: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-International-Higher-Education-CIHE/197777476903716>. Much like the Twitter page, items are posted from the professional press on this Facebook page. In addition, information is posted about the CIHE, photos from the center’s interna-

NEWS OF THE CENTER

The Center’s multifaceted information outreach strategy is described elsewhere in this issue. Considerable resources have been devoted to developing these initiatives—all with the goal of providing better access to up-to-date information about higher education worldwide.

CIHE has received a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to assist in the publication of *International Higher Education*. This support has permitted us to add pages to most of our issues. We will also enhance our coverage of African higher education.

Center director Philip G. Altbach, a member of the international advisory committee of the State Research University-Higher School of Economics in Moscow, participated in a meeting of the group in May. He also gave several lectures

at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. His coedited book, *American Higher Education in the 21st Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges* has been published in its 3rd edition by the Johns Hopkins University Press. This volume is the standard textbook for most introductory higher education courses in the United States. He will participate in an international higher education forum at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in July.

Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Center_for_international_higher_education. The center is now included in Wikipedia. The CIHE page is in the early stages of development and will continue to evolve over the coming months.

CIHE’S NEW BLOG—THE WORLD VIEW: HTTP://WWW.INSIDE-HIGHERED.COM/BLOGS/THE_WORLD_VIEW.

CIHE has a recent alliance with *Inside Higher Education*, an influential electronic newspaper in the United States, with growing international coverage. The CIHE contributes to a blog where a commentary is posted every week written by distinguished international colleagues. CIHE’s blogs cover a wide range of topics and offer perspective and information about issues often overlooked by the professional press. Recent topics have included the controversial issue of the commodification of higher education and the resulting participation of agents and other for-profit entities; issues of access and equity in Brazil; the struggle for quality in Australia, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere in the wake of shrinking budgets; and much more.

It is hoped you will visit CIHE staff online and find their information helpful in your daily work. In addition, it would be useful to add your articles, conferences, Web site, or profile to the CIHE database, as long as there are no copyright restrictions on any of that material. Your comments are welcomed, along with contributions and suggestions to: reisberg@bc.edu.

Dr. Suaad Al-Harthi of Princess Nora University in Saudi Arabia has joined the Center as a visiting scholar, as has Dr. Kazuhito Obara of Tamagawa University in Japan.



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

PRESORTED
FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
N. READING MA
PERMIT 258

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. 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.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina Kopellias

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 subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613

©Center for International
Higher Education