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Internationalization of higher education has been growing in importance and taking on new and diverse approaches. In various regions of the world it has also come to be viewed through different, context-based lenses that are not always rose-colored. The Global Survey of Internationalization conducted regularly by the International Association of Universities, since 2003, aims to monitor some of the main developments of this process. This article offers a glimpse at one or two findings of the third such survey, published in September 2010. It focuses particularly on the respondents’ views concerning the significance of internationalization, the obstacles they perceive standing in the way of more progress, and the risks that may be of concern to them.

Adopting the Jane Knight’s 2006 definition—which sees internationalization as the process of integrating an international, intercultural and/or global dimension into the purpose, functions (teaching, research and service) and delivery of higher education—6,000 institutions around the world were sent an electronic questionnaire. The analysis of results is based on 745 completed questionnaires received from higher education institutions in 115 countries. This represents a significant growth in the number of responses—in 2003 the International Association of Universities received 526 completed responses from 95 countries—though the response rate remains modest. The growth can be attributed to a number of factors, including the availability of the questionnaire in five world languages. It is noteworthy that the response rate was highest among institutions in the Middle East, lowest in Latin America and the Caribbean, and on par in Europe, Asia and Pacific, and Africa. Overall, European higher education institutions represent the largest number of completed questionnaires.

Internationalization—A Central Policy for Leadership

Many around the world maintain that internationalization has been mainstreamed, embedded in institutional strategic plans, no longer a luxury, and instead an essential part of all reforms. The survey results confirm this with 87 percent of the respondents, indicating that internationalization is part of the strategic plan; and 78 percent, reporting that the policy area had grown in distinction in the past three years. The relevance is felt at the most senior levels of the university—as presidents and vice chancellors are seen as the most notable internal driver for the process.

Visible Impact of the Economic Crisis

Internationalization is not without obstacles or risks. Focusing on the obstacles and comparing them over time, the recent survey shows the extent to which financial constraints are now a major barrier to internationalization. In the 3rd Global Survey, the vast majority of the respondents cited lack of funding as the top internal and external obstacle. This may only confirm the “informed” scholars’ tacit knowledge of the current economic situation in higher education institutions, but being able to cite these results that have constituted a significant change since 2005 is useful.

The Global Survey of Internationalization conducted regularly by the International Association of Universities, since 2003, aims to monitor some of the main developments of this process.

This strong focus on financial constraints was conspicuously absent in the survey’s findings in 2005. The issue of funding was not among the top three obstacles cited. Instead, in 2005 the institutions pointed, to matters such as: lack of faculty interest and involvement, administrative inertia and bureaucratic difficulties, and lack of policy or strategy to lead the process. The concern of funding for internationalization is likely to have serious consequences for how the process develops in the future, potentially driving toward more “commercial” approaches.

Europe, Regional Cooperation, and Contextual Differences

The 3rd Global Survey also serves to demonstrate some continuity in trends—precisely regarding the geographic priorities for internationalization. Europe, with its continuously evolving Bologna process (or the “European higher education area” since 2010) and the funding schemes offered by the European Union to promote student mobility and cooperation, remains at the top of the priority list. This was the situation in 2005 when, as now, the findings showed the power of intraregional cooperation in all parts of the world, except North America.

Even if a study based on nearly 750 completed questionnaires is far from globally representative, examining data from institutions in 115 nations in every region of the world offers a uniquely global perspective on internationaliza-
Caution for the Future

Just as economic globalization is pervasive, likewise is internationalization in higher education. How well institutions are positioned to benefit from the process, how well they can pursue their goals, and even how empowered they are to choose their partners differ around the world. In the development of institutional internationalization strategies, the overall context matters a great deal; and significant inequalities exist. The surveys, rich in comparative data, serve to underline these differences and hopefully to stimulate institutional actors to determine what needs to be considered when working in partnerships with institutions from around the world, what pitfalls to avoid, and how to ensure that benefits are shared.

Continued fear of commercialization, brain drain, and the risk of the expansion in the number of degree mills are the key risks perceived by institutional respondents.
Accessible to students interested in going abroad. They act as local promoters and a conduit of international applications for their university client(s). For this job they are typically paid a commission that ranges from 10 to 15 percent (but may go as high as 25%) of the first year's tuition, although some receive an annual fixed fee. The agents may but do not necessarily receive any professional training from their university clients, nor are formal mechanisms generally in place for keeping them current on programs or policies.

Agents may also act as guidance counselors, helping students sort through the overwhelming amount of information available on the Internet. However, their motivation does not consist of providing impartial information but rather to steer students to specific institutions—something that may not be entirely clear to a student who consults them.

The primary client for agents is the institution that hires them. In order to be successful, they must deliver an acceptable number of students to their sponsoring institutions. It is not known how frequently agents accept payment from students as well as universities and colleges, although anecdotal evidence indicates that this does happen. The key here is that the extent of their activities, source of their fees, and propriety of their services lack transparency, particularly to students.

It is not possible to confirm the extent of services provided, but they include activities required to match student clients with university clients. Many universities suspect that agents sometimes complete applications and write essays for their student clients. Although it is not possible to generalize, sufficient anecdotes have been reported to cause concern.

**Recruitment agents are not new operators in higher education, and their participation in the university admissions process has always been controversial.**

To be successful, these professionals must cultivate a local reputation for providing excellent service to students, not institutions; they must be well informed with current knowledge about a wide range of colleges and universities, academic programs, and admissions requirements throughout the world. They welcome contact with institutions, meet with traveling representatives, contact alumni, and often visit campuses abroad. In fact many universities seek out these advisors and provide them with information to share with their student clients; this “triangle” of communication works to everyone’s advantage.

Also, advisors and extensive information are accessible to students in many countries at nonprofit advising centers operated by the British Council, the US State Department, and other governments and associations that provide a basic orientation to higher education in their respective countries and guide students to helpful resources. Yet, staffing at these agencies is inadequate to serve the growing international student market.

**Perverse Incentives**
The dynamic between an intermediary, an institution, and a student is inevitably influenced by the incentives and rewards that shape it. A recruitment agent’s income depends on directing students to specific institutions. While this action may result in a good match for the student, the incentives are not set up to ensure the best match for the student or, for that matter, to work in the student’s best interests.

Agents are entrepreneurs who earn their income from providing a service to two entities whose best interests may, or may not, be the same. The rewards arise from the relationship between the agent and the institution that hires him or her, not from the service provided to the student, presenting a potential conflict of interest that no professional standards or guidelines can eliminate. In fact, as long as the incentives favor the interests of the institution and agent over the interests of the student, professional standards will have limited effect.

No conflicting incentives exist for private consultants or nonprofit advising centers. The work is unambiguously directed toward the best interest of the student.

**False Arguments and Lost Opportunities**
Most of the arguments in defense of overseas agents appear somewhat hollow—such as, students cannot be expected to sort through vast amounts of data on opportunities abroad on their own; small institutions do not have staff or resources to launch effective international marketing campaigns; since agents are not going to take leave, standards should be set for their behavior; and the market will weed out unscrupulous recruiters.

**Other Information Sources**
Another service available to internationally mobile students is offered by a growing number of private independent advisors. This service is hired by students to provide guidance in matching their goals, objectives, and academic profile to appropriate institutions overseas. Private consultants do not have contractual agreements with any university that would influence the advice they provide.
Given the investment and consequences of the procedure, students should be required to participate actively in the research. It is too risky to have someone else make their decisions or even influence them, if the students lack the knowledge needed to judge advice fairly. It is inappropriate that a recruitment agent, motivated by economic gain, should be the source of all information.

While it is easy to commiserate with overwhelmed students who turn to agents for help, it is harder to sympathize with the inclination of institutions to do the same. International students enrich every campus, and hosting them requires a great deal of responsibility. When institutions work through agents, they sacrifice the benefits that result from the direct engagement of university administrators and faculty in recruitment, which ensures a necessary flow of information—about foreign cultures, foreign education systems, and international student needs. Similarly, direct communication with institutional representatives helps students receive accurate and up-to-date information.

Many alternatives are open to colleges and universities. College administrators can travel with a number of companies that organize international recruitment trips, at a range of costs; they can participate in overseas education fairs. Institutions with limited budgets have found creative ways to increase their visibility overseas and to reach out to potential applications. Numerous examples of recruiting successfully exist through students on study-abroad programs, faculty who travel, or combining efforts (and budgets) of multiple offices such as admissions, alumni relations, and development to send a single administrator abroad to represent the institution, Webinars (Web-based seminars) and other online events. Also, as mentioned above, many private consultants and advisors (professionals hired by students) welcome contact with international institutions.

Not knowing what agents actually tell their clients leaves students (and universities) very vulnerable. It is unrealistic to expect that “the market” will regulate quality or that unethical agents will be unsuccessful. The “market model” assumes that students (as consumers) have the knowledge and experience necessary to choose the best-quality service, and that is unrealistic. Adequate oversight is impossible, and professional certification will only provide “ethical cover” and a false sense of security to the institutions and students alike.

**Conclusion**

New enterprises have responded to opportunities that have arisen from growing international student mobility. Still, not all businesses that have found markets for their services should be welcomed. The use of recruitment agents by universities and colleges is clouded by many factors. Their activities cannot be adequately monitored to guarantee that student interests are protected. No international standards can guarantee local activity or that the relationship between an agent and a university will be entirely transparent to the student. Furthermore, the incentives and rewards do not depend on ethical behavior. One might also ask why, if the use of agents is forbidden in the United States for domestic recruitment of students, would it be acceptable for overseas recruiting?

Some universities do invest time and resources to ensure close communication with the agents they hire. Some are participating in a process to certify agents who adhere to ethical standards. Yet even then, ethical behavior is interpreted differently in various cultures. Who will provide the oversight and mediation to create compliance with standards as they are intended? By “outsourcing” recruitment, institutions are putting their reputation and vital communication with students to a third party, and this is a serious mistake.

---

*Agents may also act as guidance counselors, helping students sort through the overwhelming amount of information available on the Internet.*

---

A combination of good information available on the Web, the availability of impartial advice from experienced professionals and nonprofit agencies, and well-informed and user-friendly services by the host universities can address student needs. Paid recruiters are simply not necessary and, furthermore, work to the detriment of the process by standing between the direct exchange of information among students and institutions.

Perhaps most significantly, prospective students must take an active role in this research, ask good questions, and make informed decisions about where to study. Alumni of foreign universities can help them. The Internet is a good tool; visits to education information centers or education fairs can help; and direct contact with staff at prospective universities is essential.

There is no debate that agents are a strong presence in many countries. However, the issue of employing agents merits more public discussion, and it would be most unfortunate to forego the debate and proceed on the basis of “if you can’t beat them, join them.”

---
Overseas Education in China: Changing Landscape and Policies
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The 2009 Sino-US Joint Statement declared that the United States would encourage more Americans to study in China, by sending 100,000 students in the coming four years. It is mentioned in the joint statement that the United States sends students to China on a large scale. Compared with the then 20,000 US students in China, 100,000 would equal a breakthrough. Actually, there is a continuous increase in the number of students studying in China, and overseas education in China has attracted extensive attention.

