

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Number 37 Fall 2004

International Issues

- 2 Academic Freedom and International Higher Education
Robert Quinn and Carla Stuart

GATS Update

- 3 GATS Update
Madeleine F. Green
- 5 GATS Redux: The WTO Returns to Center Stage
Philip G. Altbach

Student Mobility and National Policy

- 7 International Student Mobility and its Limits: The Australian Case
Fazal Rizvi
- 10 International Student Mobility: Project Atlas
Adria Gallup-Black
- 11 Where Did All the International Students Go?
Liz Reisberg
- 13 Japan and Transnational Higher Education
Fujio Ohmori

Women's Higher Education

- 15 Educating Women Worldwide
Louise W. Knight
- 16 Women's Higher Education in Asia
Patricia B. Licuanan
- 18 Women's Colleges and Universities in International Perspective
Francesca Purcell and Robin Matross Helms

Private Higher Education

- 20 Private Universities in South Korea
Seung-Bo Kim and Sunwoong Kim

Corruption in Central Asia

- 22 Academic Integrity and its Limits in Kyrgyzstan
Madeleine Reeves
- 24 Kazakhstan: The Issue of Corruption
Nataliya L. Rummyantseva

Countries and Regions

- 25 The End of Civic Diplomacy and International Education
Philip G. Altbach

Departments

- 28 News of the Center
- 29 New Publications

Academic Freedom and the Promise of International Higher Education

Robert Quinn and Carla Stuart

Robert Quinn is the director and Carla Stuart is the program officer of the Scholars at Risk Network headquartered at New York University, 194 Mercer Street, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10012, USA. E-mail carla.stuart@nyu.edu. Website: <http://scholarsatrisk.nyu.edu>.

The expansion of international higher education is good news for everyone. Better-trained and educated populations, greater familiarity with other cultures, the sharing of expertise and experiences across boundaries all offer promise of a brighter, more prosperous and peaceful future. But without a firm rooting in principles of academic freedom, international higher education forfeits this promise and risks being coopted to the service of discrimination, corruption, and repression.

Respect for Academic Freedom

Academic freedom—including constituent freedoms of thought, opinion, expression, association, travel, and instruction—is essential to any free, open, and stable society. Academic freedom helps to create space for free inquiry and expression and space in which members of the academy (and by extension all members of society) are able to evaluate conflicting ideas, policies, and points of view. Every scholar depends on this space, using it to test and shape one's thoughts and theories or drawing upon earlier generations of ideas, data, materials, and methods. Academic communities are in their essence physical (and, increasingly, virtual) manifestations of this space. The promise of international higher education *presumes* the existence of this space and the vigorous combat of ideas within it, and it presumes the sharing of the *best* ideas across borders.

Around the world, however, repressive authorities intent on maintaining power seek to strip higher education of its essential core of freedom. They use higher education as a necessary vehicle for the economic and technologic development that sustains their position but repress inquiry and expression beyond officially sanctioned limits. They closely monitor academic communities. They discriminate against dissenters and “new” voices—including women and ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities. With shocking frequency they target individual scholars for intimidation and violence—including arrest on false charges, trial, and imprisonment and, in the worst cases, torture, disappearance, and death.

Take, for example, the sociologist from the Middle East whose examination of infant mortality rates showed significantly higher rates than those published in official public figures. Rather than review their own figures, the government expelled the professor from the university and imprisoned him.

There are the three scholars whose work exposed corruption in their respective countries in Central Asia, Latin America, and Africa. The first exposed corruption in the government, the second in the commercial sector, and the third in the university system itself. All were forced into hiding and exile.

There are the three political scientists—one from Europe, one from South America, and one from Southeast Asia—whose calls for peaceful, nonviolent reexamination of decades-long armed conflicts within their respective countries triggered assassination attempts. Two survived. One did not.

These are real examples of real attacks. There have been perhaps hundreds more like them in recent years. Each attack is an attempt to silence a particular voice. Each is also a message to those not directly targeted that they could be next.

Where academic communities are silent about these attacks they risk being coopted by repressive authorities.

Where academic communities are silent about these attacks they risk being coopted by repressive authorities engaging in discrimination, corruption, and repression. Silence reinforces the effectiveness of attacks: wrongdoers believe they can enjoy the fruits of educational exchanges without respecting academic freedom and basic rights. Targeted communities are left isolated and vulnerable.

Academic Communities' Responsibility

Academic communities benefit from exchanges intellectually and financially, as well as in other ways. Thus they have a responsibility to ensure that these benefits are not obtained at the expense of partner communities or their members and that the exchanges do not contribute to attacks on scholars.

What, then, is the responsibility of an academic community when a partner community in another country is dominated by a ruling authority that practices ethnic, religious, or gender discrimination? Can the partnership be maintained without supporting the practices? What if a repressive

authority employs imprisonment, torture, or murder against scholars who stray beyond restrictions on inquiry or expression?

There may be circumstances in which international higher education partnerships cannot be maintained in good faith: for example where formal apartheid-type systems are in place or where genocidal violence is occurring. But situations warranting a full withdrawal are infrequent. Circumstances are almost always complex and changing, and there is a strong perspective in international higher education that favors more exchange, not less. Academic communities must not allow this perspective to support their silence in the face of wrongdoing by their partners. To do so is at least tacitly to acquiesce.

There may be circumstances in which international higher education partnerships cannot be maintained in good faith.

Fortunately, silence is not the only option. Academic communities can work together to promote a cross-cultural dialogue that addresses the importance of academic freedom, its scope and boundaries, and steps that might be taken to ensure academic freedom is understood and respected.

One way to start this dialogue would be for every international higher education partnership (faculty or student exchanges, for example) to acknowledge the role of academic freedom in the relationship. A joint statement of understanding might address the responsibilities of faculty, administration, and students of the partner institutions in exercising, promoting, and respecting academic freedom and might include provisions for raising concerns about academic freedom issues. Through such simple measures significant improvements in understanding and local conditions might be achieved. Another way to start this dialogue would be to hold events focused on academic freedom and threats to scholarly communities. Introducing these issues to colleagues, students, media, and members of the public can expand the dialogue and magnify its effect.

Of course when scholars are presently suffering intimidation and attack, promoting understanding and organizing events are not enough. Action must be taken. Letters from higher education leaders put wrongdoers on notice that the world is watching. Joint-letters from groups of higher education communities are even more powerful in showing that concern about violations is widespread.

For the most severely threatened scholars, however, even letters are not enough—refuge is essential if their voices are to be saved. Academic communities can make

room on their campuses and in their classrooms for these individuals. By lending shelter and safety for a short time, academic communities give these scholars a chance to recover, regroup, and resume their work.

Of course, no one community can be expected to do it all. A collective response is necessary. Since 2000, the Scholars at Risk Network has provided that response. Scholars at Risk is an international network of more than 80 colleges and universities dedicated to promoting academic freedom and defending the human rights of scholars worldwide. Institutions of higher education in any country can join the Network. Some members send letters of concern about particular violations of academic freedom; others host events on their campuses featuring formerly threatened or exiled scholars. In the last four years, dozens have invited threatened scholars to be visitors at their campuses for up to a year or more, during which time the scholars lecture, do research, and write. These visits have saved many important voices and dozens of lives, including most of those mentioned at the beginning of this essay.

What is most important is that academic communities share responsibility and join in the growing dialogue about the importance of academic freedom. Such actions will not only help to achieve added protections for threatened individuals but will ensure that international higher education maintains its essential core of freedom, allowing it to deliver on its promise of a brighter, more prosperous, and more peaceful future for all.

GATS Update

Madeleine F. Green

Madeleine F. Green is vice president and director of the Center for Institutional and International Initiatives at the American Council on Education (ACE). Address: American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, USA. E-mail: Madeleine_Green@ace.nche.edu. A longer version of this paper is available on the ACE website <http://acenet.edu/programs/international/gats/2004-update.cfm>.

The inclusion of higher education in the General Agreement of Trade in Services (GATS) continues to concern higher education leaders, students, and faculty around the world. They fear that liberalization of trade in education may weaken governments' commitment to and investment in public higher education, promote privatization, and put countries with weak quality assurance mechanisms at a disadvantage in their efforts to oversee education programs delivered in their countries by foreign providers.

Commitments, Offers, and Requests: A Tally

Negotiations are conducted as a series of requests and offers. Each WTO member submits requests to individual trading partners or to groups of members. Members may then choose to respond by submitting offers; they also decide whether to make their requests and offers public. Because requests are usually handled bilaterally rather than through any central mechanism, no complete list of requests exists. Some requests have been leaked, but they cannot be verified.

Forty-four members made commitments in education in the previous round of negotiations.

Forty-four members made commitments in education in the previous round of negotiations (the “Uruguay round”), which ended in 1995; of these, 21 included commitments in higher education. The current requests and offers will only become solid commitments at the end of the current (“Doha”) round. The Doha round is supposed to end January 1, 2005, but slow negotiations may cause that deadline to be extended.

It is not known how many of the 145 WTO members have made initial requests in education, because requests are not made public. Some requests in higher education have been leaked, such as those that the United States made of the European Union, Mexico, and Brazil and the EU requests of 109 nations. In addition, some members have made summaries of their requests public. Forty-four members had submitted offers as of July 2004, including nine in education. Many negotiations are taking place outside the GATS framework, in bilateral discussions (such as between the United States and Australia).

U.S. Engagement in the GATS Negotiations

Four nations—the United States, Australia, Japan, and New Zealand—put forth negotiating proposals. The U.S. negotiating proposal (December 2000) affirms the rights of governments to regulate in order to meet domestic policy objectives, acknowledges that governments will continue to play important roles as service suppliers, and emphasizes benefits to the receiving country—for example, help in upgrading its workforce and improving its competitiveness. (See http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/s_propnewnegs_e.htm.)

The United States has released a summary of its July 2002 request, seeking increased access for higher education, training services, and testing services. (See <http://ustr.gov/sectors/services/2002-07-01->

[proposal-execsumm.pdf](#)o) The request asked that all 145 WTO members undertake full commitments for market access and national treatment in modes 1, 2, and 3. The four modes of supply are: mode 1: cross-border supply (e.g., distance learning); mode 2: consumption abroad (e.g., study abroad); mode 3: commercial presence (e.g., branch campuses or arrangements with local institutions); and mode 4: presence of natural persons (professors or researchers working abroad). The United States indicated that it was not requesting commitments in primary or secondary education, nor commitments with respect to public education or subsidies.

In addition to this general request, leaked information indicates that the United States has made requests of a number of countries—including Taiwan, Egypt, India, Mexico, Philippines, Thailand, El Salvador, Turkey, China, Israel, Japan, South Africa, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Spain, and Sweden—to remove specific barriers.

In March 2003, the United States publicly indicated that it was considering making an offer that would include commitments on higher education services.

In March 2003, the United States publicly indicated that it was considering making an offer that would include commitments on higher education services. The text, which is available on the U.S. Trade Representative website (http://www.ustr.gov/sectors/services/2003-03-31-consolidated_offer.pdf) outlines a number of limitations on potential commitments. Observers have noted the contrast between the ambitious nature of the U.S. request and the very explicit limitations to the U.S. offer. Among the limitations to a possible U.S. commitment on higher education are the following: the ability of individual U.S. institutions to maintain autonomy in admissions policies, setting tuition rates, developing curricula or course content; the granting of U.S. federal or state government funding or subsidies to U.S. schools or citizens; the requirements for regional or specialty accreditation practices; and the conditions for foreign-owned entities to receive public benefits.

Continuing Concerns about GATS

The topic of GATS negotiations in higher education has generated more heated discussion and speculation than analysis and forecasting. This is not surprising, given that GATS is an untested instrument and the outcomes are difficult to project. A number of concerns have surfaced over time.

“Tradespeak.” Not surprisingly, the world of trade uses a different conceptual framework and is underpinned by a different set of values from those of higher education. Philip Altbach and others have written about the dangers of considering higher education as simply another service to be traded, rather than as an investment in a nation’s social, cultural, and economic development.

Representation of higher education. Trade negotiations are by nature not a transparent process. Governments negotiate on behalf of the services represented in GATS. Countries have varied widely in their approach to soliciting the views of the higher education community to inform and guide their GATS positions.

Governments negotiate on behalf of the services represented in GATS.

Unintended consequences. Higher education leaders are in the difficult position of being unable to anticipate the variety of scenarios that could unfold. Higher education groups in several countries (e.g., Canada, the United States, and Switzerland) have commissioned analyses by trade and legal experts, but they have provided few definitive answers at this point.

Ambiguity about GATS. Article 1.3 of the GATS agreement indicates that “services supplied in the exercise of governmental authority,” supplied on a “non-commercial basis,” and those “not in competition with other suppliers” are excluded from GATS. In a mixed public-private system, how would GATS deal with the distinctions among public, private nonprofit, and for-profit institutions? What precisely does it mean to be “not in competition with other suppliers”? The ambiguity surrounding article 1.3 has been noted in much of the literature about GATS, with no clear resolution.

Trade-offs in continuing negotiations. Limitations on offers are not cast in stone. As the negotiations proceed, members request progressive trade-offs, either within a sector such as education or across service sectors. For example, a country could make concessions in education in order to gain concessions from another country in express delivery. The principle of progressive liberalization suggests steadily removing limitations that act as barriers.

Impact on higher education in developing countries. Many developing countries lack sufficiently robust quality assurance systems to regulate foreign providers adequately, and thus protect consumers. Additionally, many developing countries see liberalization of trade as a threat to their public higher education systems. If foreign providers establish programs in areas requiring

relatively little capital investment, such as business or information technology, the local public institutions will be left with the more expensive programs, such as engineering and the sciences, without the lower-cost programs to subsidize the higher-cost ones.

