

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 50 WINTER 2007

The 50th Issue of *International Higher Education*

- 2 A Dozen Years of Service to Higher Education
Philip G. Altbach
- 2 Globalization and Forces for Change in Higher Education
Philip G. Altbach
- 4 The Growing Accountability Agenda: Progress or Mixed Blessing?
Jamil Salmi
- 6 Internationalization: A Decade of Changes and Challenges
Jane Knight
- 7 Private Higher Education: Patterns and Trends
Daniel C. Levy
- 9 Graduate Education in Latin America: The Coming of Age
Jorge Balán
- 11 International Research Collaboration
Sachi Hatakenaka

The United States: Global Issues

- 13 International Student Mobility and the United States: The 2007 *Open Doors* Survey
Patricia Chow and Rachel Marcus
- 15 The Management and Funding of US Study Abroad
Brian Whalen
- 16 US Accreditation: International and National Dialogue
Judith S. Eaton

Financing

- 18 The Private Financing of Higher Education
Ryan Hahn
- 20 Higher Education Finance in Ghana
Francis Atuahene

European Developments

- 21 Higher Education under a Labour Government
Michael Shattock
- 23 European Students in the Bologna Process
Manja Klemencic

Countries and Regions

- 25 Corruption in Vietnamese Higher Education
Dennis C. McCornac

Departments

- 26 New Publications
- 27 News of the Center

A Dozen Years of Service to Higher Education

This is the 50th issue of *International Higher Education*. Our first issue appeared in the spring of 1995, almost 13 years ago. Our commitment then, as now, is to provide thoughtful analysis of contemporary events in higher education worldwide and information on current developments, especially in countries that do not receive much attention. We have a special concern with the broad issues of globalization and internationalization. Because of our sponsorship by a Jesuit university, we have been interested in issues relating to Catholic and Jesuit education worldwide. Ours has been an effort at network building and information provision.

We have focused attention on themes and countries sometimes neglected in discussions of higher education. *IHE* has from the beginning had a special interest in developing countries—especially on how the developing world can cope with international trends largely determined by the major academic powers. Among the topics we have emphasized over the years have been private higher education (our collaboration with the Program of Research on Private Higher Education-PROPHE at the University at Albany has been especially important), corruption issues, internationalization and globalization, and others. A combination of independent and often critical analysis, focus on central issues for higher education worldwide, and short but incisive articles has proved to be a successful strategy.

IHE is aggressively noncommercial. We do not charge for a subscription. We are always happy to provide permission, without any fee, to publications interested in reprinting our articles. Our Web site is available without charge and is linked with many other Web sites focusing on higher education. We accept no advertising in any of our publications or on our Web site. We have been able to do this work because of support from the Ford Foundation and from Boston College.

International Higher Education is by now recognized as a source of information and analysis worldwide. We mail to readers in 154 countries. *IHE* is available on our Web site and is widely used. We have been careful to archive all of the back issues and have indexed them so that researchers and others can have easy access. *IHE* articles are widely cited in the literature and are often reprinted by journals in many parts of the world. We currently work with publications in Mexico, the United Kingdom, the United States, and China that regularly reprint our articles. *IHE* is translated into Arabic, thanks to Google, and we are working on starting a Chinese-language edition in collaboration with the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Institute of Higher Education.

We have asked colleagues who have been associated with *International Higher Education* to reflect on some key trends in

higher education in an international perspective over the past decade of our publication. Several of these articles follow. Additional contributions will be published in the coming issues. We look forward to our 100th issue!

Philip G. Altbach, Editor

Globalization and Forces for Change in Higher Education

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

What is globalization and how does it affect higher education policy and academic institutions? The answer is deceptively simple and the implications are surprisingly complex. For higher education, globalization implies the broad social, economic, and technological forces that shape the realities of the 21st century. These elements include advanced information technology, new ways of thinking about financing higher education and a concomitant acceptance of market forces and commercialization, unprecedented mobility for students and professors, the global spread of common ideas about science and scholarship, the role of English as the main international language of science, and other developments. Significantly, the idea of mass access to higher education has meant unprecedented expansion of higher education everywhere—there are about 134 million students in postsecondary education worldwide, and many countries have seen unprecedented and sustained expansion in the past several decades. These global trends are for the most part inevitable. Nations, and academic institutions, must constructively cope with the implications.

Contemporary inequalities may in fact be intensified by globalization. Academic systems and institutions that at one time could grow within national boundaries now find themselves competing internationally. National languages compete with English even within national borders. Domestic academic journals, for example, often compete with international publications within national academic systems, and scholars are pressured to publish internationally. Developing countries are at a significant disadvantage in the new globalized academic system, but smaller academic systems in rich countries also face problems. In a ranking-obsessed world, the top universities are located predominantly in the United States, the United Kingdom, and a few other rich countries. The inequalities of the global age are just as profound and in part more complex than the realities of the era of colonialism.

Academic systems will need to cope with the key realities of

the first part of the 21st century for higher education.

MASSIFICATION

Massification is without question the most ubiquitous global influence of the past half century or more. The United States had the first mass higher education system, beginning as early as the 1920s. Europe followed in the 1960s, and parts of Asia a decade or so later. The developing countries were the last to expand. Most of the growth of the 21st century is taking place in developing and middle-income countries. There are now more than 140 million students in postsecondary education worldwide, and this number continues to expand rapidly. North America, Europe, and a number of Pacific Rim nations now enroll 60 percent or more of the relevant age group in higher education. What has massification brought?

Massification is without question the most ubiquitous global influence of the past half century or more.

Public good vs. private good. Stimulated in part by the financial pressures of massification and also by broader changes in economic thinking, including the neoliberal agenda, higher education is increasingly considered in economic terms a private good—a benefit accruing mainly to individuals who should pay for it rather than a public good that contributes benefits to society and thus should be financially supported by the state.

Access. Postsecondary education has opened its doors to previously excluded population groups—women; people from lower socioeconomic classes; previously disadvantaged racial, religious, and ethnic groups; and other populations. While many countries still contain disparities in enrollment, massification has clearly meant access and thus upward mobility and increased earning potential. Access also greatly expanded the skills of populations, making economic expansion possible.

Differentiation. All mass higher education systems are differentiated systems. Institutions serve varied missions, with differing funding sources and patterns and a range of quality. Successful academic systems must ensure that the various segments of the system are supported and sustained. While research universities need special attention, mass-access institutions do as well.

Varied funding patterns. For most countries, the state has traditionally been the main funder of higher education. Massification has placed great strains on state funding, and in all cases governments no longer believe they can adequately fund mass higher education. Other sources of funding need to be found—including student tuition and fees (typically the largest source), a variety of government-sponsored and private loan programs, university income generating programs (such as industry collaboration or consulting), and philanthropic

support.

Decline in quality and conditions of study. On average in most countries, the quality of higher education has declined. In a mass system, top quality cannot be provided to all students. It is not affordable, and the ability levels of both students and professors necessarily become more diverse. University study and teaching are no longer a preserve for the elite—both in terms of ability and wealth. While the top of a diversified academic system may maintain its quality (although in some countries the top sector has also suffered), the system as a whole declines.