Rapid Development

China has become the major country that sends students abroad—178,900 students in 2008, followed by 229,300 students in 2009. Meanwhile, overseas education in China has developed rapidly, despite its smaller scale of sending students abroad.

China has ranked among a few countries whose international students grew dramatically. Between 2001 and 2008, the average annual growth rate was over 20 percent, and the annual net growth reached 30,000. The year of 2008 laid a landmark, when international students first exceeded 200,000 and increased by 14.32 percent since the previous year. The number of international students in 2008 equaled 180 times of those in 1978 (1,200), 38 times of 1988 (5,835), and 5 times of 1998 (43,084).

Overseas education in China has become more diversified. International students enrolled in nonformal programs usually take Chinese-language training or short-term study, not in the purpose of earning a degree. The proportion of international students enrolled in formal programs has increased yearly, while the proportion enrolled in nonformal programs has reduced. In 2004, among all the 110,844 international students, the percentage of students in nonformal programs accounted for 71.5 percent but dropped to 64.2 percent in 2008, when the total number was 223,499; meanwhile, the proportion of students in formal programs increased from 28.5 percent in 2004 to 35.8 percent in 2008.

Institutions enrolling international students have also been increasing. There were 23 academic institutions with international students in 1979, 55 in 1984, above 330 in 1997, 363 in 2001, and 420 in 2004. In 2008, institutions’ numbers grew to 592. Besides regular institutions of higher education, many research institutes and other types of educational institutions admit international students, such as the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the China Civil Aviation Management Institute. Private institutions, such as Beijing Geely University, also enroll international students.

Significance of Growth

Overseas education helps China develop partnerships with other countries. From 1950 to 2000, China has trained more than 360,000 international students, who later became experts in science and technology, education, diplomacy, and administration of sending countries. Among students who studied in China, a few served as prime ministers, some worked in ministerial positions, hundreds were appointed professor or associate professor, and thousands of them were engaged in cultural, economic, and trade cooperation with China. Briefly, overseas education in China has contributed in developing and consolidating China’s political, diplomatic, economic, and trade cooperation with the outside world, as well as conducting cultural, educational, and personnel exchanges.

Overseas education strengthens China’s national soft power. International students become “bridges” to enhance friendship among people across countries. A majority of international students became professionals, promoting mutual understanding and friendship between Chinese and foreign youth. A large number of international students understand China well. Overseas education in China has enhanced soft power through training international students who take positive attitudes toward China, disseminating Chinese language and culture, expanding the country’s international influence, enhancing its image, and improving its management level, as well as other aspects.

Overseas education promotes constructing world-class universities. China’s top universities are the main institutions recruiting international students. These students bring new and different ideas, activate the academic atmosphere, enrich cultural diversity, and expand internationalization of universities. Also, overseas education encourages China’s universities to improve quality and enhance international reputation.

Overseas education also leads to economic gains. Based on the estimate of a task force of Peking University, long-term international students create a direct annual income
in China of about US$0.96 billion to US$1.15 billion, while short-term students contribute US$0.09 billion. The two types of students create a direct annual income in China of about US$1.05 billion to US$1.24 billion. Besides direct income, other spending includes transportation fee and rental charge, as well as consumption spurred by scholarships. Moreover, overseas education in China drives economic growth in some related sectors and creates job opportunities.

**Remaining Problems**

Despite progresses and significance, however, there are problems in further development of overseas education in China. The academic level of overseas education is relatively low. In 2008, among the 80,005 international students in formal programs, undergraduate students accounted for 81.1 percent. Graduate students made up a comparatively low proportion, with only 6.4 percent in total international students. There is a major gap in the level between China and some developed countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and France. For example, almost half of international students in the United States enroll in graduate education programs.

China has become the major country that sends students abroad—178,900 students in 2008, followed by 229,300 students in 2009.

Regarding fields of study, a high proportion of international students major in humanities and social sciences—namely 80 percent. In 2008, international students studying Chinese language and literature accounted for 55.7 percent, followed by other majors such as Western medicine, economics, business, science, traditional Chinese medicine, and engineering. The largest number of such international students come from the main top-10 sending countries, 8 in Asia. Furthermore, international students in China mainly came from South Korea, the United States, Japan, India, and Vietnam.

China’s current regulations and policies cannot adapt to development of overseas education. The Regulations on Higher Education Institutions Admitting International Students, issued in 2000, is quite outdated. Institutional autonomy for recruiting international students is inadequate.

**New Policies**

For further development of overseas education in China, the government is implementing the following new policies.

The scale of international students will expand. According to the Outline of China’s National Plan for Medium and Long-Term Education Reform and Development (2010–2020), China will become the biggest hosting country in Asia and a major destination in the world for international students. Maintaining an annual growth rate of 7 percent, international students will reach 500,000 by 2020. The Chinese government and universities are taking efforts to create conditions for enhancing proportion of international students in campuses.

The scale and magnitude of government scholarship will be strengthened. China will build a scholarship framework, in which central government plays a major role, and expand scale and magnitude of scholarship, gradually. The government plans to skew scholarship—toward key universities, disciplines, and programs—and balance its distribution among sending countries. Local governments, higher education institutions, and enterprises are encouraged to establish various forms of scholarship.

A foundation program system will be established. China is perfecting the Chinese Language Proficiency Test (HSK) examination system, to improve international students’ Chinese-language ability before departure so that they will be better prepared for study in China. The government encourages universities that have language policies to use English, fully or in part, as a teaching medium to foreign students. China has constructed a program system for overseas undergraduate students, to guarantee them appropriate study requirements.

From 1950 to 2000, China has trained more than 360,000 international students, who later became experts in science and technology, education, diplomacy, and administration of sending countries.

A favorable policy environment is emerging. The government was planning to amend Regulations on Higher Education Institutions Admitting International Students, to explicitly stipulate responsibilities, rights, and obligations of students and institutions. The Ministry of Education has been modifying and perfecting other policies, so as to normalize administration and education for international students, and ensure enrollment, visa application, study, graduation, and other steps that connect well.
The making and implementation of new policies cannot succeed without the initiative of universities that play as critical stakeholders of overseas education. In order to attract more qualified international students and improve quality of overseas education in China, the government and universities are working together to build a policy alliance.

---

**Getting Graduates to Come Home—Not So Easy**
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It is said that we live in the new era of the “brain exchange,” but in our view the old-style brain drain continues to a significant degree. With only modest success, countries, such as China, continue to try to get some of their scholars who have stayed abroad after completing advanced degrees to return home. In fact the large majority of Chinese (and Indian) students who have gone abroad for study have not returned home over more than 20 years. Moreover, the numbers recently have only improved modestly despite China’s impressive economic and academic growth.

Historically, governmental efforts to convince scholars to return home have not prevailed. India, for example, has over the years created a variety of programs to attract back successful Indian academics who settled abroad. One challenge is to match overseas salaries. Perhaps the most important serious issue—the academic conditions in Indian universities and laboratories are often problematical. Some academics who were lured by these special programs found working conditions and the academic culture inadequate and returned to their positions in the West. Only at the Indian Institutes of Technology and of Management has there been limited success.

The Chinese government and universities have also tried in many ways to convince scholars and scientists settled abroad to return, with only modest results. Similar programs in other countries have been similarly ineffectual. China recently has started a program to lure scholars back home by providing significant financial and other incentives to Chinese PhDs working abroad. The program is named the 111 Project. The national 111 Project was introduced by the Ministry of Education and the State Administration of

Foreign Expert Affairs, intending to invite 1,000 top scholars from the world top 100 universities to build 100 world-class innovation bases at top Chinese universities, in which top foreign-trained experts work with domestic experts to conduct high-level research, to enhance higher-level scientific competence and comprehensive competitive power globally. The program originated in 2005, and it created a lot of interest in China because it expressed a kind of urgency and eagerness in attracting some of the world’s top Chinese scientists back home. Many universities have used this opportunity to establish research initiatives and centers. So far, 662 111 Project scientists have been selected, and 310 of them are now working at Chinese research universities.

**Unanticipated Consequences**

However, the program has created some unanticipated problems. Some Chinese universities do not fully understand the international academic labor market and, in their search for overseas talent, have relied on résumés, educational background, titles, personal contacts, and recommendations rather than on careful evaluations of prospective candidates and their academic work and impact. In some cases, the sponsoring universities found that the scholars and scientists who agreed to return are not the ones most desired. Those who decided to return may be late career professors from middle-ranking US and UK universities who, perhaps, see a stagnant career in the United States or United Kingdom and desire either a fresh start or a cushy job in China. Some use their newfound fame in China as a platform for pontificating on a range of topics. Top-ranking Chinese academics from the best Western universities generally have not been willing to return permanently. At best, they agree to some kind of joint affiliation with a top Chinese university and visit periodically to lecture, provide advice, and collaborate with professors in China. This policy may in fact be the best strategy for taking advantage of top overseas Chinese expertise.

Another unanticipated result of the program is salary compression—highly paid returnees earn much higher salaries than local academics, often creating envy and morale problems. The success of any academic department and
this program involves the sense of academic community, which can be shattered by highly unequal salaries or better working conditions and facilities for the returnees. When domestic professors find that a returnee may not contribute more than they do, they may refuse to cooperate, and harm the work of the department. While many of the returned scholars can still speak Chinese, they may not understand the new academic culture in China. Lack of cooperation from local colleagues and problems of re-entry include the academic realities the returned scholars face.

**Solutions**

Using the talent of academics from developing and middle-income countries who have, for many reasons, chosen to settle in the West is a laudable goal. Yet, even in a globalized world, luring some of the top academics home is not an easy task, and most of the programs that have been attempted have failed. The truth is that as long as the conditions of academic work vary significantly from country to country—including salaries, conditions of academic work, the academic culture, and academic freedom, to name a few—the “best and brightest” are unlikely to return. Those who are most desirable—midcareer academics who are highly productive and located at the top universities—are the least likely to return.

The best that can be done—and it is in fact quite a good alternative—is to build ties with these academic “stars” and create ties that can yield practical results that will neither harm the local academic culture nor demand impractical results.

Another unanticipated result of the program is salary compression—highly paid returnees earn much higher salaries than local academics, often creating envy and morale problems.

**Westernization in the Post-Soviet World: Risks and Benefits of the Bologna Process**

**Arevik Ohanyan**
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The Bologna process is evolving as an important tool of globalization in higher education. In “The Bologna Declaration: An Explanation,” prepared by the Confederation of European Union Reform rectors’ conferences and the Association of European Universities, the Bologna process is described as a “common European answer to common European problems.” The document highlights the value of “coordinated reforms, compatible systems and common action” to meet the challenges in higher education in all of Europe. Unquestionably, the Bologna system was created to meet the European challenges. However, a different issue is whether the Bologna process as a European response can be effective when applied to “postcommunist problems.”

The intended and unintended consequences of the Bologna process on poorly consolidated and/or illiberal democracies in the postcommunist world have been treated insufficiently by policymakers and researchers. The Bologna process, as a top-down endeavor, is poorly positioned to accommodate the shared history of postcommunist states and their socialist legacies.

