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Foreign Outposts of Colleges and Universities
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Over the past several decades, many colleges and universities have been expanding their global footprint through the development of research sites, outreach offices, and classrooms in foreign countries. At times, these initiatives are done in collaboration with other educational institutions, as dual or joint degrees. More recently, though, the stand-alone extension of the home campus has garnered scholarly and policy attention. Often called international branch campuses, they have been critiqued and lauded, even as their scale and scope remain unclear. In attempts to provide some clarity to this international phenomenon, however, it has been realized that not all institutions accept the label “branch” to define their activities. Moreover, other methods universities use to offer degrees off campus seem to be absent from academic and policy discussions.

Defining the Branch Campus

There are several definitions of international branch campuses in the literature, but all focus on specifying the links between home and branch governance and academic oversight. The working definition we have used is typical: “An entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; engages in at least some face-to-face teaching; and provides access to an entire academic program that leads to a credential awarded by the foreign education provider.”

Through this lens, we have sought to study how, where, and why colleges and universities are developing a physical presence in other educational markets. The key elements defining international branch campuses are that foreign locations should use a name that reflects their home campus parentage, have an actual on-the-ground presence (online only does not count), and award full degrees to enrolled students. Ownership is important, too, so thus it should be avoided to count franchising or 4+0 arrangements, where the home campus has no real stake in the foreign operation. Using this definition, we have found nearly 200 such entities scattered across every inhabitable continent.

Based on our list of international branch campuses, local branch campus leaders have been surveyed to gain a better understanding of their governance and academic activities. It has been found, however, that several respondents rejected our branch campus label. They typically justified their exclusion from our definition, by referencing labels used in local quality assurance or government regulations. For example, one respondent noted that they were “an autonomous university accredited by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research in the United Arab Emirates.” Therefore, we are not considered as a branch campus in the UAE.” This campus, however, is listed as a branch on the main university Web page.

On the other hand, some locations claimed the branch campus label even when they fell outside of our definition. In an example from another country, the respondent advocated for recognition in this research, arguing that their home government and accreditation agency both approved the branch as an “off-site location for foreign nationals to matriculate and receive a [university] degree.” There seemed to be no ownership stake in the initiative, however, which had originally excluded their programs from the survey.

More recently, though, the stand-alone extension of the home campus has garnered scholarly and policy attention.

Foreign Outpost Approach to Offshore Delivery

The responses received to the survey led us to consider the existence of other forms of off-shore campuses. There is apparently a hidden population of “foreign outposts” operated by geographically dispersed universities. Foreign outposts have forms that diverge from formal international branch campus definitions but still represent intriguing variations of the branch campus phenomenon.

Manipal University, based in southern India, provides an excellent example of how an institution can use a variety of foreign outposts to develop a multinational presence. Established in 1953, Manipal is the first private educational institution in India to become an autonomous, or “deemed,” university—meaning that the government has recognized the institution to be of high academic quality. Through the eponymous Manipal Education Group, its corporate parent, there are several educational institutions that bear the Manipal name in India and abroad. All of these institutions...
draw from the programs and curriculum of the original home campus, which also provides academic oversight. These outposts have many characteristics of branch campuses, but only one—Manipal University in Dubai—meets all the standard criteria for an international branch campus.

Manipal University in Nepal could be considered an international branch campus as the curriculum is provided by Manipal faculty at a Manipal facility, except the degrees are formally granted by Katmandu University—following local Nepalese regulations. Manipal Melaka Medical University is also a branch of Manipal University, but it requires students to complete a preclinical curriculum in India, before completing their medical training in Malaysian hospitals and health centers. The American University of Antigua is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Manipal Group, with a medical curriculum supported by Manipal University, but operates with more academic autonomy than the other outposts. Manipal International University, also located in Malaysia, is more like a spin-off than a branch. It relies on the Manipal administrative and academic infrastructure but was established as a private Malaysian university. Finally, Sikkim Manipal University has all the characteristics of a branch, except it was established as a public-private partnership with the small Indian state of Sikkim, rather than a foreign government.

There are several definitions of international branch campuses in the literature, but all focus on specifying the links between home and branch governance and academic oversight.

These foreign outposts are all physically located in a separate policy and regulatory environment. They offer full-degree programs, all linked administratively and academically through the Manipal Education Group. They are linked also through common ownership and centralized investments in the Manipal system. Most also share the Manipal name; and though the Antigua outpost has not adopted the Manipal brand, it is an integrated part of the Manipal education family.

Although these locations may be questionable as international branch campuses, as foreign outposts they are obvious extensions of the Manipal brand beyond the home campus.

**Conclusion**

A variety of ways exist in which a university from one country can establish a presence in another country. The Manipal example, plus the responses from some campus leaders to our international branch campus definition, suggests great diversity within this subgroup of higher education institutions. A broader consideration of all forms of foreign outposts is needed. Both research and policy need to examine the diversity of strategies employed by colleges and universities, as they expand their global footprint. It is important not to allow restrictive definitions to blind us from the innovations that are now happening on the ground.

---

**How Well Are International Branch Campuses Serving Students?**
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The academic literature and professional journals both reveal no shortage of criticisms of the international branch campus. Yet, each year, more branches are established all around the world, and existing campuses continue to expand. So, it seems that there must be a demand for these campuses. But how well are they actually serving students? It is interesting that the growth of student numbers at international branch campuses does not seem to have affected enrollments at the home campuses of Western universities. This implies that branch campuses have found a new, additional demand for higher education.

**Widening Access**

Although the majority of branch campuses operate as for-profit enterprises, these institutions provide a service that is much needed and wanted all around the world. Branch campuses have enabled many students to receive a higher education, who would otherwise not have had the opportunity to do so. In particular, the large expatriate populations in countries such as Singapore and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) are often unable to secure places at state higher
education institutions or able to afford overseas study in a Western country. Also, in some cultures it is not acceptable for families to allow unmarried daughters to live and study abroad. Foreign universities have already provided over 30,000 student places in the Arab Gulf States, and in Singapore it is expected that branch campuses will provide much of the new capacity to achieve the country’s target of 150,000 international students, by 2015.

Convenience and Country-Specific Advantages
A recent study, conducted in the UAE, found that students chose to study at a branch campus in the UAE, rather than at the home campus of a Western university—for a mix of convenience and country-specific reasons. The convenience reasons were associated with avoiding financial expense, “hassle” or effort, or maintaining the status quo in the student’s personal and working lives. The convenience reasons were concerned with specific attractive features associated with living and studying in the UAE—such as, personal safety, religion, familiarity, and the comfort with the local culture and lifestyle, and improved prospects in the local/regional labor market after graduation.

Yet, each year, more branches are established all around the world, and existing campuses continue to expand.

Improved Prospects in Local Labor Markets
A degree from a country with a respected higher education system—such as, Australia, the United Kingdom, or the United States—opens the door to opportunities in the labor market in many of the countries, where branch campuses operate. Most branch campuses specialize in professional subjects—such as, business, management, and computer science/information technology—due in part to the fact that these fields are relatively cheap to establish and can cater for large numbers of students. In the UAE, these courses are popular with both expatriate and national students wanting to start or progress careers in industries—such as, banking, finance, and human resource management—but for students wanting to study subjects in the liberal arts there are far fewer options.

Youth unemployment among nationals is high in several of the Arab Gulf States. Thus, equipping young people with the skills needed to take up employment in the private sector has benefited both individuals and governments. During the last two-to-three years, many institutions have widened their product, by offering to include subjects from different disciplines and those that are particularly relevant locally. In Dubai, for example, Heriot-Watt University offers a postgraduate degree in petroleum engineering, and Murdoch University offers an undergraduate program in environmental management and sustainable development. A number of branches globally have also begun to offer doctoral-level programs.

Student Experience
While it is generally accepted that students at branch and home campuses cannot possibly have the same educational experience, students, parents, employers, and quality-assurance agencies expect the student experience at each location to be at least comparable or equivalent. Ten years ago many branch campuses had libraries with limited collections, no student accommodation, and no sports or leisure facilities. This is no longer the case. The desires and expectations of many students in transnational higher education have increased. Moreover, in markets that have grown quite competitive, many institutions feel the need to differentiate themselves from the crowd, by offering additional services and facilities.

The majority of branch campuses worldwide still, each, have less than 1,000 students, and, thus, so they do not possess the scale necessary to offer the range of facilities and experiences available at home campuses. Furthermore, the need to produce profit, or at least break-even, deters institutions from higher investment in facilities and resources. However, there now exist several purpose-built full-scale branch campuses around the world that are intended to replicate the home campus experience—both educationally and socially/culturally. Examples include New York University Abu Dhabi and Monash and Nottingham in Malaysia. The large-scale “replica campus” format seems to be largely successful, and it may prove to be the most sustainable form of the international branch campus, over the next two or three decades.

Student Satisfaction
To date, there has been limited research into student satisfaction at international branch campuses. However, the created research—including a study of Australian transnational higher education programs in South East Asia and another in the UAE—has generally found high levels of student satisfaction, both with institutions and programs. Students at branch campuses seem content that they are achieving the same qualification that students at the home campus receive, and they generally have realistic expectations about the comparability of the student experience at branch and home campuses. The majority of students regard their programs as effective, worthwhile, and relevant to their job/future career intentions.
Quality
Many writers seem to assume that it is not possible that for-profit institutions achieve high quality. In transnational higher education, the division between for-profit and public-sector institutions becomes somewhat blurred, anyway—given that even most public universities need at least to break even overseas, as they cannot rely on funding generated at home. Only a handful of institutions globally are relatively free of financial constraints—such as, New York University Abu Dhabi and Paris-Sorbonne University Abu Dhabi, which are both funded by the local government.

An expectation exists among all stakeholders that an international branch campus will deliver the same programs and adhere to the same standards and procedures that are demonstrated at its home campus. Branch campuses are subject to accreditation requirements and quality-assurance audits from agencies—located both in their home countries and locally in the countries, where they operate. Although franchised and partner-delivered programs have frequently been criticized by quality-assurance agencies, the branch campuses of Australian, UK, and US universities have generally achieved favorable reports. Foreign accreditation and quality-assurance bodies have already closed branch campuses on quality grounds, but none have been institutions based in a Western country.

Future Prospects
International branch campuses have filled a gap in the market and are simply meeting the demand for foreign higher education that exists in many countries. The sector is not free of problems, and more institutions are likely to fail; but as this happens, the surviving institutions will grow further and become even stronger.

Although the majority of branch campuses operate as for-profit enterprises, these institutions provide a service that is much needed and wanted all around the world.

International Joint- and Double-Degree Programs
DANIEL OBST AND MATTHIAS KUDER

While the international exchange of students continues to occur predominantly through traditional, study-abroad programs, a growing number of higher education institutions have also begun to establish joint- and double-degree programs. This development, which largely started in Europe in the 1990s, has become an important global trend—prompting higher education institutions, governments, and funding and accreditation agencies worldwide to consider strategies and policies with regard to cross-border collaborative degree programs.

In response to this burgeoning trend, the Institute of International Education and Freie Universität Berlin conducted an international survey in spring 2011. The survey addressed itself to higher education institutions that offer joint- and double-degree programs, receiving responses from 245 institutions in 28 countries. The subsequent report, Joint and Double Degree Programs in the Global Context, presents the findings from a global perspective, as well as country-specific trends for the 6 countries with the highest number of responding institutions: Australia, France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

How Many Are There and What Are the Trends?
First, the bad news: The survey cannot provide accurate information on the total number of existing joint- or double-degree programs. Just as it is impossible to determine the exact number of standard-degree programs, so it is with collaborative-degree endeavors. However, the available data suggest that such programs are growing: 95 percent of the 245 responding higher education institutions plan to expand their current portfolios of joint- or double-degree programs in the future. This figure is remarkable, given that many institutions reported having difficulties with the development of their existing joint- or double-degree programs. About one-third of all survey participants confirmed that they canceled some of their programs in the past, for a variety of reasons—including, lack of student interest, lack of funding, and unsustainability. Survey participants identi-
A growing number of higher education institutions have also begun to establish joint- and double-degree programs.

that is taught in English, includes a partner institution from a European country, has a student enrollment rate of 25 or less, and was initiated between 2001 and 2009. According to the outlook of survey participants, such programs will remain common, in the near future.

The majority of respondents who plan to develop more collaborative-degree programs aim to do so for double-degree programs, at the master’s level. The most favored disciplines continue to be business management or engineering. However, there is a marked difference in terms of regional distribution. While higher education institutions from European countries dominate the list of existing collaborative-degree programs, it is expected that in the future such programs will become more diverse, with the United States and China becoming increasingly involved—along with higher education institutions in Asia (India, in particular), South America (Brazil, in particular), and Canada and Australia.