PEAKS AND VALLEYS IN GLOBAL SCIENCE AND SCHOLARSHIP

A variety of forces have combined to make science and scholarship global. Two key elements are responsible. The growth of information technology (IT) has created a virtual global community of scholarship and science. The increasing dominance of English as the key language of communicating academic knowledge is enhanced by IT. Global science provides everyone immediate access to the latest knowledge. Thus, everyone must compete on the same playing field to participate in research and discovery. It is as if some teams (the wealthiest universities) have the best training and equipment, while the majority of players (universities in developing countries and smaller institutions everywhere) are far behind. There is increased pressure to participate in the international big leagues of science—such as publishing in recognized journals in English. Thus, while IT makes communication easier it tends to concentrate power in the hands of the “haves” to the disadvantage of the “have nots.” National or even regional academic communities, located in the valleys of higher education, are overshadowed by the peaks of the global academic powers that dominate the new knowledge networks.

The increasing dominance of English as the key language of communicating academic knowledge is enhanced by IT.

GLOBALIZATION OF THE ACADEMIC MARKETPLACE

More than 2 million students are studying abroad, and it is estimated that this number will increase to 8 million by 2025.

Many others are enrolled in branch campuses and twinning programs. There are many thousands of visiting scholars and postdocs studying internationally. Most significantly, there is a global circulation of academics. Ease of transportation, IT, the use of English, and the globalization of the curriculum have tremendously increased the international circulation of academic talent. Flows of students and scholars move largely from South to North—from the developing countries to North America and Europe. And while the “brain drain” of the past has become more of a “brain exchange,” with flows of both

people and knowledge back and forth across borders and among societies, the great advantage still accrues to the traditional academic centers at the expense of the peripheries. Even China, and to some extent India, with both large and increasingly sophisticated academic systems, find themselves at a significant disadvantage in the global academic marketplace. For much of Africa, the traditional brain drain remains largely a reality.

CONCLUSION

Thomas Friedman's "flat world" is a reality for the rich countries and universities. The rest of the world still finds itself in a traditional world of centers and peripheries, of peaks and valleys and involved in an increasingly difficult struggle to catch up and compete with those who have the greatest academic power. In some ways, globalization works against the desire to create a worldwide academic community based on cooperation and a shared vision of academic development. **The globalization of science and scholarship, ease of communication, and the circulation of the best academic talent worldwide have not led to equality in higher education.** Indeed, both within national academic systems and globally, inequalities are greater than ever. ■

The Growing Accountability Agenda: Progress or Mixed Blessing?

JAMIL SALMI

Jamil Salmi is the tertiary education coordinator of the World Bank, Washington, DC, USA. E-mail: jsalmi@worldbank.org.

Compared to the well-established tradition of accreditation in the United States, **public universities in many countries have typically operated in a very autonomous manner.** In the francophone countries of Africa, for example, institutions enjoy full independence in the selection (election) of their leaders and complete management autonomy. They do not have to answer for their inefficient performance. In several Latin American countries, the constitution entitles public universities to a fixed percentage of the annual budget that they are free to use without accountability. Some countries do not even have a government ministry or agency responsible for steering or supervising the tertiary education sector.

In the past decade, however, accountability has become a major concern in most parts of the world. Governments, parliaments, and society at large are increasingly asking **universi-**

ties to justify the use of public resources and account more thoroughly for their teaching and research results. This undertaking may include many forms: **legal requirements such as licensing, accreditation, assessment tests to measure what students have learned; professional examinations; performance-based budget allocation; and governing boards with external participants.** Sometimes the press itself enters the accountability arena with its controversial league tables.

THE ACCOUNTABILITY AGENDA

Nobody can argue that universities should not be accountable. **First, governments are responsible for establishing a regulatory framework to prevent fraudulent practices.** Accusations of

Governments, parliaments, and society at large are increasingly asking universities to justify the use of public resources and account more thoroughly for their teaching and research results.

flawed medical research in the United Kingdom, reports of Australian universities cutting corners to attract foreign students, and the student loan scandal in the United States show the need for vigilance, even in countries with strong accountability mechanisms. **Second, universities should legitimately be held accountable for their use of public money and the quality of their outputs** (graduates, research, and regional engagement). The evolution toward increased accountability is reflected in the expansion in the number of stakeholders, themes under scrutiny, and channels of accountability.

The teaching staff has traditionally been the most powerful group in universities, especially where the head of the institution is democratically elected. Even at Harvard, the demise of President Summers in 2006 was largely due to the opposition of some professors. **But today university leaders must at the same time meet the competing demands of several groups of stakeholders: (a) society at large; (b) government, which can be national, provincial, or municipal; (c) employers; (d) the teaching staff; and (e) the students themselves.** Even within government structures, demands for accountability are coming from new actors—as has happened in Denmark, where responsibility for the universities' sector is now with the Ministry of Technology.

The pressure for compliance comes through an increasingly broad variety of instruments. Government controls take the form of compulsory requirements, such as accreditation, performance indicators, and mandatory financial audits. They can also operate indirectly through financial incentives such as performance-based budget allocation. In countries with a student loan system, these loans are usually available only for studies in bona fide institutions. Innovative funding approaches—such as the voucher systems recently established in the state of Colorado and in several former Soviet Union republics

or the contracting of places in private universities piloted in Brazil and Colombia—put the decision making on where to study in the hands of the students themselves. Establishing university boards with outside members who have the power to hire (and fire) the leader of the institution, as has recently happened in Denmark, is another accountability channel. In many countries, accreditation reports are made available to the public, unlike the practice in the United States.

PUBLIC OPINION

Colombia was the first country in Latin America to set up a national accreditation system, but the number of programs reviewed by the new accreditation agency remained relatively low because accreditation was voluntary and the most prestigious universities did not feel any compulsion to participate. But after the country's main newspaper started to publish the full list of accredited programs, many more universities joined the accreditation process out of fear of being shunned by the students. In the same vein, the Intel Corporation announced in August 2007 that due to quality concerns it was removing more than 100 US universities and colleges from the list of eligible institutions where its employees could study, for retraining, at the firm's expense.

In recent years, grievances about excessive accountability requirements and their negative consequences have come from many quarters.

The power of public opinion has been revealed in the growing influence of rankings. Initially limited to the United States, university rankings and league tables have proliferated in recent years, in more than 35 countries. Notwithstanding the methodological limitations of these rankings, the mass media have played a useful educational role by making relevant information available to the public, especially in countries lacking any form of quality assurance. In Japan, for instance, for many years the annual ranking published by the *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper fulfilled an essential quality-assurance function in the absence of an accreditation agency.

THE ACCOUNTABILITY CRISIS

In recent years, grievances about excessive accountability requirements and their negative consequences have come from many quarters. In the United Kingdom and Australia, for example, universities have complained of performance-indicator overload. In the United States, a controversy arose recently around the recommendations of the US Department of Education Spellings Commission on the Future of Higher Education regarding the need to measure learning outcomes. This reaction illustrates the weariness of the tertiary education community vis-à-vis accountability demands beyond accreditation. Another common complaint concerns the tyranny of the rankings published by the press.