The Search for International Consensus

It is important to note that opposition to or reservations about including higher education in GATS negotiations does not equal opposition to cross-border education. There is widespread recognition of the benefits of cross-border education and its potential to provide higher education capacity to nations whose demand outstrips supply. In recognition of the importance of cross-border education, four higher education associations (the American Council on Education, the Council on Higher Education Accreditation, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, and the International Association of Universities) have drafted a statement, “Sharing Quality Higher Education Across Borders: A statement on Behalf of Higher Education Institutions Worldwide.” The statement, addressed to higher education institutions and their nongovernmental associations worldwide and to their national governments and their intergovernmental organizations, aims to create an international consensus on a fair and transparent framework for managing higher education across borders. It outlines principles that should underpin cross-border education and government policies in trade negotiations and suggests specific actions that reinforce those principles. The document is on the websites of all four drafting organizations (www.acenet.edu/programs/international/sharing_quality/statement.cfm) and will be open for comment through September 2004. At the end of the consultation period, the document will then be finalized and circulated for signature by higher education associations. ■

GATS Redux: The WTO and Higher Education Returns to Center Stage

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is J. Donald Monan SJ professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

With the collapse of the WTO’s Cancun trade talks a year ago amidst recriminations between developing countries and others concerning agricultural exports and other issues, treaty negotiations were pushed to the back burner. Trade discussions moved to the regional and

bilateral levels. Now, there are signs that WTO negotiations are again taking center stage. Leaders of the world's trading nations worry that failure will weaken the WTO, move negotiations on to a highly complex set of bilateral treaties, and prevent a "rational" world trade regime. The "Doha round" is being resurrected.

All of this has implications for higher education. The momentum to conclude formal treaty agreements relating to the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) also weakened in the aftermath of Cancun. What had been an active set of discussions among trade officials and some in the education community in many countries slowed down. It is likely that GATS will again move to center stage.

It is likely that GATS will again move to center stage.

Why GATS Is Important

It is very difficult for the higher education community—and, for that matter, the general public—to understand GATS and its implications. It is stated in "trade speak" and the legal circumlocutions of treaties. And much of GATS focuses on broader issues relating to intellectual property, banking services, and other aspects of the international flow of services peripheral to higher education. Parts of GATS, however, have implications for higher education. GATS, as an element of the WTO is part of an international treaty. Countries, and by implication academic institutions, are subject to WTO adjudication decisions. Thus, the stakes are very high.

GATS potentially strikes at the heart of academic autonomy, institutional decision making, and national higher education policy. GATS agreements can, once individual countries have agreed, enforce open higher education markets and enable institutions and companies from other countries to engage freely in higher education activities—setting up branch campuses, offering degrees, and so on. Local authorities, perhaps including accreditations and quality control agencies, might have little control. Local institutions, unless complex exceptions were written into the treaty, might be forced to consider foreign applicants for academic posts on an equal basis with local applicants. For countries such as the United States and the larger European countries with strong and mature higher education systems, the chances of being greatly affected by foreign providers is slim. However, for countries with high unmet demand for access, smaller academic systems, and universities at the periphery of the world knowledge network, GATS could result in considerable external impact.

GATS as a Political/Ethical Issue

GATS is actually being pushed by a small but very powerful segment of the education and trade communities. It is highly significant that the government agencies arguing for GATS are not education departments or ministries in general, but rather trade and commerce agencies. In the United States, it has been the U.S. Trade Representative and, in the United Kingdom, the Department of Trade and Industry. The growing for-profit education sector, the testing industry, and the English-language schools, among some others, have also favored GATS as a way of obtaining easy access to markets overseas.

Until 2000 or later, the higher education community worldwide, including the universities and other institutions, accrediting agencies, faculty and student organizations, education unions, and other groups, had little awareness of GATS or its implications. This has changed. A large number of institutions, organizations, and interest groups have now educated themselves about GATS and now constitute a significant force. Conferences about the WTO and GATS have been held around the world. Recently, the Association of African Universities sponsored a conference that passed a statement highly critical of GATS. The International Association of Universities, the American Council on Education, and others have drafted a statement focusing on cross-border education and the public interest, dealing in part with GATS. Education International, a federation of major education trade unions such as the National Education Association in the United States and the German teachers union, have also been quite critical of GATS.

A large number of institutions, organizations, and interest groups have now educated themselves about GATS and now constitute a significant force.

Why the Opposition?

While the groups critical of GATS have many rationales and represent many different interests, they are unified by a concern with what can be called the public good and by a conviction that higher education is not a commodity to be traded without constraint. There is recognition that higher education is a complex phenomenon involving not just the marketplace but also national culture, the values of a society, and access and social mobility.

GATS opponents do not oppose the internationalization of higher education, cross-border collaboration, or even necessarily trade in education. Overseas study, collaborative research, institutional cooperation, and other aspects of internationalization are

welcomed. They do oppose at least three basic underlying elements of the WTO-GATS approach to higher education—the dominance of the market and the accompanying notion that higher education is a commodity to be traded on an open market where those who have a “competitive advantage” will come to control, the idea that higher education is a private good (to be paid for by “users”—students), and the idea that higher education is a common commodity, easily transferable from one country to another.

GATS critics see the role of higher education differently. Higher education is seen as more than a commodity—it is part of the cultural patrimony and the research infrastructure of a society, and is therefore a public good and at least to some extent, a public responsibility. It is seen as a means of access and social mobility to disenfranchised segments of the publication. And for developing countries, it is seen as a central element for nation building. GATS opponents see higher education as much more than a tradable commodity to be determined by the vagaries of an international marketplace.

The Future

For the first time, there are articulate groups debating the pros and cons of GATS and seeking to understand the highly complex details. The playing field, which was at one time completely dominated by pro-GATS forces, is now contested, with ideas flowing in all directions. The WTO remains dominated by government agencies and commercial interests, and it is thus difficult to gauge the outcome. It might be that the very complexity of the issues involved will make GATS difficult to legislate and even more difficult to implement. One thing is clear—those with concern about the future of higher education need to be actively involved in the debate and the politics that will inevitably follow. ■

Offshore Australian Higher Education

Fazal Rizvi

Fazal Rizvi is professor in the Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois. He was pro vice chancellor (international) at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) in Australia from 1998 to 2001. Address: 1310 S. Sixth Street Champaign IL 61820, USA. E-mail: frizvi@uiuc.edu.

Much has been written about the spectacular success of Australian universities over the past decade in recruiting international students to their campuses. However, one other aspect of their internationalization

efforts has attracted much less attention: the export of their teaching programs offshore.

Nature and Scope

Each of Australia’s 38 public universities is now involved in providing offshore education. The idea of offshore education (increasingly called “transnational education”) is complex, covering a whole range of financial, institutional, and pedagogic arrangements. At the most basic level, it refers to educational arrangements that necessitate the crossing of national borders; for example, when a program of study is offered to learners located in countries different from the one where the program has been developed and from where it is awarded. Of all the countries involved in the delivery of educational programs offshore, Australia has perhaps been the most innovative, entrepreneurial, and aggressive. Australian universities have forged a bewildering array of relationships with a whole range of institutions, from universities and colleges to educational agents and large corporations.

Of all the countries involved in the delivery of educational programs offshore, Australia has perhaps been the most innovative, entrepreneurial, and aggressive.

According to a report by the Australian Vice Chancellors Committee (AVCC), the number of offshore programs of Australian universities has risen from just 25 in 1991 to almost 1,600 in 2003. The number of international students enrolled in offshore programs of Australian universities now exceeds 70,000. More than 85 percent of these programs are in China (including Hong Kong), Singapore, and Malaysia, with the remaining much smaller programs scattered around the world, from India and Indonesia to Canada and South Africa.

The institutions that were once colleges of advanced education and were granted university status only after 1988, following the introduction of market-orientated reforms to Australian higher education, have been among the most active players in offshore education. Universities such as Curtin, the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), Southern Queensland, and South Australia have viewed offshore education as essential to their growth and profile. On the other hand, with the exception of Monash, elite universities such as New South Wales, Sydney, Melbourne, Queensland, and the Australian National University have only belatedly joined the business of offshore education, after initially expressing major reservations about its financial and academic viability.

These reservations are no longer expressed as strongly as before, partly because some of their earlier predictions about the long-term sustainability of offshore programs have not been realized but also because the Australian government itself has become a vocal champion of offshore education. The government views offshore education as incredibly valuable in promoting its economic and political interests, especially within the Asia-Pacific region, in performing the tasks of public diplomacy. Understandably, therefore, the Australian government has been a leading advocate of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), organized by the World Trade Organization. Not only is the government committed to multilateral agreements designed to liberalize the global economy, it has also argued strongly in favor of the application of GATS to educational services.

For many Asian students, twinning programs constituted an affordable option to gain access to Australian higher education.

Multiple Forms

The origins of Australian offshore education lie in “twinning” arrangements with colleges in Southeast Asia, designed to enable students in countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, and Hong Kong to complete the initial part of their studies within their own country before completing their degrees in Australia. For newly industrializing Asian countries, offshore education provided an effective way of meeting the fast-growing demand for higher education. In twinning programs Australian academics and local instructors share the responsibilities of teaching courses assumed to be identical to those offered at Australian campuses, making articulation a reasonably seamless process. For many Asian students, twinning programs constituted an affordable option to gain access to Australian higher education, which otherwise might not have been possible for all but the wealthiest families. For Australian universities, this arrangement provided a guaranteed source of supply of full-fee-paying international students, albeit for a shorter period. It also enabled Australian academics to travel abroad and enhance their understanding of intercultural and educational issues at a time when all Australians were being encouraged to forge closer links with Asia.

The early twinning arrangements thus had an educational purpose and were not viewed primarily in financial terms. Issues of access and purpose have increasingly become secondary to the focus of most

Australian universities on the ability of offshore programs to broaden their financial base. Indeed, a study conducted by IDP Australia in 2001 indicated that more than 40 percent of the universities surveyed cited the generation of additional sources of revenue as their main rationale for offering educational programs offshore. Most other rationales were also couched in commercial and corporate terms, such as increasing profile and reputation and recruiting more international students to Australian campuses.

Australian offshore education has developed rapidly from early twinning programs to a wide variety of arrangements including distance learning, joint-award programs, program articulations of various kinds, and branch campuses. Most of these arrangements involve developing partnerships with local organizations and complying with the requirements of local legislation concerning the provision of educational services. More than 70 percent of the partnerships Australian universities have developed are with private organizations—some of which are recognized universities and colleges while others are private agencies seeking mainly to generate profits from the business of education. Partnerships involve creating commercial contracts that specify the role and responsibilities of each partner and the formulas for the distribution of profits.

More than 70 percent of the partnerships Australian universities have developed are with private organizations.

Emerging Issues

While Australian universities have succeeded in negotiating, managing, and delivering on these contracts, offshore education has also generated a number of complex issues that universities are just starting to address. To begin with, there is a great deal of debate on Australian campuses about the costs and benefits of offshore programs. Many senior managers are now openly skeptical about the financial windfalls from such programs promised by their proponents. Indeed, while many of these programs bring considerable financial rewards to particular individuals or even to the departments, for the universities as a whole a net loss is often incurred. Many universities have developed new models for calculating the financial viability of offshore programs, only to conclude that real profits can only be generated either from large-scale programs or from programs that provide a minimal level of student service and support.

This has led many Australian universities to shift toward franchising their programs—that is, providing institutions offshore the syllabi of the courses developed in Australia but assigning teaching responsibilities to local instructors. In this mode, Australian universities restrict their role to quality assurance, leaving most of the remaining tasks to local partners. This helps keep the costs down for Australian universities while still allowing them to receive a share of the income generated from tuition fees. The main problem with the franchise model is that it is almost totally devoid of any expectation of academic exchange. It is purely a financial arrangement through which a commodified product is bought and sold. It cannot be said to contribute in any way to internationalization, which universities often claim as one of their goals.

Not all Australian offshore programs involve such franchising.

Of course, not all Australian offshore programs involve such franchising. Other programs involve Australian faculty traveling to partner institutions to teach the courses they have developed, mostly in short bursts of one to two weeks of intensive instruction. This mode of program delivery has many advantages, not the least of which is the opportunity for offshore students to engage with Australian teachers. The teachers acquire a better understanding of their students, which they can in turn use to help local tutors meet their pedagogic challenges. However, this mode of delivery can be highly onerous for faculty, making it difficult for them to sustain the effort. It is also often disruptive of the programs on Australian campuses for which the same faculty are also responsible. There is a high turnover of faculty interested in this kind of academic work, except of course when they are offered excellent conditions and additional remuneration.

There are many other risks associated with offshore programs. These relate to the fluctuations in demand, which can be affected by a whole range of factors, including changes in government policy; and to the difficulties associated with pulling out of contracts without doing immeasurable amount of damage to students in the pipeline and to institutional reputations. There are also risks associated with the faculty working abroad, not only with respect to health and security but also visa conditions for working in another country. In a number of countries, national regulations governing offshore education remain fragmented, unclear, and ambiguous, making them difficult to interpret and therefore easy to violate. Some Australian universities have also experienced difficulties caused by poorly crafted contracts and joint-venture

agreements. There is also the risk of choosing a partner that lacks professional integrity or cannot sustain the institutional longevity required of degree programs taught over more than one year.

The capacity of Australian universities to sustain multiple relationships offshore has also emerged as an important issue. Educationally effective and culturally sensitive relationships are not easy to develop. They require an appropriate level of resources, effective leadership, and constant vigilance. They are forged over a long period and demand continuing commitment. If this is so then it is an open question as to how many relationships it is possible for a university to be able to sustain. Yet some Australian universities have opportunistically signed an unrealistically large number of contracts (over 70 in one case) that cannot possibly be managed in an effective and sensitive manner, without compromising on quality.

Australian universities are self-accrediting institutions and are responsible for the management of the quality of their programs, no matter where or by whom they are taught. With excessive number and dispersed nature of offshore partnership, quality is not easily managed. While all Australian universities have signed on to a Code of Ethical Practice in the Provision of Education to International Students by Australian Universities, developed by the AVCC, many universities have been faulted by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) for the lack of adequate quality assurance procedures, for inadequate services to students, and more generally, for failing to uphold academic standards. Indeed, the Australian government has recently announced a major audit of Australia higher education offshore.