**Joint vs. Double Degrees**

What is the difference between a joint- and a double-degree program? Definitions of international collaborative-degree programs often differ between institutions, countries, or continents. For the survey, we chose a general definition: a collaborative-degree program is one that is offered by two or more institutions in different countries and features a jointly developed and integrated curriculum, as well as a clear agreement on credit recognition. The line between joint and double was drawn according to the degree-awarding praxis. In joint-degree programs, students receive a degree certificate issued jointly by the host institutions; in double-degree programs, students were given degree certificates, issued separately by each of the institutions involved in the program.

The survey results highlight other characteristics that differentiate joint from double-degree programs. While the latter are much more common—with 84 percent of survey participants offering double-degree programs—joint-degree programs seem to represent a more integrated and complex form of cooperation. Roughly, 72 percent of the reported joint-degree programs are stand-alone programs; that is, they were built exclusively as joint ventures with foreign universities. In contrast, many double-degree programs are established as an additional track to an already existing degree program. Another indicator is student selection and enrollment. The majority of the reported joint-degree programs features the joint selection of students, whereas for double-degree programs universities often select students separately, though based on jointly agreed-on criteria. In joint-degree programs, students tend to be enrolled at both (or more) cooperating institutions for the entire degree period, which is not necessarily the case for double-degree programs.

**Institutional Expectations and a Lack of Strategy**

Institutional motivations for the development of collaborative-degree programs varied, with the highest scores attributed to (1) broadening educational offerings, (2) strengthening research collaboration, (3) advancing internationalization, and (4) raising the international visibility/prestige of the institution. The least important motivations were increasing revenue and offering courses from partner institutions that do not exist at the home institution. Given that most joint- and double-degree programs enroll small numbers of students, the former is not surprising. Interestingly, the latter, which proponents of collaborative-degree programs often refer to in the context of “synergies” and “resource pooling,” seems to play a marginal role.

While 91 percent of respondents indicated that the development of collaborative-degree programs was an integral part of their institution’s internationalization efforts, this is not necessarily mirrored in their respective institutional policies. According to the responses, a large number of uni-
versities either lack a clear strategy for developing joint- and double-degree programs or have yet to implement it. Fewer than half of the responding institutions have created particular marketing and recruitment initiatives, despite the fact that the majority of them aim to attract top international students for their joint- or double-degree programs. While two-thirds of the responding institutions have policies for addressing the issue of double counting of credits, their comments suggest that these policies are implemented on departmental, as opposed to institutional levels.

Overall, the survey indicates that strategies and internal regulations for collaborative-degree programs are not sufficiently developed, yet, at many higher education institutions. The most frequently mentioned challenges (funding and sustainability) might in fact be direct consequences of these institutional shortcomings. While most joint- and double-degree programs spring from existing partnerships and are nourished by individual faculty engagement, institutions are well advised to include top-down elements, with clear institutional policies and guidelines—in order to avoid uncontrolled growth and, most importantly, to ensure quality standards.

At a branch, the home institution is, at least to some extent, “on the ground” overseas and guides hands-on direction for teaching and local supervision. Franchising is the provision of the curriculum and a degree without direct involvement. Franchising is exactly what McDonald’s does. The McDonald’s corporation sells the right to “brand” its products so long as the franchisee adheres to strict standards and policies. Thus, a Big Mac tastes the same in Chicago or Shanghai. “Inputs” (potatoes, meat, the “special sauce”) are carefully monitored. Business practices are stipulated, and the “brand image” closely monitored and protected. There is modest latitude for local adaptation. For example, a Big Mac in Riyadh is halal, and one can find a McPork in Bucharest. The purpose of the entire enterprise is to earn profits for the franchisee and for the corporation.

One difference between McDonalds and a higher education franchise is that a McDonald’s franchise requires a significant investment by the franchisee—in facilities, equipment, and the like. In many cases, an education franchise just needs to rent space with little additional investment from either side. More worrisome, an easy exit is possible for either party with the possibility of leaving students in the lurch.

Franchising is yet another example of the commodification of higher education, and the entire purpose of the operation is to make money.

Franchising is the provision of the curriculum and a degree without direct involvement. Franchising is exactly what McDonald’s does.

What’s Wrong with It?
If one accepts that nonprofit higher education institutions at home should operate as profit-making businesses overseas, nothing is fundamentally wrong. But a number of questions must be raised. Concerns have been expressed by quality-assurance agencies and in the British media that several universities—generally those at the lower end of the pecking order—have been caught offering substandard products overseas or at least not adequately monitoring the degree programs offered in their names, thus sullying the reputation of British higher education. It is very hard to adequately monitor what is being done in the name of an institution far away.

Franchising—The McDonaldization of Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach
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Almost 20 percent of students studying for a British first academic degree are not residing in the United Kingdom but rather pursuing their degree at one of Britain’s 13 branch campuses or, much more likely, at a foreign institution that has franchised a British degree. More than 400 franchise arrangements were reported in 2008. The UK institution provides the curriculum, learning materials, quality assurance and, most important, the right to award a British degree. Universities in other countries are also involved in franchising; Australia and the United States are examples. There are even multinational franchising and twinning operations; for example, a British university and an Indian institute offer degrees in Oman.
In a recent article in the Guardian, a senior administrator at the University of Nottingham, which has several branch campuses in Asia, notes that—in franchise or twinning arrangements—the overseas partner may have the UK curriculum; but it may not be taught with the same ethos that characterizes the home campus. An emphasis on interactive learning or critical thinking, for example, may be missing. In other words, the form but not necessarily the substance of education may be provided by the franchisee. Adequate quality assurance is not easy. Home evaluators may not be aware of conditions overseas; and in any case, the logistics are difficult and often expensive.

All of this also begs the question as to whether the curriculum offered for most specializations in the United Kingdom or in other developed countries will be appropriate for the needs of developing or middle-income countries. Yet, the essence of the franchise arrangement is that the “product” offered should be the same as at the home institution.

Higher education franchising seems to be a growing phenomenon. As with all commercial investment in higher education, there are significant possibilities for problems.

While no one has researched who are the franchise providers in developing and middle-income countries, they seem to be a variety of agencies. Some are private universities and other educational institutions. Some are property developers or other business interests, wishing to enter the lucrative higher education market or add an education facility to a new shopping mall or condominium complex. There may well be nothing wrong with these sponsors, but it balances the educational mission against other business interests.

Higher education franchising seems to be a growing phenomenon. As with all commercial investment in higher education, there are significant possibilities for problems. So far, the franchisers seem to be working on the McDonalds principle. It would be interesting to ask why no one is looking at the educational equivalent of Intercontinental Hotels—aiming at a higher-end market segment—as a better model. (This article has also appeared in Times Higher Education, London).

Cross-Border Higher Education: Two Models

Amy Stambach
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Like boxers in corners, two models of the free market appear to sit in opposition. One is the global marketplace; the other is the global commons. The first stresses the commercial value of the exchange of people and products. The second emphasizes the open exchange of knowledge, goods, and information—of natural and social resources, most useful when shared. Proponents of both models spar over how best to regulate cross-border higher education—to structure international trade in education services. Disagreement arises because ideas about the free market, upon which both models turn, rest upon different yet related understandings of wealth, freedom, and the public. Now positions embedded in these models will be illustrated with reference to an education tool developed at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Global Marketplace

A global marketplace model maintains that universities compete for the best minds in a world of limited resources. That is, students and faculty are competitive goods and tied to positions, tuition, and salaries. Stem-cell scientists developing medical patents—or researchers with knowledge of biomedicine—represent the resources that are traded in the university marketplace. Seen from this perspective, scientists and researchers and scholars and artists are rival goods (economists’ term for competitive commodities); universities use researchers’ knowledge for commercial advantage; and researchers compete for limited spaces in universities.

As rival goods, the “best minds” in the form of students and researchers are most productive when they are rewarded and funded handsomely. Examples of arguments upholding education-as-industry frequently appear in popular media (e.g., Wall Street Journal, US News and World Report). Within these outlets, people and positions are a form of wealth; freedom is the absence of regulation; and the free trade of researchers and their intellectual products serve the interests of a wide community—that is, it operates for the public good.
**Global Commons**
A global commons model contends that knowledge is a form of wealth commonly shared (not competitively traded), and that this wealth is underprovided for by markets. That is, if every aspect of knowledge was sold for money without state regulation, the public value of information would be lost in the interest of private earnings. Knowledge of how to make and use pharmaceuticals is a good example. If such knowledge was overly restricted—with universities putting a price tag on access to knowledge—humanity as a whole would suffer.

---

**A global marketplace model maintains that universities compete for the best minds in a world of limited resources.**

As a nonrival good, education requires nonmarket means—such as governmental subsidy, philanthropic support, and pooled resources—to support it. Understood as limitless knowledge, education is most useful when widely shared. Examples of arguments upholding education-as-knowledge frequently appear as peer-reviewed scholarship but also in commercial media (e.g., *Atlantic Monthly*, or *Harpers Magazine*). Within these media, wealth is conceptualized as wisdom; freedom is the wide circulation of wealth; and that which is public constitutes the open domain of free-flowing information.

**Mutual Territory**
As an example of how these two positions integrate, consider the work of the Wisconsin Center for Education Products and Services (WCEPS), which licenses nonpatentable, copyright-protected forms of intellectual property. English-language learning assessment tools are among the products WCEPS will sell to K–12 institutions, particularly those reaching underserved populations. Returns from profits earned on licensed tools will be reinvested in basic research and—if WCEPS operates in any way like its parent program, the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF)—about 20 percent of its returns will go to the research and development group, 15 percent to the researchers’ department, and 65 percent to the university. These percentages, however, must be long-term. Reaching them will depend on the success of researchers’ spin-off companies. Currently, WCEPS is subsidized by the University of Wisconsin Foundation and will need to pay its costs out of an independent investment portfolio. Its parent model, WARF, which has been up and running since the 1920s, owns equity in 36 faculty companies and sells over US$1 billion in products annually. But WARF’s investments took off exponentially at the beginning of its creation, through the licensing of Vitamin D. It remains to be seen if WCEPS can grow independently.

Critics of the marketplace model argue that WCEPS unethically privatizes public knowledge. After all, language is a social-cognitive skill, not a copyrightable commodity. Another reasoned objection is that selling language services to underserved populations further impoverishes the already poor. Success of the center relies on making a profit from products that socially disadvantaged children do not have.

Marketplace proponents reasonably reply that the WCEPS does not go far enough in freely trading knowledge. Reinvestment of up to 65 percent in the university is not a wise investment if the center is to generate its own revenue. Moreover, marketplace proponents might regard the investment of resources into researchers’ departments as a camouflaged form of an outdated welfare system.

Closer inspection of the center, however, reveals an integration of marketplace and commons forms. Seen from a marketplace view, the center treats researchers and products as competitive goods that must be kept at a particular institution. It regards the university as a public service industry that must maximize investment and advocate free trade but reinvest profits in basic research. Seen from a commons view, the center acknowledges that markets alone underprovide for research. Research requires pooled resources and philanthropic as well as federal support. Free-flowing knowledge is not always marketable but must be protected and subsidized, and services and tools of the research university must be invested internationally.

**International Interdependence**
This latter point about international investment raises one final concern. In a global age when products are generated or sold internationally, what should be the criteria for reinvesting intellectual property and copyrights? WARF handles these concerns by working with foreign associ-
Combating Unethical Behavior in Higher Education
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Examples of unethical behavior can be found in tertiary education worldwide, in rich and poor countries alike, spanning virtually every process and function of colleges and universities—from admission to academics and research, financial management, and hiring and promotion. Such behavior hinders the effective functioning of institutions, erodes public trust, and ultimately, if left unchecked, has the potential to prevent tertiary education institution systems from fulfilling their missions and obligations to their stakeholders.

A variety of approaches are currently in use to combat unethical behavior in tertiary education. These measures fall into four categories in terms of purpose: those that aim to prevent unethical behavior, those that are designed to detect it, those that punish it once it has been detected, and those that address all three of these functions at the same time.

Examples of unethical behavior can be found in tertiary education worldwide, in rich and poor countries alike, spanning virtually every process and function of colleges and universities.

PREVENTATIVE MEASURES

Measures designed to prevent unethical behavior include standardized processes and procedures implemented by institutions and governments, as well as legislation that increases oversight of institutions or aims to prevent problematic behavior—by making it illegal. Examples include automated scoring for examinations and other standardization of admissions procedures, antidiscrimination laws and policies, and legislation that addresses fraud and other financial misconduct.

Institutions and organizations may also implement broader policies focused on morals and ethics rather than specific actions—attempting to pre-empt the impulse to engage in unethical behavior earlier on, by creating a culture and climate in which such behavior is not accepted. Examples include student honor codes and faculty ethics policies, set forth by institutions and disciplinary associations.

