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International Race for Accreditation Stars in Cross-Border Education

Jane Knight
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A scan of trends and issues related to program and provider mobility shows diverse new types of education providers, delivery modes, as well as innovative and complex forms of public/private and local/foreign partnerships. New courses and programs are being designed and delivered in response to local conditions and global trends, and new qualifications and awards are being offered. These developments are designed to meet the increased demand for continuing education and higher education to provide the human resource capacity for the growing knowledge society. But they also present new challenges for the world of higher education, especially with regard to accreditation and the recognition of qualifications.

RECOGNITION OF QUALIFICATIONS

Increased cross-border activity creates a need for mechanisms to recognize academic and professional qualifications gained through domestic or international delivery of education. The key questions include who awards the qualification (especially in collaborative provision arrangements and for private company providers); is the provider recognized, if so by what kind of accrediting/licensing body; and in what country is that body located if in fact it is nationally based?

Recognizing the qualifications offered by nondomestic institutions or providers involves a new level of complexity. Recognition is usually based on a national system that registers or licenses the education institution or provider and then requires a quality assurance assessment or accreditation for the academic program or for the institution or provider. In the past decade, many countries have established some type of governmental or nongovernmental evaluation and accreditation system, which represents a significant accomplishment. However, many of the new and existing systems are appropriately oriented toward traditional domestic institutions, and they lack the ability to register, license, or assess the quality of cross-border programs and qualifications offered by foreign institutions and providers. New mechanisms and frameworks at regional and international levels need to be considered to complement and strengthen the capacity of national-level governmental, nongovernmental, and professional bodies.

DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS

Traditional higher education institutions are no longer the only deliverers of academic courses and programs at home or across borders. International conglomerates, media and IT companies, and new partnerships of private and public bodies are increasingly engaged in the provision of education both domestically and internationally.

The growing diversity of cross-border providers includes nontraditional or alternative types that are not part of any national education system and are in essence “stateless.” Therefore, their status in their “home” country lacks relevance with these types of providers, which are unknown entities in terms of the quality of the education courses and programs and the acceptance or trustworthiness of awards. One common response to not being part of a national education system is for providers to obtain accreditation status from different types of accreditation bodies or agencies. This in turn leads to the question of whether the accreditation agency is bona fide and can be trusted.

DIVERSITY OF ACCREDITORS

Awareness of the need for quality assurance and accreditation has led to several new developments in accreditation, of which some are aiding the domestic and international recognition of qualification and others are only serving to hinder and complicate matters.

Many countries have made efforts to establish criteria and procedures for quality assurance recognition systems and the approval of bona fide accrediting agencies. At the same time, the world has seen an increase in the number of self-appointed and rather self-serving accreditors as well as accreditation “mills” that simply sell “bogus” accreditation labels. The need and desire for accreditation status is bringing about commercialization of quality assurance and accreditation. Programs and providers strive to acquire as many “accreditation stars” as possible to enhance their competitiveness and perceived international legitimacy. The challenge pertains to distinguishing between bona fide and rogue accreditors, especially when neither the cross-border provider nor the accreditor is nationally based or recognized as part of a national higher education system.

The race for accreditation also entails growth in the internationalization and the global market for accreditation. It is important to acknowledge the upside of the internationalization of accreditation. New initiatives for mutual recognition of accreditation processes among countries, especially in the reg-
ulated professions, have given rise to some positive developments. Countries lacking fully developed quality assurance systems have benefited from the assistance of foreign bona fide accreditors. However, in some instances motives of commercial progress and competitiveness have fueled the desire for more accreditation stars, resulting in inappropriate and unreliable quality assurance procedures. While this downside can involve both cross-border and domestic provision, it is a particular concern for cross-border provision given that national policy objectives and cultural orientation are often neglected. Both forms of provision do not provide a way of understanding if the accredits is bona fide and if the qualifications will be acceptable for academic or professional purposes.

Market forces are enhancing the importance of an institution’s or provider’s profile, reputation, and courses. Major investments are being made in marketing and branding campaigns to get name recognition and to increase enrollments. Some type of accreditation is part of the campaign, assuring prospective students that the programs and awards are of high standing. This is introducing a commercial dimension to accreditation practices and the desire for institutions or providers to have as many accreditation labels or stars as possible. However, it is very important not to confuse fee-based bona fide accreditation agencies with accreditation mills.

Bona fide national and international accreditation agencies have increased in number and now operate in over 50 countries. For instance, U.S. national and regional accrediting bodies are providing and selling their services in over 65 countries. The same trend is discernible for accreditation bodies of the professions such as ABET (engineering) from the United States and EQUIS (business) from Europe.

At the same time, self-appointed networks of institutions and new organizations engage in accreditation of their members. These developments appear positive when viewed as an attempt to improve the quality of the academic offer. However, there is some concern that accreditors are not totally objective in their assessments and may be more interested in joining to the race for more accreditation stars through self-accreditation processes than in improving quality.

Another worrisome related development involves the growth in accreditation mills—organizations, neither recognized nor legitimate, that more or less “sell” accreditation status without any independent assessments. They are similar to degree mills that sell certificates and degrees with little or no course work. Different education stakeholders—students, employers, and the public—need to be aware of these accreditation (and degree) mills, which often constitute nothing more than a web address and are therefore out of the jurisdiction of national regulatory systems.

The credibility of higher education programs and qualifications means a great deal to students, employers, the public at large, and the academic community itself. Additional efforts are needed at institutional, national, and international levels to inform the different stakeholders (and actors) of new opportunities for education and professional mobility while keeping them aware of the new risks of rogue providers and diploma and accreditation mills. One of the most critical issues constitutes assurance that the qualification awarded is legitimate and will be recognized for employment purposes or for further studies either at home or abroad. This issue now presents a major challenge facing the national and international higher education sector.

Quality and an International Higher Education Space

JUDITH S. EATON

Judith S. Eaton is president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Address: CHEA, One Dupont Circle, Suite 510, Washington DC 20036, USA. E-mail: chea@chea.org.

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) held its fourth International Commission meeting in January 2005. Individuals from a dozen countries addressed several questions about the regional and international quality assurance and accreditation initiatives.

What Is Happening in Specific Geographic Regions with Quality Assurance and Accreditation?

Commission members examined two significant regional undertakings: European initiatives in accreditation and quality assurance and steps toward the establishment of a regional accreditation body in the Arab world.

Europe’s current focus on quality assurance and accreditation is an outgrowth of the Bologna Declaration of 1999. The active “Bologna Process” (as it has come to be known) now involves strengthening the relevant policies at the national level and building a European-level structure for quality assurance and accreditation that serves the interests of universities, quality assurance bodies, and students. The issues dominating the dialogue include whether to create a European QA Register for quality assurance bodies and how to advance the role of peer review, enhance a quality culture within universities, and sustain the autonomy of higher education institutions.

In the Arab world, quality assurance and accreditation authorities, ministers, and higher education leaders are looking into creating new quality assurance bodies and strengthening existing national operations. They are considering the cre-
ation of a regional quality assurance and accreditation body. At the core of these discussions lies assembling the key actors—universities, ministries of higher education, nongovernmental bodies, and businesses—to create a robust quality assurance and accreditation environment.

**What Is Happening Internationally?**

Commission members examined three very different international responses: a trade response through the World Trade Organization (WTO) and negotiations related to the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), a multinational response through the Joint Guidelines Project of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and a higher education association response through a statement on quality provision developed by the American Council on Education, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), and the International Association of Universities.

The OECD/UNESCO project is conceived, at least in part, as a reaction to WTO/GATS and may ultimately emerge as a defining feature of the international higher education space.

The WTO/GATS negotiations continue, perhaps at a slower pace than in prior years and without higher education, at present, as a major focus. The negotiations influence the international space for higher education with questions such as what quality has to do with nationality. Even though many opine that the role of trade is not to determine quality, WTO/GATS is a powerful presence in the international space, forcing higher education and quality assurance leaders to address the impact of trade on the role and function of institutions and providers. It is likely that negotiations will continue into 2006, and perhaps into 2007.

The multinational organizational response through the OECD/UNESCO project is conceived, at least in part, as a reaction to WTO/GATS and may ultimately emerge as a defining feature of the international higher education space. This effort is focused on quality provision in cross-border higher education and is intended to support and enhance student mobility and protect students from dubious providers of higher education. The guidelines are to be nonbinding and offer suggestions for practice to six stakeholders: higher education providers, national governments, quality assurance and accreditation bodies, student associations, professional bodies, and academic recognition bodies. UNESCO also intend to establish an “international information tool,” buttressing the guidelines with valuable information that students can use to identify legitimate providers of higher education.

The commission’s joint statement, “Sharing Quality Higher Education Across Borders: A Statement on Behalf of Higher Education Institutions Worldwide,” provides a set of principles to anchor various initiatives in cross-border higher education. It addresses the importance of the voice of higher education providers and their associations in the international space—looking to this leadership to make the case vigorously for core academic values such as higher education’s commitment to the public good and serving the public interest. Higher education is, in most countries, a public good as well as a private benefit. The statement seeks to ensure that the social compact between higher education and society at the national level is vital and effective internationally.

**What Do These Initiatives Tell Us about the Emerging Characteristics of an International Higher Education Space?**

Three characteristics of the international higher education space became clear from conversations at the CHEA International Commission meeting: (a) movement not only toward international structures for quality assurance and accreditation but toward developing regional structures as well; (b) a preference to retain—rather than eliminate—national structures for quality assurance and accreditation even while developing regional and international structures; and (c) continued dialogue and debate on a number of difficult questions, the answers to which will involve the ultimate nature of an international higher education space.

The questions that will need to be addressed include:

- Should the emerging expectations and agreements about quality in the international space be collegial understandings or regulatory obligations?
- What is the nature of the ownership of international quality? Does it derive from institutions, governments, multinational organizations, and students? Or, is it shared among various stakeholders?
- Are either or both a single set of international quality standards and “meta-accreditation” (external review of the quality of quality assurance and accreditation bodies) essential—or optional—to a viable international higher education space?

The configuration of the international higher education space will take a considerable period of time. The 2005 CHEA International Commission meeting was a modest yet valuable moment along the time continuum, hopefully offering useful ideas and encouraging a vibrant debate.
The High Profile of Trade in Higher Education Services
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Proponents of free trade in higher education services present legitimate and convincing arguments to include higher education in major international trade agreements like the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). Increasing access for American providers to foreign markets, providing services to willing education consumers abroad, and expanding educational opportunities in countries with less broadly developed systems of higher education are some of the perceived benefits of removing trade barriers to higher education providers. Indeed, free-trade supporters enjoy advocates in high places, including the U.S. Office of the Trade Representative (USTR), who promote such benefits of free trade for American higher education interests overseas. The protrade position, however, lacks a developed perspective on the implications of free trade for domestic higher education.