Australian offshore education has spawned a whole class of educational entrepreneurs.

Australian offshore education has spawned a whole class of educational entrepreneurs, located both within Australian universities and throughout Southeast and East Asia, more interested in monetary gains than in issues of appropriate transnational curriculum and pedagogy. It has also generated a fundamental dilemma for Australian universities concerning how to relate to private for-profit organizations offshore, in a way that does not undermine universities' formative mission to promote public good. They have yet to find a way of reconciling their educational and cultural goals with their new commercial interests.

International Student Mobility: Project Atlas

Adria Gallup-Black

Adria Gallup-Black is director of research and evaluation for the Institute of International Education. E-mail: agallup-black@iie.org.

At the turn of the millennium, all trends pointed toward increasing international student mobility with no sign of declines. However, the data that supported these trends could not adequately address the transnational movements behind them. While UNESCO collected and disseminated international student data annually, transnational comparisons were problematic because countries differ in their choice of data definitions and time frames; most of the data were obtained only from state-run institutions.

This was an example of what Todd M. Davis, former senior scholar at the Institute of International Education (IIE), called a “lack of global vision” about student mobility, stemming from the absence of “a global source of baseline data that [enabled] us to see this emerging global higher education space as more than just the sum of its national host country parts.” Underscoring this scenario was the absence of a consensus, among the private and public entities charged with the collection and dissemination of international student data, about how that global vision could be conceptualized and defined.

The Atlas of Student Mobility

In 2003, the IIE, in partnership with the British Council and IDP Education Australia and with generous support from the Ford Foundation, produced *The Atlas of Student Mobility*, by Todd M. Davis (IIE Books, 2003). The *Atlas* was a first attempt at pulling together various sources of international student data from the perspective of the 21 main destination countries and 75 leading home countries, using publicly available data from the year 2000.

The *Atlas* was disseminated widely among NGOs, universities, and scholars. In response, several country representatives noted that the student numbers listed for their countries were incorrect, while acknowledging that the problem was due to the data upon which the creators of the *Atlas* had to rely. In this way, the publication served as a wake-up call and a reminder to those responsible for data collection that researchers and other important stakeholders were paying attention.

Ideally, this would serve as an incentive to improve the quality and timeliness of the data, but this would only be a first step. To truly facilitate a global analysis of student flows, countries would need to think collectively about how their data were collected and presented. This would

require a collaborative approach, because transnational data would need to reflect common classifications and definitions.

Global Consensus Building

Approximately six months after the release of the *Atlas*, parties responsible for the publication initiated such collaboration, by hosting the first Project Atlas conference in France. Participants included policymakers who offered a broader perspective on the use of data for planning and development and individuals with hands-on experience in the intricacies of data collection. Over a short but very productive period of two and a half days, the group worked out agreements about several definitions and constructs. The following paragraphs explain some of the agreed-upon definitions.

International students. Should the definition be based on citizenship or some government-authorized mechanism for entering a country, such as visa status? Or, should this be based on where the student received his or her last qualification or degree? The group decided that the definition should fit different national contexts but at the same time concluded that the most useful and globally relevant definition should focus on “nonimmigrant, nonpermanent resident” status.

International study. Should this be defined based on whether a degree or qualification is issued? What about duration? Due to the rise in short-term courses (e.g., less than an American semester), it was agreed that data might be gathered to reflect differences in duration patterns: less than eight weeks, eight weeks to six months, more than six months. In addition, the group agreed that both full-time and part-time study be counted and that the course of study need not lead to a qualification or degree.

What about higher educational institutions operating internationally?

Who should be counted, and when. Should the definition be limited to incoming students only? Or should the “snapshot” approach be followed? The group agreed that both counts would be valuable, if feasible, but that the latter was the most commonly employed and should be maintained. In addition, there was strong consensus that the head count, rather than a full-time equivalent or fee-paying status, serve as the criteria.

International study in different contexts. For example, what about higher education institutions operating internationally? These could include U.S. universities with their own campuses in Europe, privately owned

institutions recruiting internationally, public-private partnerships (for example, U.K. and Australian universities operating with local partners in Singapore and Malaysia and recruiting international students to those countries), and institutions operating across national borders and sometimes with multinational public-sector ownership. Here, the group agreed to keep to its original definition of an international student: a person who physically moves from his or her place of residence for the purposes of study, regardless of the “ownership” of that place of study.

Next Steps

Apart from a series of tangible outcomes of the conference—for example, a document outlining the various decisions about definitions and plans to expand participation and update the data via a website to be launched in late 2004—there was one less tangible but important outcome: the message that no single organization “owns” Project Atlas, that everyone has a vested interest in its success and that it is the product of a collaborative effort with many avenues for contribution. More than anything else, this message was foremost in the building of a collective enterprise of data collection and dissemination, vital for the development of a global understanding of international student mobility.

(Note: the *Atlas of Student Mobility* may be purchased through IIE Books for U.S.\$49; see www.iiebooks.org).

Where Did All the International Students Go?

Liz Reisberg

Liz Reisberg is executive director of the MBA Tour. Address: The MBA Tour, 20 Shawnee Road, Arlington, MA 02476, USA. E-mail: liz@thembatour.com.

By early 2004 it became apparent that the rate of international applications to graduate programs in the United States, Europe, and Canada had dropped alarmingly. International applications are down by 20 to 30 percent at most universities. The most precipitous decline has been in applications from China. Admissions officers had become complacent about the seemingly endless supply of talent from China and were stunned when the number of Chinese taking graduate admissions tests (both the GRE and GMAT) had dropped by half. Although speculation is widespread as to what caused this discouraging trend, no definitive answer has yet been found.

Changes in visa policy have created new impediments for individuals planning to study in the United States. The U.S. government now requires interviews for everyone applying for a U.S. visa, regardless of the purpose of the visit. Of course, without authorization for extended hours, additional staff, or budget increases, a backlog of requests for appointments was inevitable. The lack of training for interviewers means that the interview experience and outcome vary considerably. A new, nonrefundable \$100 price tag has been instated for a visa application and an additional \$100 fee for being registered in the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) once a student visa is approved.

The perception of many prospective students outside the United States is that they face a high probability of being rejected after all their trouble.

The perception of many prospective students outside the United States is that they face a high probability of being rejected after all their trouble, although it is not clear whether this is actually the case or not. Rumors abound, but it seems that while the rejection rate may be higher for nondegree study (e.g., English as a Second Language programs), most students with admission to a degree program and a well-articulated plan for when they will still graduate seem to be getting visas. Certain countries may be the victims of political backlash. Students from Moslem countries will certainly have a tougher time getting visas to study in the United States.

It is not only U.S. visas that presents new challenges. Since last year when three Chinese students were charged with murder, the Japanese have denied 73 percent of the Chinese applicants for student visas. Visa applications to study in Europe and Canada have a better probability of being approved, but even there the process and screening are more elaborate and take longer. Students are obliged to enter the admissions cycle earlier, hoping for a prompt decision so that they can begin the visa process as soon as possible. Given the prolonged process, until orientation week universities may not know how many of their foreign students will succeed in obtaining visas.

The question being asked around the world is whether it is worth the trouble of applying to study abroad as well as enduring the indignities and costs of the visa process. For an increasing number of individuals the answer is now “no.” Furthermore, there are a growing number of alternatives at home.

Studying at Home

Many students have decided not to go abroad at all. Globalization seems to have created new options for people who decide to study at home. New private universities have opened up throughout the world, many located in countries that were historically the primary “exporters” of students. While some new institutions are little more than storefronts, others boast internationally educated faculty and infrastructure hitherto unknown at many traditional universities. Exchanges of students and faculty and joint-degree programs with top internationally recognized universities motivate many of these universities to pursue international standards of quality. Furthermore, with more public and private money being invested in higher education in countries like China, programs at home compete handily with programs abroad. Today, students are as likely to aspire to earning a graduate degree from Tsinghua University and other top Chinese universities as a degree from abroad.

Seeing the international market starting to dissipate and the rise of new off-shore economic opportunities, many universities in North America and Europe have launched operations overseas. These endeavors can be as simple as an executive education program or as elaborate as an entire campus. It is impossible to document all of the international degrees being awarded overseas today. Rutgers, Fordham, the University of Southern California, MIT (to name a few) are offering degree programs in China in conjunction with top local universities. INSEAD, in France, has created an entire campus in Singapore. This offshore activity inevitably contributes to the declining numbers of students leaving home to study.

New Destinations

It is now more common for students, particularly in Asia, to look more seriously at opportunities in Australia rather than the United States or Europe. With the rising cost of the dollar and the euro, Australia represents (not only) a more welcoming destination but a better value. Australia experienced a 16.5 percent increase in the number of foreign students in 2003, attracting students who probably would have chosen a different destination in the past.

Many aspiring graduate students hope not only to earn an international degree but to acquire work

experience while abroad to improve their job prospects when they return home. Although the United States allows foreign students to remain for 12 months of practical training, extended work permission is more elusive since the current Bush administration reduced the number of H1Bs (visas allowing nonresident aliens to work in the United States) awarded annually by two-thirds. Canada has become a more attractive destination for students who wish to remain abroad to work for several years after graduating, as foreign talent is welcomed into the Canadian work force. The United Kingdom has announced new initiatives to integrate more international professionals into their job market as well. Universities in countries that offer the possibility of postgraduation employment will undoubtedly be very attractive.

Universities in countries that offer the possibility of postgraduation employment will undoubtedly be very attractive.

The Degree as a Commodity

Finally, there is the issue of “return on investment.” As painful as it sometimes is to concede this, academic credentials are often seen as a tradable commodity. Students often went abroad because of the economic advantage on the job market earned by a foreign degree. A degree from abroad from *any* university implicitly guaranteed that the holder was (at least) bilingual, skilled in cross-cultural communication, and well-prepared to work in an international environment. These qualities were once a rarity and could command a salary that justified the cost of going overseas. Today these skills are more common and simply *expected* by many employers. As a result, an overseas degree is much less likely to guarantee the fantastic remuneration of yesteryear.

The ever-increasing cost of studying abroad gives more prospective students pause. When the world economy was growing rapidly, individuals might not have hesitated to invest in an MBA abroad (one of the most expensive graduate degrees, after medicine) that may have represented an investment of anywhere from U.S.\$60 to U.S.\$100,000. When there was literally a world of opportunities available upon graduation, the investment could be recovered within a few years. Static or depressed economies in Asia and Latin America no longer offer the same return. This uncertainty has led to the underutilization of government-subsidized loans, in countries like Chile, designed to encourage people to earn graduate degrees abroad; the risk and scale of the debt to be incurred are both too high.

Internet Resources

Visit our website for downloadable back issues of *International Higher Education* and other publications and resources at <http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>.

In fact, individuals now have to wonder whether they can recover their investment and even whether they will find a job after graduation at all. The concern about future opportunities on the job market now motivates people to consider studying part time at one of the better-quality programs at home while continuing to work.

Conclusion

Students will most certainly continue to go abroad, but more out of preference than necessity or the promise of fantastic salaries. While going abroad might once have been the only way for many talented young people to get a high-quality education, this is no longer the case. Likewise, an international degree no longer guarantees significant financial rewards, let alone a job. But much as on-line education has not eliminated the desire for a classroom experience, an education at home that meets international standards does not offer the same experience as studying in another country. The numbers of people moving about the planet will not be as grand as they once were, but the migrations will continue. Visa processing, prejudice, and, perhaps most important, economic conditions will determine which countries will send students and which countries will benefit by receiving them. ■

Japan and Transnational Higher Education

Fujio Ohmori

Fujio Ohmori is a professor at the Research Center for Higher Education, Kumamoto University. Address: 2-40-1 Kurokami, Kumamoto-shi, 860-8555 Japan. E-mail: f-ohmori@ge.kumamoto-u.ac.jp.

As early as this year, the Japanese government is expected to implement new policies to recognize transnational higher education both domestically and internationally. On March 29, 2004, the Ministry of Education published its study group's report on quality assurance of transnational higher education. The group, consisting of experts and stakeholders in higher education, recommended that the ministry radically change its regulatory framework for transnational provision.

The current framework is said to be based on the "territorial principle." Foreign institutions' branch campuses on Japanese soil, including those accredited in their countries of origin, are not recognized as higher education institutions in Japan unless authorized by the minister as universities or colleges under Japanese law. Similarly, Japanese institutions' offshore programs in other countries are not recognized as part of Japanese higher education, and the ministry's view has been

that it is up to a host country's authorities whether or not to recognize the programs.

The current regimen may have been a reasonable part of the national education system in the modern world where sovereign nation states control domestic affairs including education. However, current postmodern trends—including globalization and marketization—are pressuring the Japanese system to change itself.

Foreign Branch Campuses

Although no official statistics exist on foreign branch campuses in Japan, there were probably around 40 American branches in the early 1990s. Most of them have shut down, and only a handful have survived. The largest one is Temple University Japan (TUJ) that started to operate in 1982—earlier than any other branch. In addition, quite a few institutions in China, Australia, and other countries have branch campuses in Japan.

Quite a few institutions in China, Australia, and other countries have branch campuses in Japan.

The branch campuses of foreign institutions are free to provide educational services without having official recognition of the Japanese authorities as part of the country's higher education system. To be recognized under the current system, those branch campuses need to reestablish themselves as universities or colleges under Japanese law in accordance with the standards and criteria set for local universities and colleges. None of the branches have pursued that course. Therefore, for example, credits acquired at Temple University Japan are not transferable to Japanese institutions, while those acquired at Temple University's home campus (TU) are.