**Poor Governance**

Several factors complicate the successful implementation of the Bologna process in the postcommunist area. The poor governance and weak institutions in this higher education sector remains a major challenge. The successful implementation of the Bologna process assumes a democratic organizational culture characterized with bottom-up and decentralized mechanisms of administration. Transparency and accountability are assumed to be the foundation for the successful implementation of these reforms. Unfortunately, the postcommunist world inherited institutions of higher education that are highly centralized and opaque in their governance. Some stand out with autocratic and centralized management, ineffective bureaucratic practices, and massive corruption. Russian citizens pay out annually up to US$520 million in bribes for places in higher education institutions. Even more is disbursed throughout the
four-to-five years of a student’s enrollment in a given institution to ensure that the student does not drop out.

This picture is much alike the scene in Armenia, another postsocialist economy, where anticorruption mechanisms and policies produced few changes—aiming at decreasing the interactions with the faculty members during the exams and at creating conditions for objective evaluation—and in some of the universities computerized tests were implemented. As the experience shows, the computer has been a poor deterrent of corruption practices during centralized entrance examinations to institutions of higher education.

In short, the mismatch between the goals of the Bologna process and local realities has been problematic for effective realization of these policies so far, and the delay in appropriate reforms can result in even more of a developmental lag.

Ingrained Academic Culture
The Bologna process, aimed at increasing mobility and “brain circulation,” has constituted more self-centered and Eurocentric policies, but is poorly tailored to consider the developmental needs of the signatory countries beyond western Europe. This system could be better described as supporting and creating conditions for one-way mobility and one-sided development. Also, the European visa regulations support the policy of attracting and keeping the “cream of the crop” from the post-Soviet countries. The absence of mechanisms to balance brain drain with brain-circulation policies can be particularly disastrous for small economies. Indeed, “attracting talent from all over the world” into Europe is one of the major policy goals of the Bologna process, as discussed during the Convention of European Higher Education Institutions held in Salamanca in 2001.

The intended and unintended consequences of the Bologna process on poorly consolidated and/or illiberal democracies in the postcommunist world have been treated insufficiently by policymakers and researchers.

In contrast to the highly dynamic and ambitious European educational initiatives, the post-Soviet academic culture in universities is characterized with limited academic freedom, low wages, and lack of incentives and motivation among both faculty and students. The flawed and inadequate compensation system for professors is a major contributing factor to this problem. These factors restrain innovation and individual initiatives, and by extension, they make the European higher educational area and European research area even more attractive to students and young scholars, thereby producing and sustaining brain drain from these regions into Europe. Even if students and scholars return back to their home societies after studying in Europe, they are faced with the problem of reintegration into academia and the local labor market.

Arbitrary Policies
The centralization of educational policy and administration by the government is one of the legacies of the Soviet rule. Centralized governance undermines the much-needed local ownership and innovation of universities and, thereby, weakens the prospects of effective implementation of the Bologna reforms. The Bologna process facilitates equality between private and public universities. However, particularly in Armenia, some policies strengthen and support public universities and even undermine the private ones: exemption from mandatory military service for students serving in state universities, public financing of state universities, and mandatory accreditation of private universities but not state universities represent some examples to that end. The recent developments in Armenia, though, are promising and leave room for hoping that the market will soon be equalized by creating conditions for transparent quality-control mechanisms, as well as operating prerequisites applied both to state as well as private universities.

In short, the mismatch between the goals of the Bologna process and local realities has been problematic for effective realization of these policies so far, and the delay in appropriate reforms can result in even more of a developmental lag.

Conclusion
While Europe is responding proactively to increased global competition in higher education with Bologna reforms, the former-Soviet countries seem to be reacting to the European initiatives. Such reactive, as opposed to proactive, policies increasingly facilitate mobility from post-Soviet countries to European educational institutions—offering few, if any, mechanisms also to ensure the reverse process. Treating the Bologna system only as structural-institutional reform
can weaken the educational systems in post-Soviet countries, unless the policymakers recognize that reforms at the organizational level in universities are equally important.

The gap between the Western value systems supporting the Bologna reforms and the post-Soviet legacies produces discrepancy in the goals, priorities, and initiatives. It can be asserted that no harmonization of an education system will be effective unless there is a harmony in philosophy and values underlying the decision-making processes within universities. The initiated changes and reforms would be fruitful and positive for all of the involved states in the presence of open and dynamic organizational cultures within institutions of higher education and beyond, which would contribute to much-needed innovation, adaptability, and sustained organizational learning.

English as “Lingua Franca” and the Internationalization of Academe
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English is considered as the Latin of the 21st century and a language playing a relevant role in the internationalization of academe. Data collected through the Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey—referring to 25,000 academics working in 18 countries located in 5 continents—allow to investigate whether and to what extent English is the contemporary academic “lingua franca,” and how it contributes to the internationalization of the academic profession in different countries.

English as Lingua Franca

At the global level, 53 percent of the academics involved in the CAP survey primarily employ English for their academic activities: 17 percent of the academics use it as their mother tongue and 36 percent as their second language. English is much more used as lingua franca for research activities than for teaching activities: while 51 percent of the academics employ English for research, only 30 percent actually use it for teaching. This gap mainly concerns non-native speakers. Among native speakers, almost all academics use English both for teaching and for research purposes. On the contrary, twice as many academics employ English as their second language in research than those who use it as their second language for teaching.

English-Speaking Countries

English can play a different role in the internationalization of both higher education and the academic profession, depending on the official language of a country. Countries participating in the CAP survey can be divided into three groups. First, in three countries English is either the official or the main language: Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In these countries, the overwhelming majority of academics teach in English as it is their mother tongue, but a significant minority uses English for teaching as the second language, while few academics teach using a different language than English. Briefly, in these countries practically all academics teach using the contemporary lingua franca, giving institutions and higher education systems a competitive advantage in the global student market.

Second, in four countries with a special bilingual or multilingual context, English is one of the official languages, together with one or more other languages: Canada, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and South Africa. In these countries English is used for teaching by the majority of academics as it is either their mother tongue (Canada) or their second language (Hong Kong, Malaysia, South Africa). Moreover, a significant minority of academics mainly use a different language for teaching, but a smaller minority also exists that teaches in English as the second language (Canada) or main language (Hong Kong and South Africa). All in all, in these countries 65 to 75 percent of academics teach in English. As a consequence, these countries also enjoy quite a strong competitive advantage, globally.

The role played by English as the second language in these two first groups of countries is somehow different. In three multilingual countries—Hong Kong, Malaysia, and South Africa—many academics (57% to 71%) use English for teaching as their second language. In most cases, these people are national academics employing a language that is not their mother tongue. So, it can be argued that in these countries as non-native speakers academics may have two goals: introducing an international dimension into teaching and providing a common language for education in a multilingual national context.

In Canada, Australia, and the United States, the majority of academics employing English for teaching as their second language—more or less two out of three—are national citizens, likely belonging to linguistic minorities or having acquired the national citizenship during their career. International academics are a minority, around one
out of three. This situation probably depends on the long-lasting capacity of international attractiveness of the three countries’ higher education systems. In the United Kingdom, most academics employing English for teaching as their second language are international academics, mostly European, witnessing the attractiveness of the UK higher education system.

In countries where English is either the official, or one official, or the main language, almost all academics, or a strong majority, employ English in research either as their mother tongue or their second language. In these countries, employing English in research cannot be considered as an indicator of participation in international research. The use of English gives academics working in these countries an ipso facto advantage as it is the dominant means of communication in the international scientific community. Yet, when English is academics’ mother tongue, employing it in research does not necessarily imply participating in international research networks. Moreover, using English as a second language may simply be necessary to take part in national research activities.

**Non-English Speaking Countries**

The third group of countries includes those where English is not an official language. According to the CAP data, this group can be split into two subgroups. On one side, in three countries a small but considerable part of academics (10% to 20%) are committed to employing English as the mean of instruction, as an effort to attract international students and/or to provide domestic students with useful language skills: Finland, South Korea, and Norway. In these three countries, almost all or most academics teaching in English are national academics whose mother tongue is the official language of the country or one of the official languages. On the other side, in eight countries with strong linguistic identities, English is not, or seldom, used for teaching: Argentina, Brazil, China, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and Portugal. In most of these countries (except China, Italy, and Japan) academics belong to non-English-based international language communities.

In four countries (Italy, Finland, Portugal, and Norway), English is used in research by the majority of academics, and in other three countries (Germany, South Korea, and Brazil), it is used by a significant minority. Finally, in four countries (Argentina, Mexico, Japan, and China) English is used in research by a small minority.

In countries where English is not an official language, the use of it by national academics whose mother tongue is not English is a necessary tool for participating in international research. As a consequence, employing English as the second language in research can be viewed as an indicator of integration within international research networks. On this basis, two groups of countries can be identified. The first group includes the six countries where the percentage

**English can play a different role in the internationalization of both higher education and the academic profession, depending on the official language of a country.**

In four countries (Italy, Finland, Portugal, and Norway), English is used in research by the majority of academics, and in other three countries (Germany, South Korea, and Brazil), it is used by a significant minority.

**Internationalization—Certain Conclusions**

The CAP data support the conclusions that English is the contemporary “lingua franca” within academe and that research is the most internationalized academic activity. Besides, they also provide a map of the internationalization of academe, based on the role of the English language. According to CAP data, it can be argued that academics working in 13 countries, representing 64 percent of the sample (Australia, Canada, Germany, Finland, Hong Kong, Italy, South Korea, Malaysia, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States, and South Africa) are more internationalized, albeit for different reasons, while those working in five other countries, representing 36 percent of the sample (Argentina, Brazil, China, Japan, and Mexico), are less internationalized.
While in the countries where English is not an official language, the use of it as second language can be considered as a clear indicator of the internationalization of academe, in English-speaking countries the relationship between the use of English and the internationalization of academe is less straightforward. In these countries, higher education institutions and academics enjoy an advantage as almost all or most of the academics use English, but the use of English as such cannot be considered as an indicator of participation in international research networks. Moreover, the use of English as second language for teaching has different meanings, depending on the nation context. It possibly refers either to academics’ contribution to the internationalization of their higher education or to their contribution to its national integration or to the international attractiveness of higher education systems.

University Autonomy and Academic Freedom: A Historical Perspective
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University autonomy and academic freedom are intimately related but form different concepts. The former is an institutional authority; the latter is a personal privilege accorded to academics to safeguard unfettered pursuit, transmission, and dissemination of truth and knowledge. What follows is an interpretation of the historical roots of these concepts and, in particular, how the determinants of university autonomy evolved in response to changing views regarding higher education.

Historical Background

The two concepts evolved over centuries in a mutually reinforcing fashion. Their historical roots can be traced back to the Authentica Habita (Bologna, 1158), which exempted students and teachers from tolls and taxes and protected them against undue justice, and Parens Scientiarum (Paris, 1231), which recognized the right of the university as a body corporate to award degrees. The first was an edict by an emperor; the second was a papal bull. Such bulls and edicts provided privileges and support and stipulated detailed conditions under which the institutions and teachers could operate and function—including syllabi, graduation, and promotion requirements, libraries, facilities, and codes of conduct. The price for seeking protection, financial support, and legitimacy from an external authority was accountability.