A few informed representatives at national higher education associations have produced the only localized response from American higher education to the issue of including higher education in any trade agreements. Thus far, however, the issues raised locally have not led to a more broadly informed debate about the topic. It may be useful to present a “worst-case scenario” to showcase some of the ways in which trade liberalization could adversely impact American higher education through GATS and other international trade agreements.

Progressive Liberalization

Current trade proposals protect the autonomy of American higher education institutions in areas like admissions, financial aid, and hiring practices. However, years of progressive liberalization might one day remove all previously existing protections. All WTO member-nation providers of higher education services become subject to the legally binding terms of GATS. GATS excludes services provided “in the exercise of government authority, defined in the GATS as any service which is supplied neither on a commercial basis, nor in competition with one or more service suppliers” (USTR, “United States announces proposals for liberating trade in services,” www.ustr.gov, July 2002). Nevertheless, American public higher education, which receives only a (shrinking) portion of its funding from government sources and could be deemed to operate in competition with other higher education providers, might not prove to be a protected service. At several levels, absolute free trade without any exceptions or protections could force significant change within American higher education. Admissions and financial aid, market competition among institutions, and segregation among academic disciplines are just a few of the areas in which trade could alter the landscape of American higher education.

Admissions and Financial Aid

Admissions and financial aid policies at both public and private institutions would face scrutiny regarding any conditions that might appear favorable to domestic students. Regarding the challenges to public higher education, it is possible that another country would perceive the mere existence of publicly funded higher education as a violation of free trade. Public financing, which helps hold down tuition prices at levels below what a private institution can offer, could be interpreted as a form of domestic subsidy. If challenged through an international dispute settlement process, public higher education might be forced to privatize, in order to maintain a truly free market in which institutions compete for students. Public institutions might also be challenged about their admissions policies, through which they currently reserve places for residents of their home state and other protected groups. Such a practice would illegally impact a foreign student’s ability to be admitted and might be deemed illegal.

Private institutions might also face complaints over admissions and financial aid policies if they maintained different standards for domestic and foreign student admissions.

Private institutions might also face complaints over admissions and financial aid policies if they maintained different standards for domestic and foreign student admissions. For example, if an institution maintained need-blind admissions for domestic students but noted foreign students’ financial status when evaluating their applications, this would likely be considered an unfair and illegal practice. In addition, if an institution provided full financial-need aid to its domestic students but did not offer the same aid structure to foreign students, this could be challenged as an illegal policy. Institutions might lose their ability to admit and support students in any subjective way that could be deemed unfair to foreign applicants.

Market Competition

Following the scenario described above, the resulting privatization of public providers as well as the arrival of foreign suppliers would heighten the competition for students across the higher education “market.” A situation could occur in which the traditional sector of higher education, in choosing to compete with the for-profit sector instead of fighting against the tide of trade liberalization, would focus on its financial inter-
Another potential academic scenario involves entire fields of study becoming transformed due to international enrollments.

Segregation among Disciplines

Finally, another potential academic scenario involves entire fields of study becoming transformed due to international enrollments. Science and engineering already face intense enrollment pressures, as American students do not seek advanced degrees in the numbers needed to fill classrooms and laboratories at institutions across the country. In many cases, domestic students with less impressive credentials are currently admitted to programs over qualified international students—to ensure some American enrollees. Under an absolute free-trade model, such protectionist admissions policies would be illegal, and all applicants would have to be considered the same way.

One could predict, then, a rapid increase in East and South Asian students, for instance, in graduate programs in computer science and engineering, which are vital for U.S. national security and economic development. It is not unimaginable that free trade could actually lead to diminished capacities to compete in business (say, in high-tech fields) and pose a real threat to national security—not due to the presence of foreign students, which is already an issue, but because few if any domestic students would be qualified and eligible for employment in classified areas and fields. With burgeoning high-tech sectors across Asia, for example, it is reasonable to expect that more foreign students in these fields would return to their home countries, where they would not face stringent U.S. immigration restrictions and where their entrepreneurial opportunities would likely be greater than in the United States. Exporting economically vital areas of expertise could, in fact, threaten national security and further disadvantage the U.S. economy by moving the forefront of technological and scientific innovation overseas.

The Worst-Case Scenario

These examples within this worst-case scenario are extreme, of course, but they ought to stimulate debate about the potential ramifications of unfettered free trade in higher education services and the ongoing skepticism worldwide over the promise of free trade for higher education. Assuming that higher education is a service industry—a hotly contested idea, given the social and cultural significance of higher education—the extent to which the sector ought to be subjected to the free market requires an informed, inclusive process, which is not in place today.

For the United States, in particular, formulating comprehensive trade policies that impact the massive, decentralized, states-centered system of higher education should involve input from actors at all levels—from the campuses to representative organizations to government agencies. Thus far, however, protrade advocates have dominated the discussion, with more mainstream higher education stakeholders valiantly trying to catch up. Maybe the shock of these potential repercussions will provoke greater involvement across all segments of American higher education, leading to more inclusive debate about free trade and its implications for higher education here and around the world. Without greater interest and broader input in this debate, these worst-case possibilities could become worst-case inevitabilities.

GATS and Higher Education’s Role in Development

Olve Sørensen
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The GATS treaty includes specific commitments to ensure that the liberalization of trade in services benefits developing countries and enhances global development. Some developing countries interpret these provisions as an exemption from most of the hard bits of GATS obligations, while trade hard-liners see them more as lofty expressions of goodwill not to be taken as binding in any real sense.

For a rich country, traditionally committed to both global trade and the interests of less-developed countries, it can be a challenge to balance the two objectives in a GATS context. Education represents a particularly sensitive area because of its pivotal role in development. How should a country act to fulfill its obligations to the global development of education for the benefit of all? An interesting case entered the public eye last year when South Africa took some developed countries to task
for what it saw as aggressive behavior over education under GATS.

**Basic GATS Negotiations**

After setting out their initial positions, countries negotiate in the GATS setting by requesting from one another improved market access in sectors of interest. Remember that any concession given to one country must apply as well to any other country wishing to trade—national preferences toward individual trading partners are outlawed by the Most-Favored Nation rule, one of the cornerstones of GATS. Also, keep in mind that a request is made and granted or rejected without any quid pro quo; a country may request increased market access for education services from others without opening its own market.

**The South African Offensive**

Since relatively few countries have engaged in the request-and-offer process regarding the education sector and since the secrecy of the negotiations has generally been observed, it attracted considerable interest when the then South African minister of education, Professor Kader Asmal, attacked several countries for making negotiation requests to South Africa. He specifically targeted Norway, as a country that presented itself as committed to the welfare of countries in the South yet was acting in the GATS process as a market aggressor.

South Africa openly broke the explicit rule in GATS protocol that no country make public the requests it received from others.

**Norwegian Reactions**

Several factors contributed to making this attack a disturbing episode for the Norwegians. First, South Africa openly broke the explicit rule in GATS protocol that no country make public the requests it received from others. Each country is free to publicize its own requests but in practice most choose not to do so.

Second, the South African hostility to the action of launching a request seemed to question the legitimacy of the whole intricate scheme of negotiations, the courtly dance of advance-and-retract and offense-and-defense, through which the GATS process is designed to liberalize world trade. Public accusations of the exchange of offers and counteroffers as acts of aggression may result in wariness that could lead to a complete standstill in the process.

Third, this episode demonstrated that public opinion will quickly swing behind anyone able to appear as a victim of GATS. The complexity of the issues together with the moral high ground of South Africa’s status as spokesman for the plight of less-developed countries provoked widespread outrage within and outside Norway. The responsible authorities, whose explanations were drowned out by the emotional outbursts and have yet to make much of a dent in the widely reported simplified version.

Finally, the Norwegian response gave mixed signals. The camp that supports development expressed dismay and apologies; the requests to South Africa in the education sector were described as an unfortunate accident. In its wake, the episode is mostly portrayed as a full retreat by Norway and a retraction of the request. In reality, the minister of foreign affairs answered a question in Parliament by saying the requests had been made but if South Africa chose not to accede to them there would be no further follow-up or pressure from the Norwegian side. In other words, the requests still stand but nothing more is likely to happen—which is exactly the status of many requests made under the GATS regime.

Norway’s involvement is also based on the idea that remaining passive in GATS would allow a few influential countries with special interests in trade in education services to shape the framework of the future global education system.

**The Norwegian Rationale**

Norway’s decision to play an active role in the GATS negotiations on education grew out of a number of convictions, one of which was the rationale that GATS would benefit trade in education, which in turn would support the global effort to provide education for the millions in Third World countries that lack adequate capacity to provide education services.

Norway’s involvement is also based on the idea that remaining passive in GATS would allow a few influential countries with special interests in trade in education services to shape the framework of the future global education system. The belief that many countries should participate in the process led to a strategy of requesting extended market access in a number of countries, including some of the stronger developing countries. While realizing that these countries would most likely not comply fully with the requests, Norway views the negotiations as a way to involve developing countries in these development issues.

South Africa’s Position

South Africa chose, however, to interpret the requests as an opening for commercial ventures in the South African market. Leading intellectuals, Kader Asmal among them, have claimed that merely placing education under the GATS umbrella is tantamount to supporting the commodification of education and undermining the status of education as a public good and a human right. In this light they aggressively portray the requests and any other initiatives to involve South Africa in GATS as a strategy to force developing countries to bare their throats to the onslaught of unbridled market forces in the education sector.
From Graduate Student to World Citizen in a Global Environment
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As globalization advances, societies become more dependent on information and knowledge. Knowledge societies rely on the production of knowledge, its transmission through education and training, and dissemination through communications technologies. Universities are placed in a unique position since they play a significant role in the production of new knowledge and training of future leaders. This applies particularly to doctoral education.

Responding to the competitive pressures of globalization, several countries have introduced and implemented innovative structures for the training of doctoral students. Examples of these new structures include the German Graduiertenkolleges; the Australian Cooperative Research Centre Training programs; and the National Science Foundation’s (NSF’s) Integrated Graduate Education and Research Trainee Programs (IGERTs). The new structures often share many characteristics: They are often problem- and theme-based, rather than disciplinary in orientation; engage in multidisciplinary research connected to the outside world; provide professional socialization through multiple mentoring; offer professional skills training in such areas as making presentations, teaching, publishing, and grant-writing skills; introduce teamwork as a required component of the program; and include international components and collaborations.

Evaluating Ph.D. Programs

One way to envision the prospects of Ph.D.s in the future is to consider whether existing programs are suitable for a knowledge-based society and to evaluate the emerging forms of doctoral education. The Center for Innovation and Research in Graduate Education (CIRGE) at the University of Washington is establishing an empirical base for assessing both existing doctoral programs and innovative ones, through studies of Ph.D. recipients. CIRGE is also directing efforts to evaluate U.S. NSF-funded innovative doctoral programs—the IGERT programs. The evaluation focuses on whether the programs are appropriate for the demands of the new economy and address the issues that have been at the forefront of current debates about graduate education since the 1990s.