MEASURES FOR DETECTING UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR

Unfortunately, not all instances of unethical behavior can be prevented. In order to minimize the impact of such behavior, effective and efficient measures are needed to detect it as early as possible. In recent years, new developments in technology have come to play an important role in unveiling unethical behavior. Computer programs have been
Punitive Measures

Measures that aim to detect corrupt and unethical behavior are only worthwhile when complemented by measures that punish such behavior once it has been discovered. The most severe of these measures is legal action, including the arrest and prosecution of offenders, as well as lawsuits that result in financial or other consequences if it is determined that the alleged perpetrator acted illegally. Such measures are applied in cases of a variety of unethical behavior, particularly bribery and undue influence in admissions, the production and awarding of fake degrees and other false credentials, harassment, and financial fraud and mismanagement.

When the problematic behavior does not rise to the level of legal action, career status and academic/professional sanctions may be taken by institutions. This situation is often the case in instances of academic dishonesty of certain types, which may result in failing grades and revocation of degrees for students and suspension or termination for faculty and other employees. Likewise, faculty members who engage in certain types of academic and research-related unethical behavior may be subject to professional sanctions by journals, disciplinary associations, and other academic organizations.

Measures with Multiple Purposes

Along with measures that prevent, detect, or punish unethical behavior in tertiary education, ones such as accreditation and other quality-assurance procedures are designed to fulfill all three of these functions. Accrediting bodies and other oversight agencies set forth operational standards and standardized procedures. When followed, such decisions serve a preventative function by reducing opportunities for individuals to engage in unethical behaviors that may corrupt the educational process and other academic and operational functions. Regular reporting requirements and periodic inspections ensure transparency and detect some aspects of problematic behavior. Sanctions imposed on institutions and individuals that are found in violation of standards and procedures fulfill the punitive function.

What Works?

In the case of anticorruption measures, more is better. Countries that systematically fully implemented such measures have had relatively low levels of unethical behavior. The United States, for example, has a robust accreditation system, legal structures to facilitate the reasonably efficient prosecution and punishment of offenders, explicit institutional policies to impose status/career sanctions on students and employees who behave unethically, and an active reporting and press network to publicize instances of problematic behavior. Together, these measures, and the parties and stakeholders involved in implementing them, form a system of checks and balances that maximizes the chances of detecting, punishing, and ultimately preventing unethical behavior.

Of course, in countries where resources are constrained and/or where corruption is deeply entrenched, it is simply not feasible to implement all of these measures at once. Governments, systems, and institutions must prioritize measures, taking into account the overall context of tertiary education—historical, political, economic, etc.—in doing so. For example, in countries where corruption is centralized within the government, introducing policies that allow greater institutional autonomy and oversight of operations may help reduce unethical behavior overall. Conversely, where corruption is decentralized and institutions themselves are notoriously corrupt, increased centralization of processes, which supports an increased oversight of key functions—such as the admission process—may be more beneficial. Resources and capacity for implementation should be considered, as well. If the government does not have adequate resources to implement a high-quality admissions process, then another way to end corruption in admissions must be sought. In all cases, policies that are “on paper” only and are not feasible to implement, given available resources, should be avoided. These practices are likely to do more harm than good by demonstrating to perpetrators and potential ones that the real consequences of their behavior are minimal, thus encouraging rather than hindering unethical actions. Organizations such as the World Bank and the Organization for Economic Coopera-

Institutions and organizations may also implement broader policies focused on morals and ethics rather than specific actions.
US Internationalization Faces the Recession
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US higher education has been hard hit by the recession. Unemployment stands at more than 9 percent; states are experiencing severe budget shortfalls. At the same time, tuition costs have risen steadily over the past decade. The budget situation promises to be even worse in 2012, with the prospect of a deepening recession and the loss of funding provided in 2009 and 2010 by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 ("stimulus funding"). This legislation provided funding to states to meet their shortfalls in state and local revenue ($107 billion in 2009 and $89 billion in 2010).

Cuts in Federal Funding

The relatively modest federal support for international education is spread out through several federal departments, making it difficult to identify all cuts enacted in 2011. The most visible programs are located in the Departments of State and Education. Department of State programs include faculty and student exchange programs, which were cut by about 5.5 percent—from $635 million in 2010 to about $600 million in 2011. Further cuts may be seen in 2012. The House Appropriations Subcommittee for State and Foreign Operations dropped 10 percent from the 2011 level.

US higher education has been hard hit by the recession.

The Department of Education sponsors small, but important, programs to support internationalization. Deep cuts ($50 million or 40 percent) were made within Title VI programs and the Fulbright-Hays Program in the Department of Education for 2011, which had been funded at approximately $125 million in 2010. The Fulbright-Hays Program primarily supports doctoral students to conduct research overseas; Title VI supports a variety of internationally focused academic centers. No new awards were made in several programs. Additionally, the Department of Education sponsors institutional collaborations with Brazil, the European Union, Russia, and the North American Mobility Program—all of which are to be phased out in 2012. The general competition for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, which provides funding for campus internationalization initiatives, was suspended for 2011. Although externally funded programs have a significant impact on some campuses, most internationalization initiatives in the United States are funded from institutional resources.

Responses by Higher Education Institutions

The report on which this article is based focused on public research universities; the findings are to a large extent ap-
Intensified Recruitment of International Students

Many US institutions now see recruiting more international students as one solution to their fiscal woes; some have set numerical targets. For example, in a departure from past policy, the University of California institutions have been given a mandate by the regents to increase the number of international students.

Not surprisingly, many institutions are targeting Asian students, particularly Chinese. Open Doors reported that in the 2009/10 academic year, 18.5 percent of all international students in the United States came from China, and 36.4 percent came from five Asian countries.

Expanding international recruitment raises new issues and options. Many institutions have limited expertise in international student recruitment and little or no travel budget. Institutions may choose to do this work alone, collaborate with other institutions, hire agents, or partner with a private provider.

Beginning about 10 years ago, institutions within various states began to join forces to develop Web sites, to market to international students; nearly half of all US states now have them. It is unclear how successful these joint efforts are in recruiting international students, but they are cost-effective and well received. A new organization, the American International Recruitment Council, was developed to set professional standards for agents, taking the position that agents are already an essential part of the higher education landscape.

As more universities strive to professionalize their international education operations, one can surmise that they will see value in investing in the professional development of their international office staff.

Another approach for recruiting international students lies in private-sector partnerships: arrangements between universities and private companies, to recruit international students for pathway programs. INTO University Partnerships, Kaplan Career Institute, and Navitas are the three major providers, with rather different models. These companies enter into longer-term agreements with the institutions, partnering with them to recruit students and provide prematriculation, academic-enrichment programs, often in collaboration with the faculty.

Staffing, Funding, and the Role of the International Officer

The budgetary fate of the international office is tied to the overall financial health of the institution, and interviews with senior international officers revealed a wide range of budgetary situations and effects on international offices. Most offices experienced no greater hardship than other institutional units; others were somewhat protected. All campus interviewees expressed anxiety about further cuts in 2011/12.
Some universities are expecting the international office to expand existing sources of funding or to create new ones. For example, the severe cuts in the international office budget at one institution forced the office to rely more and more on income-generating activities, to balance the budget. Also, study abroad and visa fees for international students and scholars have been increased. Several senior international officers interviewed pointed to study-abroad fees and English-language programs, to provide flexible revenue for the office. Some institutions are reorganizing or reallocating funding.

As institutions become more deeply engaged in strategic internationalization, the role of the senior international officers seems to be developing into a more central position at a more senior level. The senior international officer is now more commonly a member of the faculty, or one with other senior-level experience, and is sometimes situated in the office of the provost or with a dual reporting line to the president and the provost. He or she is involved at the highest levels in integrating internationalization into the overall mission and strategic plan and developing partnerships and other connections that go beyond study abroad or exchanges.

**More Strategic International Partnerships**

National higher education meetings and interviews with senior international officers point to a trend toward fewer and more-strategic international partnerships. This development seems to be the result of greater experience in managing overseas partnerships in the academic community, declining resources, and perhaps lessons learned from some high-profile failures.

Institutions are reviewing and tightening their processes for vetting and approving agreements, seeking to ensure that they align with institutional priorities for internationalization and to aggregate resources into fewer initiatives with, most likely, a greater impact. Assuring that sufficient funding exists, to make the cooperation real, is a priority.

**Conclusion**

Institutions are coping with the economic downturn, by using a time-honored mix of revenue generation and cuts. In the next few years, it most likely will be revealed whether the current crisis is indeed another cycle or if US higher education is indeed in an era of a “new normal.” No matter how dire the funding situation, it is unlikely that US higher education institutions, especially research universities, will retreat from expanding their international focus.

---
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Over the last decade, the number of students traveling to another country in pursuit of higher education increased by 65 percent, totaling over 3.3 million students in 2008. Although the phenomenon of student mobility itself is not new, the rapid growth in recent years has changed the global landscape of international education. As more individuals seek out “nontraditional” educational experiences abroad and new and emerging host countries compete for international talent, the historical movement of students from the global South to the North and East to West is now significantly more multidirectional. The “brain drain” of talent from developing nations is shifting to “brain gain,” as many emerging host countries implement policies to recruit students; and “brain circulation” as students continue to pursue more diverse and multinational educational experiences.

**Traditional Hosts and New Players**

Although Anglophone and western European countries continue to attract the highest numbers of international students, new and emerging hosts are vying for a place in the global market of international education. Jordan has set a goal of hosting 100,000 international students by 2020; Singapore aspires to 150,000 by 2015; and Japan plans on hosting 300,000 by 2025. Yet, by far the most ambitious goal is set by China, which aims to have 500,000 international students by 2020. According to Project Atlas (www.iie.org/projectatlas), there were over 265,000 international students studying in China in 2010—including both degree students and nondegree students enrolled in study-abroad programs through their home institutions. To meet its goal, China has taken significant strides to improve institutional capacity to host international students and has earmarked scholarship funds specifically for international students.
This policy change among the “suppliers” of international students (countries like India and China) to attract more international students poses a challenge for developing countries that are poised to become popular study destinations. Developing countries may face the dilemma of increasing the capacity of their higher education systems—to provide adequate opportunities for their expanding college-age population—while also accommodating incoming international students and engaging an international educational exchange necessary in today’s globally competitive world.

At the same time, many top-host countries continue to address the challenge of “pushing” more of their students to study abroad. As international understanding and intercultural skills become critical for the modern global workforce, it is increasingly important for students to have international experience. However, due to a variety of factors both at the receiving and sending end, the number of students from Anglophone and western European countries who study overseas has not kept pace with the ambitious goals of countries hoping to host them.

Over the last decade, the number of students traveling to another country in pursuit of higher education increased by 65 percent, totaling over 3.3 million students.

Redefining Mobility
One of the most significant shifts in recent years, the definition of mobility itself has evolved from a more traditional geographic mobility—to one in which students, higher education institutions, and education programs are all mobile. Information itself has become mobile in the form of distance and virtual learning. These shifts are most evident in the advent of the branch campus model and, more recently, in the emergence of regional education hubs—such as, Dubai’s Knowledge Village, Qatar’s Education City, and Singapore’s Global Schoolhouse.

These nontraditional forms of mobility have significant implications for domestic and international higher education. As prospective international students choose branch campuses located in their own countries over the institution’s home campus, traditional student mobility, as we know it, might decline. Conversely, possibly these diverse forms of internationalization will continue to grow rapidly, serving different types of students with varying educational needs.

Is English the Lingua Franca of Mobility?
A key driver for studying overseas is the acquisition of a new language. But despite the growing popularity of foreign languages, it is indisputable that English drives much of today’s student mobility. It is not a coincidence that the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada—all Anglophone countries—attract a large number of international students. At the same time, many European countries are strategically offering an increasing number of courses and even entire programs of study in English. But this change and the growing dominance of English in non-Anglophone countries come at a price. It is likely to lead to a slow erosion of a country’s native language(s), defeating one of the fundamental purposes of a global education: for students to widen their global knowledge and awareness, by immersing themselves in unfamiliar languages and cultures.

There are many developments underway that will likely have an impact on global student flows in the near future. For example, Sweden is already beginning to see the impact of newly implemented tuition policies for international students, and the United Kingdom and Australia are also feeling the impact of new immigration and higher education policies. All of these rapidly occurring developments in mobility are forcing international educators to think about student mobility in new ways, while also posing unique challenges and opportunities for measuring mobility trends.

Brazil Seeks Academic Boost by Sending Students Abroad
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Brazil has just launched a program to dramatically increase the number of Brazilian students abroad. Although it counts with public-financial resources, no one really knows if the ambitious quantitative goals can be reached.