Once the policy recommendations in the study group's report are implemented, the above distinction between Temple University and its branch campus in Japan will be eliminated. Under the new regime, foreign institutions' branch campuses in Japan that satisfy certain conditions will be recognized in the same way as their programs in their countries of origin. These conditions will not require matching Japanese quality standards but rather proving the programs are recognized as bona fide higher education in their countries of origin. In short, this new policy will recognize higher education services provided in Japan by established foreign institutions.

Apparently the World Trade Organization General Agreement on Trade in Services negotiations have revitalized the issue of American branch campuses, and

the U.S. government has been raising this issue not only in the World Trade Organization negotiations but also in other bilateral talks. However, the proposed policy change will affect not only American but also other foreign institutions, including Chinese, Australian, and British institutions, and the consequences can significantly impact higher education in Japan.

Japanese Offshore Programs

On the global transnational higher education market, Japanese institutions have been virtually absent. Although quite a few Japanese private institutions operate overseas, mainly in the United States, most of the overseas programs are for Japanese nationals to study abroad. However, it has been reported that some prestigious institutions (both private and public), including Waseda University and Tokyo Institute of Technology, are now starting to embark on new overseas activities. At this stage, these activities tend to involve nondegree programs and academic collaboration with local institutions. Furthermore, Japanese institutions have received government or nongovernment invitations from some East Asian countries—including Malaysia, Thailand, and China.

Offshore programs of Japanese institutions are not recognized as part of Japanese higher education.

Under the current system, offshore programs of Japanese institutions are not recognized as part of Japanese higher education. Host-country authorities may recognize those programs. In that case, the programs are recognized not as Japanese but as “foreign” higher education from the Japanese legal point of view. As a result, Japanese institutions are not able to award their Japanese degrees to graduates of their offshore programs, while foreign degrees may be awarded by these programs if the host-country authorities recognize them. Quality assurance of the programs and degrees is not provided by the Japanese system. In short, Japanese law prohibits Japan’s brand of higher education from being exported. Until recently there has not been much demand for removing this seemingly crazy self-regulation either from Japanese institutions or foreign hosts—although this has changed to some extent, as stated above. The proposed policy on offshore provision is that the Japanese government will recognize offshore programs and degrees and integrate them into the national quality assurance framework.

Prospects in a Shrinking Market

In Japan, the population of 18-year-olds, the traditional undergraduate student age cohort, has been rapidly shrinking and will continue to do so. After reaching a peak of 2.05 million in 1992 that population is now down to 1.41 million in 2004. The participation rate is about 50 percent. It is expected that by 2007 the number of young people taking entrance higher education exams will be roughly equal to that of the potential freshman population as a whole, which means no selectivity for admissions. With the increasing deregulation of the chartering process or of ministerial authorization of new universities and colleges, as a part of neoliberal regulatory reforms, it is now much easier and cheaper than ever before to establish new institutions—while spending less on lands, buildings, and so on. Even two for-profit universities have now been allowed to exist in the “special zones for structural reform,” one of the Koizumi Cabinet’s flagship initiatives.

In Japan, the population of 18-year-olds, the traditional undergraduate student age cohort, has been rapidly shrinking and will continue to do so.

The policy changes for transnational provision should be judged against this background. Will the consequences of the changes be disastrous for Japanese institutions that already face the hardships of survival in a shrinking, fiercely competitive market. Or will the changes encourage Japanese higher education to adapt to globalization, expand its market transnationally, and stimulate innovations in the sector? The Japanese government seems to believe that the latter will be the case, while it is too early to say what will happen after the implementation of the new policies. There may simply be no choice but to change the system when not only the United States, Britain, Australia, and other Anglophone developed countries but also other East Asian countries, including China and Singapore, are aggressively embarking on transnational provision in the Asia-Pacific region, which is surely the most active part of global higher education market. Otherwise, the Japanese higher education system may be left behind regionally and globally.

Among the various factors that may affect the consequences, the issue of language and the possibility of partnership with industry will be, important ones. How popular will foreign institutions programs in English and other foreign languages be, or

how significant will the language barrier be for foreign institutions? How difficult will it be for Japanese institutions to offer programs in English or find demand for programs in Japanese overseas? How realistic will it be for Japanese institutions to expect cooperation and assistance from Japanese companies in overseas enterprises? These questions have yet to be answered. ■

Educating Women Worldwide

Louise W. Knight

Louise W. Knight is a historian and former university and women's college administrator who presently teaches at a coeducational university, Northwestern University, in Evanston, Illinois, USA. E-mail: lwnknight@aol.com.

In every country of the world women lag behind in their development as citizens and leaders. A strong consensus exists among international development organizations, although admittedly not among all national governments, that education is the essential means to correct this imbalance. The question then becomes how best to deliver it. In higher education, as in primary and secondary education, two models are available and both are effective. But while coeducational institutions worldwide have played a crucial role in advancing women, women's colleges and universities have always been and continue to be the beacons, the innovators, and the heart and soul of the international women's education movement. Both their enduring success and a renewed worldwide interest in the single-sex model deserve more attention.

What do women need educationally to fulfill their human potential? In societies that, consciously or unconsciously, treat women as inferior—that is to say, in virtually every society in the world to a varying degree—women need educational affirmation. Access issues aside, they need classrooms where their intellect is respected and their bodies are forgotten, they need a campus life that is not sexually charged, and they need older women as teachers, mentors, and models of what they may become. Coeducational institutions have the potential to provide these things but, to date, these needs are more commonly met at women's colleges and universities. The absence, or minimal presence, of men is part of it, but the institution's priorities are the other, more essential, part.

Women's Separate Higher Education on the Rise

Compared to men's separate higher education, women's separate higher education has a short history. It began in the early 19th century in the United States, and spread to

Europe and Canada, and then was exported around the world by Protestant and Catholic Christian European and American missionaries, many of them graduates of American women's colleges. Later, national governments adopted the model. After a period of relative quiescence in the post-World War II years, the less-than-200-year-old international women's separate higher education movement is vital and spreading. Impressionistic research has revealed that women's colleges and universities have been founded in countries where previously they have been extremely rare—in Africa, much of the Middle East, and China—and their numbers have surged forward in India.

The first woman's university in East Africa, Kiriri Women's University of Science and Technology, was founded just three years ago in Nairobi, Kenya, by a consortium of visionary Kenyan business executives to encourage women to pursue technological education. In the Middle East, the United Arab Emirates has Dubai Women's college, founded in 1989; Saudi Arabia has Effat College, founded in 1999. Both of these are government funded. The state-funded China Woman's College, China's first women's college in the communist era, is less than 10 years old. In India, women's colleges are on the increase. In 1987, there were 780 women's colleges. By 1997, there were 1,195. Finally, a new Asian University for Women, to be based in Bangladesh, is in the planning stage.

While it is difficult to know exactly what forces are contributing to the sudden renewed interest in women's higher education and the separate education model, a case can be made that international development organizations are having some influence.

International Interest

While it is difficult to know exactly what forces are contributing to the sudden renewed interest in women's higher education and the separate education model, a case can be made that international development organizations are having some influence. The decision to establish the China Women's College, for example, came in the wake of the 1994 United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. More broadly, under UNESCO's guidance, a strong campaign worldwide to educate *all* people has been building in recent years, inspired in part by article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948, which reads, "[H]igher education shall be accessible to all on the basis of merit . . . Education shall be

directed to the full development of the human personality." The International Federation of University Women, which promotes women's education worldwide, was founded in the same year. It has consultative status with the United Nations and meets every four years. The international commitment to women's education was affirmed at the 1990 Education for All Conference in Thailand; at the 1998 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education in Paris; at the 2000 World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, which launched the formal Education for All (EFA) Campaign; and at the 2002 United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI), in Paris. In response to the EFA campaign, which focuses on primary and secondary education, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund are both targeting funding toward achieving the goal of gender equity in education worldwide by 2015. When the campaign turns its attention to higher education, women's colleges and universities, unnoticed in their current discussions, should emerge as of particular interest.

At just the right moment, women's colleges and universities around the world are themselves coming together to promote women's education as an international priority.

Meanwhile, at just the right moment, women's colleges and universities around the world are themselves coming together to promote women's education as an international priority. The leaders of 29 women's colleges and universities from five continents met for the first time this past June, in western Massachusetts, USA, at the invitation of two of the leading American women's colleges, Mt. Holyoke and Smith. The gathering was titled, "Women's Education Worldwide 2004: The Unfinished Agenda." The discussions focused not on the merits of the single-sex method but on their shared commitment to preparing women leaders, both professionally and as agents of social change. The group is just in the early stages of forming—it may soon have a website and a listserv—and it hopes its membership will expand. (Contact: jlytle@mtholyoke.edu) They plan to meet again in two or three years. Indeed, the question of whether coeducational institutions committed to women's education might eventually participate seemed open for further discussion.

Women's education is one of the most powerful tools available for uplifting a nation. It is also a human right that too many women around the world have been denied. Perhaps the 21st century will be the Century for Women's Education Worldwide. It is a revolution longverdue. ■

The Challenge of Women's Higher Education in Asia

Patricia B. Licuanan

Patricia B. Licuanan is president of Miriam College in the Philippines. Address: Miriam College UP, P.O. Box 110, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. E-mail: plicuanan@mc.edu.ph.

The value of women's education has received global recognition over the past two decades. As early as the 1990 World Conference on Education for All, in Jomtien, Thailand, women's education was cited as a top priority for international development agencies. The "Beijing Platform for Action," the outcome document of the 1995 United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, in Beijing, focused on 12 critical areas of concern. The education and training of women was one of these critical areas. Governments committed themselves to ensuring equal access to education; eradicating illiteracy among women; improving women's access to vocational training, science, and technology and continuing education; developing nondiscriminatory education and training; allocating sufficient resources for and monitoring the implementation of educational reform; and promoting lifelong training for girls and women.

The "Human Development Report," produced by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), utilizes the Human Development Index (HDI) to measure quality of life in a wide range of countries. Through the HDI, specifically through the Gender Differentiated HDI or GDI, which is a measure of gender inequality in the achievement of the basic components of HDI (longevity, knowledge, and income), the importance of gender equality in educational attainment is stressed. In 2000, the United Nations held a Millennium Summit at which world leaders from 189 countries committed themselves to achieve eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), with gender equality and women's empowerment as one goal. Goal 3 emphasizes, among other issues, the need to eliminate gender disparity at all levels of education.

A Focus on Higher Education

While the case for women's education has been eloquently made, there has been considerably more attention to literacy and basic education. The relevance of women's higher education is not revealed in the neglect it has received in most quarters of the international development community for years. The arguments for women's higher education center on human resource development, economic returns, and gender equality and women's empowerment. Women

graduates must be seen as part of the human resource base of a country. Discriminatory practices in access to education and career opportunities are not only unjust but are also a flagrant waste of valuable expertise. Higher education for women leads to substantial economic returns achieved by raising productivity and the income levels of families.

Women graduates must be seen as part of the human resource base of a country.

While the benefits of educating women for the welfare of societies in general and their families in particular are well understood, education's role in reducing gender inequality and benefiting women themselves is less clearly established. It is often assumed that education enhances women's well-being, strengthens their voice in household decisions, improves their opportunities to participate in community affairs and the labor market, and gives them greater autonomy to determine the conditions of their lives. The empirical literature, however, reveals that education is a necessary but not sufficient investment for achieving gender equality and improving women's well-being. Often it is only secondary or higher education that leads to improved options, opportunities, and outcomes for women. It is also suggested that the enabling environment (i.e., a range of social and economic factors) needs to be favorable before female education, even higher education, makes a real difference in women's lives. Women's education is most beneficial to women themselves in settings that are less patriarchal, where they have access to services, where they have real options and opportunities, and where market and social conditions favor positive returns.

Inequality in Higher Education

Global trends reveal a growing representation of women in higher education in many regions—with the highest ratios in Europe, Latin America, and the Arab states and the lowest representations in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Despite improved ratios of access and participation over the past decades, there remains a definite pattern of gender tracking in most countries with women dominating certain courses or fields such as liberal arts, home economics, nursing, and teaching; while men dominate courses in law, agriculture, engineering, and natural sciences. Gender tracking, which channels women into careers that are basically extensions of their domestic responsibilities and allows men to acquire more marketable skills and enjoy greater earning power, only

exacerbates the problem of unequal opportunities for women.

The climate on Asian campuses has not reached desirable levels of gender fairness. Bias is revealed not only in inequality of access and gender tracking but also in curriculum, instructional materials, language, policies, programs, and projects. Women and gender programs and projects do not yet have widespread support, and mainstreaming gender into the curriculum is even farther off. Men outnumber women in the top-level posts of colleges and universities.

Women's Colleges and Universities

In many countries in Asia, the enrollment of women in higher education is extremely low. Women's colleges and universities play a particular role in these societies, where conservative families prefer to send their daughters to all-women institutions. But aside from allowing more women access to higher education, women's colleges and universities in Asia (as well as elsewhere) are in a unique position to educate women for leadership. All-women institutions are good training grounds because in these settings women can more freely develop their leadership in a context that is relatively unencumbered by the cultural stereotypes and social pressures of a male-dominated society. Women's colleges and universities provide women with successful role models and mentors as the proportion of female faculty and administrators are greater. Women's colleges and universities provide the affirming and liberating atmosphere at a critical period in their lives to develop their confidence, self-esteem, and talents.

The main challenge to women's higher education, whether in the context of all-women or coeducational institutions, is to provide gender-fair education to students.

Gender-fair Education

The main challenge to women's higher education, whether in the context of all-women or coeducational institutions, is to provide gender-fair education to students. Gender-fair education does not mean merely equal access to education for women and men, but more important, the equality of women and men in the very substance of education. Gender-fair education involves an aggressive move away from emphasis on separate and complementary spheres for men and women and on stereotyped careers to expanded options and outcomes. The attainment of equality, rights, and empowerment should not be accidental or simply an offshoot of a good education but rather

an explicit, overarching goal. The challenge of gender-fair education is not simply to provide women students with the best education possible but to create an enabling environment in society.