In developing and transition countries, university leaders may accuse government of mixing accountability with excessive control. Comparing recent trends in two former Soviet Union republics, Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan, helps to illustrate practices that may stifle the tertiary education sector. In 2001, Kazakhstan introduced a voucher-like allocation system to distribute public resources for tertiary education. About 20 percent of the students receive education grants to study at the public or private institution of their choice. To be eligible, institutions must have received a positive evaluation from the quality-assurance unit of the Ministry of Education. As a result, all tertiary education institutions have become more mindful of their reputation as it determines their ability to attract education grant beneficiaries. In Azerbaijan, by contrast, the Ministry of Education controls student intake and program openings, even at private universities. Thus, for the more dynamic tertiary education institutions it becomes extremely difficult to innovate and expand.

Even in the absence of unethical behaviors, institutions may succumb to the natural temptation to pay more attention to those factors that receive prominence in rankings. In the United States and Canada there have been rumors of universities and colleges “doctoring” their statistics to improve their standing in the rankings.

Accountability often involves the need to reconcile multiple objectives, some of which are incompatible. For example, the pursuit of equity may be defeated by high admissions requirements—especially in countries like Brazil, with socially segregated secondary schools. While the proportion of low-income families is 57 percent in the state of São Paulo, it is only 10 percent at the University of Campinas (UNICAMP), one of the country's top universities.

On the positive side, however, many university leaders seek to make their institutions more accountable on a voluntary basis. In the United States, for example, the same presidents who decided in 2007 to boycott the *US News and World Report* rankings announced that they would start publishing key performance indicators in the context of a Voluntary System of Accountability Program. In Belgium, the Flemish universities have voluntarily joined the German ranking exercise for benchmarking purposes. In France, ironically, when the government in July 2007 offered increased autonomy against more accountability on a voluntary basis, there was a unanimous outcry. The scope of proposed autonomy was then reduced but imposed on all universities.

THE WAY FORWARD

The universal push for increased accountability has made the role of university leaders much more demanding. This irreversible evolution toward greater accountability has transformed the competencies expected of university leaders and the ensuing capacity-building needs of university management teams.

Accountability is meaningful only to the extent that tertiary education institutions are actually empowered to operate in an autonomous and responsible way. In the final analysis, their successful evolution will hinge on finding an appropriate balance between credible accountability practices and favorable autonomy conditions.

Author's note: The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this article are entirely those of the author and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank, the members of its Board of Executive Directors, or the countries they represent. ■

Internationalization: A Decade of Changes and Challenges

JANE KNIGHT

Jane Knight is adjunct professor in the Comparative, International Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: janeknight@sympatico.ca.

As we progress into the 21st century, the international dimension is a key factor shaping and challenging the higher education sector in countries all over the world. During the last decade internationalization has increased in importance, impact, and complexity. It is a formidable force of change in its role as agent and reactor to the realities of globalization. But are all these changes positive?

NEW ACTORS

For several decades international academic relations have generally been under the purview of ministries of education, culture, and foreign affairs. Since the mid-1990s, ministries of immigration, trade, employment, industry, and especially science and technology have focused on the international recruitment of students and professors; the global competitiveness for the production and commodification of knowledge; and the commercial and economic benefits of cross-border education.

Not only have additional national government agencies become more engaged, so have intergovernmental bodies such as UNESCO, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the World Bank, as well as international and regional nongovernmental agencies. In fact, international education is now seen by both politicians and academic leaders as instrumental to regionalization initiatives such as those underway in Europe through the Bologna process, in Africa through the African Union higher education harmonization project, and the efforts in Latin America to work

toward a community of higher education. The role of higher education as an international or regional political actor has clearly gained ground in the last decade.

INCREASED DEMAND AND A DIVERSITY OF PROVIDERS

The forecasted growth for international education moves from 1.8 million in 2000 to about 7 million in 2025. This has major implications for the number and type of institutions, companies, organizations, and networks involved in the cross-border provision of higher education. Traditional public and private universities, primarily in Europe, North America, and Asia, are more and more active in sending and receiving education programs through a variety of delivery modes including franchising, branch campuses, twinning, and distance. At the same time, alternative or nontraditional providers are seeking business opportunities based on the rising demand for higher education and the attractiveness of foreign degrees for employment mobility. As a result, more than 50 large transnational companies are publicly traded on stock exchanges and are active in providing international educational programs, degrees, and services on a for-profit basis. In addition, multitudes of small private companies are now involved in cross-border education. Many offer quality education programs and recognized qualifications, but others are rogue, temporary, and unaccredited profit makers. The “for-profit” side of internationalization is increasing in many countries of the world, but certainly not all.

The recent inclusion of education services in the General Agreement for Trade in Services has been a wake-up call for higher education. As already noted, the export and import of higher education programs have been steadily growing, and so it should be no surprise that the World Trade Organization sees the education sector as a lucrative market. But what is unexpected, and of concern to many, is that the movement of private higher education services and programs between coun-

International education is now seen by both politicians and academic leaders as instrumental to regionalization initiatives such as those underway in Europe through the Bologna process.

tries is now subject to multilateral trade regulations where before it was done primarily on a bilateral basis, usually between government departments related to education and foreign affairs—certainly not trade. This raises new implications, questions, and challenges for higher education.

QUALITY

A worrisome trend is the treatment of quality assurance and accreditation as strategies for “international branding” and market position rather than for academic improvement pur-

poses. The international ranking “game” is another illustration of a preoccupation with international standings based on questionable and biased indicators. To what end does this competitiveness for international status serve? Is it to improve higher education's contribution to solving some of the global challenges? Or is it a sign of the market approach, where often position is more important than substance? Internationalization can be used as a strategy to enhance the international, global, and intercultural dimensions of teaching and learning, research and knowledge production, and service to society. It also has the potential to improve quality, but a preoccupation with status plus the emergence of rogue providers, diploma, and accreditation mills are overshadowing and jeopardizing the added value that internationalization can bring to higher education.

More than 50 large transnational companies are publicly traded on stock exchanges and are active in providing international educational programs, degrees, and services on a for-profit basis.

INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES

More institutions around the world are establishing a central office and an institutionwide policy for internationalization. This trend takes many forms but illustrates a gradual change from a reactive ad hoc approach to internationalization to a more proactive planned approach. Nevertheless, a strategic approach is still out of reach for most institutions. Considerations as to the obstacles with regard to internationalizing an institution have evolved. Previously, the key barriers were viewed as lack of senior-level commitment, finances, and policies. Currently, the major obstacles include lack of expertise in the international office and lack of faculty interest, involvement, and international/intercultural experience. Clearly, human resources are now a major challenge and in need of more attention.