Science without Borders
Just a few days after the official visit of President Barack Obama to Brazil in March 2011, the Brazilian president Dilma Rousseff announced that it is a top priority of the gov-
government to send at least 75 thousand university students to spend a period in US higher education institutions. Today, it is estimated that there are around 8,800 Brazilians enrolled in American campuses, the 14th rank among such foreign groups. Although the statement was made with considerable fanfare, it was given without further details. Also, the speech mentioned this kind of program’s importance for the hard sciences and technological programs, mainly engineering, in order to allow the country to have a more qualified workforce in these strategic areas.

Since this announcement, the Brazilian research agencies struggled to design the plan, now called Science without Borders, launched officially in July 2011. The program finally includes not only the United States, but also other countries. The Brazilian government claims that it will look for private sponsors to pay tuition and fees to partner universities. The plan includes undergraduate students (around 35% of the scholarships), PhD students (46% of the scholarships), and also fellowships for postdoctorate and senior researchers. The total budget for a period of four years is estimated to be around US$2 billion.

It is clear that the intentions of the Science without Borders program are significant; and clearly some international experience should become a fundamental part of higher education, especially for a country like Brazil, which has seen increasing engagement in the international arena. Providing students with the possibility of an international experience is considered to be an effective strategy—from a geopolitical perspective as well as the academic viewpoint.

**Higher Education in Brazil**

Brazil has a population of 195 million inhabitants. Brazil has a quite diverse higher education system, with a relatively small number of public (federal, state, or municipal) research universities and a large number of private institutions—both philanthropic/confessional and for-profit. Approximately 6 million students have enrolled in undergraduate programs around the country, with 77 percent of those in private institutions. There are a number of consolidated research centers (both federal and state owned), which granted 12,000 PhDs and 41,000 master’s degrees, in 2010. The consolidation of the graduate system during the 1970s and 1980s included a systematic effort to finance graduate and postdoctoral studies in other countries. A large part of the participants in those programs returned to Brazil and helped to qualify the higher education institutions and the budding graduate programs in the country, particularly in public universities. After this initial period, the federal policies changed to strengthen the different programs within the country, drastically reducing the number of fellowships to send students abroad. Such policies resulted in a decrease of the degree of international experience of faculty in research-intensive universities. Thus, the proposed initiative discussed here reveals the reversal of current federal policies toward the graduate education sector.

**The Comparison with the US Initiative to China**

This program is certainly related to the so-called “100,000 strong Initiative,” considered to be a key component of the Obama administration’s foreign-policy agenda. Thus, there would be a coordinated effort designed to increase dramatically the number and diversify the composition of American students studying in China. Similar to the Brazilian case, this initiative is tempered by serious concerns about the achievability of such an ambitious target. However, contrary to the Brazilian case, the Obama administration is putting forward a challenge but no cash, claiming that financial support for the effort is required from private sources.

The main challenges in Brazil are of another nature, related to the number of qualified students able to undertake academic study in foreign universities. Considering the quality and leadership of the US higher education sector, for example, it is fair to suppose that any good student at a high-quality university would consider applying to a “bridge scholarship,” given by the Brazilian government.

Nobody really understands how this “magic” number of 75 thousand students was set as a goal. In 2009, approximately 58 thousand PhD students and 104 thousand master students were enrolled in Brazilian universities in all fields of knowledge. Only 20 institutions granted more than 100 PhD titles in 2009. Considering these numbers, it is clear why undergraduate students and postdocs must also participate in the program. The challenge will be to verify whether there are enough qualified students, with minimum language requirements, capable and willing to travel abroad and study in top world universities.

**Priorities and Funding**

The program focuses mainly on health and life sciences and on the so-called STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), with an emphasis on engineer-
ing. It is well known that engineering and basic-science education (both in number and quality) are considered to be among the main constraints to the immediate and future development of the Brazilian society, and certainly a program centered in these fields is an urgent necessity. On the other hand, it would be interesting to extend the program to other fields of knowledge in the near future.

From the point of view of the partner countries, the program has already received some criticisms, mainly in the United Kingdom, where a recent £200 million cut of state funding for higher education was made by the government. It is expected that Brazilians would not attain places otherwise available to British and European Union students. Nonetheless, concerns were raised that the UK government’s funding model for higher education is becoming increasingly reliant on attracting overseas nationals who, if born in the United Kingdom, might have struggled to become a regular student at a university there. Also, long-term partners such as Portugal were almost completely excluded, at least in this initial stage of the program, causing some negative reactions.

From the point of view of the partner countries, the program has already received some criticisms, mainly in the United Kingdom, where a recent £200 million cut of state funding for higher education was made by the government.

Finally, one of the most important criticisms regarding this program is its unilateral character. The program should be a real exchange program, with reciprocity from the counterpart university to support and stimulate their students to perform academic study in Brazil. This would be extremely beneficial to the Brazilian universities to boost their incipient internationalization process. Considering the total budget of the program, the issue of further planning and discussions in regard to priorities for spending public money in overseas universities becomes even more important.

The main stakeholders assume that a program like this needs further discussion and should be based on solid studies that constitute higher education policy, goals and priorities, and taking into account the reality of the current Brazilian education scenario and the globalized higher education sector.
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Since the advent of the knowledge economy society, higher education is seen as a major contributor to poverty reduction and sustainable human development. Over the past two decades, many regional organizations have invested in the revitalization and further development of their higher education systems—in order to benefit from the opportunities offered by the knowledge economy. These efforts include the implementation of the Bologna process of construction of a higher education area in Europe and beyond by 2010 and the Higher Education Harmonization Strategy in Africa designed by the African Union. These two initiatives are mainly motivated by the need to move to a new system known as the bachelor-master-doctorate system.

The bachelor-master-doctorate reform does not aim at establishing a unique higher education system. In fact, the various national systems will be placed in a common framework of comparable and compatible qualifications, in order to promote and further strengthen academic and professional mobility. The Bologna process is a major reform of higher education in the participating countries. In France, for example, this process is considered as the most significant higher education reform since 1968.

Given their historical relations with Europe in the area of higher education, the African Francophone countries have taken steps since the mid-2000s to implement the bachelor-master-doctorate reforms, in order to maintain and further strengthen their academic and research cooperation with European countries.

In the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), made up of eight Francophone and Lusophone countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo, and Guinea Bissau), the bachelor-master-doctorate system was adopted by the ministers of higher education in July 2007 to achieve the following objectives: to improve the efficiency and performance of higher education institutions; to ensure international recognition of degrees issued in the WAEMU member states; and to promote students and staff mobility.

The Bachelor-Master-Doctorate Reform

The implementation of the bachelor-master-doctorate reform in the WAEMU–member countries is considered
an important step toward the construction of the African higher education and research space initiated by the African Union.

The main features of the bachelor-master-doctorate reform in Africa include the adoption of higher education systems made up of the three internationally recognized cycles of bachelor, master, and doctorate; the setting up of national qualifications frameworks, which will eventually lead to subregional and regional frameworks; and the division of periods of training in semesters and the adoption of two instruments that will facilitate comparability of qualifications and encourage academic mobility. These are the credit transfer system and the diploma supplement.

The implementation of the bachelor-master-doctorate reform in the WAEMU–member countries takes place at four levels: institutional, national, subregional, and African regional levels. At the African regional level, implementation of the bachelor-master-doctorate reform is coordinated by the African and Malagasy Council for Higher Education made up of 17 countries that include all the 8 WAEMU–member countries. Despite the progress made, implementation of this reform is still facing several challenges.

Given their historical relations with Europe in the area of higher education, the African Francophone countries have taken steps since the mid-2000s to implement the bachelor-master-doctorate reforms.

**Challenges of Implementation**
Implementation of the bachelor-master-doctorate reform in the WAEMU–member countries is facing three major challenges related to the quality of teaching and learning and the relevance of academic and research programs; the low level of research development; and the lack of a credible mechanism for monitoring the credit-transfer systems. These challenges have been widely documented in recent publications on higher education in African Francophone countries.

**Opportunities**
In recent years there has been a renewed interest for African member states and the donors’ community to support the revitalization and further development of higher education and research in Africa. Indeed, almost every regional economic community in Africa has identified higher education as a major area for reform. The importance of higher education in Africa was reaffirmed at the 2009 World Conference on Higher Education and recent summits of African Union Heads of States and Governments. The first opportunity is, thus, provided by the priority given by the African Union to the development of higher education and the way it reflects in the various cooperation agreements recently signed between the African Union and developed and emerging countries. The second opportunity is related to the increased access to virtual infrastructures and the third opportunity is offered by the lessons that the WAEMU–member countries may learn from the Bologna process and adapt it to fit the African context, cultures, and values.

Based on several regional and interregional consultations, the WAEMU–member countries have developed, with the assistance of UNESCO, a three-year-pilot project for implementation of the bachelor-master-doctorate reform for the period of 2011–2013. This project is based on the use of information and communications technologies to strengthen the capacity needed for effective implementation of the reform.

In recent years there has been a renewed interest for African member states and the donors’ community to support the revitalization and further development of higher education and research in Africa.

The project aims at achieving three broad results. The first result is related to upgrading information and communications technology physical infrastructure to widen access to broadband Internet. For this purpose the campuses of public and accredited private universities in the eight WAEMU countries will be equipped with fiber optic facilities and at least 200 computers with high-speed data connection. The second result is related to the establishment of a series of virtual infrastructures to improve quality of teaching, learning, and research and to strengthen capacity for effective academic management. These include a network of virtual libraries and digital repositories; a virtual institute for delivery of online courses; university Web portals, and an online credit transfer system.
The third-expected result is linked to strengthening capacities to ensure effective implementation of the bachelor-master-doctorate reform. These include capacity for effective teaching and learning in higher education; development of effective accreditation and quality-assurance mechanisms; and research-capacity development. The project also aims at integrating the WAEMU centers of excellence into regional and international research networks.

**Conclusion**

Since the mid-2000s, all the regional-economic communities in Africa are involved in the implementation of higher education harmonization processes based on the bachelor-master-doctorate reform. Today it is agreed that the WAEMU strategy, based on the use of information and communications technologies to build the capacity required for effective implementation of this reform could lead to meaningful and sustainable results and therefore should serve as a model for the other subregions.

---

**A Decade of Regulating Private Higher Education in South Africa**

**Chika Sehoole**

Chika Sehoole is head of the Department of Education Management and Policy Studies at the University of Pretoria, South Africa. E-mail: chika.sehoole@up.ac.za.

Globally, the growth and expansion of public higher education have been accompanied by the decline in public resources for higher education. This has impacted negatively on the quality of public higher education—thus prompting students to look for alternatives, including private higher education institutions. South Africa is no exception to these developments and has, since the end of apartheid in 1994, experienced a rapid expansion of private higher education activities. This happened given the availability of a limited number of places in public higher education institutions for high school graduates. This created a fertile ground for the growth in the number of private providers. From a pre-1994 period, whereby under apartheid private higher education was outlawed, the number of private institutions grew rapidly—to about 300 in 1999. Many of these institutions, especially foreign private providers, were operating in partnerships with public institutions.

**Enter the Regulations**

The proliferation of private higher education institutions led this sector to government’s focus on legislative and regulatory action. This happened against the backdrop of reported stories of the public losing money to bogus private institutions that would open their doors at the beginning of the academic year and the owner(s) disappearing without trace within a few months. In 1997, government passed the Higher Education Act that legalized private higher education. In 2002, the regulations for the registration of private higher education institutions were passed and were implemented since 2003. The regulations made it mandatory for private and public higher education institutions to register their programs with the South African Qualifications Authority. These programs should be quality assured and accredited by the Higher Education Quality Council.

The purpose of registering private higher education institutions was to ensure that they offer an acceptable quality of education; students receive higher education from institutions that have the resources, capacity, and/or expertise to deliver quality programs; students enrolled with these institutions obtain qualifications that are aligned with the National Qualifications Framework; and the education system continues on a path of transformation in accordance with government policy.

The regulations outlawed franchising arrangements. This led to many providers disappearing from the scene. Out of a reported 300 private higher education institutions that were operating in South Africa in the late 1990s, about 89 applied for reaccreditation of their programs with the Higher Education Quality Council in 2002.

**Private Foreign Institutions in South Africa**

The regulations made provision for the registration and operation of foreign private higher education institutions. However, a foreign applicant was required to submit proof that: (a) its parent institution operates lawfully as a higher education institution and is accredited by the appropriate accrediting body in its country of origin; (b) a qualification awarded in its name will be fully recognized by its parent institution and by the appropriate state authorities in its country of origin; and (c) a student who is awarded its qualification will suffer no disadvantage if she/he applies to enroll for an appropriate advanced qualification in the parent institution.