Some major instruments of gender-fair education are affirmative action and quota systems, aggressive recruitment of female faculty and administrators, reform programs to remove bias from curricula and teaching materials, gender-sensitivity training for teachers and counselors, a review of policies and procedures for possible gender bias, and active recruitment of women into nontraditional fields of study. Also important are the identification and projection of role models among faculty, administrators, and alumnae; systematic inclusion of women among speakers and resource persons for campus events such as graduation; setting up of policies and mechanisms to handle sexual harassment cases; support services to alleviate the double burden of women on campus and to make campuses more family-friendly workplaces.

Women and gender studies programs and centers are important institutional mechanisms for gender-fair education. In addition to offering courses, these programs and centers do research, design and conduct training programs, and publish books and monographs. There should be efforts to link up with women's nongovernmental organizations and activists for women's empowerment. These partnerships are not only valuable models of cooperation and synergy but they also lead to high impact advocacy and action aimed at the larger sociocultural and political environment.

The challenge of gender-fair women's higher education should be the transformation of women's lives as well as the transformation of society itself. ■

Women's Colleges and Universities in International Perspective

Francesca Purcell and Robin Matross Helms

Francesca Purcell is a policy analyst at the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education. E-mail: fpurcell@bhe.mass.edu. Robin Matross Helms is a doctoral candidate in higher education administration at Boston College and is on the staff of the Institute for International Education. E-mail: matrossro@bc.edu.

Women's colleges and universities play an important role in the higher education of women in many countries worldwide. Approximately 1,200 of these institutions can at present be found in Asian countries (e.g., Korea, the Philippines, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and India);

in Middle Eastern countries (e.g., the United Arab Emirates and Iran); in Western countries (e.g., the United States, Canada, and England); and in the African country of Sudan. In each of these countries, the history and purposes of women's colleges are broad and varied, dependent upon local and national contexts. This article provides a brief background of women's colleges and universities in an international perspective and highlights some of the findings from a recent research initiative on this topic undertaken at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

The earliest women's colleges typically offered "female-appropriate" academic subjects such as teacher training, literature, and music.

Evolution of Women's Colleges and Universities

Some of the earliest women's colleges date back to the early and mid-1800s, while the most recent ones have been founded in the past two years. Across cultures, the earliest women's colleges typically offered "female-appropriate" academic subjects such as teacher training, literature, and music. The schooling these early students received had as much to do with preparing them for their futures as wives and mothers as it did with academic development. Internationally, as more women began to work in the public sphere and take on roles outside of the home, women's colleges expanded and diversified their curricula and programs to meet these new demands. Long-established women's colleges now offer a much wider and deeper range of courses and activities than they did in the past.

The number of women's colleges and universities has declined in many Western countries (e.g., the United States, England, and Canada) over the past three decades as coeducational institutions have become the norm. Countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East have simultaneously been taking steps to establish women's postsecondary institutions, in response to increasing demands for women's higher education. For example, recently efforts have been made to establish new women's colleges in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bahrain, Kenya, and Zimbabwe. The missions of these institutions are dedicated to educating women in various fields including technology, medicine, and business, underscoring the contemporary promise of these singular institutions in the provision of tertiary education to women.

Debates over Women-only Institutions

The legitimacy of women-only colleges remains a hotly contested topic in many countries, despite a growing body of U.S.-based empirical research literature outlining the advantages and disadvantages of women's colleges. Critics assert that women's colleges perpetuate inequalities between men and women, do not prepare women for the integrated world after college, relegate women to traditionally feminine areas of study, and are inextricably linked to the legacy of separate and inferior roles for women. Proponents contend that women's colleges provide supportive climates that prepare women more effectively for postcollege life. Women's colleges instill in women an awareness and critical understanding of women's issues, thereby enhancing women's empowerment, self-esteem, and leadership skills. In countries with restricted access for women to higher education, women's colleges open doors to women seeking higher education that would otherwise be closed.

These arguments over the pros and cons of women's colleges vary from country to country, and from region to region within countries. The debates inspired over the existence of women's colleges involve not only local economic and political circumstances but also fundamental questions of the differences between men and women, culturally and religiously appropriate gender relations, and the role of women in society.

An Initial Portrait

In order to gain a fuller understanding of the standing of women's colleges and universities across the globe, we distributed a survey to over 300 of these institutions worldwide and received completed responses from 126 of them. We asked respondents about general topics such as institutional missions, tuition costs, and types of degrees offered, as well as information on student and faculty demographics.

The top three countries in our study (both in terms of surveys sent and responses received) were India, Japan, and the United States.

Numerically, the top three countries in our study (both in terms of surveys sent and responses received) were India, Japan, and the United States. Together, these three countries comprised 88 percent of the total number of responding institutions. Comparing and contrasting the "prototypical" institutions for each of these countries, which seem to have the highest number of women's higher education institutions in the

world, provides a useful first portrait of both the similarities and regional and cultural differences of women's institutions worldwide.

In India, the prototypical institution is urban and not religiously affiliated. It relies on a combination of funding sources, including the government, the University Grants Commission, and a small amount of student tuition and fees (about \$274 per year). The enrollments are comprised of about 1,200 undergraduate students and 400 graduate students. Overall enrollments have increased in the last five years. The most popular fields of study among students are commerce, arts, science, and computer science.

In India, the prototypical institution is urban and not religiously affiliated.

In terms of faculty, India boasts the highest proportion of female full-time professors of the top three countries in our survey. The average Indian institution employs about 50 full-time professors, nearly 80 percent of whom are women, as well as 10 part-time faculty, about 50 percent of whom are women. The student/faculty ratio is 24:1, and just over 50 percent of upper-level managers are women.

In contrast to India, in Japan tuition is overwhelmingly the major source of funding for respondent institutions, so the prototypical Japanese women's college is funded almost entirely by student tuition, which amounts to around \$8,600 per year, plus about \$5,878 for room and board (though many students live off-campus). Colleges are typically located in an urban or suburban area, with undergraduate enrollments of around 2,111 and graduate enrollments of only 69 students. Enrollments have either remained the same or decreased in recent years, which is consistent with Japanese demographic trends. In sharp contrast to the science and business focus prevalent in India, the most popular fields of study in Japan are more traditionally "feminine": English language and literature, Japanese language and literature, education, and psychology.

In terms of faculty, the prototypical Japanese institution employs 116 faculty, 42 percent of whom are women. Part-time faculty outnumber the full-timers; there are 143 part-timers, 39 percent of whom are women. The student/faculty ratio is 18:1, and just 22 percent of upper-level managers are women.

Like its Indian and Japanese counterparts, the prototypical American women's institution is located in or near a metropolitan area. It is almost certainly private, but it is difficult to predict whether or not it has a religious affiliation (of the schools that responded to the survey, 21

Private Higher Education

are religious and 20 are not). As in Japan, tuition is the major source of funding, and costs students about \$17,000 per year plus an additional \$7,000 for room and board. Endowments and gifts or donations are also important sources of income for institutions.

The prototypical U.S. institution enrolls on average 1,246 undergraduates and 520 graduate students (if it offers graduate programs). Enrollments have either increased or remained the same over the last five years. Regarding academic interests, American students are a blend of their Indian and Japanese counterparts; the most popular fields of study at the prototypical U.S. institution are business, psychology, education, English, biology, and nursing.

In terms of the professoriate, the average American institution employs 92 full-time faculty, 63 percent of whom are women. In addition, it employs 76 part-timers, among whom the proportion of women is almost identical to that of the full-time faculty (65 percent). The student/faculty ratio is 11:1, and 73 percent of upper-level managers are women.

Women's institutions in the three countries share a few key dimensions, but overall the differences outweigh the similarities.

Women's institutions in the three countries share a few key dimensions, but overall the differences outweigh the similarities. In terms of commonalities, in all three countries women's institutions are mainly urban or located near metropolitan areas. Reflecting a trend in higher education worldwide, a portion of the faculty in all countries is part time. In terms of differences, the main sources of funding vary considerably, ranging, as mentioned earlier, from tuition in Japan to government funding in India. There is a wide disparity in academic focus, from business and technology in India to more traditionally "female" subjects such as education and literature in Japan. Institutional missions vary along similar lines, from "impart education in the field of applied sciences such that women develop skills which will allow them to gain employment or start their own enterprises" to "educate a woman so that she can upgrade her father's home and family and her husband's home and family." In addition, large differences were found in the percentage of managers who are women, which likely reflects cultural and historical differences among the three countries.

A Call for Further Research

The results of our study give a general picture of women's colleges and universities worldwide and provide important comparisons among countries and in-

dividual institutions. However, much more research is needed, for which this study is intended to serve as a starting point. We hope that our findings will inspire other researchers to learn more about this very important segment of higher education.

Women's Colleges and Universities in International Perspective: An Overview, by Francesca B. Purcell, Robin Matross Helms, and Laura Rumbley, will be published by the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College in September 2004. To request a copy, please e-mail Laura Rumbley at rumbley@bc.edu. ■

Private Universities in South Korea

Seung-Bo Kim and Sunwoong Kim

Seung-Bo Kim is a doctoral student at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management. Address: 207-43, Cheongnyangni 2-dong, Dondaemun-gu, Seoul 130-868, Korea. E-mail: skimbo@hanmail.net. Sunwoong Kim is professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. Address: P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201, USA. E-mail: kim@uwm.edu.

South Korea (Korea hereafter) has experienced a spectacular expansion of higher education during the last five decades. In 1950, the number of students enrolled in higher education institutions amounted to just 11,358. In 2002, 52 years later, enrollments had increased to more than 3.5 million, and more than 40 percent of the age cohort is enrolled at four-year higher education institutions. Even in a period of global massification of higher education, the Korean experience is particularly spectacular.

Throughout this rapid expansion, the private sector has played a vital role in the supply of higher education, as the government has concentrated its scarce resources into the speedy implementation of universal primary and secondary education. As of April 2002, there were 159 two-year junior colleges and technical colleges in Korea. Out of these 159, 143 were private institutions, accommodating more than 95 percent of students. At the same time, there were 163 four-year colleges and universities, 137 of them private. Out of about 2 million students enrolled at four-year universities, three-quarters of them were in private institutions.

Reliance on Tuition

The rapid expansion of higher education by utilizing the private sector comes with substantial structural problems. First, the overall quality of education is considered to be low, while the prices paid by students are

relatively high. The research output of Korean universities as measured by the Social Science Index is less than 4 percent of the U.S. output and 15 percent of Japan's output. According to the IMD Management School of Switzerland, the competitiveness of the higher education sector in Korea ranks 28th among 47 countries. Year after year, a substantial portion of Korean secondary school and college students seek to study abroad.

Most private institutions rely heavily on student tuition. In the 2000 academic year, tuition comprised 78 percent of the revenue of four-year private institutions.

As the government's financial support to private universities has been rather limited, most private institutions rely heavily on student tuition. In the 2000 academic year, tuition comprised 78 percent of the revenue of four-year private institutions. Even the national universities rely on tuition for 33 percent of their revenue. Such heavy reliance on tuition creates a heavy financial burden on households, particularly those with a lower ability to pay. Consequently, the dispute over the level of tuition has been a perennial problem for higher education.

Profit Motives

Besides the lack of government subsidy, low levels of endowments is another reason for institutions' heavy reliance on tuition. Besides the obvious reason for low endowments—the relatively short history of higher education—most Korean private universities have failed to attract a lot of donations, because they are regarded as for-profit organizations by the general public, even though they are legally designated as nonprofit. To encourage the private sector to provide such a large volume of higher education services, the government had to give a great deal of leeway to the founding families of institutions. The current law stipulates that the board of trustees can exercise almost complete control over financial and personnel matters. Also, one-third of board members can be a member of an immediate family of the founder. (In a recent survey of 83 private universities, control over 23 universities has passed, or is in the process, to the immediate family member of the founder.) Consequently, there is a great deal of room for the founder to misbehave. Nevertheless, the Korean system requires very little disclosure of financial and academic information from private institutions.

Faculty and students often challenge the owner regarding the improper transfer of funds. For example, the owner of a university may own a for-profit construction company, and the owner builds school

facilities using the company. Another example is the personal usage of university properties, such as houses or vehicles. Such disguised profit motives create an incentive for the owner to allocate more school funds to facilities and less to faculty development, research, and instructional activities, which are more difficult to embezzle. Such illegal behavior creates many campus disputes. Between 1997 and 2000, 44 universities (more than 40 percent of the examined institutions) have been engulfed with some form of disputes.

Regulations to Market-oriented Policies

Up until 1995, the Korean government not only maintained strict guidelines regarding the establishment and operation of higher education institutions, it also controlled the number of students in each department at each school, as well as student selection methods. In most cases, student quotas and school licenses were rationed to those institutions that could demonstrate to the government their capacity to provide quality education. Naturally, the strict regulations created substantial rent-seeking activities, while leaving little room for individual educational initiatives among institutions.

The 1995 higher education reforms greatly reduced government regulations.

The 1995 higher education reforms greatly reduced government regulations. It became much easier to establish a new university. The government no longer dictated the number of students outside of the Seoul metropolitan area. Consequently, more private universities have been established, and the enrollments increased. Recently, the government tried to create more competition and diversity among higher education institutions. The institutions that adopt more competitive and market-based policies—such as introduction of the probationary period and tenure evaluation of faculty members, salary increases based on merit rather than the length of service, and allowing students to choose their majors—are awarded government grants or subsidies. As college admissions in Korea have always been determined through competitive entrance examinations, Korean universities have a very well established ranking system. With more market competition, higher-ranking universities have a definite advantage in attracting better students, professors, and donations. Therefore, they want to have more autonomy and deregulation, while less-established institutions seek more government protection and entitlement. Since the number of college students is expected to shrink in the

Corruption in Central Asia

next two decades, the divergence of interests will create political conflict among institutions. It seems inevitable that some of the institutions will have to be closed down or merged with others.