The approach of a long list of inactive bilateral agreements has been shifted to participating in international or regional networks. In fact, networks are becoming important branding tools as institutions look for prestigious partners and funding sources. Networks are often formed to enhance student and professor exchanges, develop joint curriculum and degrees, undertake benchmarking exercises, or engage in collaborative research. In other cases, networks are oriented to cooperating for competitive purposes with regard to student recruitment, franchising programs, or applying for research grants. It is interesting to note that the recent worldwide survey by the International Association of Universities found that the three most important growth areas for internationalization include institutional agreements and networks as number one, fol-

lowed by outgoing student mobility and international research collaboration.

International student recruitment remains a top priority for traditional receiving countries like the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada; but new initiatives by several European and Asian countries are making them popular destination points. The efforts of Asian countries and several wealthy Gulf states are worth watching in the next few years as they compete for increased market share of international students.

RATIONALES, BENEFITS, AND RISKS

Many observers would claim that in the last decade they have witnessed a dramatic movement of internationalization rationales toward income production. While this trend may be true for a small group of countries, it is certainly not the case for the majority of institutions around the world. A more accurate description is an increased diversification of rationales driving internationalization at institutional and national levels. Current leading motivations still focus on enhancing the international knowledge and intercultural skills of students and professors, but other goals include the creation of an international profile or brand, improving quality, increasing national competitiveness, strengthening research capacity, developing human resources, and diversifying the source of faculty and students. In the past decade the importance and benefits of internationalization have been recognized, but at the same time, new risks have been widely acknowledged. The most important risks include commercialization, foreign degree mills, brain drain, and growing elitism.

All in all, we have seen a very dynamic evolution of internationalization in the past 10 years. It is critical that we continue to nurture positive results and remain vigilant to potentially negative and unexpected implications so that internationalization builds on strengthening individual, institutional, community, and national development in the more interdependent and interconnected world in which we live. ■

Private Higher Education: Patterns and Trends

DANIEL C. LEVY

Daniel C. Levy is Distinguished Professor at the University at Albany, State University of New York, and director of the Program for Research on Private Higher Education. E-mail: DLevy@uamail.albany.edu.

In its 12 years, *International Higher Education* has published many articles on the continued growth of higher education,

as well as on related matters such as access policy. Within this powerful higher education growth, even more spectacular is the growth of *private* higher education. Today, best estimates indicate that about one in three students globally is in the private sector.

There is no magic year that marks the inception of accelerated private growth. **Certainly the last two decades have been unprecedented in private growth, but each country has a different starting date or period** in which private enrollment begins to soar. **As recently as 1980, while much of the world already had private higher education, still many countries did not. Now virtually all the world's regions have private higher education in the large majority of their countries and pre-existing private sectors have grown strikingly**

The private higher education surge mixes with a substantial degree of privatization in a range of other economic and social fields. However, neither primary nor secondary education has paralleled higher education for the proportional surge of private to total enrollment.

The last two decades have been unprecedented in private growth, but each country has a different starting date or period in which private enrollment begin to soar.

In some ways the most arresting private higher education growth has come in regions where two decades ago, even sometimes one decade ago, there was no such sector. In the Middle East, emergence is often basically a creature of the new century, otherwise of the 1990s. We are referring to such varied countries as Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. With only scattered examples dating to the 1980s, private growth in Africa has more recently spread to country after country, including all the largest ones. Predictably, the private sector is larger in anglophone than francophone countries.

Latin America and Asia generally have longer continuous private higher education experience. But in the former it has recently grown to almost **half (45%)** of total enrollment and includes every country except Cuba. Elsewhere in the region some countries have gone from minority to majority private enrollment. Only with the 1989 **fall of communism did private higher education emerge in modern eastern and central Europe** and it spread like wild fire in the first half of the 1990s. That leaves only **western Europe** as the outlier region where the **public sector remains almost unchallenged** by private growth (though it itself is partially privatizing). In Asia several countries, most importantly **China, have launched private sectors.** Several older private sectors account for most of their countries' higher education enrollment (notably Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea, and Taiwan).

So powerful is global private growth that almost no country

has seen a *decline* of the private share in the last decade or two. This is not to rule out that changing national conditions could lead to a decline. Those changed conditions could include an aging population (Japan, eastern Europe), partial privatization of public sectors, and the threat that populist regimes such as Venezuela's could curtail private institutions.

FOLLOW THE LEADERS

Two very common myths about private higher education are more false than true. One is that private-public differences are insignificant as both types pursue public purposes. The second is that each country is unique so we cannot intelligently generalize about private higher education. In fact, the private growth of the last decade or two is remarkable not only in weight but in replication of patterns long observed in other countries; among these patterns are **prominent private-public differences.**

Regarding patterns of growth, for example, we continue to see **private emergence outside government plans** (the Middle East excluded) and often taking officials and others by surprise. Private institutions continue to be considerably smaller than public ones on average. The basic causes of private expansion remain religion, social advantage, and absorption of the accelerated demand for higher education. As before, the causes of the growth now often shape the kind of ensuing private type that functions.

In finance, **the great majority of private institutions (old and new) continue to be overwhelmingly financed privately,** usually through tuition and fees. **Philanthropy, corporate contributions, and alumni giving are still rare outside the United States, and elite private universities remain almost nonexistent outside the United States.** In governance, private institutions continue to be **more hierarchical** than public counterparts, limiting faculty and student participation. The private places still concentrate on a few fields, mostly in commercial areas. They remain narrower than public institutions in this and other respects. Another common and enduring private-public distinction exists where **the private institution represents a religious or ethnic group.** And concerning the demand-absorbing institutions a crucial challenge yesterday and today is to be able to distinguish "garage" operations from serious operations. Even the serious institutions **rarely pursue academic research or graduate education and rarely have ample full-time faculties, top students, and laboratories and libraries.**

NEW PATHWAYS

But it would be wrong to say there is nothing new under the sun. We should identify several key fresh tendencies and hybrid forms or developments. One tendency is the increased role of **foreign institutions.** In many instances they construct partnerships with local institutions or government. Usually the partnerships involve collaboration between countries of more and less development. On both ends, the institutions may be private or public but probably a disproportionate share of the

involved local institutions are private. In other cases (e.g., Greece) local institutions engaged in partnership with foreign institutions get leeway outside national rules (and cannot offer national degrees).

Local-foreign partnerships increasingly have a for-profit side. The financial incentive for Australian, UK, or US universities is clear, even if their institutions are juridically public. It appears that an increasing proportion of the local actors are for-profit, in conjunction with “branch” campuses of foreign universities.

In other respects, the for-profit growth is yet more astonishing. Several for-profit businesses invest in higher education. The three most prominent internationally are Laureate (formerly Sylvan), Apollo (which owns the massive University of Phoenix in the United States), and Whitney International. Clearly these companies are in it for profit and do not claim otherwise. Alongside them is a growing list of domestic investment companies. In some cases lines between ownership and investment are fuzzy. Laureate has often bought up existing private nonprofit institutions and invested, yet the institutions remain legally nonprofit, as law in countries such as Chile and Mexico proscribes for-profit higher education. However, the line between nonprofit and for-profit is notoriously unclear. Many legally nonprofit institutions are functionally for-profit, simply not distributing financial gains to stockholders. Meanwhile, even truly nonprofit institutions are becoming more commercial. For-profit growth is one of the striking global tendencies within the United States.