Doctoral Education in the 21st Century

After a decade of doctoral education outcome studies and the results of research-based IGERT evaluation, CIRGE findings showed that Ph.D. holders were satisfied with multiple mentors, the interdisciplinary approach to problem solving, the richness of the multidisciplinary research environment, and the opportunity to study with a cohort of peers from various disciplines.

Based on CIRGE studies and evaluations, we make the following recommendation for future-oriented doctoral education. Such programs should have the following characteristics:

1. They will prepare Ph.D. students to work in interdisciplinary groups by providing epistemology courses that focus on the nature of knowledge, its foundation, and validity. As most scientific, technical, or social problems become too complex to be solved by individuals or from a single perspective, research needs to be approached from a multidisciplinary perspective.

2. Future-oriented doctoral programs can integrate professional skill building into doctoral education by providing students with the experience of teaching, presenting research findings before a diverse audience, writing and publishing—in short, preparing doctoral students for a variety of future careers.

3. These programs introduce collective supervision. The demand that one person perform all functions as an ideal mentor is unrealistic and contributes to faculty burnout. A panel of advisers can provide students with more advice, insight, and consistent guidance.

4. These programs introduce effective teamwork and provide opportunities for collaboration on small research projects or coauthoring of articles by students or by students and faculty.
5. They establish structured international collaborations with doctoral programs in other countries to conduct research on some global issues and problems.

6. They encourage multiple flows in research collaboration between economically advanced and poorer countries with limited research resources or infrastructure.

7. They reintroduce foreign-language requirements, especially in English-speaking countries. The lack of foreign-language requirements for Ph.D. education has had negative consequences: much is lost by not being able to communicate directly with colleagues and collaborators, and communicating solely in English grants privileges to some students and puts others at a disadvantage.

8. Future-oriented programs initiate an approach that revives an awareness and commitment to civic engagement and world citizenship. World citizenship includes the notion of a citizen who crosses national boundaries without seeking to assimilate and to conform but instead accepts differences and embraces diversity.

In preparing for a knowledge-based society, higher education systems will need to be modified. We recommend programs that focus on creating opportunities for doctoral students to become global citizens who not only can operate within a small sphere of elite intellectuals but also “move beyond critical public intellectuals to world citizens whose collective knowledge and actions presuppose visions of public life, community and moral accountability” (Henry Giroux). To put into operation and implement these changes will be our task for the future.

**Private Higher Education in Ethiopia: The Current Landscape**

_Damtew Teferra_
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_Ethiopian higher education is undergoing a quiet transformation both in public and private domains. Until a few years ago, Ethiopia had only two public universities. There are now eight such universities. A major campaign is currently underway to establish another 13 (10 new) universities—at a cost of about $1.4 billion. More than 172,000 students are enrolled in the country’s higher education institutions, of which 77 percent are public institutions. More than 100,000 students—88 percent in public institutions—are enrolled in degree programs.

Ethiopia now boasts about having some 60 private colleges, which enroll about a quarter of all students. Most of these institutions are based in the capital, Addis Ababa, with a few branch campuses in major towns. Virtually all of these institutions were established in the last half decade. While a closer analysis is warranted, the enrollment rate appears to have been climbing rapidly for several years; but the pace has now moderated, and in a few cases a decline has been reported.

Most private institutions in Ethiopia, like others in Africa, offer courses that create good employment opportunities. The programs include business administration, computer studies, and information technology (IT). Others also provide training in health care and teacher education. A few of these colleges also offer distance education to tens of thousands of students._

**Most private institutions in Ethiopia, like others in Africa, offer courses that create good employment opportunities.**

**Unique Scenarios**

There are some notable scenarios in the Ethiopian private higher education system. One institution, for example, reports having 10 percent students on scholarship while many others also claim a large number of students holding either full or partial scholarships. One health care institution grants full scholarship to all its students who after graduation will work for the private hospital that owns the college.

Many leaders of private institutions recognize the importance of raising the institutional profile through research and publication. A few institutions have established research offices, earmarked resources, assigned personnel, and published journals and annual proceedings. One prominent private institution, for example, claims to evaluate faculty promotion based on research productivity.

Private institutions are not all born equal, and thus each institution is unique in character. While many fear competition as a threat, though only a few admit this to be the case, a handful have already established good reputations. For instance, in one prestigious IT college a minimum six-month enrollment waiting period is the norm. Overall, the highly regarded colleges feel that they are “publicly accredited”—meaning they are more concerned about public opinion than about the evaluation by government regulatory bodies.

**Regulatory Regimes**

All private institutions operate under the direct supervision of the national, regional, and subregional educational offices across which accreditation authority is distributed. All private institutions are required to register and become preaccredited before they start operation. Once the institution receives a peer-reviewed preaccredited status and operates for one year, it normally receives full accreditation. An institution is evaluated every two years, and virtually no institution has its accreditation revoked.
Private institutions are required to obtain recognition not only from educational offices but also the Office of Investment and the Ministry of Health—the latter if they run a health care program. To make matters more intricate the educational offices that grant accreditation vary based on the kind of credentials institutions require. While degree-granting institutions (12+3 and 12+4) are accredited by the central office of the Ministry of Education, those that grant diplomas (10+3) are licensed by a regional educational office; other low-end credentials are licensed by a subregional educational office.

Registration costs money and time. Institutions that offer a variety of credentials and operate branch campuses in the regions find the procedures especially cumbersome and costly. Many also criticize the lack of requisite expertise and professionalism in certain educational bureaus.

**Challenges Confronting the Enterprise**

Private higher education in Ethiopia is a highly regulated enterprise, to the resentment of the community of private providers. While a few skeptics allege shady practices in bestowing recognition, they all decry the stringent regulations. Many contend that some of the imposed regulations, such as the ratio of senior personnel, cannot be met even by some public institutions. Many fear that the ephemeral nature of policies governing private institutions would put them at great financial risk. While many recognize the need to regulate the enterprise to ensure educational quality, many call for a stable and conducive policy, less red tape, and more operational flexibility.

Leaders of private colleges deeply regret the lack of recognition and appreciation for their role in the development of the nation. They also allege that the government treats them as any other for-profit enterprise and insist that the ministry is much more interested in regulating them than in addressing their pressing issues.

Second, most private institutions vigorously complain about the high cost of leased buildings in the capital. No wonder some of the institutions operate in a less-conducive environment, which often is a subject of contestation for accreditation. Many regret the slow progress of the land procurement process and lack of easy access to bank loans.

Third, private institutions are confronted by a shortage of highly qualified personnel. Faculty in areas such as IT and business management are in short supply. The common practice of poaching faculty from public institutions has now also spread to private colleges. Some critics describe these faculty as “taxi” professors and charge that they spend more time in a taxi commuting from one institution to another than in a class. To discourage this, a few private colleges restrict their full-time faculty from engaging in moonlighting. Private institutions that have already established brand and credibility—and enroll a large number of students—have more full-time faculty than others. A few even brag about their success in poaching faculty from public institutions, especially those based outside the capital.

**Conclusion**

Without doubt, private institutions provide crucial service to the nation as the country struggles to increase access. In the light of burgeoning demand for higher education and limited capacity of public institutions, a more favorable policy and a positive attitude toward private colleges are highly warranted. The burden rests as much on the private colleges to address the prime concern of the government in maintaining educational quality and integrity. Some institutions operate in the education landscape with considerable disparity in capacity, ownership, motive, and commitment, hence necessitating a stringent—but fair and expedient—scrutiny. To be sure, “natural selection” will take its course and weed out the weakest institutions. But the government cannot sit idly by until nature takes its course. That said, despite the commendable intentions of the strategy to regulate private institutions, implementing the policy will require meeting many challenges.

There is a need for a more positive and constructive engagement between the private providers and the various regulatory bodies. The establishment of the Association of Private Institutions in Ethiopia, which now comprises half the private institutions, is expected to play a vital role in addressing the issues and concerns of all the parties involved.
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Gender has hardly been studied in the international literature on private higher education, despite both the great international surge in private higher education and the increased attention to gender equality in general. Like social class and ethnicity, gender is a major issue in official and other discourse today, worldwide, and Japan follows that global tendency.

The private sector accounts for 86 percent of Japanese higher education institutions and 77 percent of enrollments,
according to recent research at PROPHE. Other studies have established that the private sector generally trails the public sector in academic prestige. Yet, to understand issues like gender we must explore not only private versus public dimensions but extensive differences across private subtypes.

Four-year Universities
Four-year universities constitute the best known and most important part of Japanese higher education. (In Japan, all four-year institutions are called daigaku, with basically no distinction between university and college. Examination of trends in female enrollments at these institutions shows that little has changed in recent years. Female enrollments have increased slightly but still amounted to only 38 percent of the four-year university enrollments in 2002. The low figure exists even though the sector includes an ample number of women’s-only institutions (with variable academic-rankings). Indeed, along with a few other Asian countries, Japan is among the world leaders in the number of such institutions. Women’s colleges account for roughly 12 percent of the number of institutions in this four-year category—and at least 90 percent of them are private.

Regarding the 2002 total enrollments in graduate schools, another prestigious sector, females make up only 31 percent.

Whereas enrollments at these private universities have stagnated, the female proportion there has increased moderately. Thus, in this subsector the longstanding correlation between women and private higher education in Japan has intensified. So, a dual reflection of gender stratification at four-year universities exists: (1) fewer females than males in this prestigious sector; and (2) female concentration in the private subsector, which is less prestigious than the public subsector.

Graduate Schools
Regarding the 2002 total enrollments in graduate schools, another prestigious sector, females make up only 31 percent. They make up only 26 percent in the public subsector, versus 39 percent in the private subsector. Therefore, regardless of the public-private distinction, females remain greatly underrepresented in graduate schools; and their public share is particularly low. However, female numbers have increased recently (1998–2002), almost doubling in the public subsector.

Including as factors field of study and program level (i.e., master’s and doctoral) illustrates the gender gap even more starkly in graduate schools (as in other higher education sectors as well). The higher the level (maximum=doctorate), the lower the female representation. The same holds true for the status of fields. For example, at the doctoral level, engineering is the most male-dominated field (89 percent in the public subsector), whereas home economics is totally female. In general, the gender gap by field of study is sharper at the doctoral than at the master’s level. Furthermore, such gender differences by field persist in both public and private sectors.

Junior Colleges
Compared to four-year universities and graduate schools, two-year junior colleges are much less prestigious. Compared to the two institutional types just considered, private junior colleges have historically facilitated female access to a remarkable extent. This trend continues today. Junior colleges are dominated by private institutions (88 percent, with 91 percent of enrollments), and women constitute 89 percent of total private junior college enrollments. Among the total of 508 junior colleges in 2005, over 20 percent are women’s institutions.