These requirements were also responding to reported cases of foreign institutions offering qualifications that were not recognized by a parent institution. Many foreign providers that had entered South Africa, through franchising arrangements or in their own right, withdrew as a result of these requirements. By mid-2004 there were only six foreign providers that remained operational in South Africa.
Overview of the Implementation of the Regulations

The latest register of private higher education (August 2011), shows that, since 2003, the government has dealt with about 177 institutions (both local and foreign), which applied for registration. Eighty-six of these institutions are currently registered; 31 are provisionally registered; 3 have been given notice of cancellation; and 57 had their registration canceled. The reasons for cancellation of institutions include the resistance to submit a financial surety agreement, failure to submit audited financial statements, and loss of accreditation status of their programs that are some of the conditions for registration. Sometimes, cancellation would be at the request of an institution.

South Africa’s adoption of this regulatory framework has not gone without challenges. During the period of the implementation of these regulations, government has faced litigations from three providers that were all won by the plaintiffs. Pressure also came from the negotiations of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) where South Africa received requests for market access to its higher education “market” from countries such as New Zealand, Norway, Kenya, and the United States. South Africa has refused to accede to these requests, on the grounds of the potential danger such action would pose on its efforts to transform higher education, and in particular to strengthen the public sector so that it can participate effectively in a globalizing environment. This stand was also inspired by the principled position of seeing higher education as “public good,” and subjecting it to the GATS agenda would undermine this position.

Lessons

In many developing countries, private higher education has grown faster than public higher education—mainly given that governments have not been able to make adequate provision of quality higher education. South Africa has been able to regulate private higher education and in so doing weeded out unscrupulous providers and maintained control over the activities of legally registered providers. The application of these regulations, many of which are also applicable to public institutions, also accounts for the reputation South African higher education has in terms of quality and stability.

How has South Africa succeeded where many countries have failed? The case of South Africa demonstrates that it is possible to use the law supported by sound policies to achieve one’s objectives. South Africa requires private institutions to have sound financial systems, subject their programs to quality check, and ensure that awarded qualifications have global relevance and application. South Africa has further been principled and consistent in its view of education as a public good, and this has enabled it to enforce its policies and withstand the pressure for deregulation of private higher education that other developing coun-

South Africa has been able to regulate private higher education and in so doing weeded out unscrupulous providers and maintained control over the activities of legally registered providers.

tries have been unable to do. Through these policies the public has been protected even during the global financial crisis as it had registered credible and financially sound institutions that could weather off the financial storm. South Africa’s principled position on private higher education further supports the assertion that globalization (of education) is not happening in spite of the state but with the collusion and active participation of the nation state. South Africa remains an active player in the global financial and multilateral institutions that shape global economics and politics, although this trend has not deterred it to also develop and pursue policies consonant with the national interest. Thus far, there has not been any evidence of South Africa having been disadvantaged by the pursuit of its education policies.

In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider “following” us on Twitter!
Graduate Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Prospects and Challenges

Fred M. Hayward
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Higher education in Africa in the 1960s and 1970s pictured excitement, creativity, and pride—given that faculty members dedicated to teaching were involved in innovative research, and many helped lay the foundations for governance and development. Quality was high, and universities held in great esteem. Most students were eager scholars, exhilarated by their good fortune, and certain they were destined for leadership roles. And a start was made on graduate programs. By the early 1980s, the picture was different for most universities—including budget shortfalls in declining national economic circumstances, repression, curtailed academic freedom, civil unrest, and loss of status. Donor interest shifted to primary education, and external funding declined from US$103 million annually as late as 1994, dropping to an average of US$30.8 million from 1995 to 1999.

Enrollment pressure added its toll with student numbers increasing from 21,000 in 1960 to 473,000 in 1983. By 1991 enrollments reached 2.7 million, and by 2006 there were 9.3 million students. This resulted in tremendous pressure on governments to increase access. Yet, only 5 percent of the college age population is in higher education in Africa, and demand will grow especially as the success of “education for all” at the primary level produces more secondary school graduates.

While public expenditures in education continued at about 20 percent of government budgets, over the last 15 years student expenditures declined about 30 percent. Public spending per capita fell from US$6,800 in 1980 to US$1,200 in 2002, and by 2009 to US$981. The combination of declining per capita budgets and growing student numbers at many institutions led to larger classes, declining real income for faculty and staff, and falling faculty morale. Efforts to establish graduate programs became especially difficult, given their higher cost and greater demands on staff time.

Today’s Condition of Graduate Education

Graduate education expanded after the 1980s. By 2001, 82 African universities reported they offered PhD programs (or the French equivalent). In spite of that expansion, only 7 percent of enrollments are in graduate education.

The financial problems of African higher education have spawned a shortage of faculty members, and fewer than 34 percent of those have PhDs. That has hindered graduate education. The World Bank estimates that if the current trends in enrollment continue, African universities will need an additional 450,000 faculty members by 2015.

Graduate training at high-quality institutions outside Africa is expensive. The costs for a PhD in Europe or the United States can be US$200,000 or more. In contrast, graduate study in sub-Saharan Africa is much less expensive, being as low as US$3,000 for science and engineering in Ghana (for students living at home). In South Africa it is about US$11,000 a year. Thus, postgraduate training locally, or in other African countries, is the least-expensive way to foster advanced training for faculty.

The decline in funding has also resulted in a reduction in faculty research. The level of research at most universities is not adequate to support quality graduate programs. One measure of this decline is the drop in output of African scholars over the last 25 years, as measured by international journal publications. Sub-Saharan African publications in the sciences, for example, declined by 31 percent since its peak in 1987. To produce high-quality master’s and PhD graduates, an institution must have its own active research program with faculty members ready to serve as advisers, mentors, and research models.

Providing adequate opportunities for women in higher education, both as students and faculty members, has proven difficult. My 2009 examination of graduate programs found that only 29 percent of the graduate students were women. Ethiopia was at the low end, with 8 percent. Only South Africa, with 45 percent of women in graduate education, came close to gender equity.

Fiscal austerity has also resulted in deterioration of infrastructure, making quality graduate education more difficult. It is estimated that the investment required to bring the higher education infrastructure to satisfactory levels is US$45 billion.

By the early 1980s, the picture was different for most universities—including budget shortfalls in declining national economic circumstances, repression, curtailed academic freedom, civil unrest, and loss of status.
In spite of the severe financial problems, staff shortage, overcrowding, and declining working conditions in most universities—there remains a corps of dedicated faculty members and administrators throughout Africa, who are committed to quality teaching and are producing excellent research. Also, several centers of excellence in graduate education in universities in places like Ghana and South Africa have continued to have the resources needed to provide high-quality graduate training.

**The Need to Expand Graduate Education**

In many respects, the development of postgraduate studies has been held hostage to the growing demand to expand undergraduate programs, which have consumed limited university resources. Thus, the lack of graduate programs is part of the reason for the shortage of faculty members.

The case for the expansion of graduate education is compelling. The critical contribution of higher education to national development has been empirically demonstrated by the World Bank’s research and other studies. In large part, African universities continue to provide the majority of the research done in Africa, and graduate programs are a key to meeting the critical shortage of faculty members.

The short-run major efforts to expand graduate studies should focus on existing quality graduate programs and give them a regional focus—much as South Africa has done through the Southern African Development Community, providing lower-cost tuition to its members. In addition, university partnerships might focus on regional solutions to the current shortage of quality graduate programs.

The primary focus in developing graduate programs must be on high quality. The most promising way to build the kind of outstanding graduate programs and the research capacity needed in Africa is to focus resources on a few high-quality programs in countries with governments willing to invest in graduate education and cooperate with regional partners. These centers will attract the brightest minds, best teachers, and public-minded academics to build programs equal to any around the world. Success will require major investments in higher education by governments, foundations, and other funders. Such commitments are critical to expanding outstanding graduate programs in Africa—programs that will build on existing examples of excellence and on those universities willing and able to create the conditions to produce first-class research, graduate teaching, and service.

---
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The degree to which Chinese higher education has maintained some institutional diversity is quite remarkable, in spite of pressures to conform to the model of a global research university. University presidents are naturally concerned about their institutions’ locations in global-ranking systems, and national policy has supported significant efforts to enable universities to achieve world-class quality and standing. Strong national programs have also been under way to support fields of knowledge seen as important in China’s development and to ensure some redistribution of resources to less-developed parts of the country.

**Globalization as a Process of Homogenization**

Chinese higher education has been reshaped in the massification process toward a highly hierarchical system, with substantive priority funding given to the top 100 institutions in Project 211, initiated in 1993. An even-steeper hierarchy has emerged with Project 985, established to support 30 top institutions in 1998. These institutions benefit from resources and opportunities for global engagement, setting them apart from the majority of regional and local institutions. A kind of homogenization toward world trends in the mergers have taken place, as well as the strong impetus toward curricular comprehensiveness. While China’s medical universities were separate institutions under the Soviet model of the 1950s, virtually all of them have been merged with top-level comprehensive and polytechnic universities.
Faculty have argued that this was important in raising their rankings, since medical research attracts considerable research funding. In addition, comprehensive universities, such as Peking and Fudan Universities, which formerly focused only on basic arts and sciences, have now developed faculties of engineering and management. Polytechnic universities, such as Tsinghua and Shanghai Jiao Tong, have developed programs in humanities and social sciences.

In spite of this trend, some of the unique types of universities developed under Soviet socialist influences in the 1950s have survived and enhanced their profiles over the recent period. This has ensured the maintenance of considerable diversity in the system. These include normal universities, agricultural universities, and universities engaged with minority cultures. Their persistence has been made possible by national policy and by the initiative of institutional leaders in a period of enhanced autonomy. Three examples may give some insight into how this has happened.

**Education-Related Universities in a Diverse System**

The “normal university” is an almost unknown concept in Anglo-American academic discourse. Derived from France’s Ecole Normale Supérieure, it is a comprehensive university focusing on basic arts and sciences and the preparation of teachers for secondary and tertiary schools. China already had normal universities before 1949, and under Soviet influence they were developed into a nationwide system. Leaders of East China Normal University in Shanghai, one of China’s top educational institutions, explained their resentment of a government policy that forbade them from removing the word “normal” from their title or from any kind of merger, except those bringing in cognate educational institutions for early childhood, special education, or adult education. While seeing this as a serious disadvantage at first, later they managed to attract substantive funding from the Shanghai government for strengthening their image as an enhanced version of the normal university. The East China Normal University took on new responsibilities for education at all levels of schooling and for adult learners, as well as broadening the curriculum into new areas of the social and natural sciences.

A strategic partnership with the Ecole Normale Supérieure in graduate education and the decision to make this Shanghai campus an international education city has now given this institution a unique identity and profile. The efforts of successive presidents and the support of the Shanghai municipal government enabled them to enter Projects 211 and 985. These activists have led the way in demonstrating the contribution normal universities can make to a knowledge economy. Shanghai’s stunning debut as number one in the world, in the most recent Program for International Student Assessment tests (of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), has now given them visibility on a global stage.

**The “normal university” is an almost unknown concept in Anglo-American academic discourse.**

**An Agricultural Multiversity**

Northwest Agricultural and Forestry University (NWAFU) in the small town of Yangling, some distance from Xi’An, made a similar strategic decision. This institution has promoted its image as a high-level center of food research rather than the comprehensive multiversity it has become, through the merger of two universities and five research institutes. The government discouraged the merging of agricultural universities with other types of universities, yet there was not as strong a fiat against merging or changing the title, as in the case of normal institutions. Nevertheless, NWAFU’s leaders saw the value of emphasizing their location in the heartland of traditional Chinese agriculture and creating a major center for the development of international food policy and research. They used the resources, given to them at the time of their merger, and the greatly enhanced regional infrastructure developed under China’s Great West Project. When we first visited NWAFU in 1993, it took two or three hours on a rutted rural road from Xi’An. Now, a four-lane highway gets visitors there from the Xi’An airport in 40 minutes. NWAFU’s leaders told us that they had purposefully chosen international partners—such as Wageningen in Holland and Cornell in the United States—to strengthen their capacity in such important areas as global food security and agricultural environmentalism, rather than pursuing the global research university model.
A Multicultural University for Minorities

Yanbian University in Northeast China, on the border of North Korea, provides another interesting example of persisting diversity. Founded in the early 1950s to train Korean minority students for teaching and local governmental leadership, it has recently raised its status to a national university, supported by funding from Project 211. Here, institutional leadership seems to have been crucial to the preservation and enhancement of this institution’s unique identity as a multicultural university. The six country talks, involving China, Russia, Japan, the United States, and the two Koreas, have drawn considerable global attention to the region; and Yanbian University has made international relations and global geopolitics a main area of curricular focus. It has also attracted students nationwide because of its bilingual Korean-Chinese pedagogy and the exchange and employment opportunities resulting from the dynamism of the South Korean economy. While originally a local university, it now attracts more than half of its student body from all parts of China. This includes majority Han students and other minority students who are as keen as Koreans to learn the language and connect to the region. Even though Yanbian is not located in China’s northwest, its leaders were successful in applying for infrastructural support from the Great Northwest Project, since it qualified as being in a disadvantaged region.