The great majority of private institutions (old and new) continue to be overwhelmingly financed privately, usually through tuition and fees.

Even where the basic private types of yesterday are the private types of today, changed mixes emerge. There is a relative decline of religious focus. Whereas elite private higher education is rare outside the United States, exceptions arise (perhaps Turkey's Bilkent University) alongside longer-standing Japanese and Korean cases. A much more common phenomenon is the development of “semielite” private institutions. These may evolve out of some of the serious demand-absorbing institutions. Though their elite nature may be more about clientele than academics, some do achieve distinction, often in a niche field. The niche field is usually business related. Semielite universities can be markedly entrepreneurial. They could evolve into a competitive threat to public universities of the second tier.

In terms of sheer numbers the most important private development is the clear dominance of demand-absorbing institutions. In certain countries (e.g., Brazil, Philippines) such institutions have for many decades held the majority of

private enrollment, sometimes the majority of total enrollment. Now, however, the dominance in growth and enrollment numbers of these institutions spreads to more and more countries. Unsurprisingly, the proliferation, against a legacy of little regulation, has given rise to increased concern about quality assurance and to the establishment of public accrediting agencies in country after country. ■

Graduate Education in Latin America: The Coming of Age

JORGE BALÁN

Jorge Balán is a senior researcher of the Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad in Buenos Aires and a visiting professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies of Education at the University of Toronto. E-mail: j.balan@cedes.org.

A research-based, academically oriented graduate program had an early start in Latin America. In the 1950s and 1960s, many countries in the region established national councils for the support of scientific research and advanced training. During that period the leading public universities sought to build a niche for advanced training and research to expand and renovate the professoriate. Since the mid-1980s, the democratic regimes in the region have provided greater institutional legitimacy and more generous funding to improve the scale and scope of training and research. Within the public university, graduate education obtained a larger degree of academic and administrative autonomy.

Flying under the radar screen of university politics, graduate education is today perhaps the most dynamic and innovative sector of higher education. Its market is expanding and diversifying, responding to the manpower needs of higher education and other economic sectors and to the career needs of a growing number of graduates. Government plays a key role in stimulating demand through regulation, incentives schemes, and the provision of funds for research and development. This article examines academically oriented graduate programs (the MA and PhD degrees) in a few major countries in the region.

LOCATION, SCALE, AND FUNDING

In 1985 Brazil developed a plan to send 10,000 students abroad for advanced training. However, during the 1990s the country gave priority to achieving greater domestic capacity for research and training in all areas of knowledge. Brazil is today the leader in the field of graduate education in the region, with an enrollment of over 100,000 graduate students in academic

degree programs, 38 percent of them in doctoral programs. Scientific production, 85 percent located in university research and graduate training programs, has grown 2.5 times in the last 15 years. Mexico shows a larger volume of graduate students but with a very different mix: around 100,000 students were enrolled in master's programs in 2005, five times more than in 1990, but only 13,000 registered as doctoral students. Argentina ranks third, with almost 25,000 master's and 8,000 doctoral students. Chile, a smaller country, currently enrolls 13,000 master's and almost 3,000 doctoral students, while Colombia lags behind with less than 12,000 and 1,000 students in master's and doctoral programs (until recently Colombia's graduate students largely concentrated in professional specialization programs). In all these countries, the figures correspond to accredited programs recognized by national agencies mandating standards monitored through peer review processes. Requirements vary significantly, with Brazil showing the highest standards under a sophisticated quality assurance system developed in the 1970s. The five countries, with a combined population of approximately 370 million, by 2005 offered hundreds of doctoral programs, producing well over 10,000 doctorates a year.

In contrast to China, Korea, or India, in the 1980s and 1990s Latin America did not rely heavily on doctoral training overseas, instead building upon previous investments to expand the domestic supply. Today many fewer PhDs in the United States are granted to Latin American than to Asian students. In addition, Latin America tends to employ a larger number of the graduates with doctorates the region produces in higher education. Moreover, a greater proportion of Brazilians and Mexicans with PhDs earned in the United States—in contrast to Asians with US PhDs—plan to return to their home countries.

Doctoral programs are largely concentrated in public universities and almost entirely supported through public funding allocated to education and/or scientific research. Private universities, with few exceptions, lack the research infrastructure required for doctoral programs in the sciences and engineering, although a number of these institutions are highly competitive in the social sciences and the humanities—fields in which the master's degree is most common. The recurrent fiscal crises of the state and the equally recurrent governance crises of the public university in Latin America have not inhibited the growing scale and production of graduate and doctoral education, since the return to democratic regimes in the region, in spite of neoliberal economic policies. Public funding for research has grown in absolute and relative terms. Brazil today spends approximately 1 percent of its gross national product in research and development, up from 0.7 percent in the 1990s, while Argentina and Chile spend a lower percentage but also have significantly increased public funding for R&D during the years of rapid economic growth. Although still a minor player in world science, the relative weight of Latin America in world production has doubled in the last 15 years.

Industry plays a modest role in funding and execution of research and employs few people with doctorates. Yet, public universities with capacity for research developed technology transfer programs, and many projects of university-industry collaboration (with public-sector support) have proven to be successful.

RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC MEGAUNIVERSITY

Although the California three-tiered model was often in the minds of university reformers in Latin America, neither the idea of a research university nor the structure of a graduate school ever took off in the region. Yet, research and graduate training are gaining a more comfortable niche within the traditional megauniversity dominated by professional schools and professionally oriented undergraduate programs.

Flying under the radar screen of university politics, graduate education is today perhaps the most dynamic and innovative sector of higher education.

Governments have created significant incentives for universities to develop and support graduate programs. In some countries higher education institutions are required to offer a number of research-based graduate programs to gain university status and thus enhanced autonomy. Graduate degrees are mandatory for entry into the academic profession and provide salary incentives to current faculty, thus fostering demand for graduate education even in professional schools that traditionally required only a professional degree (i.e., engineering, law, medicine). Governments have negotiated loans from the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank to strengthen public university research and graduate programs.

Accreditation of graduate programs has become widespread since the 1990s—the harbinger of broader efforts in quality assurance. Peer review plays a key role in accreditation systems and competitive research funding, strengthening the voice of the disciplinary-based academic communities in university affairs.

Reforms have often succeeded in shortening the length of undergraduate professional programs to four or five years. The expanding number of graduates has created a larger demand for professionally oriented graduate certificates and degrees offered by the same units and faculty in charge of academically oriented MA and PhD degrees. A market-driven, professionally oriented segment of graduate education provides some opportunities and fresh funding to the graduate faculty, enhancing its status within the university. Increased decentralization, administrative autonomy, and the pressure upon institutions to diversify funding have largely favored graduate programs and graduate faculty. Salaries for graduate faculty might

be paid, or supplemented, by research agencies or special funding schemes outside of university control. Competitive research funding, largely from public agencies, became the rule. Graduate programs may charge fees, and in fact many specialization and master's programs are self-sustained. Diversity of funding at the graduate unit level brought increased autonomy vis-à-vis the central administration, with more flexible contract arrangements and workplace rules. Thus, graduate education became a safer niche for research-oriented, full-time faculty than in the past within the professionally dominated public university. The downside is that often this niche is quite isolated from the rest of university life, except for the market-driven specialization courses.