Over time, the nation-state supplanted the Vatican and the emperor/king/prince as the external authority. According to Peter Scott, the modern university and today’s higher education systems are creations of the nation-state since the late 19th century.

Two models emerged with the advent of the nation-state. Napoleon’s Université de France (1806) was, in effect, a system of national education that replaced all universities in France and the occupied lands. Wilhelm von Humboldt was put in charge of reviving German universities after Napoleon’s defeat. His views on the structure of the university are collectively expressed as freedom to teach (Lehrfreiheit), freedom to learn (Lernfreiheit), and the unity of teaching and research (Einheit von Forschung und Lehre). Many of von Humboldt’s views were found to be utopian, and he was fired. These, however, formed the basis not only for the modern research university but, according to many, also the modern concept of academic freedom. Although still lacking a universally accepted definition, academic freedom is widely regarded as an inviolable attribute of the modern university, and is fully internalized in the West.

From the beginning of the 19th century, state bureaucracies in continental Europe took on a “regulatory” role, indeed regulating every aspect of university activities.

From the beginning of the 19th century, state bureaucracies in continental Europe took on a “regulatory” role, indeed regulating every aspect of university activities. Thus, university autonomy came to be defined as the relative powers of academia and the state bureaucracy in making decisions regarding activities of the university. Outside of the Anglo-Saxon world, market and society were not significant actors then.

For centuries, criteria for university autonomy remained essentially unchanged. In 1965, the International Association of Universities defined university autonomy as the authority to make decisions regarding: who will teach, what will be taught, who will be taught, who will graduate, and what will be researched—with only perfunctory reference to financial matters. This definition is obviously not fundamentally different from what is embodied in Parens Scientiarum.
Autonomy in a Regulatory Environment
In the late 1970s, OECD-CERI (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-Center for Educational Research and Innovation) undertook a survey of decision-making structures in 52 institutions of higher education in Europe. A “relative index of autonomy” was defined on the basis of institutional authority to make decisions on 20 issues referred to as “indices of autonomy.” These ranged from creation of teaching posts, appointment and promotion of academic staff and granting a leave of absence, appointment of rector/president and vice-chancellor, teaching methods, curricula and student admissions, and various aspects of resource allocation and budget management—down to minute details. While UK universities scored 100 on the relative scale, Dutch, French, Austrian, German, and Swiss (federal) universities were at the bottom with scores of 43, 42, 32, 29, and 20, respectively.

Higher education across the globe continues to become more international and more competitive. New types of both higher education providers and stakeholders/actors exist.

In many cases, especially in countries outside the Anglo-Saxon world, public resources were allocated in the form of detailed line-item budgets; and many decisions, including a number of those on key academic matters, were made by bureaucrats outside of the institutions. This was typical of the regulatory state that left little room for institutions to define their missions and choose the means to achieve them.

Autonomy in an Evaluative and Global Environment
Since the mid-1980s, the role of the state changed dramatically, in Guy Neave’s words, from “regulatory” to “evaluative.” There was a marked shift worldwide from the “state-academic oligarchy axis” to the “market-society apex” in Burton Clark’s “triangle of coordination.” The university autonomy survey, carried out by OECD in 2003, reflected the changing landscape of higher education worldwide. This time, eight broadly defined, rather than 20-detailed, indices were used. These were institutions’ authority to own buildings and borrow funds, set academic structure and course contents, employ and dismiss academic staff and set salaries, decide size of student enrollment and level of tuition fees, and freedom to spend budget according to institutional mission and objectives.

In marked contrast to the detailed indices used in the 1980 survey, which reflected the regulatory role of the state at the time, indices used in 2003 were much more broadly defined. They dealt more with financial and human-resources diversification and management, clearly reflecting the change in the role of the state from regulation to evaluation and, again in Guy Neave’s words, to “steering from a distance” and the “rise of market forces” in university governance.

Rather than quantifying autonomy, countries—including Mexico, Japan, Korea, Australia, Turkey, Poland, United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Australia, and Ireland—were evaluated in terms of their universities having full, limited, or no autonomy in making decisions. Results indicate, given models of institutional behavior in decision making, a worldwide trend consists of less bureaucratic, less political, and more entrepreneurial universities. State universities in southern Europe and Latin America are possible exceptions to this trend.

Higher education across the globe continues to become more international and more competitive. New types of both higher education providers and stakeholders/actors exist. The latter now constitute supranational bodies (OECD and UNESCO), international quality-assessment agencies (International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies, European Quality Assurance Register), processes (Bologna), and agreements (General Agreement on Trade in Services, if and when it comes into force). These new realities create challenges for defining and implementing academic freedom in a changed environment.

Stalin and Contemporary Higher Education Change: A Short Provocation
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Over the past 30 years a university has been pushed to “leave its ivory tower,” “come down to earth,” and pursue “innovation.” Academics know what they are supposed to do: make education more applicable to societies’ needs, be more practice driven, change classrooms to be student centered, expand student numbers to supply knowledge workers, and connect to the world of work.
Contemporary higher education policy has become a dogma: difficult to question without sounding like some conservative who cannot live in the “real world.” But when policy starts sounding like dogma or a moral imperative, this is exactly when academics should be asking questions. The alternative is a captured higher education sector: with no critical distance, existing simply as an arm of state policy.

Here is a parallel: in the USSR Josef Stalin used similar policies as today. This is a surprising historical connection, but also a common ground. Stalin was attempting rapid industrialization; today, states want to move to a knowledge economy. Stalin wanted universities to become instruments for state policy. Through both direct and indirect methods of control, European universities, for instance, are increasingly in the same situation.

**Here is a parallel: in the USSR Josef Stalin used similar policies as today. This is a surprising historical connection, but also a common ground.**

In the USSR, the end result was universities directly under state control; research separated from the teaching process; classrooms dedicated to bringing in and pushing out students as quickly as possible, with a specific set of technical competencies; and stunted development of disciplines that threatened to critique the state’s policy values.

**Back in the USSR**

In 1929, Stalin began an ambitious plan for rapid industrialization. Recognizing the importance of higher education for this process, Stalin fundamentally remodelled the sector. A substantial group of educated individuals were needed for industrialization, requiring a rapid increase in graduates, especially in the technical fields. So, from the early 1930s onward Soviet higher education underwent rapid massification. But Stalin’s plans also required graduates to be quickly available. The big, broad aims of a German fundamental education were removed. Degrees became shorter and focused toward skills development in a specified vocational field. Time of study to a degree was shortened from five or more years to three or four. Specializations (degree programs) became increasingly specific so that students could fully learn a technical skill in the shortened period.

Understandably, the number of higher education institutions multiplied rapidly. But the state primarily supported alternatives to the universities— institutes, pedagogical colleges, and technical schools, which fulfilled a practical function providing vocational degrees for the needs of the economy. Many were directly affiliated with a particular ministry or economic enterprise. What would now be called research-intensive universities became a small group within the overall sector. Indeed, research was predominantly moved out of the universities.

The world of work was to be an integral feature of student life, with an emphasis on practice in the Soviet curriculum and classroom. Finally, the formation of curriculum, the knowledge, skills, and competencies required for each specialization, the writing of textbooks, and even the development of specific courses became increasingly centralized as the state took charge. These reforms were highly problematic. Some disappeared quickly, and others—such as the emphasis on narrow technical skills—continued and led to atrophy in other disciplines, especially the social sciences and humanities, out-of-control multiplication of increasingly narrow subdisciplines, and a problematic connection between Soviet education and research.

Did Stalin achieve his policy goals? Certainly there was rapid though very patchy industrialization. Long-term scientific advancement, even in technical disciplines, was, however, not doing well. The state captured the sector but in doing so undermined scientific and technical development—the very areas it hoped to cultivate.

**The world of work was to be an integral feature of student life, with an emphasis on practice in the Soviet curriculum and classroom.**

**Yesterday Today**

Today, once again, rapid modernization has become a priority. The knowledge economy has prompted transnational change processes—such as the Lisbon agenda and the Bologna process and individual state initiatives impacting higher education. Stalin’s policies are being repeated: massification; the movement to shorter, skills-based degrees with an emphasis on knowledge application to the real world; internships; promotion of technical subjects; movement toward team learning; the importance of university/world of work relations; and responsiveness of higher education to state interests.

Of course, the stories behind the parallel are more complex and further questions are possible. Do large-scale shifts in economic goals, for instance, require large-scale reorganization of higher education? Or do such shifts simply provide an opportunity for a state to reconfigure power relations with the universities? And what about the specific issues: the benefits of active pedagogy and the role of skills-based education?
The example of Stalin also reveals that the university as “ivory tower” belongs mainly to fairy tales, as does the rhetoric of “innovation.” Higher education has always been to a greater or lesser extent a part of state policy. Sometimes it has been pushed to serve—for instance, under Stalin—and at others there has been a meeting of minds such as in Humboldt’s plan for the University of Berlin when he was minister of education.

Contemporary policy thinking is not a moral imperative for a university out of touch with the real world; nor is it to critique such thinking a conservative reaction to change. Policies are simply tools for a state to obtain its specific ends. They are also an act of experimentation, for good or bad. There are genuine questions to be asked here, both about then and now—including one concerning the productivity of a “captured” sector. After all, unlike our colleagues under Stalin, academics are free to ask.

Policy Stasis in Many Countries
Roughly half the countries in the survey—namely, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Finland, France, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Malaysia, Mexico, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Turkey, and the United Kingdom—saw no change in policy for either tuition fees or student aid for domestic students. A few countries—notably, Hong Kong, Finland, and Sweden—did, however, see increases in fees for foreign students.

In most of Canada and in some parts of the United States, Korea, and Vietnam, students were in a situation somewhat similar to the “no-change” countries because tuition increases were offset by concomitant increases in financial assistance. Vietnam, in particular, was notable for large tuition rises (or at least, in the maximum allowable tuition charge) offset by significant increases in student assistance.

No country in the survey reduced its rate of tuition. An exceptional case involves Brazil. No change has occurred in the country’s student aid or tuition policies; fees are essentially free in the public system, but roughly two-thirds of students are taught in private institutions where fees are often very high. However, a scheme is moving the country in the direction of expanding the public system. As a result, even with no change in fee policy, a greater proportion of students are paying lower fees. This trend could be thought of as equivalent to a reduction in tuition.

It is neither unheard of nor impermissible for governments to reduce support to higher education in times of fiscal stress. However, the decision of these governments to hold the line on tuition, while reducing direct aid to the poorest, is in fact a highly regressive policy that above all benefits the affluent.

Students in Chile, China, Germany, India, Japan, Nigeria, the Russian Federation, and Spain all saw no change in tuition but improvements in student financial assistance. However, in most cases these improvements were quite marginal. For example, the new loans program introduced in Russia is intended to serve just 10,000 students out of a population of roughly seven million; in Nigeria, the new merit scholarships are similarly expected to reach just a few thousand of more than a million students. The only country
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Since the start of the global financial crisis a little over two years ago, many concerns have been raised on how it might affect funding to higher education and whether or not it might hasten moves toward greater cost sharing. While, globally, some steps have been taken in this direction, in most countries, hard decisions have yet to be taken on this issue.