Persisting Diversity in Face of Globalization

A first look at recent developments in Chinese higher education would suggest conformity to the homogenizing forces of globalization. A closer look reveals a balancing of efforts to support world-class universities on a global stage, with national policies in support of diversity and national programs of economic redistribution. Thus, even the elite group of top universities includes diverse types of institutions, which draw attention to local dimensions of China’s educational traditions, agricultural-development trajectory, and policies for the support of minority cultures. In this, China may have an important lesson for other developing countries, as they seek to balance efforts to reach global standards with support for the integrity and authenticity of local or national values and patterns.

Hong Kong’s Academic Advantage
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Why is it that Hong Kong, a special administrative region of China, with a population of 7 million, has more highly ranked research universities than mainland China—with its population of 1 billion and unprecedented expenditures for establishing world-class research universities? The answers may yield important insights for the improvement of research universities everywhere.

Hong Kong’s Academic Realities

Hong Kong has three universities that score well in the global rankings, and all eight of its public universities are academically respectable institutions. The three top schools—the University of Hong Kong, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, and the Chinese University of Hong Kong, score respectively at 34, 61, and 151 in the Times Higher Education 2011 rankings. The two top mainland Chinese universities, Peking University and Tsinghua University, rank at 49 and 71. The new greater China rankings, prepared by the new Academic Rankings of World Universities (“Shanghai ranking”), place the three Hong Kong institutions at 3, 5, and 6; only Tsinghua University and National Taiwan University score better. The three Hong Kong institutions are medium sized by global standards—with between 10,000 and 20,000 students each. Two are comprehensive universities with medical schools, and one is a science and technology university. All were established in the 20th century—the University of Hong Kong in 1911, Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1964, and the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology in 1991. All of Hong Kong’s universities are public institutions, with good financial support from the government; and all charge students a relatively modest tuition.
The Context of Success

There are a variety of ingredients that have contributed to the success of Hong Kong’s big three. It is useful to note that none of the three schools were academic powerhouses until the 1990s. The two older institutions were respectable second-tier institutions, and the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology was not established until 1991. Hong Kong decided to invest significantly in higher education in the 1990s, as the territory anticipated the transition from British colonial rule to its current status as a Special Administrative Region of China—with considerable institutional autonomy and academic freedom of action. Flush economic times permitted government investment. Hong Kong began to emphasize research universities, for several reasons. First—as one of the four tigers with Singapore, Korea, and Taiwan—Hong Kong had to keep up; and even though the government left investment in high tech to the private sector, it was willing to establish a science and technology university. Second, this was the beginning of the age of massification. As Hong Kong’s postsecondary colleges and polytechnics moved toward university status, its three universities could take the step toward becoming research universities, as Hong Kong moved toward developing a diversified academic system.

Characteristics of Success

A brief overview of some of the key factors that have contributed to Hong Kong’s academic success may yield some useful explanations.

“Steering” and autonomy. Hong Kong’s government, through the Research Grants Council and the University Grants Committee, provides overall direction to the higher education sector; prioritized funding, combined with performance guidelines, shape university policy. At the same time, the universities have almost complete internal autonomy and self-management.

Effective governance. The University of Hong Kong stems from the British academic tradition and the Chinese University, though established by the consolidation of American missionary colleges in 1963, brought American missionary and Chinese traditions into Hong Kong’s colonial framework for higher education. The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology added the American research university model and academic governance to the mix, without assaulting the status quo. All three have strong international governance arrangements that emphasize control by the academics, while at the same time strong administrative leadership. Shared governance seems to work well in Hong Kong, although all three of the universities have somewhat different approaches to it. The universities do not seem to get bogged down in endless academic bickering, nor are they ruled by autocratic administrators.

There are some interesting variations between the British-influenced University of Hong Kong and the more American-oriented arrangement at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, though in recent years the two arrangements have begun to merge.

English dominates. English is the medium of instruction in all the universities, although both English and Chinese (the Cantonese dialect but also Mandarin) are used at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, to reflect its name. This means that Hong Kong’s universities are immediately in the mainstream of global science and scholarship. Though academics at the Chinese University of Hong Kong may use Chinese as a medium of instruction, they are as capable as any to fully participate in the global scientific community through the medium of English. There is a strong orientation toward the key international academic journals; and most publications produced are in English, although in recent years Chinese publications have increased as Hong Kong academics have begun to take advantage of the impact won by publishing in the massive academic landscape on the Chinese mainland.

Shared governance seems to work well in Hong Kong, although all three of the universities have somewhat different approaches to it.

Internationalism. Hong Kong as a place is highly internationalized. This has always meant North America, England, and Australia but has gradually come to include more academics from the Chinese mainland and a small but increasing number of top academics, from every continent. Hong Kong is the Asian headquarters for many multinational companies, and is one of the top-three (after New York and London) international banking centers. Although its population is 95 percent Chinese, an international cosmopolitan spirit pervades. Most of the top academics at research universities have doctorates earned overseas, and many go on to academic and administrative posts in overseas universities. The universities have always seen themselves as international institutions. No other regions in Asian higher education have better access to international scholarly books and publications. There is no censorship of the Internet, and academic books that may be restricted elsewhere in Asia are all available in Hong Kong. Hong Kong’s research universities hold international academic events—forums, seminars, and conferences, on a caliber of anywhere in the world.
The academic profession. Clearly the most important aspects of Hong Kong’s success in higher education, academics there are relatively well treated. While they are no longer the highest-paid academics in the world, salaries compete globally, and Hong Kong is able to recruit some of the best academic minds. The universities also ensure that top scholars and scientists, including Nobel laureates, are invited to lecture; and their own academics have ample opportunities to attend international conferences. Terms and conditions of academic work—including teaching loads, administrative support, and the availability of research funding, on a competitive basis from local sources—are all globally competitive. Leaders in academic fields also play a role in external assessment of research grant applications and teaching programs. Hiring, promotion, and tenure are performance based and quite competitive, contributing to academic productivity. Hong Kong is not only able to hire talented academics globally but has a special attraction for some overseas and mainland Chinese academics, who can live in a Chinese environment, while at the same time enjoying good salaries and working conditions—superior to what is offered to most academics on the Chinese mainland. Just as important, Hong Kong offers mainland returnees an atmosphere that is not stifled by bureaucracy, where decision making is more participative and transparent and in which academic freedom and information access are unfettered. What mainly distinguishes the academic profession in Hong Kong from elsewhere is its view that personnel matters and resource allocations are largely perceived by academic staff to be made on the basis of performance measures. This was not always the case. For example, a few decades ago, the University of Hong Kong resembled a provincial British university in its academic culture. A remarkable transformation has taken place.

University leadership. The faith of the academic profession in the research universities of Hong Kong has hinged on the academic caliber of its institutional leaders. Each of the three research universities has ensured that only outstanding academics would be at the helm of their institutions. This has undoubtedly had a great deal to do with the rise of Hong Kong’s universities in the international rankings. For example, the last president of the University of Hong Kong is a world-renowned geneticist, and the president of the Chinese University of Hong Kong was awarded a Nobel Prize for his work in fiber optics, named an “Asian Hero, by Time magazine for his work on SARS. The current president of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology distinguished himself as a key assistant director of the US National Science Foundation, in charge of the Mathematical and Physical Sciences Directorate. There may be other considerations in the selection of university leaders. However, to sustain its rise in the global rankings, Hong Kong must ensure that the most significant aspects are that the most-respected global scholars and scientists are the ones that are in positions of authority at their universities.

While they are no longer the highest-paid academics in the world . . . Hong Kong is able to recruit some of the best academic minds.

The Hong Kong case has special relevance for mainland China and indicates some of the factors that may inhibit China’s rise to top-academic status.

Hong Kong and China: Useful Comparisons
The Hong Kong case has special relevance for mainland China and indicates some of the factors that may inhibit China’s rise to top-academic status. While the investment in the facilities of its top research universities has been impressive in recent years, the “soft elements” of the Chinese academic system may well inhibit the system from achieving the top levels. Among these, the most prominent are governance and academic culture. China still places an inordinate emphasis on the political skill of its academic leaders—something that is understandable, given the context in which academic leaders operate on the Chinese mainland. Nevertheless, the new education blueprint for 2020 has made the “de-administration of universities” a major objective in raising the academic quality of its universities. Thus, government would take more of a steering role than a direct interventionist role in the academic life of universities, although the recent case of the South China University of Science and Technology has demonstrated the difficulty of this process. There has been a steady and unmistakable rise in the internationalism of China’s research universities. The surge in the amount of Sino-foreign cooperation in higher education, including overseas campuses on Chinese soil, is an indication of progress. More presidents of top research universities have a doctorate from overseas or have spent a good deal of time there.
A key factor in the continued rise of mainland research universities relates to low academic salaries. Low-base salaries mean that academics must search for additional income through research grants, consulting, and extra teaching and, thus, pay less attention to their core academic responsibilities. A related problem is the development of a mature academic culture. Mainland China will benefit by looking at Hong Kong’s recipe for academic success.

Chile: The Rise and Decline of a Student Movement
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Shortly after the beginning of the academic year in March, Chilean university and high school students took their grievances to the streets and unleashed what the leaders of the movement like to describe as the largest popular demonstrations since the return to democracy, in 1990.

In Chile, as in most of Latin America, university student protests have been a staple of the social movement’s scenario. Since the 1980s, higher education in Chile—private and public—is funded chiefly through tuition payments by students. Thus, in the past two decades, facing increasing costs of tuition, the mobilized students had regularly pushed for more student aid and obtained it. But these demonstrations were brief and focused. A novelty first emerged in 2006, when public high school students, demanding better education in the public sector, went on strike and barricaded themselves in dozens of schools—effectively interrupting classes for thousands in several of the main cities of Chile, bringing down the Minister of Education, and turning the quality of education into a political crisis that lasted for several months.

This year’s student movement follows in the wake of the 2006 riots but has achieved greater scope and depth. Its support has extended way beyond the most politically active students, who had typically led and galvanized their peers, involving at its peak a majority of public opinion. The transformations the movement seeks to leverage are not just changes in education but in the “model” of development Chile has been enacting for the past 30 years.

What began as the expected seasonal rioting of high school pupils (only deferred last year, due to the earthquake in southern Chile) acquired momentum when university students joined in the taking of buildings and organized weekly massive marches on the streets of downtown Santiago and other major cities. For the past six months, numbers sometimes approaching 200,000 have marched to demand fundamental changes in Chile’s educational system, and more. Hundreds of schools and college buildings have been occupied by live-in demonstrators and classes forcefully suspended—for some 250,000 high school students (7% of the national total) and for most public universities, whose students went on strike.

Origins of the Uprising

The educational demands of the students mix well-worn banners—such as more funding for public universities—and greater access of underprivileged populations, with newer and more fundamental proposals—such as the reform of the municipal administration of primary and secondary public schools, the ending of for-profit education at all levels, and the introduction of tuition-free higher education for all.

Several factors have contributed to ignite and sustain the protests. The weakness of popular support for the rightist government of President Sebastián Piñera, with poll numbers hovering in the low 30s, leaves the government with little legroom for a political solution of the problem.

The charisma of the two main spokespersons for the movement—Camila Vallejo, president of the Student Federation of the University of Chile, and Giorgio Jackson, president of the Student Federation of the Catholic University of Chile—has provided the movement with agreeable and articulate faces and helped leverage the students’ cause with the national and international media.

In Chile, as in most of Latin America, university student protests have been a staple of the social movement’s scenario.
of profiteering, elitism, or substandard quality. While this portrayal of the private sector is a caricature, it has played well with ample sectors of society that are not particularly fond of the private provision of public goods and, instead, long for greater state control of education, health, energy, or infrastructure.

Lastly, there appears to be a good measure of frustration among the Chilean middle class, with the neoliberal model of development that Chile has followed since the years of General Pinochet’s dictatorship (with marginal corrections during the 20 years ruled by a coalition of left-of-center parties). The “model” has done good for Chile’s economic growth, and for the very poor, for a whole generation. However, its individualistic and competitive overtones and a growing sense of overall social inequality, which includes but is not limited to educational opportunity, seems to be subjecting the social compound to severe stress. Popular solidarity with the students is nurtured by this complex social environment.