The Korean government decided to move away from strict regulations to more market-based policies. Despite this change in direction, the government's role in higher education will not diminish at all, as it is imperative that the government maintains and enforces the rules of the game used in the competition. Since Korean higher education relies heavily on the private sector, the sector's effort of imposing market principles of transparency and openness would be useful in evaluating whether these policies create accountability and other desirable outcomes. ■

Academic Integrity and Its Limits in Kyrgyzstan

Madeleine Reeves

Madeleine Reeves is a doctoral candidate in social anthropology at the University of Cambridge. She is currently research associate at the East-West Center for Intercultural Dialogue at the American University–Central Asia in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. Address: Trinity College, Trinity Street, Cambridge CB2 1TQ, UK. E-mail: mfr21@cam.ac.uk.

A recent issue of *International Higher Education* sought to draw attention to the question of corruption in academe, a topic that has tended to be politely passed over in analyses of higher education policy and practice (see *IHR* no. 34). When it is discussed, corruption is generally portrayed as a deviation from some presumed “normal” state of affairs: it is portrayed as the exception, rather than the rule—the fault of the miscreant teacher, the lazy student, or the immoral administrator, rather than the product of systemic difficulties. The very language we invoke tends to presume the corruptness of a basically sound system, rather than a fundamental mismatch between what individuals and institutions are nominally “supposed” to provide and their ability to do so in practice.

This article proposes a somewhat different framework for thinking about the possibilities for ethically sound educational practice. It asks about the preconditions for, and limits to, academic *integrity*, the latter term understood in its double definitions of “moral uprightness, honesty” and “wholeness, soundness.” Corruption, in this perspective, is interpreted not as the deviant action of particular immoral individuals, but the symptom of a much broader, systemic *dis-integration*: the inability of certain parts of a system to integrate with, and thus respond to the needs of, other parts. This article draws upon interviews with academics and students in

Kyrgyzstan over three years, as well as the author's direct participant observation as a teacher of English in a remote, regional state university in which instances of corruption are widespread.

Kyrgyzstan, as many other post-Soviet educational systems, retains a high degree of ministerial control over the content and structure of university curricula.

Impositions and Improvisations

Kyrgyzstan, as many other post-Soviet educational systems, retains a high degree of ministerial control over the content and structure of university curricula. Ministerial plans dictate the precise number of hours that students of a given “speciality” are to dedicate to different subjects during the course of their five years of university education; these plans are typically displayed prominently in university corridors, and they regulate closely student and teacher course loads in any given term, the scope of particular disciplines, and the chronological order in which subjects are to be taught. A small percentage of courses can be nominated by faculty deans and departmental chairs (also subject to ministerial approval), and students are nominally entitled to one or two “optional courses” (*kursy po vyboru*) in their final years of study, although in practice these tend to be narrowly prescribed—often to a choice of just one. The standard teaching course load is 500 classroom hours per term, a figure that, week-by-week, would stagger many Western academics. Punishingly low rates of pay mean that it is not uncommon for teachers, especially younger teachers (who need more time for course preparation) to take on 1.5 and even double course loads in order to make ends meet.

Such a system presupposes both a considerable degree of homogeneity among student intakes across the population (students all entering university with an identical degree of preparation) and the ability of all universities to meet ministerial requirements in terms of personnel, literature, and material resources. Rural universities expose with particular clarity the absurdity of such assumptions. For while the university curricula in such institutions mirror those taught in the capital city, entering students come with nothing like the same degree of preparation, and the pool of qualified teachers that the institution is able to attract is far smaller.

The reality, of course, is that with all the goodwill in the world teachers simply cannot deliver what is expected of them. The result is either that they decide to deviate massively from the nominal content of a course

in order to cover the basics or that they stick to the intended content, leaving the students floundering as they fail to grasp the meaning of the material presented. In either case, academic integrity is jeopardized, since the list of courses and grades that are accumulated in the grade book (*zachetka*) at the end of each term bear little correspondence with material taught or knowledge gained. What is true of the individual student's grades is true also of the department's register of lectures given, the dean's list of courses taught, the rector's reports on the institution's ability to meet its academic targets, and the ministry's announcements to the outside world about the impressively high levels of tertiary education in Kyrgyzstan. In each case, the rhetoric has little correspondence with the reality facing students and teachers.

The reality, of course, is that with all the goodwill in the world teachers simply cannot deliver what is expected of them.

Dis-integration and Corruption

Such a lack of correspondence leaves the door wide open for corruption. Obviously, teachers are far more likely to seek bribes, and students are far more likely to give them when it is nearly impossible to answer exam questions honestly for want of coverage of the relevant material. More insidiously, the constant—indeed *institutionalized*—lack of correspondence between what is claimed and what is delivered (and what can, in fact, be delivered), between the actual and the “certified,” blurs the boundary between ethical and unethical. Acting “ethically” in academe becomes divorced from the idea of testing ability according to firm, transparent, and nonnegotiable standards of knowledge gained. With so much improvisation required by the system (the paradoxical consequence of ministerial overcontrol), the grade book is no longer an index of “knowledge gained” but instead a statement of a personalized relationship between teacher and student. This transformed relationship is only reinforced by a system of government grants for higher education that penalizes students financially for a single grade below a “4” (corresponding roughly to a “B” in the U.S. system) and by the chronic underfunding of higher education, which means that fee-paying students (*kontraktniki*) will virtually never be excluded from a university for poor academic performance if they continue to pay their bills. In such a context, institutions often consider it perfectly “ethical” for a teacher to give a high grade to an academically under-serving but financially needy student studying at uni-

versity on a government stipend. The motivation is to ensure that the student concerned retains the grant that supports her family or to lower the academic requirements for the *kontraktniki* who are paying for their degrees—to keep the enrollments up for a given program and to keep money flowing into the university coffers.

These practices may not be instances of corruption per se, but they certainly damage the academic integrity of the institution and represent a violation of the ethical obligations that exist between teacher and student and between university and the wider society. They also open the door to other, more egregious forms of corruption that are widespread in Kyrgyzstan: bribes to teachers for end-of-term grades and bribes by teachers for academic positions; the purchasing of course papers, senior theses (*diplomnaya rabota*), and even candidate of science degrees; and payments and favors to admissions committees, departmental chairs, and examination commissions.

The result is not only the production of underqualified specialists whose real knowledge corresponds only remotely with the list of courses detailed on their diplomas. Another effect is a much more profound societal scepticism regarding assertions of educational expertise. As the title of a recent newspaper article on the issue put it, “the red diploma is fading” in contemporary Kyrgyzstan. What was formerly an indicator of academic excellence, awarded only if one had the highest grade in all subjects, has been devalued into a near meaningless currency.

“How do we stop students from giving bribes, and teachers from taking them?”

To deal with the problem of corruption in higher education, therefore, it is not enough simply to ask, as is typically done in Kyrgyzstani public discourse, “how do we stop students from giving bribes, and teachers from taking them?” We must ask the much broader questions, “how do we *re-integrate* the system?” “What are the institutional and administrative preconditions for academic integrity?” “How can we reinstate a boundary between ethical and unethical in a way that meets rigorous *academic* criteria?” To address these questions, it is not enough only to pay teachers more (although that is crucial since academic integrity is impossible when teachers cannot earn a living wage), nor is it sufficient simply to expose instances of bribe giving and taking within a given institution.

Answering these questions demands, more radically, that we think structurally and systematically about the

relationship between the Ministry of Education, particular institutions, the student body, and the wider public. Greater autonomy is required to determine curricular content for faculties and individual departments. Basing the allocation of funding for university programs on individual student grades needs to be ended since it can lead to grade inflation. A substantial cut is needed in the number of courses that students are expected to take and teachers are expected to teach, which leaves little time for assimilating and preparing material, and encourages a “memorize-recite-forget” approach to learning. Perhaps most importantly, it demands that curricula and individual courses at all universities, especially those catering to a predominantly rural student body, be configured to meet the needs of today’s school leavers, taking into consideration actual rather than imagined levels of preparation and available rather than hypothetical course materials. ■

Higher Education in Kazakhstan: The Issue of Corruption

Nataliya L. Rumyantseva

Nataliya Rumyantseva is a doctoral student in higher education administration, in the Department of Leadership, Policy and Organization, Peabody College at Vanderbilt University. Address: Vanderbilt University, 230 Appleton Place, Box 520, Nashville TN 37203, USA. E-mail: n.rumyantseva@vanderbilt.edu.

According to multiple reports from students, corruption has hampered higher education systems in the post-Soviet region. Faculty members charge students for exam grades; administrators charge for admissions. Anecdotal evidence suggests that academic corruption may be a pervasive phenomenon in higher education in the region.

Higher education in Kazakhstan provides an illustration of corruption in the sector. According to a 2002 World Bank survey, higher education in Kazakhstan is perceived as corrupt by the public. One out of four surveyed households that had a student at a university reported paying a bribe for higher education services. Seventy-four percent of reported bribes were made to a specific person associated with a university. When asked about why they paid a bribe, 69 percent of respondents said they did it to obtain admission to a university and 10 percent to receive better grades.

The existence of corruption inhibits the ability of educational systems to serve the economy and society. It misleads employers and evokes mistrust among the general public. Corruption deprives civic culture by generating the impression that universities are unfair to

young people, while breeding a culture of cynicism about the nation and its claimed civic virtues. When higher education is corrupt, young people come to believe that cheating and bribing may advance their careers.

Despite the possible pervasive and serious consequences, educational corruption has only recently drawn some attention in higher education literature. The current discussion of educational corruption is largely supported by anecdotal evidence. This article is based on a survey and interviews with students in the Republic of Kazakhstan in spring 2003 on their personal experience with and perception of corruption.

Two survey instruments were administered to 1,000 university students and 250 faculty members at a large state university in Kazakhstan with about 10,000 students and 900 faculty. To ensure reliable responses, respondents were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality. Additionally, interviews were conducted with top university administrators, to obtain their views on corruption at their institution.

The findings of the survey support the claim that corruption in higher education exists.

Evidence of Corruption

The findings of the survey support the claim that corruption in higher education exists. Although few students (10 percent) and faculty members (6 percent) explicitly admit personal involvement in educational corruption, the vast majority (88 percent of faculty and 74 percent of students) agree with the statement that corruption in higher education is a widespread occurrence. Areas perceived as most corrupt are admissions and exams. Some 78 percent of students and 62 percent of faculty report that corruption most frequently occurs during examination sessions. Seventeen percent of students and 28 percent of faculty in the sample consider admissions the most corrupt area in higher education. The interviews of administration officials revealed that they are rather reluctant to acknowledge the issue and choose to deny it, at least to the external observer.

Control Mechanisms

The state of formal control mechanisms that explicitly regulate corruption appears to be weak. About 80 percent of faculty members report that they have never read rules explicitly regulating activities such as charging students or accepting gifts or services for grades. Similarly, about 90 percent of students report they never read any rules that explicitly regulate faculty-student exchange of money, gifts, or services for grades. University offi-

cials largely refuse to acknowledge that corruption is an issue at their institution and, as a result, found the need for rules unnecessary. Occasionally, they mentioned that they did not believe that any formal rules could prevent bribery.

The state of formal control mechanisms that explicitly regulate corruption appears to be weak.

The state of informal norms related to corruption is difficult to detect, and the findings reported here should be interpreted with caution. Some organizational participants consider money exchanges for grades between students and professors acceptable and appropriate. Seventeen percent of faculty members see nothing wrong with educational corruption and about 12 percent of faculty think that charging students for a grade is either an acceptable or generally ignorable behavior. Although these numbers are not high, they may describe the beginning of a disturbing trend.

Interestingly, about 70 percent of students think that educational corruption is a disturbing phenomenon requiring administrative intervention. However, over 65 percent of students report that if a teacher requests payment for a grade they will satisfy the request without complaining to the administration. Apparently, students' expectations that administrators will support their complaints about teachers' demands for bribes are rather low. This may be interpreted as indirect evidence of administrators' turning a blind eye to corruption.

According to students' responses to open questions in the questionnaire, they are likely to comply with teachers' demands for a bribe at the exam because a refusal might hurt their chances to get a satisfactory grade regardless of their performance. Others may agree because it gives them an opportunity to obtain an "easy grade." This is especially pertinent for the poorly prepared students who are able to afford a bribe. Students say they are not likely to complain to the administration out of fear of an aggressive reaction by officials and a possibility of being expelled from the university. This raises questions about the nature of the leadership culture of the university.

The Impact of Corruption

There appears to be some agreement among faculty, and to a lesser degree among students, regarding the consequences of educational corruption. The majority of fac-

ulty members (about 72 percent) and half of the students surveyed consider educational corruption harmful to society and in general a problem. But 50 percent of students and 28 percent of faculty do not see any negative impact on society from corruption in the higher education system.

The general picture presented here is troubling. Feelings and beliefs about the impact of educational corruption and the necessity for policies targeting its prevention and eradication are greeted by both students and faculty with mixed feelings. Administrators appear to ignore the problem, which leaves little opportunity for students to raise it as an issue. Further research on corruption in the post-Soviet region is necessary to understand the causes and consequences of this phenomenon and to develop effective policy recommendations. ■

The End of Civic Diplomacy and International Education

Philip G. Altbach

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

Half the battle in the Middle East is for the hearts and minds of the Islamic world. A longer-term goal for the United States is to build relations of respect not only with nations but with people around the world—especially with students, scholars, and intellectuals—the opinion makers of today and tomorrow. Last week, a symptomatic event occurred—evidence of how the United States is putting itself in a position that makes it completely impossible to win that battle. The State Department suddenly revoked the visa already granted to Professor Tariq Ramadan, on the basis of undisclosed information supplied by the Department of Homeland Security. Professor Ramadan is not just one of the many individuals caught up in the machinations of the post-September 11 world. He is one of the most visible, if controversial, Muslim scholars in Europe. His work on Muslim-Christian relations and the role of Muslims in Western nations is at the cutting edge on a set of issues central to contemporary society. He is a professor in Geneva, Switzerland, and was invited by the University of Notre Dame to teach a course on Islamic ethics. He had already arranged for his children to attend schools in Indiana.