Again, females clearly choose gender-linked disciplines. For example, home economics and education represent almost half of the enrollment choices by women. Thus, junior colleges demonstrate gender stratification in all three dimensions: private-sector concentration, high total female enrollments in a less prestigious sector, and field of study concentration. Yet, it is noteworthy that the total enrollments at junior colleges are drastically decreasing (from 416,825 in 1998, to 267,086 in 2002).

Colleges of Technology
Colleges of technology also play an important role in gender stratification. This type of educational training is responsible for the rapid development of skilled technicians, promoting Japan’s industrialization. In this sector the female presence is minimal. Colleges of technology are dominated by the public subsector and have very low female enrollments (18 percent); total female enrollments have decreased in the past five years, which suggests that these colleges are contributing to a wider gender gap. The fields of study available at colleges of technology are traditionally dominated by males.

Specialized Training Colleges
Specialized training colleges represent a vital subtype, given their sizable enrollments. Rather than academic subjects, they provide programs and curriculum for specific licensure, certifications, and vocational training. Like junior colleges, specialized training colleges are mostly relatively low in status and, like the former, mostly private (91 percent). Though it may at first appear that gender equality exists, as females account for 54 percent of enrollments, stark gender stratification is again revealed in fields of study. According to a 1977 survey, females choose educational and social welfare programs (72 percent) and dressmaking and domestic science (84 percent) over male-dominated fields (e.g., agriculture, industry).
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Diversification has characterized private growth in higher education worldwide. As in many nations where diversification is a policy imperative to facilitate growth, private higher education institutions in Thailand have evolved diversely in their institutional configuration since the sector was legally created in 1969.

Literature suggests that, typically, institutional diversification signifies variation in private higher education by mission, clientele, source of control, size, and resources. Even where public institutions maintain a majority of enrollments, the private ones usually offer alternatives. Indeed, private institutions often find their niche in the specific interests of individuals and groups with somewhat distinctive characteristics from the general public’s. As a typical example, Thai private higher education has become a principal industry producing labor for the job markets. However, while institutional diversification grows, a counterforce is that government policy may promote mimicked growth—distinguished by private sources of funding more than by academic differentiation. Also, apart from imposed policy, these private institutions are motivated by status and market competition to mimic more than to innovate. So, the relative weight of diversification versus copying can be a complex issue. In any event, we know that diversification has been notable and merits our exploration here.

The role of growth in Thai private higher education institutions can be identified and analyzed using Daniel Levy’s 1986 three-part typology—wave I: Catholic universities; wave II: elite universities; and wave III: demand-absorbing institutions.

Additionally, however, it is useful to develop a modified category—hybrids. The hybrids can blend any two of the above—and even have aspects of all three. Based on 2003 information, 54 Thai private higher education institutions are identified and analyzed using the following variables: mission, size, programs offered, faculty qualifications, and socioeconomic clientele.

To begin with, the growth of Thai private higher education institutions follows much that has been seen in other countries and conceptualized in international literature. There are eight religion-oriented institutions—all are Christian, except one that is Islamic. These institutions differ from others in that their prime mission is to provide religious service via the study of theology and philosophy. Several—such as nursing schools—follow the goal of ancient missionaries coming to Thailand to offer Western medical institutions. Most of the religious institutions are governed by priests as top administrators, and several have only priests as faculty members. As Thailand is mostly Buddhist, we see a reflection of an international pattern in which minority religions (or ethnic groups) develop their own institutions.

Private elite universities are rare in Thailand—as is the case in most countries outside the Americas. We can identify up to four such universities (three clearly secular). They constitute providers of advanced professional training for specialized business elite groups. These universities differ from others as they are the oldest among the private institutions and have a longstanding reputation in business-related fields. There is some echo of Latin American and other patterns in which the elite status may not imply broadly based excellence but rather niches. Thailand’s private higher education institutions are distinctive due to their high socioeconomic clientele, faculty qualifications, and academic excellence in their job-market-attuned programs. As to access, even though elite status is often perceived as involving limited access, Thai private elite universities have been consistently large, each encompassing approximately 10 percent of total private enrollments. Whether for Asia or worldwide, 40 percent of the private sector’s enrollments is a large share for the elite subsector.

Following the increasingly global pattern, the bulk of Thai private higher education institutions can be regarded as demand absorbing. Generally, demand-absorbing institutions intend to accommodate an overabundant demand for higher education and are often concerned more with quantity than quality. These institutions have grown enormously in the past decade. All but three hold only a tiny share of total private enrollments, whereas the three account for one-third of the
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Private higher education in Mexico is growing at a notable pace. Data from 2003–2004 show its 646,000 students account for 33.1 percent of national enrollments. The surge of the last decades has lifted the private sector well over the roughly 15 percent of a quarter century ago. However, private growth has not occurred evenly across all types or categories—based on evidence of the types of licensing and accreditation received.

**Demand-Absorbing Institutions**

The greatest growth has appeared in demand-absorbing institutions—which were still fairly limited when Daniel Levy first categorized Mexico’s private sector, in the 1980s. Many of these institutions—popularly labeled as *patito* (little duck), in reference to low quality and other limitations—offer relatively inexpensive undergraduate programs relevant for service sectors (i.e., accounting, marketing, and business) and provide opportunities to lower-income students who have not been accepted at public institutions (because of limited, though expanded, slots). More than 300,000 students currently seek degrees from these institutions.

The proliferation of low-profile institutions is a double-sided issue. It provides modest-background students with a chance to get a credential, join the competitive job market, and climb the socioeconomic ladder. However, these institutions have no reputation for providing high-quality education, which means that students may not be prepared for a desired professional future.

The expansion of the demand-absorbing subsector follows a wider Latin American (and global) tendency, led earlier in the region by Brazil. Meanwhile, data indicate that the private subsector that dominated Mexican private higher education a quarter century ago—elite institutions—are still important. These elite institutions remain especially impressive since they attract accomplished candidates, especially from privileged backgrounds and secondary schools. Some of them have grown in regional breadth and, importantly, in the fields they offer—often adding components of research and graduate education. In contrast, religious higher education seems to be heading in two directions: focusing on middle-income, traditional-values families in large cities (becoming “niche institutions” in a sense) or trying to act like elite, secular universities.

**License and Accreditation**

It is necessary to differentiate between the license to operate as a higher education institution and being accredited as an institution (or having individual programs that are accredited).
Legally, private institutions are required to comply only with the rules stated by the Ministry of Education. Nevertheless, the accreditation issue is becoming more relevant and is perceived as a proof of seriousness and a way to gain legitimacy in the higher education realm and the postsecondary market. Going through an accreditation process is a “plus” many institutions perceive as a good idea but on which not every institution focuses. Investing time and resources in order to get accredited is logical and feasible for elite institutions but may be problematic for many demand absorbers.

The accreditation issue is becoming more relevant and is perceived as a proof of seriousness and a way to gain legitimacy in the higher education realm and the postsecondary market.

In this sense, it is appropriate to take a look at the four basic schemes of accreditation operating in Mexico. The first three involve institution-wide analyses, the fourth academic or professional programs: (a) international accreditation such as the one granted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), which only four (elite, private) institutions in Mexico have; (b) membership in the National Association of Universities and Institutes of Higher Education (ANUIES), as only 22 privates have; (c) membership in the Federación de Instituciones Mexicanas Particulares de Educación Superior (FIMPES)—77 private institutions, some of which are graduate or normal schools only; and (d) having programs accredited by one of the 15 organizations officially recognized as accrediting bodies by the “Consejo para la Acreditación de la Educación Superior”—32 private institutions have at least one accredited program. Although membership in ANUIES or FIMPES is not formally an accreditation, it could be interpreted as rather equivalent to that because institutions interested in joining them have to show strength on a number of issues related to academe, faculty, facilities, etc.

**A Three-Tier Taxonomy**

One way to address the diversity of private institutions in Mexico and help to differentiate between the academically sound institutions and the ones trying to improve or the ones that are not looking for improved status is through a classification based on their accreditation. This approach yields a three-tier taxonomy: (1) high profile (having at least two of the four mentioned accreditations), (2) midprofile (having one of the above-mentioned accreditations), and (3) low profile (institutions without accreditation, having only the license to operate). The first category roughly corresponds to the classically labeled elite subsector and the third is closely related to the demand-absorbing one; a contribution of this taxonomy is the second category, which helps to show institutions with a more mixed standing than an elite vs. demand-absorbing dichotomy would capture.

In the 2002–2003 school year, the 28 high-profile institutions enrolled about 230,000 students (37.0 percent of the private enrollments), the 63 midprofile institutions enrolled about 89,000 students (14.3 percent), and the 643 low-profile institutions enrolled some 302,000 students (48.7 percent).

The data show that contrary to stereotypes many private nonelite institutions are serious about seeking some form of quality and standing. Yet most low-profile institutions, because of lack of interest or budgetary limitations due to their dependency on student fees, are not presently on this road.

This taxonomy builds on the data from the accreditation processes being carried out in Mexico. In this sense the numerical growth of the high and midprofile groups of institutions will depend on the accreditation processes institutions go through. This of course will depend on the initiative of nonelite private institutions and their willingness to improve major aspects of their academic performance. In any event, it is clear that Mexico has notable variations within its private higher education sector, numerically weighted now to the low-profile or demand-absorbers but probably still with ample change in progress. This situation is not restricted to Mexico; to a significant extent, similar statements could be made about much of Latin America.

---
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It is widely held that investing in higher education can bring significant benefits to both individuals and society as a whole. In terms of the global economy, the importance of higher education becomes paramount as knowledge plays an increasingly key role in economic development. Both in the United States and abroad, many studies have articulated the benefits of higher education, showing that an educated workforce increases productivity along with individuals’ ability to sustain employment and earn higher income. Subsequently, the nation sees a return in the form of a higher tax base and a rise in demand for goods and services. In addition, so the argument goes, an educated workforce with a lower unemployment rate diminishes the demand for government-provided social services.

In the report *Financing Education—Investments and Returns*, published by UNESCO in 2002, researchers found that in 16 middle-income countries, human capital investments may have accounted for roughly half a percentage point in the annual growth rates of those countries. Likewise, a number of
papers published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development have consistently shown that increased educational attainment leads to expansion of human capital, which plays a key role in economic development and per capita output growth. These factors lead to a rise in posttax earnings and in employment prospects for individuals.

As illustrated above, discussions about the value of higher education highlight the economic gains of the students and, to a lesser degree, society—often to the exclusion of the other public and private benefits. However, many benefits that accrue to individuals or groups are not directly related to economic, fiscal, or labor market effects. In the United States, several organizations have chosen the public good of higher education as a key theme of their ongoing work, ranging from the National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good to the American Association of Colleges and Universities, among many others. Recently some efforts have been made to articulate all the benefits that result from the investment in higher education, both to individual students and society (see the Institute for Higher Education Policy’s Investment Payoff and the College Board’s Education Pays). Some of the main areas of measurable benefits include enhancement of personal health, community involvement, political participation among the people, and concern for the quality of life for both society and the individual.