**Peak and Decline**

In part, as a reflection of this generalized malaise and, also, out of sheer political opportunism, other aggrieved groups joined secondary and university students in the streets—such as the teachers’ union, a newly created association of debtors of university loans, government employees, and the national union of workers.

In late July, the movement achieved a political victory, by forcing the president to remove the minister of education. The new minister invited the leaders of the students to discuss a policy-reform proposal, encompassing all levels of education. For higher education, the government was offering quite likely the most generous package ever put on the table in 40 years, both in terms of financial commitments and in response to the historic demands of the educational actors: the proposal considered injecting additional US$4 billion (2% of gross domestic product) to the educational budget over a period of 4 to 6 years, which would fund increased access to preschool, reforms in schools of education to improve teacher training and certification, changes in the governance of public school districts, and increased per student funding for K–12 education.

In higher education, the government offered to create an enforcement agency to protect students’ rights, monitor accountability, and ensure universities to abide by their nonprofit status. It also proposed strengthening of the national accreditation commission and its procedures—as well as more to the core of the students’ agenda, increase funding for public universities, ease loan payment conditions for outstanding debtors, lower the interest rate on educational loans, and give full-tuition scholarships to the poorest 40 percent of students.

The government did not, however, offer to eliminate for-profit private education (let alone private education, as a whole) or to make higher education free of tuition. More generally, the government is reluctant to change the model of subsidy to students’ demand, through vouchers, scholarships, and loans—under which public financial support is channeled both to school education and higher education.

The students remained unmoved. Mere adjustments to the educational system would not suffice. They want to transform what they see as Chile’s “free market,” “neoliberal” education—as a means of changing the Chilean free market, neoliberal model of development. They believe that well-funded, state-run education can achieve better outcomes for students and a more inclusive, cohesive, and just society. Their response to the government was a pledge to continue and radicalize the movement.

---

**Rectors have sometimes accused the private sector of higher education, which accounts for 3/4 of all postsecondary enrollments, of profiteering, elitism, or substandard quality.**

---

The expansion of the student movement, to include other causes, added to its influence, but that stage blurred its agenda and turned it increasingly ideological and political. Its success in garnering the support of public opinion clouded the judgment of the students’ leadership and their political advisers, who at this critical juncture chose to exchange actual reform for the chance of affecting a transformation in capitalism itself.

The government reacted by taking back what it had offered, transferring its responsibility, of finding a solution, to congress and the discussion therein of the budget bill for 2012, and betting on the progressive erosion of the movement. The gambit is paying off: exhaustion with the violence often associated with the protests is eating on popular support for the movement; rectors are eager to grab what the government offered and are for the first time, in six months, putting pressure on students to go back to classes; some of the leaders face elections in their student federations; and the press is moving on to other issues.

The movement’s unprecedented success conspires with its effectiveness. With grand and ever-evolving goals, multiple and diffuse leaderships, political radicalization among many of its constituents, and mounting damage to public schools and universities from six months of paraly-
sis—the movement seems increasingly unable to find an acceptable endgame. The student movement has brought the problems of education to the forefront of the political agenda—no small feat, even if it’s the only one this gesture can manage to accomplish.

Why the Argentine Private University Sector Continues to Lag

Marcelo Rabossi

Marcelo Rabossi is assistant professor at the School of Government, Torcuato Di Tella University, Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: mrabossi@utdt.edu.

IHE devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See http://www.albany.edu/.

In Latin America, the private sector holds roughly half of all higher education enrollment. In Argentina it holds a fifth. No other large country in Latin America is nearly as low in the private share. Why does Argentina continue to be so different and will this change?

Early Stages

The private university sector in Argentina began late, in comparison to other systems in Latin America. Attempts to challenge the public monopoly, particularly during the first half of the 20th century, faced strong state opposition. Only after intense compromises with the executive power, would Argentina open its first private university (in 1959). At the time, the large majority of Latin American countries had already established a private sector, and only 3 of the 20 republics would not have done so by 1962. After Argentina’s public monopoly of more than 130 years was broken, the private market began a process of enrollment expansion. By the end of the 1960s, it captured almost one of every five university students.

The expansion of the private market was in some instances, as in Mexico, a response to defend the status of elites in higher education as the public university absorbed more and more students of modest socioeconomic background. In Argentina, however, the public sector was not only the main absorber of new students but remained committed to keeping its position at the top of the hierarchical pyramid. The private market was never thought as a complementary tool to lessen the paramount stature of the national institution. In comparison to the region overall, private options have never found fertile ground to expand to a large share of enrollment.

Argentina’s historical emphasis on the public university has held, even during periods of fiscal crises. Though it may appear economically perverse, the nature of the Argentine political system meant that during the 1980s, while an exhausted state was begging for funds, the doors of the national university were opened for all secondary school graduates. Policy in effect since 1973, allowing no new private universities, was not lifted until 1989. Thus, Argentina became one of the few Latin American countries to witness a decline in the private share of enrollment. In sum, the private sector in Argentina was tolerated but not part of a systemic design.

A New Opportunity for Private Alternatives

However, the early 1990s, amid neoliberal political/economic policy, brought another chance for private expansion. With the entry of 23 new institutions between 1989 and 1995, for the first time private universities outnumbered public ones (48 to 40). These newcomers added heterogeneity in a system dominated in enrollment by the public side (86% in 1995). But, quickly, the opening of the National Accreditation Agency (CONEAU) in 1996 was a new barrier to private expansion. The agency was immediately strict in its requirements, rejecting almost 9 of every 10 entry applications. For example, looking at the last 10 years of available official data (2000–2009), only 12 private universities were allowed to enter the market, and only 3 since 2005. Within this panorama, by the end of 2009, 60 private institutions are found to be enrolling only 20 percent of all university students—in other words, a percentage not dissimilar to the one reached at the end of the 1960s (18%).

A significant fact during the period (2000–2009) was that new public enrollees remained stable (at 290,000), while private freshmen grew (from 62,000 to 97,000). Thus, 25 percent of all new students in 2009 chose the non-public option. Consequently, private enrollment increased by 6 percentage points (from 14 to 20%). Probably the increase in the purchasing power of salaries during the last five or six years helps explain this private growth. Also, we can speculate that an increasing number of families perceive that from an academic and organizational perspective the private sector is less internally politicized or conflicted and thus enhances the ease of completing degrees. Such a
More Room for Private Alternatives?

Even as the private sector is now enrolling one out of every four new students, its ability to increase this proportion remains unclear. Argentina does not offer the friendliest environment for private undertakings. Most public policies are far from fostering private alternatives. The open admission that mainly rules the public sector since 1983 hardly favors the development of a larger private market. Unlike some regional counterparts (though not others), Argentina also maintains a policy of no tuition for public higher education at the undergraduate level. Also, there are no available public-subsidied loans for students who chose a private institution. Loans are not prevalent for the public sector either, but it is only the private sector that charges major fees. From the supply side, public policies are not friendly for new private investors. While the opening of new public universities does not need to get the National Accreditation Agency’s approval, nonpublic undertakings are strictly controlled by the agency. Such a situation may arise when the state trusts its national institutions more than the private counterparts.

In sum, Argentina has debatable but strong dual barriers to private higher education growth: demanding public-policy regulations on the private sector and expansive or even lax policy within the public side, particularly concerning the opening of new institutions. Thus, no major conditions are seen as an expectation for a private boom in Argentina that would bring the country toward the regional private higher education share.

Argentina’s historical emphasis on the public university has held, even during periods of fiscal crises.

Welcome to the National University of Germany!

Sebastian Litta
Sebastian Litta is a fellow at the Stiftung Neue Verantwortung, a think tank in Berlin, where he leads a project on the future of German universities. E-mail: sebastian.litta@gmail.com.

Six years ago, Germany’s federal government proposed the idea of creating an artificial Ivy League of a handful of research universities that would receive extra money—to compete with the likes of Harvard, Stanford, and Cambridge. A first round of this so-called excellence competition, in 2007, produced nine universities that were subsequently showered with modest sums of public money. The funding was limited to five years and will end in 2012. Recognizing that new Harvards cannot be built within half a decade, the federal minister of education and research soon announced a second round that will start next summer. Some politicians and the few German higher education visionaries are already thinking about how to ensure the long-term success of the winner universities. Creating federal universities seems to be one option.

Universities’ Linkage to Shrinking State Budgets

Traditionally, the German system of responsibility between the federal level and the states provides power concerning universities and other educational institutions to the states (Länder). The federal level takes care only of research organizations—such as Max Planck, the National Science Foundation DFG, and international exchange organizations. While this arrangement could make a theoretical sense on how to organize a federal state, it clashes with the fiscal reality of Germany’s 16 states, many of which must make severe budget cuts in the future. Tuition fees, only recently introduced, might need to be abolished again, because the numerous opponents were successful in portraying them as unjust. Hence, German public universities will lose this only significant nonpublic source of income. In 2017, when the public funds of the second excellence competition round will have been spent, the 9 to 12 winner universities might fall back to “normal” levels of financing, which often means one-tenth of Harvard’s budget per student.

Undoubtedly, the idea of using federal money to bring state universities to a reputation of international fame has been mentioned. A recent article, in Germany’s Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, even proclaimed that federal universities or Bundesuniversitäten already exist. This referred to the merger of Karlsruhe’s state-financed Technical University with a nearby federally financed research institute. The new institution, rebranded as KIT or Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, has been mentioned. A recent article, in Germany’s Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, even proclaimed that federal universities or Bundesuniversitäten already exist. This referred to the merger of Karlsruhe’s state-financed Technical University with a nearby federally financed research institute. The new institution, rebranded as KIT or Karlsruhe Institute of Technology.
Technology, is now a university officially run by a state but actually receives a large part of its funding from the federal level. When Annette Schavan, the federal minister of education and research, remarked that she could imagine in the future more federally funded universities, the public reaction was mildly positive. However, two problems should be discussed before entering this new path of German higher education. First, the debate is entirely based on finance questions. Policymakers and education experts seem to assume that it is only the size of the budget that separates Heidelberg from Harvard or Bochum from Brown University. Second, even after realizing that money alone cannot buy academic reputation, it seems difficult to organize the transfer from state to federal funding.

Some politicians and the few German higher education visionaries are already thinking about how to ensure the long-term success of the winner universities. Creating federal universities seems to be one option.

More Money Is Not Enough

Regarding the question of how to build a world-class university, more money can, of course, help to lessen the most severe problems. However, several institutional obstacles hinder German universities from becoming a top-20 university in the world. These issues cannot be explicitly discussed, but they include the Kapazitätsverordnung, a legal monster that basically prohibits all universities from improving the student-faculty ratio because of the need to automatically admit more students for every additional professor hired.

Another problem is the relatively weak position of university presidents, caused by both a romantic illusion of enormous self-managing capacities of individual research professors and an ongoing obsession with trying to add more veto players to every university decision-making process. Also, the concentration of many top researchers outside the universities might not harm the research system, but maybe the universities. The discussion about Bundsuniversitäten is, therefore, more about a chance to allow some universities to escape drastic cuts in the future, but it does not produce a master plan of how to actually improve their academic standing. However, if the federal level links funding with institutional reform and a Bundesuniversität could become a laboratory for the future of German higher education, then the case becomes more interesting.

Incentives to Transfer Universities to the Federal Level?

Another question concerns which universities will transform into federally funded institutions. The total list—9 or even 12 winners—of the excellence competition might be too numerous, and it seems unclear how to quantify the amount of excellence in higher education that a government can afford to fund. Even if the federal level determines the number of universities to be funded, how should institutions be selected? It seems doubtful that the states will willingly give up their most prestigious institutions to save them. Some state ministers of education might be interested in keeping a bit of international Ivy League glamour under their financial jurisdiction.

To many observers, a clear example indicates Berlin’s Humboldt University. Once the global prototype of the modern research university, it nowadays cannot be found in the top position of any university ranking—unless 100-year-old Nobel Prizes are given extra weight. The state of Berlin has been facing severe budget problems for many years. Many members of Angela Merkel’s government would like Humboldt to become a federal university, not at least because of geographical proximity. You can walk faster from Humboldt to the Reichstag and Chancellor Merkel’s office than being able to read and understand an average Hegel sentence. However, the mayor-governor of Berlin—like many other politicians—will most likely prefer to see Humboldt stagnate under state-level tutelage rather than to see it prosper once the federal level took over. Universities, along with police, regional culture, and primary and secondary education are among the few divisions that are left to state politicians. Most other important issues are decided at the federal level. “Buying” a state university will thus be very costly, if not too costly, for the federal level.

Learning from Switzerland

All the obstacles mentioned above do not mean that it would be impossible to create a federal university. When the Swiss, more than one-and-a-half century ago, debated
the same question and encountered massive resistance by establishing regional universities, they came up with an intelligent compromise. The newly erected federal universities would only focus on research areas not considered worth working on by other universities: engineering, sciences, and other technical subjects. Today, the ETH (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) Zürich is not only an excellent technical institution but clearly also one of Europe’s best universities.