Our inaugural annual survey of global trends, in tuition fees and student financial assistance, examined the “G-40” of higher education—that is, 40 countries that, combined, account for 90 percent of global university enrollments and 90 percent of global scientific research production. Though G-40 is obviously not an exhaustive list, comprehending the main lines of policy in these countries provides an essentially comprehensive global picture without the need to examine policy in all the world’s 200-plus states.
to have really significantly improved affordability by enriching student assistance is Australia, where the Youth Allowance scheme was substantially enriched, in particular for students who have to move away from home in order to attend school. Vietnam also saw improvement in student assistance, but this was offset by increases in tuition.

**The Asian Trio and Major Student Aid Cuts**
Significant decreases in affordability probably occurred in Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines. Though these countries held the line on tuition, all experienced major cuts on student financial assistance—on the order of 30 to 45 percent. It is neither unheard of nor impermissible for governments to reduce support to higher education in times of fiscal stress. However, the decision of these governments to hold the line on tuition, while reducing direct aid to the poorest, is in fact a highly regressive policy that above all benefits the affluent.

---

**In sum, the global situation for tuition fees and student financial aid in 2010 and 2011 is largely status quo, despite the economic crisis.**

In the developed world, the Netherlands and the Canadian province of Alberta both introduced cuts to student assistance and allowed tuition to rise. However, given the high levels of personal income in Alberta, the effects may not be too severe, even though the aid cuts were about at the same level as in Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines. Meanwhile, in the Netherlands, the changes in tuition apply only to the fourth year onwards and the reductions in student assistance are at the master’s level, which suggest that the impact on access of the new policy is likely to be negligible.

Other jurisdictions involving reductions in affordability have taken place in parts of the United States with large increases in tuition but only a slight offsetting increase in student assistance. The most notable example is California, where automatic increases in the availability of aid through federal programs such as Pell grants, Stafford Loans, and work-study programs fall well short of compensating for substantial increases in tuition.

**Status Quo Minus**
In sum, the global situation for tuition fees and student financial aid in 2010 and 2011 is largely status quo, despite the economic crisis. Faced with a looming public sector squeeze, most countries simply made no moves on either tuition or student assistance. Nevertheless, to the extent that states did make policy changes, the more significant ones increased, rather than reducing, net prices. The most notable diminution of affordability occurred in Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, and some US states (most notably, California). As mentioned earlier—the Netherlands and Alberta, in Canada—increased tuition and reduced student aid but seem unlikely to pose any threats to accessibility. The only state to take a major step forward in terms of affordability is Australia, with its significant expansion of student aid programs. A number of other countries combined tuition freezes with increases in student aid, but the growth of support in many instances was marginal, at best.

Our best estimate is that this trend will intensify somewhat in the near future. While improvement of student aid in Colombia and the elimination of tuition in North Rhine–Westphalia will possibly exist, policy trends in the rest of the G-40 suggest that the overall trend is headed in the negative direction. As stimulus funds to states dry up in the United States, as inflation in China begins to feed through into tuition, and as European and North American governments adapt to the realities of deficit reduction and an ongoing demographic shift, the balance of probabilities is for increased costs to students and their families. The only issues will be the extent to which this cost sharing will be practiced in a manner in which student aid will rise to partially offset increased costs (as in Vietnam) or not (as in Pakistan and some other countries), and whether or not access to higher education will consequently be affected.

---

**The Cost-Cutting Reforms of Higher Education in England**
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The British coalition government’s response to the economic crisis constitutes cutting public expenditure—to reduce the fiscal deficit and stimulate economic growth. Higher education in England has been disproportionately hit by these cuts, compared with other public services. Most of the savings will be delivered by reforming the funding of higher education, changes informed by the Independent Review of Higher Education Funding and Student Finance, in October 2010. The review proposed radical reforms affecting the character and purpose of higher education.
The Reforms of Higher Education Funding
Following the review’s recommendations, the coalition government is withdrawing the funds it gives universities for teaching most of its undergraduate courses but will continue to subsidize science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) courses, at a reduced level. The lost income stream will be replaced by higher tuition. In future, the majority of arts, humanities, and social science courses will receive no direct government funding and will be financed purely by tuition.

The maximum tuition a university can charge is set by the government. From 2012/13, the current ceiling of £3,290 per annum will rise to a maximum of £9,000. Like at present, all students will be eligible for income-contingent student loans to cover all their tuition and some of their living costs. They will repay these loans on graduation once they earn £21,000 a year (increased from £15,000). The interest rates on these loans have also been increased and in future will rise in line with a student’s earnings. Students will pay 9 percent of their income above £21,000 until their loan debt is cleared, and 30 years after graduation (currently 25 years) any outstanding balance will be written off. Consequently, these student loans remain heavily subsidized by the government; for every £100 borrowed, it will cost the government about £28.

This means the overall higher education resource budget, excluding research funding, will be cut by 40 percent and reduced to £4.2 billion by 2014/15.

The Potential Impact of the Reforms
It is questionable if choice and competition alone will drive up quality and drive down price. First, students have always been able to choose where to study, but their choices rarely follow the logic of economic orthodoxy and may not do so in the future. Second, all universities now charge the maximum tuition permitted by government and probably will in the future, too. They will need to charge a minimum of £7,000 just to recoup their lost government funding. Overtime, substantial variability in tuition is unlikely. Third, currently universities’ income for teaching depends on their success in recruiting students. The mechanisms the government now uses for allocating teaching funds provide both financial stability for the higher education sector and a brake on public expenditure. Both would be at risk in a true higher education market. In reality, so long as the government funds higher education—through teaching grants to

Unfinished Agendas
These cuts form part of more long-standing higher education policy agendas, associated with its expansion. First, similar to the trends in many other countries, policies in England have shifted the costs of higher education away from government and taxpayers so that more are borne by students and/or their parents. Underpinning this “cost-sharing” agenda are the private returns to academic study and the notion that those who benefit financially from higher education should pay for it. Indeed, all major student-funding reforms in Britain since 1990 have sought to restructure the balance of private and public contributions to higher education.

The second agenda has entailed the quest to create a market in higher education. User choice and provider competition were central to the previous Labour government’s reforms of higher education. The coalition government is attempting to complete this unfinished agenda. Their cost-cutting reforms aim to increase competition between universities through variable tuition and by giving students what is in effect, an educational voucher in the form of student loans—loans akin to an installment plan. So students enjoy the benefits of higher education, free of charge, while studying but pay for them later.

Consequently, the bulk of universities’ money will follow the choices of students. Theoretically, consumer demand will determine what universities offer. Students will have greater choice as new providers, including private universities and further education colleges (akin to community colleges in the United States), are allowed to enter the market through a liberalization of rules governing degree-awarding powers and compete by driving up teaching quality and driving down price through efficiency gains. This, too, represents a radical change. Currently, Britain has only two private universities; one of these—BPP [Brierley Price Prior] University College of Professional Studies, owned by Apollo Global—only gained university status in 2010.
universities or financial support to students—it will have to control student numbers. Universities will not be free to enroll as many students as they wish, and student choice will be constrained.

Improbably, these reforms will in fact reduce public expenditure on higher education. Public expenditure will increase in the short term because of the greater costs for the government to provide larger, subsidized student loans to cover students’ higher levels of tuition. In the long term, the reforms probably will cost more than they save because of the government’s misplaced assumptions about future levels of tuition and growth rates in graduate earnings, and hence the amount of money that will be recouped via student-loan repayments. Public borrowing will look as if it has fallen because government teaching grants to universities count as public borrowing, but student loans do not.

The ideological and political ramifications of the reforms are just as significant as their economic consequences. Implicit in this strategy is a radical revision of the purpose of higher education. Up until now, higher education has been seen by governments as a public good, articulated through educational and academic judgments, and financed mainly by public funds. Higher education’s mission has increasingly been aligned to the economic health and well being of the nation.

Consequently, higher education has been considered as an appropriate investment for the federal state on behalf of its citizens, irrespective of subject discipline. Now, large sways of higher education are no longer to be perceived as a public good but, rather, as a private investment. Humanities, arts, and social sciences, unlike STEM subjects and research, apparently lack public utility. Yet, our political leaders have enjoyed and transferred the benefits of the arts, humanities, and social sciences; only one member of the British cabinet studied pure science as an undergraduate. According to UNESCO, the creative and cultural industries are the United Kingdom’s fastest-growing sector, and the country is the world’s biggest single exporter of “cultural goods.” Effectively, however, these non-STEM subjects have been privatized, putting their future at risk outside of elite universities.

This is, indeed, radical change—heretofore an unthought-of development, even in the United States. The shift of the public financing of institutions to the public funding of student support, arguably, is not cost sharing; it constitutes cost transfer and cost cutting on a massive scale. The advocates of cost sharing argue that financial contributions from students should supplement governments’ contribution to higher education and not replace it. The way forward is a more equitable distribution of higher education costs between the beneficiaries that acknowledge both the private and public returns.

Significantly, postsecondary education will remain free at the point of access for all students, including the wealthiest, and they will get a generous package of government-funded financial support. It is impossible, however, to know what impact higher tuition and student-loan debt may have on student behavior, their higher education choices, and their perceptions of the affordability of higher education. Nor can the effects on higher education access and enrollment be determined, especially among low-income students being asked to speculate financially on an imagined but uncertain future.

What unites everyone in government and the higher education sector is the desire for a vibrant, intellectually challenging, and economically stable system. This new different model could rock its foundations and alter its character, appearing to value only the private economic returns of higher education, rather than cherishing universities as centers of teaching, learning, and knowledge creation. Some would argue it is an ideological assault on higher education others, that it will deliver a better deal for students, graduates, and universities. Undoubtedly, these changes herald the retreat of the federal state from financial responsibility for higher education. They boost private-good functions at the expense of the public-good function and reveal a policy mind-set where the public and private benefits of higher education are a zero-sum game. Fiscal savings are needed, but will these be at the expense of the longer-term effects on social equity and universities as public, civic, and cultural institutions? Universities will adapt to these changes and survive these cuts—but for whom and for what?
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In 2009, the World Conference on Higher Education of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) noted the progress made in Africa since its previous conference, in 1998, but acknowledged that many challenges still existed to be met in the 21st century.

Increasing Enrollment

The tertiary student enrollment ratio in sub-Saharan Africa reached only around 6 percent in 2007, the lowest quantity of the world regions. Thus, a determined effort must be made to significantly increase tertiary enrollment in Africa.

In increasing enrollment, however, the intake to existing public institutions must be controlled, taking into account their capacity. The vast majority of public universities in Africa have student enrollment far beyond what they were designed to accommodate. Further enrollment without adequately increasing the infrastructure and other resources can only worsen the situation and affect quality.