**Localized Benefits: The U.S. Example**

Measuring the benefits of higher education involves examining the level at which policy-related decisions are made. In the United States, this means examining benefits on a state-by-state basis as many decisions regarding higher education (and, in particular, state funding for public institutions) are made at that level. Recent efforts to determine the broad national benefits of higher education in the United States calculated the state-by-state benefits using readily available data from the U.S. Census Bureau. Six indicators of higher education benefits were selected for in-depth study—including personal income, employment, decreased reliance on public assistance programs, personal health, volunteerism, and voting rates. (For a more detailed presentation of the methodology, see The Investment Payoff: A 50-State Analysis, published by the Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2005.)

In each of the six indicators, not only did benefits accrue nationally, but the assumption held true at the more localized state levels as well. For example, in March 2004, the national average personal total income of U.S. workers age 25 and older with a bachelor’s degree was $48,417, roughly $23,000 higher than for those with a high school diploma. Similarly, 6 percent of the U.S. population age 25 and older with a high school diploma were unemployed, and 1 percent reported receiving some form of public assistance in the previous year. In comparison, those with a bachelor’s degree reported income that was roughly $23,000 higher, and only 3 percent were unemployed; less than one-half percent of those with a bachelor’s degree reportedly received some form of public assistance in 2003.

At the state level, the financial and economic benefits of holding a bachelor’s degree was clearly evident across all the states. Individuals with a bachelor’s degree reported higher earnings (an additional $12,000 to $32,000 per year) and lower levels of unemployment (a 10 percent to 100 percent decline in unemployment) than individuals with a high school diploma. Overall, in almost every state a greater proportion of those with a high school diploma reported receiving public assistance in the previous year, with the difference ranging from 3.5 percent more to 0.4 percent less (two states showed that a higher proportion of those with a bachelor’s degree reported receiving public assistance, while two states showed no difference between the populations). In addition, in 28 states no one with a bachelor’s degree reported receiving any public assistance. Despite differences among the states, therefore, a consistent pattern emerges: higher salaries, lower unemployment, and a reduced demand for public assistance programs were found among those with a bachelor’s degree.

A similar trend emerges when examining the noneconomic benefits of higher education. Across the United States, 82 percent of individuals with a high school diploma reported being in “excellent, very good, or good” health, compared to 93 percent of those with a bachelor’s degree. At the state level, respondents with a bachelor’s degree still reported higher rates of good health than those who hold a high school diploma, with increases ranging from 5 to 23 percent. Similarly, 21 percent of the U.S. population age 25 and older who had a high school diploma reported ever volunteering, compared to 36 percent of those with a bachelor’s degree or higher. In all states, higher levels of education were correlated to the likelihood that an individual would volunteer and the difference ranged from 3 to 34 percent. Lastly, 56 percent of U.S. citizens age 25 and older who had a high school diploma responded that they had voted in the 2000 presidential election, compared to 76 percent of bachelor’s degree holders. All of the states exhibited voting rates that were substantially lower for residents with a high school diploma as opposed to a bachelor’s degree, with the difference ranging from 8 to 28 percent; nationally, the difference was 20 percentage points.
NEXT STEPS
Higher education provides a broad array of benefits to both individuals and society. While such a statement constitutes a long-held belief in higher education, only recently has the combination of social and economic benefits that accrue from the investment in higher education received sustained attention. In the United States and throughout the world, the simple articulation of all the benefits of higher education at the local level needs to be more prominently featured in local policy debates regarding the investment of resources in higher education. Moreover, additional efforts should be undertaken to develop specific and quantifiable indicators of the value of higher education at this localized level of analysis.

The most striking lessons are therefore threefold: first, the quantifiable benefits of higher education extend beyond labor market and economic impacts and warrant more scrutiny. Second, the benefits of higher education accrue at multiple levels, not just the aggregate national level. Third, and perhaps most important, the benefits of higher education vary at the local level and ought to be included in policy-related discussions. In any country, an expanded understanding of the localized payoffs that result from the public and private expenditures in higher education could go a long way toward improving the prospects for local and sustainable economic development, social stability, and individual prosperity.
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American higher education, long the envy of the world, faces such serious problems—especially with graduation rates—that its position is vulnerable, says a report being released today. The report calls for the creation of new accountability systems in higher education to track problems and progress and to help lawmakers focus necessary attention on weaknesses. At the same time, the report says that many current accountability systems do little good and end up wasting time and money.

“At its best our system of higher education continues to set a standard for excellence and research that remains the envy of the world,” the report says. “But the foundations of our system are too weak to sustain our economy and quality of life.”

The report was issued by the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, a panel of politicians, business leaders, and educators charged with the task by the State Higher Education Executive Officers. Notable members of the panel include Richard W. Riley, the former U.S. education secretary and South Carolina governor; Frank Keating, the former governor of Oklahoma; Stanley O. Ikenberry, former president of the American Council on Education and the University of Illinois; and Carol Liu, chair of the California Assembly Committee on Higher Education.

While the report notes many problems with American higher education, it focuses on issues of graduation rates and related questions of college-going rates and the preparation of students or would-be students for a college education.

In a graphic called “Our Leaky Educational Pipeline,” the report notes that for every 100 9th graders: 68 graduate from high school on time; 40 enroll immediately in college after graduation; 27 are still enrolled for their sophomore year; and 18 graduate from college on time.

Other countries are doing a better job, the report says. Fifteen countries have higher graduation rates from high school than does the United States, where the rate is 73 percent. At the higher education level, countries like China and India are making significant progress in educating thousands of scientists and engineers at a time that many programs at American colleges struggle to find qualified applicants.

Currently, however, many accountability efforts—including state and federal reporting requirements, accreditation, and individual institutions’ studies and research—lack broad support and are ineffective.

The report identifies other key problems: Four of 10 college students fail to graduate within six years. One-fourth of low-income students in the top quartile of academic ability and preparation fail to enroll in college within two years of their graduation from high school. While the percentages of minority and low-income students who enroll in higher education is increasing, a majority of minority students fail to graduate.

Many of these problems could be fixed, the report says, with good accountability systems. Currently, however, many accountability efforts—including state and federal reporting requirements, accreditation, and individual institutions’ studies and research—lack broad support and are ineffective. Accountability fails, the report says, when it does little more than generate “reference-sized books of information,” when professors think of it as “administrative work,” and when it “feels like coercion or bribery.”

Good accountability systems, the report says, require a partnership between colleges and lawmakers “through which shared goals are explicitly established, progress is measured, and work to improve performance is motivated and guided.”

Those goals, in turn, must reflect goals for public policy, not just institutional goals. “Fundamental public priorities recede to the background when institutions compete for status on national rankings based on student selectivity, faculty prestige and similar measures,” the report says.

Good data are also essential for developing good goals and
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measuring them, the report says. And the commission says that many data systems cannot currently answer such key questions as how many students who enter higher education emerge with a degree, how long does it take students to reach different levels of attainment, are student aid resources sufficient to help low-income students enroll and graduate, and are students learning what they need to know.

Some states do a good job creating the right kind of accountability systems, the report says. It praises the “Closing the Gaps” effort in Texas, which aims to increase college-going and graduation rates in that state by 2015. Kentucky is also praised for using five key measures—such as whether more Kentuckians are prepared for higher education, and the extent to which local communities benefit from the state’s colleges—to review the state’s higher education system.

States that set up good accountability systems should then use them to help set priorities and budgets, the report says. But it also warns against inflated expectations about how accountability will change the budget process. “It is wishful thinking to imagine that additional public investment will make it easy to achieve state and national higher education goals. The most important financial resource is not ‘new money,’ but existing investments,” the report says.

Similarly, the report adds: “It is wishful thinking to imagine that productivity gains can make quality higher education substantially less expensive or eliminate the need for additional investment. Educating more people to a higher level is valuable; it will not miraculously become free.”

The report may be ordered from SHEEO’s Web site. This article is reprinted, with permission, from Inside Higher Education. For a free subscription, see http://insidehighered.com/signup.
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For the past several decades, “naming rights” have proliferated in American higher education. While by no means a new phenomenon, the power of names is going to extraordinary lengths. In this, academe is accompanying trends in society in the era of the Fleet Center and Gillette Stadium. Anything to eke an extra dollar out of donors is fair game. Far be it from me to criticize needed efforts to raise funds at a time of fiscal constraints, but things have gotten a bit out of hand.

Universities and colleges have long been named after donors—think of Harvard, Yale, Brown, and many others. By today’s standards, John Harvard would hardly get a bench named after him given the modesty of his gift of books for the library back in the 17th century. At least one institution, Rowan University of New Jersey, changed its name when someone made a large donation—the old title was Glassboro State College. Buildings have traditionally been named after people—distinguished scholars, visionary academic leaders, and recently, big donors.

“Old Main” and Bascom Hall are indicative of a bygone age when place and merit were recognized. Now we have the Gloria and Jake Smith Administration Pavilion and the McGinty Family Chemistry Center. Many schools give donor names to class and seminar rooms. More than one institution of higher education puts names on its chairs—the kind that one sits in rather than endowed professorships. Professorships have long been named for donors of endowments—but some of the donors who have put their names on chairs raise eyebrows—the FedEx chair and many others. No doubt there is an Enron chair still out there somewhere.

A major trend is naming colleges and schools within universities. We have long had the Wharton School, the nationally known business school of the University of Pennsylvania; Boalt Hall, the law school of the University of California at Berkeley; and the JFK School of Government at Harvard. These schools have, over time, achieved an image of their own, separate from the universities at which they are located. They are “name brands.” Now we have the Rossier, Steinhardt, and Warner schools and hundreds of others—these happen to be the education faculties at the University of Southern California, New York University, and the University of Rochester, respectively. These schools are not recognized on their own, and they are unlikely to be in the future. Yet, many at these institutions refer to them as the “Rossier School”—without referring to the function or the home institution. Beyond a block from the campus, few would know anything about it.

Branding and Confusing

Why is all of this happening now? The main motivation for the naming frenzy is, of course, to raise money. Donors love to have their names, or the names of parents or other relatives, on buildings, schools, institutions, professorships, and the like.

Donors love to have their names, or the names of parents or other relatives, on buildings, schools, institutions, professorships, and the like.

Increasingly, corporations and other businesses also like to benefit from having their names on educational facilities. At one time, there were limits on what could be named. Today, there seem to be none at all. If something does not have a name, it is up for grabs—a staircase, a pond, or a parking place.
Separate branding weakens the focus, mission, and perhaps even the broader reputation of the institution as a whole. It confuses the public, and perhaps potential students. The tactic feeds the idea that the 21st century university is simply a confederation of independent entrepreneurial fiefdoms.