Last, but not least, the growth of graduate education is associated with increased differentiation within the professoriate in terms of academic status, career orientation, and academic values. While in the past an academically oriented professoriate consisted mostly of a small group of foreign-trained and internationally oriented scholars with a tenuous status within the public university, it has now become a major (although by no means predominant) segment of locally trained faculty, more often than not associated within graduate education.

Doctoral programs are largely concentrated in public universities and almost entirely supported through public funding allocated to education and/or scientific research.

CONCLUSION

Although research and advanced training are certainly the most internationally oriented segments of higher education in Latin America, as elsewhere, the risks of parochialism and inbreeding are not to be dismissed when academic communities are still relatively small, a sizable proportion of researchers are locally trained, and mobility is restricted by the small number of research-oriented universities that often favor their own doctoral graduates in recruiting new faculty. The reliance upon domestic publication in Spanish or Portuguese, particularly but not solely in the social sciences and the humanities, is a mixed blessing in this regard. Given the decreasing number of foreign-trained researchers in the region, a number of alternatives are actively explored by funding agencies, research universities, and the academic community to counteract the risks of development. International coauthorship has increased markedly in some countries and disciplines. Collaborative efforts in quality assurance involving international counterparts, often supported by international agencies, are numerous and productive. A number of research and advanced training collaborative efforts are run with the support of electronic media, supplementing the expensive academic exchange programs. Sandwich fellowships for doctoral students to spend

time in overseas laboratories and institutes to complete their theses have become very common. Internationalization is thus a priority on the agenda, yet it has to compete with many other factors for domestic funding at a time when international donor agencies do not find compelling reasons to target their efforts on Latin American countries. ■

New Developments in International Research Collaboration

SACHI HATAKENAKA

Sachi Hatakenaka is an independent consultant and researcher on higher education policy and management. E-mail: sachi@alum.mit.edu.

International research collaboration has always helped scientists to keep abreast of international science and to share expertise and resources. Today, one-fifth of the world's scientific papers are coauthored internationally—a result of increasingly easy communication and cross-border travel. However, a new character of international collaboration is emerging, as scientific research has become an integral part of economic and innovation policy and international collaboration has become a key element in globalization strategy.

THE BACKGROUND OF SUCH CHANGES

The perception of a “knowledge economy” matured. Knowledge economy has become a key term not only in developed countries but increasingly in developing countries. Excellence in science is a prerequisite for future economic success, and international collaboration is seen as a key mechanism for international scientific competitiveness.

Some emerging economies, such as China and India, are changing the meaning of international collaboration. Today global networks are known to have contributed significantly to the success of Silicon Valley. It is possible for the old economies to benefit directly from the information technology boom in India or from high-tech electronics in China, by being connected. Moreover, the success of these countries does not derive just from cheap labor. China and India are attracting global R&D activities—something that old economies in North America and Europe have been trying to do for decades. The old economies are keen to establish connections to these new powerhouse economies—not only in downstream industries but also in upstream science.

The world is increasingly united on the need for research and innovation to tackle global challenges such as poverty and

climate change. The growing international concerns regarding greenhouse gases, crises in Africa, or diseases in developing countries are leading to new hopes about international research collaboration to address these issues.

STEPS TAKEN TO ENCOURAGE INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

The United States was one of the first nations to establish an approach to attract the “best and the brightest” in the world to their institutions. This policy placed the United States at the heart of international research collaboration, with US researchers coauthoring with researchers from over 170 countries. The unique US position was based, first, on the openness of financial aid and fellowships supported any deserving graduate student. This system grew partly through generous federal research funding but also by means of institutional competition to attract the best graduate students. Second, the tradition of openness in hiring academics dated back to World War II, during which many prominent European scientists moved to the United States. Third, the US labor market has been open to immigrants—particularly for highly skilled ones who could get companies to sponsor them.

The United States was one of the first nations to establish an approach to attract the “best and the brightest” in the world to their institutions.

Today, more countries are taking comparable approaches to attract the “best and the brightest” through similar policies to open up. The stepped-up competition for international students undertaken by other countries—most notably Australia, the United Kingdom, and Japan—and the tightening of US immigration and security rules following September 11, 2001, led to the first period when the number of international students declined in the United States for several years. The trend has since been reversed, owing in part to some steps already taken to facilitate visa processing. Other immigration measures, particularly to attract highly skilled international workers, are under discussion. Thus, competition will continue.

Since the late 1980s, Japan is a country that has been actively investing to become a viable destination for international students. Japan's strategy has been complemented by another approach to promote international research collaboration through well-targeted programs, often based on bilateral agreements with collaborating countries. These activities cover joint research grants, research fellowships, and joint workshops and seminars—particularly in Asia. Today, their regular work with Asian peers shows that the Japanese researchers have become key players in the emerging Asian research hub.

Europe is going a step further. In its Seventh Framework Programme, which just started this year, the European Union

(EU) announced its intention to “mainstream” international collaboration across the range of its programs. In many ways, this policy is a natural extension of the EU's principle role—to encourage cross-border collaboration. However, the key change is that the EU is now ready to invest in such work, particularly with researchers in emerging and developing countries, by supporting them to a greater extent than in the past.

The EU has also been strengthening its bilateral ties with key emerging economies, most significantly China and India but also Latin American countries as well as its neighbors—such as Turkey. China was its first Asian partner for science and technology (S&T) bilateral agreements a decade ago. This year, the EU and China are jointly hosting a dozen or so events across Europe and China to promote China-Europe S&T collaboration. These special partnerships are being used to identify specific research themes for targeting funding.

Another approach to international collaboration is to invest in world-class research centers of excellence. Japan has been stepping up its effort to create true hubs in global scientific networks through several programs, including the World Premier International Research Center Initiative. Singapore's approach has been much more aggressive; it was one of the first countries to use public money for attracting world-class institutions. Singapore has been at work for a decade to become a major Asian education and research center, by creating high-profile international partnerships (with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology [MIT], Stanford, Berkeley, and Wharton—to name but a few), inviting world-class foreign universities to open campuses (e.g., INSEAD, University of Chicago Business School, and Waseda), and by its ambitious biomedical science park, Biopolis. However, not all of these ventures have worked. A partnership with Johns Hopkins University was terminated, and the University of New South Wales closed its brand-new campus.

Singapore is not alone in funding institution-level partnerships with an emphasis on research. The United Kingdom provided its support for an MIT-Cambridge partnership, which covered not only education but also research. Scotland followed suit with the Stanford-Edinburgh link, which gives a greater focus on thematic research and commercialization. In the Middle East, many oil-rich nations have been investing in international educational partnerships. Recently, one unusual announcement came from Abu Dhabi on an energy-research initiative called MASDER, which is to be based on multiple international research partnerships. There is also a California-Canada partnership with an emphasis on research, though there is no promise of new public money. Portugal has also recently announced collaborative partnerships with MIT, Carnegie Mellon, and the University of Texas, Austin.