At the same time, in several African countries an effort has been taken to rapidly set up new universities that are almost copies of the existing ones. This is not the right approach, as in many cases this results in depleting the staff of the existing institutions and transferring them to the new ones. Yet another tendency is to create new universities by simply upgrading polytechnics and technical colleges. Africa needs differentiated institutions, ranging from research-strong universities to polytechnics and technical colleges, as well as diversified programs within each institution, to cater for different types of learners and needs of the country.

During increasing access, appropriate steps must be taken to ensure the success of the admitted students. The lack of resources, including faculty, often leads to high dropout rates. The time to complete a three-year degree program sometimes takes as much as five to six years. The situation is also exacerbated by frequent campus closures as a result of student unrests, which hamper revitalization initiatives. Both a national and regional approach to this challenge needs to be considered.

Clearly, the increasing demand for higher education in Africa will never be met by traditional face-to-face delivery alone. Other approaches such as open, distance, and online learning will have to be met, especially for continuous adult education and teacher training. This is already happening with the creation of open universities in several countries and the use of distance education in traditional universities to complement face-to-face teaching.

Funding

The dramatic increase in student enrollment in higher education in Africa has not been matched by public funding. Effectively, the public expenditure per student has declined considerably, and this has inevitably led to deterioration in quality. The daunting challenges facing African higher education involve the ongoing increase in student numbers, the more faculty needed to be recruited, additional infrastructure to be built; and yet, the availability of public funds will be limited.

Paradoxically, public spending per higher education student in Africa is much higher than in other developing countries, indicating overspending and inefficiency in the use of resources. Reduction in expenditures and promoting efficiency in the institutions should therefore be the first step in coping with the shortage of funds. Changing the method of budgeting is another approach. Currently, in most countries the annual institutional budget allocated by government is determined by simply adjusting the previous year’s budget by a percentage, depending on the availability of public funds. The use of formula funding, for example, based on the unit cost per student, can stimulate improvement in institutions and help to achieve more accountability and transparency.

Ultimately, however, public institutions will inevitably have to resort to the charging of tuition fees from students if they are to provide quality education. The danger here, moreover, is that public higher education then will eventually be regarded as a private enterprise, receiving decreasing contribution from the state. African governments should recognize that higher education is a “public good” and, accordingly, must benefit from state support. While
fees should be introduced, they should represent only a proportion of the actual economic cost and should be accompanied by appropriate loan schemes or scholarships for the socially disadvantaged students.

The income from cost-sharing measures, however, will never sufficiently cover the huge cost of physical infrastructural development. Capital expenditure funding to a large extent must come from government. Some countries—for example, Ghana—have served an innovative approach of using a small proportion of the national contribution from the value-added tax for funding capital projects in higher education.

Public-funded institutions alone will never manage to meet the huge demand for higher education. Private and cross-border higher education institutions, which already operate in significant numbers in Africa, should be encouraged and can be beneficial in many ways. However, many of them are profit motivated and offer poor-quality education. They, therefore, need to be regulated and quality controlled.

**Research**

The research output from African universities is very low. The reasons include a lack of research-experienced faculty, given brain drain, heavy teaching load, moonlighting by faculty, and lack of resources—such as, library facilities, information and communications technology infrastructure, and well-equipped laboratories.

The relevance of the research carried out is also questionable. Most faculty undertake research for personal gain, with the aim of publishing in internationally refereed journals for promotion purposes. The chosen topic is often not appropriate to national development. Most faculty do their research as individuals; there is insufficient multidisciplinary research, essential for solving development problems. Much of the research is externally funded, and being determined by the funders, the topics may not be of direct relevance to national development.

Research publication comprises another challenge. Most of the research results end up on university library shelves—in theses and dissertations or advanced research journals. They are, thus, not accessible to or understood by policymakers or communities. There is a dearth of African research journals; those that are started are often not sustainable.

Several steps need to be taken to redress the situation. Adequate provision should first be made for funding research at the national level. The setting up of national research councils can extend toward mobilizing resources and identifying national priorities for research. At the institutional level, universities should incorporate research in their strategic planning and ensure that it is given the same priority as teaching. Each university should also create a central research office to coordinate, promote, facilitate, and manage research. A process of upgrading the research qualification of university staff—through, for example, split-site PhDs—is already under way in many institutions and needs to be expanded. With regard to accessing publications on and in Africa, efforts should be made for greater online access to research publications and theses in Africa.

**Quality Assurance**

Quality assurance in higher education is a relatively new phenomenon in Africa. In 2007 only 16 out of 52 countries in sub-Saharan Africa had national quality assurance agencies, most of them recently set up. The agencies have been created mainly to regulate the development of higher education provision, especially by the private sector, rather than ensuring accountability or improving quality.

Paradoxically, public spending per higher education student in Africa is much higher than in other developing countries, indicating overspending and inefficiency in the use of resources.

The main challenges facing quality assurance in Africa are a dearth of adequately trained professional staff in the national quality assurance agencies, lack of knowledge about the related process among the staff in the institutions, resistance from faculty to get fully engaged in the very time-consuming process of data collection and processing, and lack of funds to establish quality assurance systems in the institutions. Sensitization, capacity building, and funding are, thus, the main issues that need to be addressed in promoting quality assurance.

**Conclusion**

Some of the challenges faced by African higher education can be dealt with at the institutional level, a number at the national level, and yet others require a regional approach. If African governments and higher education institutions are to meet those challenges, they need to plan and innovate. Their policies require commitment and collaboration of all the stakeholders. There is no reason why African countries cannot transform these challenges into opportunities to make their higher education sector a vibrant and productive one.
Free Higher Education in South Africa—Why Not?
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Recently, the largest national student organization in South Africa, the South African Students Congress, organized a public demonstration in support of free higher education. In many quarters, this demand was considered outlandish.

But is it? Are the ideas that health care should be available free of charge to all in need and that economic and social policies should prioritize full employment so that all can enjoy dignity to be scoffed at? Should we be shy of aspiring to live in societies that put human development and well-being first and prize highly educated, informed and critical citizenries? Is free higher education necessarily an undesirable _ideal_?

**Social Policy Changes**
The problem with the South African Students Congress call is that it is a demand for immediate free higher education _for all_, rather than for those who are _in need_. Given the radical politics of this organization, this is a strange call as in the South African context a large number of beneficiaries will be from the wealthy and middle classes.

However, if this free higher education demand was, more sensibly, for those who are in need, this would be far from an undesirable ideal. Indeed, such a policy is possible in South Africa and elsewhere. Of course, a policy of free higher education for those who are in need would require a fundamental rethinking of and changes in social goals, priorities, and policies. Without such modifications, it is hard to see how free higher education can be provided, or supported, by those who may cherish such an ideal.

**State Financing**
The public subsidies that public universities receive from government increasingly do not cover their full running costs. They must rely on tuition and residence fees from students, as well as income from donors, research, and other activities to maintain themselves.

If free higher education for all was to be introduced in South Africa, the government would need to provide, apart from the current public subsidy of R 17.5 billion (US$2.5 billion), an additional R 7.7 billion (US$1.1 billion) to universities. If funding for accommodation in university residences was included, a further R 1.3 billion (US$186 million) would be needed. If accommodation and subsistence for all students were to be provided, R 21 billion (US$3 billion) more would have to be made available. These funds could be at the expense of addressing poverty, job creation, health, housing, and other significant social needs.

Unless the government provided the benefits, the funding shortfall that universities would experience, based on free higher education for all, South African universities would collapse.

**Other Consequences**
There would be other issues that the South African Students Congress does not appear to fully consider. South Africa is the most unequal society on earth, with huge income and other inequalities. Free higher education would be a great boon for wealthy and middle-class parents who can afford to pay university tuition and residence fees and associated costs. In effect, this would be a fulsome public subsidy to the very rich and well-off middle classes and a further entrenchment of inequalities.

Currently, private higher education institutions in South Africa do not earn prestige. Introducing free higher education for all without increasing public funding, would create a fertile environment in which the wealthy would send their children to private institutions or to overseas universities. Higher education would become even more of a generator of class and other divisions and inequalities.

---

The problem with the South African Students Congress call is that it is a demand for immediate free higher education _for all_, rather than for those who are _in need_.

---

A university education has both public and private benefits. The graduates of universities contribute in various ways to the public good—as teachers, health professionals, engineers, public servants, and the like. However, they currently also derive private benefits in the forms of better prospects of decent employment, earning substantially higher incomes, enjoying higher standards of living, or having many more of life’s pleasures available to them than those who do not have a university degree.

Given this, it is neither unreasonable nor unfair that students should contribute financially toward higher education.
**Real Problems**

The problems to which the protests led by the South African Students Congress seek to draw attention are as real as urgent. Thousands of working-class and rural poor students with potential and talent find themselves without the means to access universities. At the same time, many hundreds of potentially outstanding postgraduate students, much needed by South Africa, languish without financial support or toil with inadequate funding.

This is notwithstanding that thousands of professional jobs in the private sector and public service remain unfilled because of a shortage of high-quality graduates. Much-needed and welcome state investment in public infrastructure is not matched by investments in citizens.

**Another Approach**

To begin with, South Africa should strive to realize progressively the ideal of free higher education for all those in financial need. A number of priorities should be pursued. The state-supported National Student Financial Aid Scheme, which has been critical in supporting indigent students, requires large capital injections so that such students can be better supported to access and succeed at universities.

Such a scheme also needs to be established for postgraduate students who are in financial need. South Africa cannot waste the talents of students who have the ability to be the next generation of academics, scientists, writers, artists, and critical intellectuals. This factor is also necessary to redress historical racial and gender inequalities.

Increased investments in academic development programs are needed to support the largely black and poor students, who are underprepared by schools for the rigors of a university education. Access without real opportunities for success is a waste of scarce resources and an injustice to these students.

Given the private benefits that accrue to graduates, those who earn above a certain level should be expected to contribute to the National Student Financial Aid Scheme so that future generations of students can be supported. Perhaps all graduates who earn above a certain level should be subject to a graduate tax payable to the state-supported agency.

**Conclusion**

Outside of such an approach, the call for immediate free higher education for all will simply further entrench and reproduce the exact inequalities that the South African Students Congress protests.

Still, and more generally, we should not fear to debate ideals that current neoliberal economic and social orthodoxies disdain or that may not be immediately desirable or achievable.

Is free higher education for all really an impossible dream? Why should it not be an ideal, one of the markers of the just and humane society that is sustainably developed and left as a legacy for future generations? Of course, this would have to be part of a wider and radical reformulation of social goals, priorities, and policies.

---
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The Brazilian Supreme Court is about to decide if affirmative action complies with the National Constitution. In 2003, the senate of the University of Brasilia decided to reserve 20 percent of its places to BBI (black, brown *pardo*, and indigenous) Brazilian candidates, starting in the 2004 admission process. After this move, several public higher education institutions adopted affirmative action programs, either by their own decision or following state laws. In 2009, the right wing Democratas political party filed a lawsuit at Brazilian Supreme Court, claiming that the University of Brasilia’s racial quota system violates no less than nine fundamental precepts of the Constitution. The decision about this case will determine the future of affirmative action in Brazil. Mainstream and specialized press are publishing opinion articles trying to sway opinion supporting one position or another. Amazingly, all articles “prove” that affirmative action is either the deliverance or a threat to the whole Brazilian higher education system.