Separate branding weakens the focus, mission, and perhaps even the broader reputation of the institution as a whole. It confuses the public, and perhaps potential students. The tactic feeds the idea that the 21st century university is simply a confederation of independent entrepreneurial fiefdoms. Branding also strengthens the professional schools and ignores the core arts and sciences disciplines, where separate identities do not work. And except for a few schools at the very top of the hierarchy, the naming frenzy will not produce schools with separate reputations and drawing power in any case.

The Future
The trends we see now in the United States, and perhaps tomorrow in other countries, will inevitably weaken the concept of the university as an institution that is devoted to the search for truth and the transmission of knowledge, of an institution with almost a millennium of history. The naming frenzy is symbolic of the commercialization, bifurcation, and entrepreneurialism of the contemporary university.

A World-Class Country Without World-Class Higher Education: India’s 21st Century Dilemma

Philip G. Altbach

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

India is rushing headlong toward economic success and modernization, counting on high-tech industries such as information technology and biotechnology to propel the nation to prosperity. India’s recent announcement that it would no longer produce unlicensed inexpensive generic pharmaceuticals bowed to the realities of the World Trade Organization while at the same time challenging the domestic drug industry to compete with the multinational firms. Unfortunately, India’s weak higher education sector constitutes the Achilles’ heel of this strategy. India’s systematic disinvestment in higher education in recent years has yielded an academic system characterized by mediocrity, producing neither world-class research nor very many highly trained scholars, scientists, or managers to sustain high-tech development.

India’s main competitors—especially China but also including Singapore, Taiwan, and South Korea—are investing in large and differentiated higher education systems. They are providing access to large numbers of students at the bottom of the academic system while at the same time building some research-based universities that are able to compete with the world’s best institutions. The recent London Times Higher Education Supplement ranking of the world’s top 200 universities included 3 in China, 3 in Hong Kong, 3 in South Korea, 1 in Taiwan, and 1 (an Indian Institute of Technology at number 41—but the specific campus was not mentioned) in India.

These countries are positioning themselves for leadership in the knowledge-based economies of the coming era. There was a time when countries could achieve economic success with cheap labor and low-tech manufacturing. Low wages still help, but contemporary large-scale development requires a sophisticated and at least partly knowledge-based economy. India has chosen that path, but will find a major stumbling block in its generally poor university system.
Higher Education Realities

India has significant advantages in the 21st century knowledge race. It has a large higher education sector—the third-largest in the world in student numbers, after China and the United States. It uses English as a primary language of higher education and research. It has a long academic tradition. Academic freedom is respected. There are a small number of high-quality institutions, departments, and centers that can form the basis of the quality sector in higher education. The fact that the states, rather than the central government, exercise major responsibility for higher education creates a rather cumbersome structure, but the system allows for a variety of policies and approaches.

The rise in the number of part-time teachers and the freeze on new full-time appointments in many places have contributed to a decline in the commitment and morale of the academic profession.

Yet, the weaknesses far outweigh the strengths. India educates approximately 10 percent of its young people in higher education, still a rather low number by international standards—compared to more than half in the major industrialized countries and 15 percent in China. India’s academic system has an unusually small high-quality sector at the top—most of the academic system is of modest quality at best. Almost all of the world’s academic systems resemble a pyramid, with a small top tier and a massive sector at the bottom. India has a tiny top tier. None of its universities occupy a solid position at the top. A few of the best universities have some excellent departments and centers, and there are a small number of outstanding undergraduate colleges. The University Grants Commission’s recent major support of five universities to build on their recognized strength is a step toward implementing a differentiated academic system—and fostering excellence. At present, the world-class institutions are mainly limited to the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), and perhaps a few others such as the All India Institute of Medical Sciences and the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research. These institutions, combined, enroll well under 1 percent of the student population.

India’s colleges and universities, with just a few exceptions, have become large, underfunded, ungovernable institutions. At many of them, politics has intruded into campus life, influencing academic appointments and decisions at all levels. Underinvestment in libraries, information technology, laboratories, and classrooms makes it very difficult to provide top-quality instruction or engage in cutting-edge research.

The rise in the number of part-time teachers and the freeze on new full-time appointments in many places have contributed to a decline in the commitment and morale of the academic profession. The lack of accountability at any level means that teaching and research performance is seldom measured.

The system provides few incentives to perform to the highest standards. Bureaucratic inertia hampers change. Student unrest and faculty agitation sometimes disrupt normal operations, delays examinations, and foments tensions. Nevertheless, with a semblance of normalcy, faculty administrators are able to provide teaching, coordinate examinations, and award degrees.

Even the small top tier of higher education faces serious problems. Political pressures on the IITs to alter admissions and other policies have jeopardized the generally effective meritocracy that has characterized those institutions. Many IIT graduates, well trained in technology, have chosen not to contribute their skills to the burgeoning technology sector in India. Perhaps half leave the country immediately upon graduation to pursue advanced study abroad—and most do not return. A stunning 86 percent of students in science and technology fields from India who obtain degrees in the United States do not return home immediately following their studies. Another significant group, which some estimates place as high as 30 percent, decide to earn MBAs in India because local salaries are higher—and are lost to science and technology. A corps of dedicated and able teachers work at the IITs and IIMs, but the lure of jobs abroad and in the private sector makes it increasingly difficult to attract the best and brightest to the academic profession.

India has survived with an increasingly mediocre higher education system for decades.

Few in India are thinking creatively about higher education. There is no field of higher education research. Other countries with vibrant academic systems collect data and focus analytic attention on their universities. No independent research or policy centers focusing on higher education exist. Those in government as well as academic leaders seem content to do the “same old thing.” Academic institutions and systems have become large and complex. They need good data, careful analysis, and creative ideas. In China, more than two dozen higher education research centers, and several government agencies are involved in higher education policy.

Why Does This Matter?

India has survived with an increasingly mediocre higher education system for decades. Now, as India strives to compete in a globalized economy in areas that require highly trained professionals, the quality of higher education becomes increasingly important. So far, India’s large educated population base and its reservoir of at least moderately well-trained university graduates have permitted the country to move ahead. But the competition is fierce, with other countries rapidly upgrading their universities and research facilities. China in particular is heavily investing in improving its best universities with the aim of
making a small group of them world class in the coming decade, and making a larger number internationally competitive research universities. Other Asian countries are also upgrading higher education with the aim of building world-class universities. Taiwan, which is a major designer and producer of IT hardware, is considering merging several of its top technological universities to create an “Asian MIT.”

To compete successfully in the knowledge-based economy of the 21st century, India needs enough universities that not only produce bright graduates for export but can also support sophisticated research in a number of scientific and scholarly fields and produce at least some of the knowledge and technology needed for an expanding economy. India’s recent decision to stop producing generic pharmaceuticals to conform with WTO rules underscores the need for the country to have an independent research capacity to develop, manufacture, and market scientific products, including medicines.

Several of the well-endowed and effectively managed private institutions maintain reasonably high standards, although it is not clear that these institutions will be able to sustain themselves in the long run. They can help produce well-qualified graduates in such fields as management, but they cannot form the basis for comprehensive research universities. This sector lacks the resources to build the facilities required for quality instruction and research in the sciences, nor can enough money be earned by providing instruction in the mainstream arts and sciences disciplines. Most of the private institutions do not focus on advanced training in the sciences.

Only public universities have the potential to be truly world-class institutions. Institutions and programs of national prominence have already been identified by the government. But these institutions have not been adequately or consistently supported. The top institutions require sustained funding from public sources. Academic salaries must be high enough to attract excellent scientists and scholars. Fellowships and other grants should be available for bright students. An academic culture that is based on meritocratic norms and competition for advancement and research funds is a necessary component, as is a judicious mix of autonomy to do creative research and accountability to ensure productivity. World-class universities require world-class professors and students—and a culture to sustain and stimulate them.

A clearly differentiated academic system has not been created in India—a system where there are some clearly identified elite institutions that receive significantly greater resources than other universities. One of the main reasons that the University of California at Berkeley is so good is that other California universities receive much less support. India’s elite universities require sustained state support—they require the recognition that they are indeed top institutions and deserve commensurate resources. But they also require effective management and an ethos of an academic meritocracy. Funding institutions that are incapable of managing resources is a wasteful investment. At present, the structures are not in place to permit building and sustaining top-quality programs even if resources are provided.

A combination of specific conditions and resources are needed to create outstanding universities.

- Sustained financial support, with an appropriate mix of accountability and autonomy.
- The development of a clearly differentiated academic system—including private institutions—in which academic institutions have different missions, resources, and purposes.
- Managerial reforms and the introduction of effective administration.
- Truly meritocratic hiring and promotion policies for the academic profession, and similarly rigorous and honest recruitment, selection, and instruction of students.

India cannot build internationally recognized research-oriented universities overnight, but the country has the key elements in place to begin and sustain the process. India will need to create a dozen or more universities that can compete internationally to fully participate in the new world economy. Without these universities, India is destined to remain a scientific backwater.

The Reintroduction of Accreditation in Japan: A Government Initiative

Akiyoshi Yonezawa

Akiyoshi Yonezawa is associate professor at the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE), Japan. Address: NIAD-UE, 1-29-1 Gakuen-Nishi, Kodaira, Tokyo 187-8587, Japan. E-mail: yonezawa@niad.ac.jp. URL: http://svrd2.niad.ac.jp/faculty/yonezawa.

Accreditation is a hot topic all over the world, with the development of the international student market stimulating government intervention on accreditation issues. No exception to this intensifying trend, Japan is now taking measures to
strenthen its accreditation system through strong initiatives on the part of the national government to promote quality assurance in higher education. As of 2004, legislation requires all public and private universities, junior colleges, and colleges of technology to be accredited by an evaluation organization authorized by the national government. In the Japanese case, it appears that the main driving forces for developing an accreditation system have always originated outside the universities.

Post–World War II: The Introduction of Accreditation

Accreditation in Japanese higher education has a long history as a nongovernment endeavor. Under the U.S. occupation (1945-1950), the Japan University Accreditation Association (JUAA) was established in 1947 to provide nongovernment institutional accreditation. After the recovery of national independence, however, the Ministry of Education established governmental “Standards for University Establishment.” As a result, nongovernment accreditation through the JUAA lost substantial influence, having become a “voluntary” process without any sanctions.

In the Japanese case, it appears that the main driving forces for developing an accreditation system have always originated outside the universities.

Until quite recently, neither the government nor higher education institutions made use of the JUAA accreditation system, while a majority of universities supported the JUAA as a symbol of university ownership in quality matters. In the 1990s, debate over university evaluation focused mainly on the assessment of university performance rather than on accreditation or quality assurance. Universities and junior colleges initiated self-evaluation at the strong urging of the ministry. In 2000, the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE), an organization established by the government, launched a national pilot project concerning higher education evaluation. The project, modeled after British quality assessment in education and research, was not yet an accreditation initiative.