If German policymakers can articulate a compelling vision of what could be achieved by establishing a federal university, this would be a major first step. If, in addition to more money, this institution would avoid some of the organizational and structural problems that keep most German universities from becoming world class. If a creative deal can be found to make this institutional transfer attractive to the states, the federal level, and the respective university, this lofty idea could then become a serious plan.

---

**Student Participation in Higher Education Governance in Europe**

**Manja Klemencic**

Manja Klemencic is postdoctoral researcher at the Centre for Education Policy Studies at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. E-mail: manja.klemencic@gmail.com.

Student participation in higher education governance is considered one of the foundational values in European higher education. This policy is derived from the democratic model of higher education governance, which emerged in Europe after the student revolts in the 1960s, and stipulates that universities as public institutions ought to be governed democratically. Moreover, this factor implies the participation of all politically significant constituencies, including students. Such student participation is also linked to the notions of higher education as a public good and of students as custodians of public interest. Today, students as a collective body in some way represent a part of higher education governance, basically, in every European country.

**European Variations**

Among European countries, quite a variety exists: if national legislation specifies the composition of internal and external stakeholders in institutional governance arrangements or if institutions have the autonomous prerogative to decide on these issues. Typically, legislation tends to specify provisions on the roles, responsibilities, and composition of the central institutional governing bodies. Accordingly, student participation in academic senates tends to be the strongest across institutions and countries. Subinstitutional aspects are decided on the institutional level—and may or may not be regulated in the organization’s by-laws. Thus, noticeable differences arise between countries and even institutions within the same systems. Based on legal provisions, student participation may be granted by purely consultative or decision-making bodies, and students may or may not enjoy full voting rights on all issues. In view of these differences between countries, representative student organizations have continued to argue a case for more participation—formal as well as actual.

**Student Participation and the Bologna Process**

The European Students’ Union, the European platform of national student representations, brought the issue of student participation onto the agenda of the Bologna process (see *IHE* no. 50). Although it is an intergovernmental initiative, the Bologna process adopted a participatory governance approach. Stakeholder organizations, including the European Students’ Union, have been involved as consultative members in the governing structures. Student participation has been a salient issue for the union. The European ministers responsible for higher education have spoken in favor of both: student involvement in the policymaking of the emerging European Higher Education Area and student decision-making participation in European, national, and institutional levels. Such political affirmation was virtually unprecedented within European higher education. Still, the extent and degree of student participation as a policy objective was left rather ambiguous. Given the consensual nature of the Bologna process, such ambiguity indicates the policy that was “in offensive” against potential rejection by reluctant governments.

**Improvement of Student Participation in Governance?**

The European Higher Education Area’s political endorsement of student participation has been used by national representative organizations to consolidate or strengthen their participation in the national policy processes. The effects vary, however, among the countries depending on the pre-existing models of student interest intermediation. In some parts of Europe, such as central and southeastern Europe, the political endorsement led to improved student
participation in national-level higher education policymaking. The general tendency across Europe has involved student representatives in the Bologna-initiated policy processes, while to a lesser degree, if at all, at the institutional level. Now, governance reforms sweeping across Europe evince a changing trend of the student participatory model—an erosion of students’ involvement of decision making on all vital policy and strategy. Along with other internal stakeholder representatives, student representatives are increasingly being eclipsed by the executive leadership, and their role is increasingly being transformed from decision making to an advisory factor.

**University Governance Reforms and New Public Management**

With the increasing pressure to modernize European higher education, universities have been granted more institutional autonomy. In general, European universities have created managerial infrastructures parallel to academic ones. This tendency shifts in decision making from collegiate governing bodies, in which students are formally represented, to managerial bodies where they are represented less or not at all. In case of Portugal, for example, the new provisions stipulate student participation in the Conselho Geral, but the minimal share of student representatives is not specified. The arguments given for the change covered disturbance of student representatives (e.g., fights over tuition fees) and the effectiveness of decision making. Concomitantly, the relative political weight of student representatives in university boards has declined. In sum, strong executive leadership has been viewed as a new ideal for supplanting the representative democracy model, discussed above.

**Student participation in higher education governance is considered one of the foundational values in European higher education.**

**Students as Clients**

Given the global financial crisis across Europe, the overall trend creates the burden of financing public higher education shifting from governments to institutions and their students. The creation or substantial increase of tuition fees in some countries has significant impacts on student-university relations. Tuition-paying students—conceived as clients, rather than partners—fit well into the emerging ideal of the modern “corporate” university. Identifying students as clients does not preclude student participation in institutional governance, but it fundamentally transforms it. The contemporary institutional preference for student participation clearly constitutes an advisory rather than a decision-making function. Students are invited to contribute in institutional quality-assurance procedures in terms of improving services and overall institutional performance.

**European Variations**

The trend in institutional governance across Europe is clearly seen as weakening formal student participation and strengthening informal student participation. The extent of such developments depends on the specific national model of student representation and how formalized and strong the channels of student involvement in higher education governance are on various levels. In statist countries with weak student representation, the conception of students as consumers may well be overriding the traditional idea of students as partners. Both conceptions are attempted to be combined in corporatist countries, such as the Nordic states, with mature and highly developed student organizations and with strong channels of influence to higher education governance, on all levels.

---

**Canada’s Egalitarian Debate**

**Daniel Zaretsky**

Daniel Zaretsky is chief ideas officer of Higher-Edge, a Toronto-based international higher education consulting firm. E-mail: dani@higheredge.com.

Some countries with much smaller populations, than Canada’s 35 million, have developed a sharply differentiated or tiered university system. But Canada’s university system evinces a different prevailing ethos. It aspires to lesser differences overall—in terms of calibre of teaching, content, research, and facilities. Thus, last year, Canada’s leading national English-language magazine, *Maclean’s*, reported on Canada’s Big Five universities crying out for more research funding. Why did the article elicit objections from other Canadian universities? And, anyway, why does Canada have a Big Five and not a Best Five?

**No Elite Tier of Universities**

For a country with 10 percent of the US population, it has proportionately far fewer institutions. There are only about 100 mainly degree-granting institutions in Canada, com-
pared to about 4,000 in the United States. The Canadian system is virtually entirely provincially funded. Tuitions are heavily regulated, and provinces offer needs-based loans and grants. Private universities are virtually unheard of. The few that exist have tiny student bodies, are generally obscure, and are not research in nature. Canada has an unusually high proportion of its universities as research universities and a similarly unusual proportion of all of these in small population centers.

**Tuition—Low and Staying Low**

What is the tuition fee import of these differences? Almost all bachelor’s degrees in Canada cost Canadians between C$6,000 and 8,000 for annual tuition (with almost all the exceptions lower—as low as C$2,000). Tuition differences do not reflect intraprovincial or interprovincial caliber—or even perceived caliber—but simply involve the budget judgment of one province, as distinct from another. Yet, Canada’s bachelor’s degree programs are highly respected outside Canada, and its professional programs and medical and law schools are considered first rate by the loftiest of US vantage points (for example, all engineering schools are accredited by the ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology).

McGill University is one of the self-anointed “Big 5” (along with the University of Toronto, Université de Montréal, the University of British Columbia, and the University of Alberta). It is one of the few Canadian universities that can lay claim to attracting a sizeable proportion of students from all over Canada (and the United States). Yet, a bachelor’s degree costs Quebec residents barely C$2,000 a year!

Since tuition prices are limited by the provinces, Canadian institutions have no undue financial incentive to make big investments in branding. Dressing up the image might help command more students or a somewhat better academic profile for the incoming class. But this is not the same conception as having the option to charge more in fees as demand and appeal strengthens.

**Commuter Country**

It is no surprise, then, that another by-product of the Canadian system means that it is exceedingly commonplace for university-bound students in cities across Canada, with small populations, to choose to study near the home region. A typical Canadian will not think Canada’s Big 5 universities—or the US top 10, for that matter—would teach biology or psychology, which are qualitatively more challenging than in the many choices they have within commuter distance.

No Canadian university has a national brand image that compares remotely with the national brand image of Harvard or of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In the international domain, Canadian universities lag very much behind a long list of US counterparts in name recognition. As a result, this system makes it likely that top students will be well-distributed across the country’s institutions.

**Lower-Stress High School**

The absence of big brand differences, a further implication of the Canadian system, is that Canadian high schoolers may work hard but are not overly stressed. This is not to say there is not any high school striving or competitiveness. Certainly, some bachelor programs at a university with limited enrollment require extraordinary achievement to gain entry (and usually do not cost more). But these demands are few and far between.

For example, fine mathematics and physics students have ample engineering spaces across the country and, for most, close to home. For a host of individual reasons, large numbers of students routinely turn down one or more of the Big Five, to attend another institution.

Though high school standardization and scoring is on the wane, for the most part, Canadian high school grades are taken at face value, without further validation required. There is no SAT (Scholastic Assessment Test) equivalent or an entrance exam system. While exceptions exist, most university programs simply require only a submission of high school results.

Because top students study at their own local university, the overall competitive framework is not skewed. The ultra-competitiveness is saved for postbachelor programs—or medicine, dentistry, law, and a wide range of thesis-based master’s dreams.

So, if there are student protests, it is not over the absence of Ivy League institutions in Canada, but rather over the fact that C$5,000 or 7,000 is still a lot of money to pay for annual tuition. Even at these prices, tuition costs remain lively issues in provincial elections.

**The Big Five Aspiration**

The protestations that do emanate come from institutions like Canada’s so-called Big Five universities (located in its most-populous urban centers). These institutions feel hamstrung from competing in research, with the world’s top echelon of research universities. This is largely due to the “burden” as faculty would see it of taking on huge classes of undergraduate students, which dwarf those of many prominent US research universities.

The US system has critiqued itself over offering too few research professors as instructors in undergraduate courses, especially in its elite institutions. In Canada, the norm is
that research faculty commit fully to bachelor’s-degree-level instruction. Good for teaching and students, not so good for enabling faculty to focus on research.

To Canada’s large research institutions, they would be happier if many of Canada’s other universities taught more undergraduate students, leaving more of the research time, and money, to them. The smaller institutions feel they have proven worthy of the research monies they have garnered and are unconvincing a shift in resources to the biggest of Canada’s universities would be better for Canada—i.e., the Big Five are not necessarily the Best Five.

**Societal Trade-Offs**
The fault line is ultimately whether having a top tier (far from assured) of superfocused research universities is worth the trade-off. Is it in Canada’s best interests to cluster research more in its ultraurban areas and fund less of its research in smaller urban areas? Does it serve the public to have more students studying less under research professors, at research universities or, indeed, more students in programs where no research companion is there?

Canada produces excellent research, but it is geographically distributed. Indeed, research production might be greater were it clustered and if the best researchers were relieved much more, or entirely, from teaching obligations. From the public-vantage point, the trade-off is whether to invest locally or concentrate funding in a few top institutions.

As the land of a single standard of state-funded health care for all, Canadians are generally apt to trade off a little excellence for a lot more equity.

---

**News of the Center**

A book launch for *The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities*, coedited by Philip G. Altbach and Jamil Salmi, took place at the World Bank on October 5 in Washington, DC. The book has received coverage in the *New York Times*, *International Herald Tribune*, and other places. Op-ed articles on the theme by Altbach and Salmi have been published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education, Daily Nation* (Kenya), and other newspapers. The Chinese edition of the book was released at the 4th World Class University Conference in Shanghai, where Altbach and Salmi delivered talks. Additional translations are in production in French, Spanish, Turkish, and Indonesian.

The Center’s joint research project with the National Research University Higher School of Economics in Moscow concerning academic salaries, remuneration, and contracts in 28 countries has been completed; and a book reporting on the results, *Paying the Professoriate: A Global Comparison and Contracts*, is now in production with Routledge Publishers.

Liz Reisberg just returned from Brazil where she gave a seminar on “New paradigms for teaching and learning in higher education,” to a group of professors at the University of Campinas, where she also collaborated on the development of the new institute for university leadership to be offered by UNICAMP next July.

In the spring of 2012, several visiting scholars will join the Center. These include Qi Wang, assistant professor in the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University; Daniel Lincoln, the editor of the *European Journal of Higher Education*; and Lin Jin of Huazhong University of Science and Technology in Wuhan, China.

**Critical International News at a Glance on Facebook and Twitter**

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

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

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

To follow the news, press “Like” on our Facebook page at: http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-International-Higher-Education-CIHE/1977774769o3716. “Follow” us on Twitter at: https://twitter.com/#!/BC_CIHE.

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

We will keep you informed and save you time!
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.