**The Inevitable Bias of Entrance Exams**

Brazil had to wait until the early 20th century to see its first universities established. Already in 1911, the minister of justice and internal affairs passed a law determining that access to public higher education institutions needed to be
through a universal exam, which became known as vestibular, since the candidates outnumbered the available places. This law had the intention of introducing equity to the selection process: instead of being chosen among the elite, the best prepared would be admitted in a democratic and impartial procedure that offered the same chances to all. One century later most institutions still organize and enforce their own admissions processes, although the Ministry of Education is trying to implement a national SAT-like exam. Over the years, the Brazilian public was led to perceive the vestibular university entrance exam as a fair and reliable admission procedure. However, studies have shown that even where the tests are carefully prepared to depend more on reasoning and verbal capabilities than on memorization, candidates from wealthier backgrounds have more chances of success. Some degree of test bias is unavoidable.

**The Best Education: Private K–12, Public Higher Education**

Since the 1990s, expansion of the higher education system has been mainly among private for-profit, lower-quality institutions. Currently only 25 percent of the 5.5 million enrollment involves the higher-quality public institutions, which are constitutionally forbidden to charge tuition fees. Due to lack of appropriate investment, public K–12 education quality decreased drastically since the 1960s. Expensive private fundamental education schools that explicitly prepare their students to succeed via the vestibular to the best public universities are preferred by those who can afford such cost. As a consequence, this exam model became a validated instrument for social exclusion: the most-coveted places in the best public universities are occupied largely by white middle- and higher-class candidates. Studying in public schools became a reliable proxy for social class.

**The Equity Debate**

Demands to make the vestibular system of public universities more equitable started in the 1990s. Following the World Conference against Racism, held in Durban in 2001, pressure on quotas for students from public schools and for BBI gained momentum. Soon, the debate was engaged on the press and intellectual circles all over the country; discussions became highly polarized. Organized social movements, especially black activists, demanded racial quotas in all public universities using arguments of historical reparation for a past of slavery and racism. However, intellectuals who really trust the fairness of the vestibular agenda claimed that the implementation of affirmative action would be unfair to candidates who score better in the tests and would certainly reduce the academic level of the public universities.

The most controversial issue was whether race could be used as an affirmative-action criterion. Due to the radicalization of the debate, quotas became a synonym for affirmative action in Brazil. Several universities (some sources claim that 70% of all public higher education institutions) enforce some form of affirmative action, most often quotas for public schools. Meanwhile the federal government created the University for All Program (ProUni), where private universities are granted tax reductions if they waive tuition fees for a number of students from public high schools, among them a percentage of BBI. Curiously, although it benefits 500 thousand students and in practice implements public school and racial quotas, this program was never subject to the fierce criticism directed to the affirmative-action programs in public universities. The Brazilian elite apparently perceives the prestigious public institutions as their exclusive grounds.

**Reliability of Selection**

As far as academic performance is concerned, quota systems that reserve places for a fixed number of students independently of demand may admit students who are not at all prepared for high-quality higher education. Anecdotal reports confirming in that way from several institutions are most often ideology driven, inconclusive, and unreliable—depending more on preconceived opinions than on hard data. In contrast, a recent comprehensive study compared the academic results of Unicamp, a top-tier research university in the state of São Paulo, with those of UFBA, the federal university of Bahia. Since 2005, the former adopts a bonus system for students from public high schools and for self-declared BBIs. The latter has a quota system, reserving nearly half of its places to essentially the same population. Unicamp’s data showed that students from public schools admitted with a bonus in average performed better than their counterparts from private schools. This means that the students admitted under the affirmative-action program are in fact more prepared than those they replaced. At UFBA, as in any quota system, the candidates who were not admitted due to affirmative action had the lowest performance in the vestibular entrance exam. The academic performance and dropout rate of students admitted under the quota are
not worse than that of those with the equivalent *vestibular* classification in the period prior to the quota years.

A large number of students entering higher education, with the help of affirmative-action programs in Brazil, come from low-quality secondary schools. Yet, this policy does not mean they lack the talented or necessary competences to complete good-quality higher education. Given the right conditions, top students from disadvantaged backgrounds outperform their colleagues after one or two semesters at the university. Their dropout rate may be higher than average in some institutions but not higher than that of the other candidates they replaced. As a fringe benefit, the institutions become more diverse, providing a better environment for education.

The real institutional and social consequences of affirmative action in Brazil remain unclear because the first cohort is still graduating. Regardless of the Supreme Court’s decision, the success of affirmative action in Brazil showed that selecting students based on performance in one battery of tests is far from being a fair, unbiased, democratic, and equitable process. The whole admissions model must be revised in the years to come.

---
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Brazil is one of the few countries to have developed a full-fledged program to assess outcomes at the higher education level, for both public and private institutions. The National System of Higher Education Assessment (SINEAES) was established by federal law in 2004, building upon an earlier program started in 1996, and is administered by the Ministry of Education. Initially, the system used a sample of the student population, but starting in 2010, it has begun to test all students enrolled in the first and last years of a degree program. Institutions get feedback from the system for their own purposes, but the main function is to provide information for the accreditation processes of programs and institutions that, in Brazil, are the responsibility of government agencies. Results have been widely publicized and used (or misused) to produce program and university rankings.

---

**What the System Measures**

The National System of Higher Education Assessment has three main components: institutional, program, and student-proficiency assessments. The National Student Performance Exam (ENADE), taken by both first- and last-year students, assesses student proficiency. Institutional and program assessments are based on data collected by the Ministry of Education and on self-evaluations conducted by the institutions. The results from the three components are combined into a final score for each undergraduate program: 40 percent from the National Student Performance Exam score for graduating students; 30 percent from a value-added index, measured using the scores of first- and last-year students; and 30 percent from program and institutional assessments. The exam’s average score for the group of last-year students and the final score are reported for each participating program. A reviewing committee visits institutions with final scores below a certain level and produces a report on their findings.

**Are the Results Valid?**

The Ministry of Education has issued a few technical reports explaining the methodology employed by the National System of Higher Education Assessment, but so far, no validity analysis of its results has been developed. Actually, some points have been raised indicating that the system may require some modifications before it could be considered valid for the intended uses.

First, the scoring methodology is uniformly applied to all areas and forms of programs and to all types of institutions. Along with a similar treatment of different programs—like teacher training and engineering—the same principles are also used to assess all institutions. Second, it has been argued that the 30 items used to assess specific area proficiency do not adequately cover the relevant knowledge developed in a degree program. The issue involves content validity, regarding the use of the exam, in the present format, to assess proficiency in any full undergraduate program. A third validity-related concern occurs when groups of students boycott the exam. Even though
students’ scores are not registered in their school records, there is still resistance from student unions against the system. While students need to take the exam, they may leave it blank, distorting the results and reducing the credibility of the system. Another possible limitation of the national assessment system originates in the three-year cycle used to test the proficiency of students enrolled in a given program. For some programs, in particular those with a small group of graduates, it is likely too long, needing too many iterations to produce results that could be considered meaningful regarding the use of the scores for assessment purposes.

**Using (or Misusing) the Results**

Although the previous section raises significant issues regarding its validity, the National System of Higher Education Assessment serves the important mission of providing criteria for accrediting degree programs and institutions. This system has had the greatest impact on the rapidly expanding for-profit sector, which is responsible for about 58 percent of the almost 6 million undergraduate students enrolled in higher education institutions in Brazil (based on 2009 data). National media reports about programs on probation, with admission spots cut, or that have had accreditation revoked by the Ministry of Education are becoming more frequent and attract intense public attention. The reports are also used as criteria for distribution of financial aid to students attending private institutions: those institutions with scores below a certain level are denied access funds and benefits from the various federal student-aid programs. As expected, institutions use the published scores and rankings for marketing goals, in particular those in the for-profit sector.

**Moving Forward**

In a welcome move, the Ministry of Education has recently appointed a permanent specialist reviewing committee to analyze the National System of Higher Education Assessment and make recommendations based on its findings. It is hoped that the committee will help foster a much-needed debate on its aspects and how the results are used. Institutions and specialists should also play a more active role in discussing the whole system. It is expected that some changes will be announced for the 2011 edition of the exam. Alternatives include an increase in the number of items in the specific area section of the exam and a new format for the exam taken by first-year students. Many universities have asked for students’ individual grades to be made part of their school records, to make boycotting less attractive, but it is unclear whether such a move is under consideration.

Despite the issues and limitations mentioned above, the National System of Higher Education Assessment has already established itself as a relevant part of the Brazilian higher education scene, playing a central role in accreditation processes and in other federal programs. It may be a good source of information and data on how such a system works and on the problems and challenges involved—so that people interested in higher education assessment could profit from a detailed analysis of the Brazilian experience.

---
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In a world where change is center stage, it is crucial for organizations to think and act strategically. For knowledge-centered organizations, management practice is required in this dynamic context. Brazilian universities and, indeed, the entire system of higher education and infrastructure for scientific and technological innovation must confront new challenges using sophisticated management and planning techniques.

A simple overview of numbers reveals how the heterogeneous higher education system in Brazil has become based on the variations in institution size, teaching and research quality, academic missions, funding sources, and extent of political oversight. Currently, 2,314 higher education institutions in the country enroll 5,115,896 students; the vast majority of these institutions are private, with 2,069 institutions enrolling 3,764,728 students. The public sector contains federal institutions (94 units, with 752,847 students), state institutions (84 units, with 480,145 students), and municipal institutions (67 units, with 118,176 students).

Despite the size of the system, net enrollment (percentage of 18-to-24-year-olds) was estimated at only 14 to 15 percent of the age cohort by the Ministry of Education, for 2009. This trend is not nearly enough to meet Brazil’s development needs, as a rapidly developing economy.
More Autonomy Demands New Skills

For a quick and effective response to the urgency of increasing participation and improving overall quality, strategic planning is key. Yet, no single formula is appropriate for Brazil, given the diversity of the sector and the different goals and challenges of public and private institutions.

Major events have raised attention to the deficit of strategic-management capacity. Since 1989, state universities in São Paulo have been given greater autonomy, which not only changed the relationship between universities and the government but also transferred greater responsibility to individual institutions. This shift of responsibility accentuates the magnitude of effective and professional institutional management. Moreover, the intense growth of the private sector during the last two decades has introduced new priorities to the discussion of strategic planning. Clearly, this sector must respond to fierce competition, the limitations of tuition income, and the expansion of distance learning.

However, attention to higher education management only began to take shape in the 1990s, when the preoccupation with evaluation and educational quality took center stage. Aiming to stimulate the development of a planning culture, in 2001 the federal government began to require that all higher education institutions prepare an Institutional Development Plan in order to get approval for their courses and credentials. The plan covers a five-year span, based on the following themes: institutional mission and targets, academic and administrative organization, pedagogical planning, physical and academic infrastructure, institutional performance assessment and monitoring, and an implementation schedule.

With no tradition of such effective strategic planning, both the public and private sector face numerous obstacles. Few institutions have developed a “planning culture”; few staff members have the training or skills necessary to participate in strategic planning; information systems are inadequate; and few systems or people are capable of monitoring and controlling the execution of a strategic plan.