A New Governmental Accreditation Initiative

At the turn of the 21st century, the Japanese government began to focus on the need for a renewed accreditation system. This trend was clearly influenced by discussions at the World Trade Organization and the European accreditation movement concerning education services. The first official argument for promoting quality assurance was presented in a University Council report, “Higher Education in the Global Age.” The need for quality assurance and accreditation was discussed in the context of cross-border and professional education, both of which require international recognition of their qualifications. In 2002, the Central Council for Education in the Ministry of Education issued a report, “Construction of a New Quality Assurance System for Universities.” The report referred to trends in European countries regarding accreditation and explained the need for quality assurance in the context of international competition and cross-border provision of education, rather than in terms of domestic requirements for quality improvement.

Japan’s School Education Act was amended in 2002, with the new accreditation scheme starting in 2004. Through these developments, the government authorized several accreditation organizations, and all public and private universities, junior colleges, and colleges of technology were required to undergo the accreditation process every seven years.

As pointed out by Rie Mori of NIAD-UE, the critical difference between the American and new Japanese system of accreditation is found in their respective approaches to voluntarism. While government guidelines for authorizing accreditation organizations were based on the American federal government guidelines for scholarship, the Japanese approach differs notably from the U.S. system because it is based on governmental accreditation organizations. As a governmental organization, NIAD-UE was therefore allowed to serve alongside nongovernmental organizations, such as the JUAA. On the other hand, the U.S. Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) acknowledges that most countries involve national bodies in accreditation; in this sense, Japan followed the prevailing global trend.

Accreditation or Market Pressure

The recent reintroduction of accreditation in terms of quality assurance is an integral part of the Ministry of Education’s strategy.

Academic and Market Pressure

The recent reintroduction of accreditation in terms of quality assurance is an integral part of the Ministry of Education’s strategy. First, the Japanese government is now urging the international community to establish a list of nationally authorized institutions (or other governmental control mechanisms) to protect quality in the world trade of education services. Second, the Ministry of Education is taking steps to conduct regularly scheduled quality assurance to compensate for the deregulation of government authorization for the establishment of higher education institutions.

The strong insistence by the government on its ownership of accreditation in Japan has contributed to confusion regarding the concept. Currently, the only reliable model of accreditation for Japan is the American, nongovernmental one, while the Japanese approach itself corresponds somewhat to newly developing European (and some other Asian) initiatives. A sense of ownership of the accreditation system is hardly shared by the Japanese universities. The universities, especially private ones, argue that the legal requirement of accreditation as it applies to private higher education institutions is a governmental trial to intervene in the autonomy of private universities.
ties. On the other hand, Japanese higher education institutions have never consolidated to protect their ownership of accreditation after it was introduced by the American forces in the mid-20th century.

The new accreditation system of April 2004 has only just begun being implemented; it will take more than six years until all institutions will be included in the present accreditation process. Nevertheless, this new initiative represents a truly critical change in quality assurance policy in Japanese higher education, as until 2004 Japan lacked any national tool to effectively demonstrate the quality of its higher education.

No accreditation system can be expected to adequately address quality assurance in university education without a strong commitment on the part of institutions based on a sense of ownership. As mentioned earlier, Japanese institutions do not yet perceive ownership of accreditation procedures, resulting in their lingering reluctance to be monitored or evaluated. If existing conditions in Japan continue, growing international and local market pressures are likely to have a far greater influence than the accreditation system itself for ensuring and improving the higher education standards.

Will There Be Free Higher Education in Russia?

Anna Smolentseva

Anna Smolentseva is a researcher at the Center for Sociological Studies at Moscow State University. Address: 5/7 B. Nikitskaya Ul, Moscow, 125009, Russia. E-mail: asmolentseva@yahoo.com.

The title of this article represents one of the key issues Russians need to resolve now, in the new stage of education reforms. According to the minister of education and science, education is never free; the only question is who will pay? Clearly, the government would prefer not to pay.

In December 2004, the Russian Ministry of Education and Science announced new priorities for educational development in Russia, which have been approved by the government and are expected to be further developed during 2005. These initiatives will involve significant changes at all levels of the existing education system. In higher education, a number of reforms are planned: a two-tier system (bachelor’s and master’s degrees), a new educational financing model, differentiation of higher education institutions and their legal status, national assessment of educational quality, among other features. These measures are expected to be implemented during the period from 2005 to 2008.

Higher Education Financing

While funding schemes are often not cited as the most important element of reform, in fact they do play a central role. Reformers will link financing with the new two-tier system. Bachelor’s and master’s degrees were introduced in the 1990s, although only about one-tenth of graduates receive these degrees. The rest of the student population is enrolled in traditional five-year programs that lead to a specialist diploma. At present, bachelor’s degree–level education is not perceived as full higher education, although the Russian government intends to make this degree the most standard one in the coming age of mass higher education. A pause between bachelor’s and master’s degrees might be introduced to allow individuals to gain professional experience and refine their educational road maps. Meanwhile, the traditional five-year system will be retained in certain fields.

The financing reforms will involve a shifting of undergraduate funding to a voucher program based on individual government financial obligations (GIFO). Each financial award corresponds to the scores a high school graduate receives on the unified national examinations (EGE): the higher the scores the higher the financial support and, conversely, the lower the scores, the more a student must pay. After analyzing the results of a GIFO initiative at several institutions, most experts judged the program as a virtual failure, since universities face actual costs per student several times over the funding provided in the highest GIFO categories. In social terms, the link between GIFO and test scores limits the higher education access of many vulnerable socioeconomic groups in society with less opportunity for test preparation. (See another article by the author, “Bridging the Gap between Higher and Secondary Education in Russia,” IIE, Spring 2000.) Nevertheless, countrywide implementation of GIFO is being planned.

At the master’s degree level, the government will provide funding for training a limited number of students in only a few specialized fields.

At the master’s degree level, the government will provide funding for training a limited number of students in only a few specialized fields. Other students will be expected to find support through corporate financing—which will be only sporadically available—or will have to pay the full tuition fees with their own (i.e., family) resources. However, even students who manage to obtain a degree at government expense, will not receive a free higher education. According to the ministry, they must either take jobs within their specialized fields for several years or otherwise reimburse the government for its funding.

Nevertheless, the ministry states that a transition toward total financing of higher education is not planned, and the government intends to fund 170 students per 10,000 population. However, the ministry does not explain how these numbers can be described as compatible with the current reforms—if, for example, only a small number of students get high enough scores on the national examinations to be able to earn a bach-
elor’s degree for free. Also not mentioned is the master’s degree level, which will predominantly constitute paid (rather than free) education. In fact, the free higher education sector has been steadily shrinking in recent years; currently, 44 percent of students study for free. The financing reforms may result in an even greater decline or the actual elimination of free higher education.

The reformers assume that the new financing model will be more effective in a market economy and will help form a knowledge-based economy. In fact, however, the model merely demonstrates the gap between the education system and the real economy (i.e., the labor market). While the government recognizes that at present higher education does not meet the needs of the labor market, it looks solely within the education system for what causes the disconnection. Increasing numbers of government officials and educators concur that graduates who take jobs in the wrong fields or who go abroad should reimburse the government for the cost of their education. However, this viewpoint ignores the fact that the majority of graduates could not afford to accept jobs that do not cover the cost of living; and these jobs are those offered by the government. People who work in areas that do not correspond to their diplomas, or who represent “brain drain,” include teachers, engineers, and scholars. While these professionals should work mostly in the public sector, the government has not turned these workplaces into attractive ones. Moreover, these higher education reforms are not focused at all on the necessity of improving educational quality, except formally. The reforms are unsupported by resources, and do not pay attention to issues of academic staff and their remuneration.

**The Differentiation of the System**

The reforms also involve the differentiation of higher education institutions. About 20 institutions will obtain the status of national universities. These universities, which provide high-quality education and research, can expect to receive federal financial support. The destiny of the ordinary universities that comprise the rest of the system is unclear. Perhaps they will receive federal funding for undergraduate education. However, given the new financing model, these institutions will have to seek funding from regional budgets (which are sparse in most regions), try to merge with prominent institutions, or—catastrophically—cease to exist.

Another idea of the reformers that might be implemented is a division of higher education institutions into autonomous state nonprofit organizations and other autonomous establishments. The former will gain state financial support but will be constrained in their for-profit activity; the latter will not receive public money and must raise funds independently. The current reforms offer the same organizational changes for the scientific research and development and health care sectors. While the ministry claims all the proposed measures will help to overcome “pseudoeducation,” they may also work toward losing some important sectors of higher education.

**Conclusion**

Over recent years, changes within the education system, as well as in other spheres, are increasingly driven by factors linked to the economy and to government bureaucracy. The education community commands few ways of influencing reforms or even of participating in policy discussions. At the same time, the government is gradually distancing itself from education in terms of providing support, while not creating the social, economic, and political conditions for filling that niche. Besides, the Russian economy is a great distance from being a knowledge-based economy, and it is impossible to envision the real steps the government might take in the future to move the country in that direction.
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A New international publisher in higher education: SensePublishers

*SensePublishers* is a new international academic publishing house with headquarters in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. It publishes books in the field of educational research—including monographs, edited volumes, and reference works.

*SensePublishers* has a new vision of academic publishing:
- The prices are low—so that, in addition to libraries and individual scholars, students will be able to purchase our books
- The books are freely accessible on *SensePublishers*’ website, in pdf format
- The copyright policy is flexible
- The books will be made available at a special rate in developing countries

*SensePublishers* will carry out its policy by using innovative printing-on-demand technology and web-based marketing, as well as by minimizing overhead costs and not aiming for excessive profits.

*SensePublishers* has launched six new book series, one of which is called Global Perspectives on Higher Education, edited by Philip G. Altbach, from the Center for International Higher Education, at Boston College. More information can be found at www.sensepublishers.com, where you can also register for alert messages and to receive regular updates on new publications as well as special discounts.

International Higher Education Clearinghouse: A CIHE Initiative

In February, the Center for International Higher Education announced an initiative, made possible through a grant from the Ford Foundation. This project will involve the task of compiling resources and research related to a range of issues in international higher education.

The International Higher Education Clearinghouse will be developed in conjunction with several other organizations. The American Council of Education, the Association of International Educators: NAFSA, and the Institute for International Education will be the CIHE’s primary partners. Other organizations that have expressed interest in supporting this new project include: The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the Council of Graduate Schools, the Graduate Management Admissions Council, AMIDEAST, and LASPAU: Academic and Professional Programs for the Americas. The Center hopes to involve additional international organizations with compatible objectives and activities.

The principal activity of the Clearinghouse will be to create a website that will provide researchers and practitioners with the perfect starting point for locating available resources—web-based “one-stop shopping.” The website will be a source of bibliographies, a venue for links to websites throughout the world, and a means to identify the location of databases with relevant data.