THE IMPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

For developing countries, these steps are likely to lead to increases in scholarship and research collaboration opportunities. Indeed, there is a specific focus on research for develop-

ing countries. US foundations led the way in supporting private-public partnerships on key research and innovations—particularly to tackle infectious diseases in developing countries. The need for action on climate change is also leading to new dialogues to support research and innovation in developing countries. The Department for International Development in the United Kingdom was one of the first official donors to articulate a policy to emphasize the funding need for research and innovation in international development.

International research collaboration has entered an era in which networking has a direct economic significance. Some governments are already beginning to pay a premium to become hubs in global excellence networks. The question is whether these developments will produce significant changes in the world's research capacity. Will these reforms yield new centers of excellence? Will one approach be more successful than others in creating effective networks? Finally, will these trends create capacity building for research in developing countries or just more research relevant to developing countries? Only time will tell us the true answers to these questions, but it is worth paying attention to these emerging trends. ■

International Student Mobility and the United States: The 2007 Open Doors Survey

PATRICIA CHOW AND RACHEL MARCUS

Patricia Chow is Research Manager and Rachel Marcus is Research Officer, Institute of International Education. E-mail: iieresearch@iie.org. More information about the Open Doors survey can be found at: <http://open-doors.iietnetwork.org>.

In 2005, more than 2.7 million students were pursuing transnational higher education—a 47 percent increase over the 2000 figure of 1.7 million students. A concurrent increase has occurred in the number of students seeking an international education in nontraditional destinations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Several countries in these regions have positioned themselves as key actors in the global economy, attracting more students to their shores. Despite these developments, the United States continues to be the top host country for students seeking higher education abroad. In 2006, the United States attracted 30 percent of internationally mobile students among the leading eight host countries (Australia, Canada, China, France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom).

This article draws upon key findings from the International Student Census of the recent *Open Doors 2007: Report on International Educational Exchange* to describe the current international student population in the United States and to examine the future trends in international enrollment. The Institute of International Education (IIE) has collected data on international student enrollment in the United States since 1919 and in the form of the *Open Doors* survey since 1954. Annually, *Open Doors* surveys approximately 3,000 regionally accredited US higher education institutions on aspects of international educational exchange. The 2007 survey reported 582,984 international students studying in the United States

In 2005, more than 2.7 million students were pursuing transnational higher education—a 47 percent increase over the 2000 figure of 1.7 million students.

during the 2006/07 academic year—a 3 percent increase over the previous year and the first significant increase in total international student enrollment since 2001/02. In addition, the number of new international students—those enrolling at a US higher education institution for the first time—increased by 10 percent, building upon the 8 percent increase seen in 2005/06.

ORIGINS

Asia remains the largest sending region, accounting for 59 percent of total US international enrollments. The number of students from Asia increased by 5 percent this year, driven by increases from the top two sending places: India (10% increase) and China (8% increase). For the seventh consecutive year, India remained the leading place of origin of international students in the United States, with 83,833 students. China remained in second place, with 67,723 students and the Republic of Korea in third place, with 62,392 students.

Turning to other regions, in 2006/07 we saw a 25 percent increase in the number of students from the Middle East (to 22,321 students), largely due to the 129 percent increase in student numbers from Saudi Arabia (to 7,886 students)—the result of a large Saudi Arabian government scholarship program launched in 2005. Enrollments from Latin America remained steady in 2006/07, with Mexico sending the most students from the region (13,826). Kenya, with 6,349 students, was the only African country in the top 20 places of origin this year. The number of international students from Europe and Oceania declined in 2006/07, to 82,731 and 4,300, respectively. Europe and Oceania are the only two world regions where the number of US students studying abroad in the region exceeds the number of students from the region studying in the United States.

STUDENT PROFILE AND FIELDS OF STUDY

Over the past 30 years, *Open Doors* data have indicated small but significant shifts in the demographics of international students. In 2006/07, 45 percent of international students in the United States were female, a 14 percent increase from the 1976/77 figure of 31 percent. Also, a larger proportion of international students were single in 2006/07 (87%), compared to 30 years ago (74%).

As has been the case since 2001/02, international graduate students outnumbered international undergraduate students in 2006/07. Forty-five percent of international students were graduate students, 41 percent undergraduates, and 14 percent nondegree/certificate students or students on optional practical training.

As has been the case since 2001/02, international graduate students outnumbered international undergraduate students. Forty-five percent of international students were graduate students.

Business and management remain the leading field of study for international students, with 18 percent of the total, followed by engineering with 15 percent. These two fields have been the most popular fields of study for international students over the past five years. International students in the United States have a particularly large presence in sciences and engineering: in 2006, non-US citizens earned 45 percent of all doctorates in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, and accounted for over half of all doctorate recipients in the fields of engineering, computer science, mathematics, and physics (National Science Foundation, 2007 <www.nsf.gov>).

DESTINATIONS

International students were enrolled in all 50 US states in 2006/07, highly concentrated in certain states and institutions. The 156 US campuses that enrolled (each) over 1,000 international students, accounted for 58 percent of total international student enrollment. The top host states are also home to many of the top host institutions. Colleges and universities in California enrolled the largest number of international students (77,987, or 13% of the total), followed by New York (65,884 students, or 11 percent of the total). New York City was the leading metropolitan area, with 51,973 students, followed by Los Angeles, with 35,870 international students. Students tend to cluster in areas with geographic and linguistic similarities to their home country, as well as an area with a large student or immigrant population from their home country.

FUTURE TRENDS IN INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT

These *Open Doors* findings, supported by similar data collected by the Council of Graduate Schools and other surveys, suggest that the number of international students in the United States

has rebounded and that the United States has not lost its attraction as a destination of choice for international students. In addition to providing high-quality teaching, the American higher education system is also esteemed throughout the world because of the availability of advanced technological facilities and extensive support for basic and applied research.

Meanwhile, US institutions have stepped up recruitment of international students and adjusted their application procedures and admissions timetables to accommodate the lead time needed for visa approval. These university-level efforts have been complemented by the US Department of State's steps to streamline the visa application and approval process and to promote the US as a welcoming place for international students.

While the results of these efforts by government and academia appear to be turning the tide, more comprehensive steps need to be taken to ensure that this trend continues. Other countries have also intensified efforts to attract international students, eliminating visa barriers and strengthening their graduate programs, especially in the sciences and engineering. Although the falling dollar may provide some relief, tuition costs in the United States continue to rise, ranging from an increase of 6.6 percent for public universities, to 4.2 percent for public two-year institutions. With the financial burden largely falling upon individuals and their families (62% of international students use personal/family funds to pay for

The number of international students in the United States has rebounded and that the United States has not lost its attraction as a destination of choice for international students.

their US education), it remains to be seen whether these increases will affect students' decisions to study in the United States. Widely disseminating information on financial resources and expanding financing options may help to alleviate the burden.