The Ramadan case is yet another example—widely reported in Europe and internationally—of how foreign individuals are treated by an American government fearful of people and perhaps ideas it does not completely

understand. Notre Dame is in fact doing exactly the right thing. It is engaging controversial people and ideas in an effort to stimulate dialog and perhaps mutual understanding. The university is bringing to the United States a prominent intellectual to interact and perhaps to learn about American ideas. Notre Dame is not concerned that Professor Ramadan might not agree with American approaches to the Middle East.

For decades, the United States has benefited from the presence in its universities of students and scholars from abroad.

For decades, the United States has benefited from the presence in its universities of students and scholars from abroad. Almost 600,000 students and 84,000 scholars from other countries are studying in the United States at present. Many foreigners from all over the world are teaching at U.S. universities for varying periods of time. Indeed, many of our best professors and researchers, including Nobel Prize winners, are from other countries and have chosen to work at U.S. universities. Foreign students and scholars constitute one of the few areas in which the United States has a highly favorable “balance of trade”—many foreigners are attracted to U.S. higher education, producing more than \$12 billion for the economy. Much more important are the ideas that they bring and the things that they learn and bring back to their home countries.

The Ramadan case is important because it exemplifies U.S. thinking and practice in the post 9/11 world. Foreigners are routinely mistreated when they apply for American visas, work permits, or permission to study. There is by now a vast array of anecdotal evidence from all over the world concerning the tribulations of dealing with American officialdom. Tales abound of uncivil consular officials in foreign posts, inordinate delays in processing visas and other documents, and seemingly arbitrary and capricious treatment of applicants. The buzz in student dormitories and faculty offices from Mumbai to Montevideo is that America no longer welcomes foreigners.

So far, polls show that the United States remains a favored destination for foreigners wishing to study overseas. Foreigners like U.S. universities and American culture, but they feel that access is no longer possible or worth the trouble or achieving. Flows of students and scholars worldwide remain strong, but the United States is being overtaken by such

competitors as Britain and Australia. There is still a reservoir of support for American education and culture around the world, but it is quickly being drained by official policy and bureaucratic procedures.

Fear seems to be the motivating force behind how the United States is thinking about dealing with the rest of the world: fear of individuals and fear of ideas. Tariq Ramadan poses no threat to American security—he may communicate with people who are distasteful to some Americans, and he may hold ideas that can be questioned. But the worst outcome of this case, and of many other less-publicized ones, is to keep him out of the country. This robs Americans of the opportunity to hear opinions about religion, culture, or world events that are relevant to central issues of the day and to interact with key thinkers. And in the Ramadan case it sends a message around the world that the U.S. government is intolerant.

All of this is not merely an academic debate. It goes to the heart of how America deals with the rest of the world. If the United States is to successfully engage with ideas and people from abroad, it must restore its openness—of course, with appropriate safeguards for post 9/11 security. But security is one thing, and building walls against ideas and individuals who might hold unorthodox opinions is quite another. Tariq Ramadan should be welcomed to Notre Dame, and the thousands of students and scholars seeking to study and learn in the United States should be similarly welcomed. To do otherwise guarantees both ignorance and defeat in a world where knowledge and ideas mean a great deal. ■

Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge and National Response 2005–2006 Fulbright New Century Scholars Program

The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State and the Council for International Exchange of Scholars announce the opening of the 2005–2006 competition for awards under the Fulbright New Century Scholars (NCS) Program.

Under the guidance of an appointed Distinguished Scholar Leader, NCS Scholars engage in collaborative, multidisciplinary examination of a topic of universal concern and together seek solutions to critical issues affecting all humankind. The topic for the current competition is “Higher Education in the 21st Century:

Global Challenge and National Response” and the Distinguished Scholar Leader is Philip G. Altbach, J. Donald Monan, SJ professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College.

Approximately 30 outstanding research scholars and professionals from the United States and abroad will be selected to participate in the program through an open competition. Of the 30, approximately one-third will be U.S. citizens while the remaining two-thirds will be visiting scholars from countries with an operational Fulbright Scholar Program.

To create a platform for collaborative thinking and pursuit of tangible solutions to the critical issues raised by the NCS theme, the program combines the traditional Fulbright research exchange experience with a series of three in-person seminar meetings and ongoing virtual communication among the multinational and multidisciplinary participants under the guidance of the NCS Distinguished Scholar Leader. It is anticipated that the Scholars will develop both a set of illustrative case studies and a broad framework for understanding and for constructive action to ensure the future of higher education in its national and global settings. At the end of the program year, NCS Scholars share the results of their collaborative interaction and engagement in a public forum at which they present their conclusions and recommendations for initiatives that will translate the results of their collaborative thinking into tangible global impact.

Outstanding scholars and professionals of any rank in any field related to the NCS theme are invited to apply. Applicants with strong interdisciplinary and comparative interests are especially welcome. Applicants must have the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree in a relevant field. U.S. applicants must have U.S. citizenship and be permanently residing in the United States at the time of application; non-U.S. applicants must be citizens or permanent residents of and residing in the country from which they are applying.

Awards/Benefits

- Individual travel/research awards in the amount of \$37,000

- Accommodations and meals for program seminars

NCS awards are intended to provide support for travel to all program meetings, travel and maintenance for the exchange visit, research materials and assistance, and some salary replacement.

Application deadline for U.S. applicants is February 1, 2005. Preliminary deadlines for non-U.S. applicants will vary from country to country. Interested non-U.S. applicants should consult with the Fulbright

Commission or U.S. Public Affairs Office in their home country.

Complete details, application materials and instructions are available on the CIES website: www.cies.org. Questions may be addressed to NCS staff at ncs@iie.org.

Letter to the Editor

Alan L. Contreras’s article about Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine contained many inaccuracies (“Ross University: Cash Cow or Pig in a Poke,” *IHE*, no. 36, Summer 2004). Having awarded more than 1,300 doctor of veterinary medicine degrees since opening in 1982, Ross University offers comprehensive veterinary training modeled after U.S. programs. Ross students are held to the same standards and must pass the same national board licensing exams as graduates of U.S. schools. Our graduates are licensed throughout the U.S., including Mr. Contreras’s own state of Oregon, and are highly regarded in the communities they serve. The U.S. Department of Education recognizes Ross as an eligible institution for purposes of participating in federal financial aid programs. We have affiliations with 20 out of the 28 U.S.-based AVMA-accredited veterinary schools, which provide clinical training to our students—the same training they provide their own students. These relationships are a testament to the excellence of our basic science and pre-clinical programs, the strength of our faculty and the high quality of our students. Mr. Contreras has found us guilty by association with a geographical location and has not based his accusations upon factual investigation, which would show Ross University to be a respected higher education institution.

David J. DeYoung, D.V.M., D.A.C.V.A., D.A.C.V.S.
Dean, Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine

Rejoinder from Alan Contreras:

Ross veterinary degrees are not legal for professional licensure and practice in every state. Oregon law requires that a degree, to be valid, must be issued by a college that has the foreign equivalent of U.S. accreditation. The same is true in some other states (e.g., North Dakota). Our concern is that because St. Kitts does not have an adequate postsecondary oversight process, it is not possible to determine whether entities based there meet customary academic standards. The degree supplier thus lies outside the norms of postsecondary education unless it undergoes state review and approval as a college, which is necessary in the absence of a preemptive federal law.

Alan L. Contreras
Oregon Office of Degree Authorization

CIHE and the Center for the Study of the University at the National Autonomous University of Mexico Collaborate on the Internationalization of Higher Education

CIHE and CESU (Centro de Estudios sobre la Universidad at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México) have signed a joint agreement to collaborate on an annual seminar focusing on higher education research, with a theme of internationalization. This is the first formal collaboration the CIHE has established. The first seminar was held at the UNAM campus in Mexico City on September 7 and featured a discussion about globalization of higher education by CIHE director Philip Altbach along with Axel Didriksson and Armando Alcantara of CESU. The agreement calls for joint planning of seminars and also sharing of research and information between the two institutions. Dissemination of research and analysis will be part of the agreement. CESU will publish material from *International Higher Education* in its journal, *Perfiles Educativos*, and CIHE will highlight CESU research and publications through its networks and publications. CESU is the largest and one of the most prominent higher education research centers in Latin America. It has 60 researchers working on a range of higher education topics, and it has a special focus on the history and contemporary development of UNAM, Mexico's largest and most prominent university, with 250,000 students.

The agreement, signed by Philip Altbach and CESU director Dr. Axel Didriksson, will run for an initial two years.

News of the Center

The Center's latest publication, *Women's Universities and Colleges: An International Handbook*, by Francesca Purcell, Robin Matross Helms, and Laura Rumbley has been published. It is available from the Center free of charge to readers in developing countries. A commercial edition will be available from Information Age Publishers. *Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Philip G. Altbach and Toru Umakoshi, will be published by the Johns Hopkins University Press in October. This book is also available without cost from the Center to readers in developing countries.

The Center welcomes several new graduate assistants—Natia Janashia, Leslie Bozeman, and Deirdre McMyler. Natia Janashia recently completed a master's degree at Vanderbilt University as a Humphrey Fellow and is from Georgia (in the former Soviet Union). Leslie Bozeman joins the Center from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education in Washington, D.C. Deirdre McMyler most recently worked at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, where she was international programs coordinator. All three will be working on their doctoral degrees. Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, formerly a CIHE graduate assistant, has completed her doctorate and is now assistant professor of higher education at the University of Arizona. Roberta Malee Bassett has assumed the role of managing editor of *Educational Policy*. She is completing her doctoral dissertation on American perceptions of GATS and international higher education issues.

Center director Philip Altbach gave a talk on globalization and higher education at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) in Mexico City as part of an ongoing collaboration between the Center for University Studies (CESU) at UNAM and CIHE. He will give a series of lectures in India in New Delhi, Mumbai, and Pune in the fall and will also participate in a conference in Bergen, Norway. He has been appointed to a fellowship by the Ministry of Education of Taiwan in December, 2004. Dr. Damtew Teferra, coeditor-in-chief of the *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, will participate in a conference in Toronto in October and in the conference of the Association of African Universities in South Africa.

We are, finally, pleased to announce several additions to the CIHE family. Roberta Bassett's daughter, Chaloratana Hall, and Damtew Teferra's son, Nathan Teferra.

New Publications

Barrow, Clyde W., Sylvie Didou-Aupetit, and John Mallea. *Globalization, Trade Liberalization, and Higher Education in North America*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer, 2003. 254 pp. \$121, £110. (hb). ISBN 1-40201791-X. Address: Kluwer Publishers, POB 989, 3300 AZ Dordrecht, Netherlands.

A critical perspective on the impact of globalization on higher education in Canada, Mexico, and the United States, this book consists of three case studies focusing on each country and discussing the broad implications of globalization. NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Association, is analyzed as well.

Bender, Thomas, Philip M. Katz, and Colin Palmer. *The Education of Historians in the Twenty-first Century*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004. 222 pp. \$19.95 (pb). ISBN 0-252-07165-4. Address: University of Illinois Press, 1325 S. Oak St., Champaign IL 61820, USA.

Recent changes in American universities have affected graduate-level training in the disciplines. This volume concerns the graduate education of historians in the United States, and was sponsored by the American Historical Association. The report includes discussion of such topics as graduate training trends—including the nature of examinations, program requirements, and related issues. The focus is on trends and recommendations for graduate training programs. The analysis is based in part on a survey of history departments. While concerning one academic discipline in the United States, this volume is relevant to other fields of study and to other countries since the pressures on doctoral training are similar everywhere.

Brown, M. Christopher II and Kassie Freeman, eds. *Black Colleges: New Perspectives on Policy and Practice*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004. \$92.95. 256 pp (hb). ISBN 1-56750-586-4. Address: Praeger Publishers, POB 5007, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

Historically black colleges and universities are a unique sector of the U.S. higher education system, mainly serving African American students. Only a

small percentage of the higher education system, these institutions continue to provide access to an underserved segment of the student population. This volume considers such topics as attracting top-quality students to these institutions, federal aid and black colleges, faculty issues, strategic planning, and others.

Chen, Peiying. *Acting "Otherwise": The Institutionalization of Women's/Gender Studies in Taiwan's Universities*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004. 315 pp (hb). ISBN 0-415-94859-2. Address: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 29 W. 35th St., New York NY 10001, USA.

Focusing on the emergence of women's studies in Taiwan, this volume is one of the few focusing on this topic in an Asian context. The process of establishing women's studies programs at two Taiwanese universities is analyzed in the context of the politics of higher education in Taiwan and the development of a feminist movement, as well as the worldwide movement for women's studies.

DeMoura Castro, Claudio and Norma M. Garcia, eds. *Community Colleges: A Model for Latin America?* Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, 2003. 193 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-931003-46-7. Address: IDB Bookstore, 1300 New York Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20577, USA. The idea of this book is that the U.S. community college model will be a useful guide to the development of short-cycle, vocationally oriented postsecondary institutions in Latin America. The role and function of the community college is analyzed in the context of Latin American realities.

Eggins, Heather, ed. *Globalization and Reform in Higher Education*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2004. 223 pp. (pb). ISBN 033521396-0. Address: Open University Press, McGraw-Hill House, Shoppenhangers Rd., Maidenhead, Berks SL6 2QL, UK.

This volume focuses on how universities can be reformed to meet the challenges of globalization. Here, globalization is seen as the impact of financial cutbacks, massification, and related themes. An international group of

analysts explore such issues as finance and accessibility, managing academe, convergence of academic systems, and others. Some of the chapters are comparative and others deal with individual countries such as South Africa, the United Kingdom, Australia, and others.