The project will track efforts underway by connecting organizations to ensure greater awareness of current activities, avoid duplication of efforts, and improve the dissemination of new data.

The research component of the project will collect, evaluate, support, and encourage research on a variety of topics—particularly policy issues and worldwide trends in international education; the mobility of students, professors, and curricula; the growing participation of the private sector in higher education; the inclusion of higher education in the General Agreement of Trade in Services (GATS); and accreditation and quality assessment. The project will also collect and disseminate information on research methodologies, researchers (by field of interest), and available bibliographies. In addition, the project intends to provide professionals and graduate students with information about career opportunities in international education.

The director of the Clearinghouse is Liz Reisberg, a research associate at the CIHE. Ms. Reisberg has extensive experience in international education as a researcher and practitioner. She has worked primarily in the area of international admissions and researched a number of issues related to the mobility of students pursuing academic and professional degrees outside their home country. For more information about this project, contact Ms. Reisberg at: reisberg@bc.edu.
NEWS OF THE CENTER

In collaboration with the Center for University Studies at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (CESU) and the Center for Higher Education at the University of Arizona, the CIHE cosponsored a seminar on the theme of “academic capitalism and globalization” in Mexico City on April 21 and 22. Philip Altbach spoke, as did CESU director Axel Didriksson and University of Arizona professors Gary Rhoades and Alma Maldonado. Dr. Maldonado is a former CIHE staff member. This seminar represented part of a continuing link with CESU.

The Fulbright-sponsored New Century Scholars program will begin in summer 2005. The thirty scholars, soon to be selected by the Fulbright Program, will come together for a conference at Boston College in late September. Collaborative research work will begin following that meeting. CIHE director Philip Altbach is the distinguished scholar leader of the New Century Scholars higher education initiative.

The Center’s “Flagship University and Development” project on research universities in developing and middle-income countries starts with a conference at Boston College in late June. Researchers from China, India, Korea, Japan, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, and Brazil will participate in this project. A book concentrating on the challenges facing research universities will result from this collaborative research project. The effort is codirected by Philip Altbach and Dr. Jorge Balan of the Ford Foundation.

A major new CIHE initiative has just begun: the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC), directed by Liz Reisberg. In collaboration with the American Council on Education, NAFSA, and the Institute of International Education, the Clearinghouse will collect and disseminate information on a range of key themes in international higher education.

The Corruption Monitor project, coordinated by Natia Janashia, has recently been posted on the CIHE website. We plan to update it continually so that readers can keep abreast of developments in this area.

Prof. Adnan El-Amine from the Lebanese University in Beirut, Lebanon was a senior Fulbright scholar at the CIHE during the spring semester, with a focus on issues relating to accreditation and evaluation. Several CIHE staff members are graduating this semester. Roberta M. Bassett, a CIHE graduate assistant, has completed her doctoral dissertation on GATS and the U.S. policy community. Robin M. Helms, currently on the Institute of International Education staff in Washington, DC, has completed her dissertation on foreign-language faculty at American universities. CIHE graduate assistant Laura Rumbley is currently in Spain collecting data for her dissertation on the internationalization of Spanish higher education.

Work is being completed on a two-volume International Handbook on Higher Education, coedited by James J.F. Forest and Philip G. Altbach. This reference book will be published by Springer in 2006. Dr. Forest, an alumnus of CIHE, is currently on the faculty of the United States Military Academy. Philip G. Altbach and Daniel C. Levy of SUNY-Albany are compiling an edited book on private higher education that will feature some of the best articles published in International Higher Education in recent years. American Higher Education in the 21st Century: Social, Political, and Economic Trends, edited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumport, has been published in a revised and updated 2nd edition by the Johns Hopkins University Press. This book is now the most widely used text in the field of higher education in the United States. The cost of the paperback edition is $28. It is available from the publisher at 2712 N. Charles St., Baltimore MD 21218, USA (e-mail: www.press.jhu.edu).

The Center has teamed up with SensePublishers in the Netherlands to publish all of the CIHE books. Our traditional practice of publishing our own editions for free distribution in developing countries will continue, and SensePublishers will publish all of the CIHE books in commercial paperback editions. In addition, this book series, Global Perspectives on Higher Education, will publish other volumes concerning international higher education issues.

New Publications


Andres, Lesley and Fiona Finlay, eds. Student Affairs: Experiencing Higher Education. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press, 2004. 170 pp. CA$29.95 (pb). ISBN 0-7748-1115-3. From a Canadian perspective, this book focuses on such issues as the financial and personal costs of studying, students’ interpretation of their experiences, ways for academic institutions to improve student life, and among others. The main purpose of the book is to suggest ways to improve student experience. Discussion ranges from community colleges to graduate schools.

The governance of nonprofit agencies, including universities, is an especially important theme in the United States, where almost all institutions of higher education have boards of trustees—as do many other nonprofit agencies, such as museums and foundations. This book focuses on the governance of nonprofit agencies and particularly the role of trustees. The authors argue that trustees are institutional leaders, responsible not only for the financial health of institutions but also for their direction and advancement. While dealing with the United States, this book will be relevant to other countries with nonprofit nongovernmental agencies.


This volume contains 21 monographs, with a primary (though not exclusive) focus on the Chilean experiences of evaluation, accreditation, and related quality assurance activities. A list of higher education theses and dissertations produced by graduates of Chilean universities in the period 2001–2003, as well as a list of books published by Chilean universities press in 2004, round out the volume.


A comprehensive analysis of the changing academic workplace in Europe, this book features case studies that examine trends in academic salaries, terms of appointment, the relationship of higher education reforms and the academic profession, autonomy and accountability, and other themes. Among the countries analyzed are Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, France, Poland, Norway, and Latvia.


An inquiry into the attitudes and activities of more than 700 American colleges and university presidents, this book discusses how academic leaders have adjusted to the new entrepreneurialism in higher education. The researchers believe that the most effective presidents will have entrepreneurial skills. The results of the survey are reported along with brief discussions of presidents considered to be exercising entrepreneurial leadership.


This volume analyzes how students make choices about attending college and university in the United States. The authors, all economists, focus on such issues as the impact of tax credits on higher education expenses, the role of financial aid and persistence in college, student aid packages and college choice, resident and nonresident tuition at public universities, and others.


A guide to the intricacies of the academic deanship in American higher education, this book discusses the characteristics of a successful dean and then analyzes the various aspects of the position. These include working with faculty members, student relations, external relations and fund raising, research, and some other topics. The goal of this book is to provide new deans with a sense of the academic enterprise. While focusing on the United States, many of the elements will be broadly relevant.


Composed of 16 essays, this book explores various historical and contemporary aspects of higher education in Argentina, with special attention paid to the effects of the country’s political and social realities on the university sector. Part one of the volume provides a series of historical reflections on the university experience in Argentina. Part two examines a variety of public policy issues of current concern, including quality assessment, institutional reform and privatization, research incentives, and articulation between higher education and employment, among others.


A comparative analysis of the problems for higher education of change, innovation, and reform represents the main focus of this book. In five relatively short sections, the author introduces the concept of comparative higher education, provides an overview of the more general field of higher education studies, explores key examples of analytical frameworks for understanding higher education, reviews contemporary developments in higher education in the industrialized world, and zeroes in on an analysis of important developments in the Latin American and Argentine higher education contexts.


Schools of education have traditionally been held in low esteem by the rest of the university. Labaree, an education professor at Stanford University, discusses why this situation persists and what impact it has on education faculties. He considers the problems of educating teachers in a university context, issues related to educational research, and other themes.

An overview of issues relating to quality assurance and cross-border degree recognition in the OECD countries, this book includes research-based essays on the United States, Canada, Europe, Australia, Japan, and non-OECD countries. There are also discussions of trade agreements (mainly GATS) and degree recognition and an overview of key topics.


This book is based on an in-depth study of how Austria developed a vocational postsecondary sector modeled on the British experience of the Council for National Academic Awards and the polytechnics. The chapters analyze the political and academic motivations in Austria and how this unusual model was selected and implemented.


A study of an aspect of McCarthyism in the United States during the 1950s, this book explores how the FBI and the various U.S. government agencies investigated, intimidated, and spied on anthropologists during this period. The anti-Communist investigations of the 1950s, which were part of the Cold War hysteria that was evident during that period, have been seen as one of the bleakest periods for academic freedom.


This book examines several recent academic “scandals” in the United States. The author argues that the media have devoted unprecedented attention to them, reshaping the academic debate. The cases discussed involve plagiarism, misrepresentation, and other issues—many of which have made headlines in the American press.


Accreditation and evaluation of academic institutions are a new phenomenon in Europe. These ideas are linked with quality assurance and the improvement of teaching and research. This volume provides case studies of how various European countries are grappling with these challenges. Included are studies of emerging accrediting arrangements in Finland, the Czech Republic, Austria, the Netherlands, and elsewhere. Case studies of quality assurance arrangements are also included.


This volume seeks to analyze how Russian universities have adapted to increasing marketization of funding and academic decision making. A broad overview of Russian higher education is provided, and case studies of specific universities show how Russian academics have responded to entrepreneurial pressures.


Focusing on the United States, this volume examines a range of topics relating to public higher education funding in a changing environment. Among the themes discussed are the relationship between enrollments and incentive funding patterns, structural constraints and public funding, merit scholarship programs funded by the states, federal student aid, and others.


Appropriately preparing American high school students for higher education is essential for providing access to as wide a section of the population as possible. This volume focuses on experience with and strategies for preparing students for higher education. Among the key elements to ensure postsecondary study are access to a college preparatory curriculum in high school, access to counselors to provide information, and the engagement of families. Chapters analyze such issues as mentoring, curricular activity, and the costs and benefits of college preparatory activities.


Based on a conference on higher education held in Georgia in 2002, this volume includes studies of private higher education developments in Bangladesh, the Russian Federation, Kenya, Georgia, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan.


With a critical perspective on higher education worldwide, this volume focuses mainly on the United Kingdom. The contributors oppose the “new managerialism” and other elements of the neoliberal revolution concerning higher education in recent years and are critical of globalization. The authors
seek to provide alternative ways of thinking about a future for higher education that stresses democratic values, cooperation, and similar themes.


This book is a critique, by a journalist, of the links between corporations and higher education in the United States. The main focus is on corporate involvement in research in the sciences, but attention is also paid to corporate involvement in the social sciences and humanities. The author argues that corporate funding and control are destroying the university’s role as a provider of knowledge to the public and its responsibility as a critic for society. This well-documented book is one of several recent critiques of the commercialization of higher education.


In the competitive world of business programs in American universities, innovation and “market niche” are increasingly important. This book discusses innovation in business education in a general framework and then provides case studies of 12 MBA programs that are considered innovative. The authors of the case studies are generally at the schools they are discussing.
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