Although several universities in Brazil approach world-class stature and are conducting and publishing research of international caliber, amateurism almost always prevails with the management of university financing, institutional engineering, decision making, and other factors. At some institutions researchers do practice sophisticated methodologies, with great rigor, and demonstrate considerable empirical acuity in their scholarly work. These same professors and scientists assume key roles in the administration and management of Brazilian universities but typically lack the training and skills to perform these tasks well. The problem is certainly not intellectual capacity but lack of experience and knowledge.

Can Brazil Respond?

Centers for training specialists in university management are desperately needed and will have an important role in this context. It is not clear how this training will be attained, especially because the models used for noneducational organizations are not definitely suited for higher education institutions.

Brazil needs exposure to successful models implemented in other countries. Better management, strategic planning, effective oversight, and coordination are critical developments needed to advance the quality of higher education in Brazil so that it can keep pace with the rapid growth of the Brazilian economy.

German Funding Ranking as a Tool for Self-Management
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The German research system is undergoing a fundamental transformation, which is nowhere more evident than in the increasing specialization and structural differentiation of the university landscape. This transition is being played out against the backdrop of a competitive system that requires universities to act increasingly as autonomous institutions. Competitive project funding by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), the European Union, and the federal and state governments—especially in connection with the German Excellence Initiative—as well as other funding sources have driven and sustained this process in an almost catalytic fashion.

The DFG is an association under private law, funded by the German government and various federal states. DFG membership consists of research universities and a number of nonuniversity research institutions. With an annual budget of about 2.2 billion euros (2009) the DFG funds more than 20,000 projects a year within all disciplines—mainly conducted at universities but often together with partners from nonuniversity research institutions in Germany and abroad.

To support its member universities, identify their strengths, and sharpen their research profiles in an increasingly competitive process, the DFG has established a regular information service since 1997, the Funding Ranking. This service is mainly funded by the DFG and financially supported by the German Stifterverband (Donors’ Association for the Promotion of Sciences and Humanities), being a promoter of the continuous growth and development of the Funding Ranking.

The Funding Ranking intends to provide comprehensive and differentiated information about the research priorities of German higher education institutions, in terms of publicly funded research given to certain disciplines or research fields. To be published, a survey conducted by the Institute for Research Information and Quality Assurance and commissioned by the DFG shows that within five years 98 percent of all professors at German universities apply for third-party funding at the DFG (74%) or other funders (24%). Thus, the indicators of the DFG Funding Ranking mainly based on statistics measuring the amount of money received from different funders, map the research activities in Germany in a quite comprehensive way.

**Funding Data and Research Performance**

The first edition of the Funding Ranking, published in 1997, mainly answered two questions: how much money did every single university in Germany receive from the DFG? and how does this sum split up on the different disciplines located at one place? Today the Funding Ranking covers data on approximately 90 percent of funds distributed by public bodies (mainly DFG, the German government, and the European Union). Donated on a competitive basis, these funds are thought to be good indicators for qualitative highly ranked research. Beside monetary indicators, the Funding Ranking also uses indicators that count the number of heads of excellent scientists—such as, research visits by domestic or foreign scientists funded by the European Research Council, Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung, or German Academic Exchange Service or scientists who act as reviewers for the DFG.

Publication statistics are usually based on data that comprise articles in international journals. In many disciplines, particularly life sciences and the natural sciences, such journal articles are the main form of publication, and the respective indicators provide a good impression of the research activity. In the humanities and some fields within the engineering sciences, however, the major publication outputs consist of books, chapters, or articles in proceedings. Moreover, researchers in some of these disciplines are used to publish in their national languages. Therefore, publication indicators based on data that mainly cover articles in English-language journals cannot adequately reflect research performance in these disciplines. A further problem results from the (considerable) time lags until an article gets published and is enlisted in the data base. Even more time passes until the first citation. Thus, citation analyses are of limited value if one aims at a recent mapping of current research performance.

The German research system is undergoing a fundamental transformation, which is nowhere more evident than in the increasing specialization and structural differentiation of the university landscape.

In contrast, the successful acquisition of external research funding is an internationally acknowledged performance indicator. The value of fund raising today is demonstrated in the above-mentioned survey: Applying for research funds nowadays is “everyday business,” not only in Germany but worldwide. Funding data provides a broad and up-to-date impression of the research activity at higher education institutions (as well as other research institutions).

**Differentiated Research Profiles**

The Funding Ranking differentiates not only by funding sources but also by the use of funds in various subject-specific and thematic research areas. It is based on a subject classification system including over 200 subjects assigned to 48 disciplinary groups and 14 research areas. For the R&D—project funding by the German government as well as for the funding within the European Union’s Framework Programs for Research and Technological Development,
the Funding Ranking uses the thematic program classifications of these funding bodies. This allows describing the subject-specific profiles of the institutions in a differentiated manner. For example, it is possible to identify the medium-sized University of Bremen not only as strong in natural and engineering sciences. The differentiated subject classification helps to identify small disciplines that define the university’s profile. This focus extends beyond the prior idea of the Funding Ranking to inform about “winners” or “losers” in the competition for additional money given by research funding organizations.

**Innovative Visualization Techniques**
Beside the “traditional” ranking approach in the form of ranking lists the main step forward of the DFG Funding Ranking includes a broad set of innovative visualization techniques. They encompass the so-called subject maps that indicate which subjects shape the profile of an institution. These maps contribute to benchmarking purposes because they show which research institutions have similar profiles and are thus likely to be competitors or even potential partners for joint research projects.

**Deemed Universities in India: Confusion Reigns**

**Asha Gupta**

Asha Gupta, an affiliate with the University at Albany Program for Research on Private Higher Education, is currently at the Directorate of Hindi Medium Implementation, University of Delhi. E-mail: ashagupta3452@gmail.com.

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

Confusion prevails over the future of India’s institutions confusingly titled “deemed to be universities.” According to the University Grants Commission Act of 1956, the “deemed-to-be-a-university” status can be granted to any higher education institution other than a university, on the recommendation of the UGC, by the central government. These institutions enjoy more autonomy than regular universities in terms of fee structure, admissions process, curricula designing, and degrees to be awarded. They can be public or private and have enjoyed the status of universities without being established by national or state legislation.

On January 18, 2010, the government filed an affidavit in the Supreme Court proposing withdrawal of deemed-university status in the case of 44 private higher education institutions, spread over 13 states with an aggregate enrollment of 200,000 students. Soon after coming into power in May 2009, the Congress Party–led government had constituted a committee to look into several aberrations in the functioning of India’s existing 132 deemed universities. The committee evaluated 127 deemed universities (41 government funded and 86 private) and came to the conclusion that only 38 were justified in retaining this status. It found 44 institutions deficient in terms of academic cur-
riculum, research, governance, and infrastructure and gave them three years to improve their functioning. The committee recommended the scrapping of the deemed status in the rest of the 44 institutions. One deemed university did not turn up for the review.

Deemed universities were conceptualized by the UGC on the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Committee set up in 1948. The idea was to grant university status to those institutions that for historical reasons or other circumstances could not become universities but were engaged in high-standard, specialized academic fields. From 1956 to 1999, the status of deemed university was conferred only on 37 institutions—such as, the prestigious Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore, the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in Delhi, the Tata Institute of Social Sciences in Mumbai, and the Birla Institute of Technology and Science in Pilani.

However, a new government in 1999 granted this status en bloc to 17 regional engineering colleges and several other private institutions providing professional courses, such as the Manipal Academy. From 1999 to 2009, their number rose from mere 37 to 127. In 1999, a special provision was made to confer the status of de novo universities for institutions showing “potential for excellence” in terms of innovative teaching methods and research, rather than excellence per se.

The idea was to grant university status to those institutions that for historical reasons or other circumstances could not become universities but were engaged in high-standard, specialized academic fields.

The committee, established by the Human Resource Development Ministry, in its 2010 report finds few of the errant 44 deemed universities actually engaged in some serious or meaningful research. In most cases, it finds the institutions in question by admitting students far beyond their intake capacity and running many distance education programs without prior approval. Most have underqualified faculty and/or poor infrastructure. Some are found allegedly functioning on illegal land, while others are offering classes and laboratories at odd hours. The committee also finds the 132 deemed universities ignoring the guidelines from the UGC and other mandatory regulatory bodies, such as the Medical Council of India.

Need of the Hour
It is not surprising that Kapil Sibal, the new human resource development minister found it necessary to freeze the sanctioning of new deemed universities and place the existing deemed universities under the scrutiny of a high-powered committee. Even the 22-member Yashpal committee, in its report on “Renovation and Rejuvenation of Higher Education in India” in 2008, had recommended maintaining the deemed status until rational guidelines are evolved. The erstwhile United Progressive Alliance government has yet to pass legislation regulating the establishment and running of private and foreign higher education institutions in India. Four bills are pending before the Parliament, aiming at stopping the malpractices in private higher education and paving the way for foreign universities in India. The real test lies in providing an environment that fosters innovation but deters malpractices.

Given the lack of proper legislation, the existing state of uncertainty is reinforced by the Supreme Court’s halting of the 44 deemed universities found in violation by the government. It has asked them to prove in the next three years their worth, based on the special status accorded to them. Meanwhile, the UGC has put a bar on running distance-learning programs by the deemed universities. Additionally, the All India Council for Technical Education has formulated new guidelines for allowing the corporate sector to establish private universities directly, instead of taking...
Center director Philip Altbach was elected to the International Academy of Education, a Brussels-based organization of educational researchers. He is giving a keynote address at an international higher education conference in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, where he is also participating in a working group of Saudi rectors. He will participate in the meetings of the International Advisory Committee of the National Research University-Higher School of Economics in Moscow in May and has also been invited to speak to a conference sponsored by the government of Slovenia, in Ljubljana.

Plans for a Spanish edition of International Higher Education are being discussed with several groups in Latin America. Spanish will be the third language for IHE. We continue to be distributed with Deutsche Universitätszeitung-Europa. Sections of our publication also are published in Vietnamese. Our publication’s global reach was recently the subject of an article in University World News (http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20110211204225750).

Iván F. Pacheco, CIHE research assistant, has recently been doing some consulting work for the government of Colombia, concerning legal arrangements for higher education.

The World View, CIHE’s blog published on InsideHigherEd.com, continues to draw attention and comments. Our 17 contributors represent 13 countries and contribute commentary on a range of current topics from diverse vantage points. Each blog post averages 1,000 unique readers and provides reflection and commentary on “breaking news,” trends, and policy initiatives around the world.

Expert Database

The Center continues to upgrade the content of the database on our Web site. During the last few months summaries of experience and CVs have been added to individual profiles.

The objective of this database is to support and encourage communication among international scholars, researchers and practitioners who share common interests. Hopefully, the database will assist individuals looking for articles, bibliography, or consultations on a range of topics in higher education.

To search the expert database, go to the Web site (www.bc.edu/cihe) and click on “Search CIHE database,” in the left column. Click on “Expert” under “People” and choose a topic from the list or enter a key word in the blank field.
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.