Ehrenberg, Ronald G., ed. *Governing Academia: Who Is In Charge at the Modern University?* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004. 324 pp. \$35 (hb). ISBN 0-8014-4054-8. Address: Cornell University Press, 512 E. State St., Ithaca, NY 14850, USA.

The authors make the argument that universities are fundamentally different from business enterprises and thus academic governance must take these differences into account. Moves to "manage" academe as if universities were corporate entities, it is argued, will fail if the realities of academic institutions are not taken into account. Among the topics considered are the roles of government and of trustees in guiding academe, collective bargaining, legal issues, and others. The authors, who focus on the United States, are among the most prominent analysts writing on these topics.

Fullinwider, Robert K and Judith Lichtenberg. *Leveling the Playing Field: Justice, Politics, and College Admissions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004. 288 pp. \$24.95 (pb). ISBN 0-7425-1411-0. Address: Rowman & Littlefield, 4501 Forbes Blvd., Lanham MD 20706, USA.

One of a number of recent books on college admissions in the United States, this book focuses on the desirability of increasing the proportion of underserved populations in higher education and discusses the role of admissions in this process. Topics include the role of affirmative action, the SAT examination and its implications, admissions testing in general, and related topics.

Greene, David A. *The Women's Movement and the Politics of Change at a Women's College: Jill Ker Conway at Smith, 1975–1985*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004. 146 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-415-94832-0. Address: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 29 W. 35th St., New York NY 10001, USA.

Jill Ker Conway became the first female president of Smith College in 1974, one of America's premier women's colleges. This volume discusses Conway's leadership during a period of rapid social and academic change. The book focuses on, among other things, the emergence of women's studies at Smith.

Johnson, Valen E. *Grade Inflation: A Crisis in College Education*. New York: Springer Verlag, 2003. 261 pp. \$27.50 (hb). ISBN: 0-387-00125-5. Address: Springer Verlag, 175 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10010, USA. This book, written by a statistician, argues that grade inflation (the practice of awarding artificially high grades to students at U.S. universities) is a problem and that it affects student choices of courses, student evaluation of professors, and other aspects of academic life. The book is based on careful statistical analysis at one U.S. university, and it is one of the most detailed studies of grading that has been undertaken. The author advocates reforms in grading policies and the evaluation systems for both students and faculty.

King, Roger, ed. *The University in the Global Age*. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 191 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-4039-1130-4. Address: Palgrave Macmillan, Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS, UK.

The broad theme of globalization is analyzed in this volume. Among the topics considered are globalization and the creation of knowledge, diversity of academic systems, borderless higher education, and changes in patterns of teaching and learning. The authors are affiliated with the Association of Commonwealth Universities.

Kronman, Anthony T., ed. *The History of the Yale Law School*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004. 304 pp. \$30 (hb). ISBN 0-300-09564-3. Address: Yale University Press, POB 209040, New Haven CT 06520, USA.

This book is an edited collection of lectures commemorating the 300th anniversary of Yale University. These essays reflect both on the history and the role of one of the most influential law schools in the United States.

Lee, Molly N. N. *Restructuring Higher Education in Malaysia*. Penang, Malaysia: Universiti Sains Malaysia, 2004. 130 pp (pb). ISBN 983-40982-1-9. Address: School of Educational Studies, USM, Penang 11800, Malaysia.

Malaysian higher education is being transformed by diversification, market pressures, and the other elements of the global academic environment. Lee focuses on such issues as quotas in university admissions, the changing academic profession in Malaysia and Singapore, private higher education, the corporatization of public universities, and others.

LeRocque, Norman. *Who Should Pay? Tuition Fees and Tertiary Education Financing in New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Education Forum, 2003. 71 pp (pb). ISBN 0-958213-5-6. Address: Education Forum, POB 24, 310 Manners St., Wellington, New Zealand.

This book contains a discussion of patterns of financing higher education in New Zealand and internationally. The focus is on private financing and the implications and realities of various financing arrangements, especially in New Zealand.

Morley, Louise. *Quality and Power in Higher Education*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2003. 200 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-335-21226-3. Address: Open University Press, McGraw Hill House, Shoppenhangers Rd., Maidenhead, Berks SL6 2QL, UK.

The focus of this volume is on the broad issues of quality, quality assurance, and measurement in higher education. The author critically examines the various aspects of these issues within the framework of globalization and accountability—such as managerialism, access, equity, and other topics. The data are from the United Kingdom but the relevance is international.

Palfreyman, David. *The Economics of Higher Education: Affordability and Access, Costing, Pricing and Accountability*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies, 2004. L9.99 (pb). ISBN 09547433-1-8. Address: <http://oxcheps.new.ox.ac.uk>.

Examining the financing of higher edu-

cation in the United Kingdom and the United States, this book focuses on the implications for the United Kingdom of the recent higher education bill for funding patterns. The appropriate balance between public funding and private contributions to the costs of higher education is a key concern, as well as the costing and pricing of study and ensuring affordability.

Pusser, Brian. *Burning Down the House: Politics, Governance, and Affirmative Action at the University of California*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004. 281 pp (hb) ISBN 0-7914-6057-6. Address: State University of New York Press, 90 State St., Albany NY 12207, USA.

Affirmative action, the provision of access to underserved racial and ethnic groups, has been a particularly volatile topic in California for several decades. Not only is the ethnic mix in California complicated, but politicians and others have found the issue relevant in the political arena. This book examines political struggles at the University of California and in the state concerning affirmative action over more than a decade. The topic is examined from within the university in terms of governance and related issues as well as in the broader political context.

Savin-Baden, Maggi. *Facilitating Problem-Based Learning: Illuminating Perspectives*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2003. 158 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-335-21054-6. Address: Open University Press, McGraw Hill House, Shoppenhangers Rd., Maidenhead, Berks SL6 2QL, UK.

A how-to and analytic discussion of problem-based learning in higher education, this book will be useful for developing approaches to this pedagogical technique and orientation. It is aimed at university teachers interested in facilitating problem-based learning in the classroom and the perspective is international.

Slowey, Maria and David Watson, eds. *Higher Education and the Lifecourse*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2003. 209 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-335-21377-4. Address: Open University Press,

McGraw Hill House, Shoppenhangers Rd., Maidenhead, Berks SL6 2QL, UK.

Taking as a starting point the importance of lifelong learning as a key element of higher education, this book discusses a range of issues related to that theme, such as self-directed on-line learning, access and persistence, student evaluation, and related topics.

Thornton, Patricia H. *Markets from Culture: Institutional Logics and Organizational Decisions in Higher Education Publishing*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004. 182 pp. \$45 (hb). ISBN 0-8047-4021-6. Address: Stanford University Press, 1450 Page Mill Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94304, USA.

This is an analysis of organizational culture, using higher education publishing as a case for analyzing how decisions are made and markets developed. The author analyzes how higher education publishing changed a culture of independent publishers to a culture of international conglomerates and commercial hierarchies.

Tierney, William G., ed. *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance: Negotiating the Perfect Storm*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. 228 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-8018-7920-5. Address: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.

Academic institutions worldwide have become more bureaucratized as they grow larger and more accountable to external constituencies. This volume focuses on the changes in governance in the United States and the implications for academic freedom, the academic profession, and related issues. International and systemwide implications are discussed. The authors are among the best-known scholars and analysts on this topic.

Tight, Malcolm, ed. *The Routledge-Falmer Reader in Higher Education*. London: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 2004. 318 pp. £23.99 (pb). ISBN 0-415-32765-2. Address: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE, UK.

Composed of 18 previously published journal articles from the mid-1990s to the

present, this volume focuses on eight themes. These include teaching and learning, course design, the student experience, quality and evaluation, system policy, institutional management, academic work and the academic profession, and knowledge and research. The editor provides a rationale for both the selection of topics and the specific choices of articles. Indeed, his introductory chapter presents both an interesting discussion of the methodology for choosing the contents of the book and an illuminating discussion of the development of the field of higher education research.

Tomusk, Voledmar. *The Open World and Closed Societies: Essays on Higher Education Policies "In Transition."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 241 pp. (hb). ISBN 1-4039-6507-2. Address: Palgrave Macmillan, 175 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10010, USA.

A series of essays on the transformation of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe, this book focuses on Russia as well as on such countries as Romania, Estonia, and others. Themes include the role of private universities, the problems of World Bank assistance to higher education, the difficulties of transition after communism among others. The author, who has wide experience in the region, takes a critical stance concerning higher education development.

Vlasceanu, Lazar and Leland Conley Barrows. *Indicators for Institutional and Programme Accreditation in Higher/Tertiary Education*. Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO-CEPES, 2004. 176 pp. \$22 (pb). ISBN 92-9069-177-8. Address: CEPES, Strada Stirbei Voda 39, R0-70732 Romania.

Focusing especially on accreditation issues as they affect Central and Eastern Europe, this volume features a general analysis of the objectives of academic accreditation and several chapters on quality assessment and accreditation in the region. Additional chapters dealing with Japan, the United States, and the European context are included.

Ward, Kelly. *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*. San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003. 171 pp. \$24 (pb). ISSN: 0884-0040. Address: Jossey Bass Publishers, 989 Market St., San Francisco CA 94103, USA.

One of the ASHE-ERIC series on higher education, this volume focuses on the role of service as part of the responsibility of faculty members in the U.S. context. Basing the discussion on Ernest Boyer's idea of the scholarship of service and engagement, the author argues that faculty roles and the evaluation of faculty should focus more on the service element.

Williamson, Joy Ann. *Black Power on Campus: The University of Illinois, 1965-1975*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003. 192 pp. \$34.95 (hb). ISBN: 0-252-02829-5. Address: University of Illinois Press, 1325 S. Oak St., Champaign, IL 61820, USA.

A case study of the development of a black student movement at one major U.S. university in the 1960s, this book provides an analysis of the origins of the black student movement, race relations on campus, the problems faced by African American students on a large public university campus, and related issues.

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. *Educating for Shalom: Essays on Christian Higher Education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2004. 310 pp. \$24 (pb). ISBN 0-8028-2753-5. Address: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing, 255 Jefferson Ave S.E., Grand Rapids, MI 49503, USA.

A series of essays by a philosophical theologian, this book discusses such topics as the mission of the Christian college, the connection between faith and learning, teaching for justice and peace, and a guide for the development of Christian higher education in contemporary culture.

Yonezawa, Akiyoshi and Frans Kaiser, eds. *System-Level and Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the 21st Century*. Bucharest, Romania: CEPES, 2003. 235 pp. \$20 (pb). ISBN 92-9069-172-1. Address: UNESCO-CEPES, Strada Stirbei Voda 39, RO-70732 Bucharest, Romania.

This book includes a conference report and set of papers on performance indi-

cators—efforts to measure the productivity of academic institutions and systems. System-level indicators are the main focus. These are defined and international indicators are discussed along with national perspectives from Germany, Poland, China, the United States, and others countries.

Focus on Student Loans

UNESCO's Bangkok office, the Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education and the International Institute for Edu-

cational Planning have sponsored a series of studies of student loan programs in the Asian context. Among the books published are:

Ziderman, Adrian. *Student Loans in Thailand: Are They Effective, Equitable, Sustainable?* (2003) 151 pp.

Shen, Hong and Wenli Li. *A Review of the Student Loans Scheme in China* (2003) 114 pp.

Chung, Yue Ping. *The Student Loans Scheme in Hong Kong*. (2003) 66 pp.

Kim, Anna and Young Lee. *Student Loan*

Schemes in the Republic of Korea: Review and Recommendations. (2003) 97 pp.

Kitaev, Igor, et al. *Student Loans in the Philippines: Lessons from the Past*. (2003) 108 pp.

The publications are available without cost from UNESCO Bangkok, 920 Sukhumvit Rd., Prakanong, Bangkok 10110, Thailand. E-mail: Bangkok@unesco.org

An Initiative in International Higher Education

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education provides a unique service to colleges and universities worldwide by focusing on the global realities of higher education. Our goal is to bring an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We are convinced that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes *International Higher Education*, a book series on higher education, and other publications. We sponsor occasional conferences on key issues in higher education and maintain a resource base for researchers and policymakers. The Center welcomes visiting scholars for periods of study and reflection. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide, and more broadly with Catholic universities. The Center is also concerned with creating dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions in industrialized nations and in developing countries. We are convinced that our future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

Our work is supported by the Ford Foundation and by the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. We are indebted to these funders for core sponsorship.

Our Website

The Center's award-winning website is a useful source of information and analysis on higher education worldwide. All back issues of *International Higher Education* are available, and an index provides easy access to articles by topic and country. Center publications are also available, and links to relevant higher education websites and information are provided. We are a featured e-link of the World Bank and other agencies.

The Program in Higher Education in the Lynch School of Education, Boston College

The Center is closely related to the program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degree study in the field of higher education. The program has been preparing professionals in higher education for three decades. It features a rigorous social science-based approach to the study of higher education, combining a concern with the broader theoretical issues relating to higher education and an understanding of the practice of academic administration. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specialization is offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, international higher education, and other areas. Additional information about the program is available from Dr. Karen Arnold, coordinator of the program in higher education, Lynch School of Education, Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA. Fax: (617) 552-8422. E-mail: <arnoldkc@bc.edu>. More information about the program—including course descriptions and degree requirements—can be found on-line at the program's website: <http://infoeagle.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/hea/JEA/html>.

International Higher Education is available full-text on our website.

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION
ISSN: 1084-0613
Editorial Office
Center for International Higher Education Campion Hall Boston College Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 USA Tel: (617) 552-4236 Fax: (617) 552-8422 E-Mail: highered@bc.edu http://www.bc.edu/cihe/
Editor: Philip G. Altbach. Assistant Editors: Robin M. Helms & Deirdre M. McMyler
<i>Material in this newsletter may be reproduced. Please cite the original source of publication. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.</i>
<i>International Higher Education</i> is published quarterly by the Center for International Higher Education. We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to be placed on our mailing list, please write to the editor on your business letterhead.