Authors' Note: The *Open Doors* Project has received support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the US Department of State since the early 1970s. The opinions expressed in this article are entirely those of the authors. ■

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

The Management and Funding of US Study Abroad

BRIAN WHALEN

Brian Whalen is associate dean of Dickinson College and executive director of the college's Office of Global Education in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, USA. He is also president and CEO of the Forum on Education Abroad. Web site: www.forumea.org. E-mail: whalenb@dickinson.edu.

US colleges and universities manage and fund study-abroad programs in a tremendous variety of ways. The wide range includes types of programs, policies for awarding academic credit, structuring of study-abroad program fees, systems for funding the study-abroad office, program evaluation methods, and other areas of program management. US colleges and universities frequently partner with overseas universities and program providers.

A recent survey conducted by the Forum on Education Abroad gives some useful data on the diverse management practices in US education abroad (www.forumea.org). Institutional members of the forum include 275 US colleges and universities, international universities, study-abroad-program providers, and independent organizations. This group accounts for approximately 75 percent of the US students studying abroad each year. Over one-third of the members responded to the forum's survey, providing a comprehensive picture of how US study abroad works.

Regarding their international education programs, US colleges and universities have different approaches for developing and overseeing their curricula, which affects the education-abroad practices. The number and types of programs, the program models, the role of faculty, and policies for the awarding of credit vary from institution to institution. Study-abroad business models are based on the many factors influencing institutions' decisions and best practices for funding education abroad. Charging "home-school fees," adding a study-abroad fee, negotiating a discount with a program provider, controlling the number of students allowed to study abroad and for how long include some of the practices that differ from institution to institution.

DIVERSE PROGRAM TYPES

Curricular diversity can be seen in the many types of study-abroad programs offered by institutions. Over 85 percent of US colleges and universities report that they offer multiple types of education-abroad programs: with at least one special course developed for US or other international students on the program (93%); integrated university study, where students take regular university courses (93%); reciprocal exchange (89%); and faculty-led, short-term (less than a quarter or semester) programs (86%). Additionally, over half the institutions offer

faculty-led, long-term (one quarter or semester or longer) programs (55%), while in a number of cases faculty take students abroad for course work on sojourns rather than formally approved study abroad programs (53%). The majority of provider-funded study-abroad programs include at least one special course (95%), followed by integrated university study (60%), faculty-led, short-term study (50%), reciprocal exchange (30%), and faculty-led, long-term programs (10%).

STUDY ABROAD FUNDING

Study-abroad offices and programs are generally funded through the institution's general resources and revenue from study-abroad-program fees. Three-quarters of US study-abroad offices are funded by general funds, while half the institutions fund the office through the study-abroad fees paid by students, with the average funding level consisting of 60 percent of the office's operation. Most institutions support the programs from the general budget and study-abroad fees, although other reported sources of funding include student fees paid by every student at the institution, restricted endowments, and cost sharing provided by program providers.

US colleges and universities have different approaches for developing and overseeing their curricula, which affects the education-abroad practices.

INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAM PROVIDERS

US colleges and universities often depend on study-abroad-provider organizations (both nonprofit and for-profit), overseas universities, and independent programs to organize these programs; and these partnerships take many forms. Institutions partner with provider organizations half the time (50%) when running programs with at least one special course and no on-site participation by the institution's faculty, and 35 percent cooperate with providers when offering nonexchange programs with integrated university study.

Academic quality is the most reported factor that colleges and universities consider when deciding to affiliate with or approve programs. The next most important factors reported include health and safety, quality of program administration and ease of working with program provider, in-country support (e.g., resident directors, cocurricular activities), and program structure (e.g., direct enrollment, hybrid, field study). Notably, despite media reports about program discounts, the cost of study-abroad programs ranks only sixth on the list.

Institutions set the fees for affiliated or approved study-abroad programs in different ways, with the single-most-common practice being that students pay the program provider directly (35%). Other approaches are almost as common and

include students paying the institution for the program fee and the institution then paying the program (31%); students paying full-home-school tuition but paying for their own room and board (29%); students paying full-home-school tuition and fees and the institution paying all of the program expenses, including room and board (18%). In addition, some institutions report that they assess an additional fee that study-abroad students must pay.

Study-abroad offices and programs are generally funded through the institution's general resources and revenue from study-abroad-program fees.

Institutions report that they commonly negotiate reduced program fees with provider organizations. Forty-four percent of institutions reported that in deciding whether to affiliate with a program they negotiated fee reductions (“always” or “sometimes”) for each student sent on the provider’s program. Fewer institutions report that they (“always” or “sometimes”) negotiate rebates for each student sent (8%), with this rebate funding used to support their study-abroad office. A more common approach employed by institutions is to negotiate scholarships for their students, with 38 percent of institutions reporting that they (“always” or “sometimes”) take part in this practice. Seventeen percent of institutions report that they (“always” or “sometimes”) negotiate scholarships based on student volume.

Also noteworthy, given the recent media coverage in the United States, only 3 percent (two institutions) reported having exclusive agreements with program providers. “Exclusive agreement” here refers to the practice of an institution not affiliating with or not permitting a student to enroll in any other study-abroad program in the same city, country, or region covered by the provider program. Based on the survey, exclusive agreements appear to be an uncommon practice.

Another aspect of the relationship between colleges and universities and study-abroad-provider organizations is institutional representation on the program providers' external advisory boards or committees. Seventy-four percent of provider organizations report that they have an external advisory board or committee or similar group, demonstrating how common this practice is. Provider organizations report that these entities have several responsibilities. Eighty percent of organizations report that they provide guidance on the needs of institutions and 80 percent report that they provide guidance on the needs of students. Fifty-three percent report that such boards give credibility to the program provider's offerings. Almost half of program providers (47%) report that these bodies are utilized to evaluate programs, while 33% of them report that the advisory board actually approves programs.

FINANCIAL AID FOR STUDENTS

It is not surprising that some portion of study-abroad fees go to institutions' general funds given the amount of financial aid that institutions provide for students who study abroad. About 75 percent of US institutions report that their students who study abroad receive need-based and merit institutional financial aid when they study on the institution's programs, while approximately 60 percent report their students receive this type of aid when they study on programs on an approved list. Most provider organizations also offer scholarship funding to students in a variety of ways, with the most prevalent practice, reported by 63 percent of organizations, being that students apply directly to the organization for scholarships.

STANDARDIZATION OR ADHERENCE TO STANDARDS

Some might suggest that the diversity of approaches and practices among US institutions represents a failure of the education-abroad field to agree on a set of standard practices. It would be a mistake, however, to recommend that all institutions and study-abroad organizations adopt the same specific policies and practices. Nevertheless, institutions and provider organizations should agree on a set of principles that guide study-abroad management and funding practices.

While adhering to standards of good practice does not mean adopting the standardization of practices, it does mean practicing transparency and openness, avoiding conflicts of interest, and keeping the student-learning experience foremost in mind. Institutions and organizations that adopt standards of good practice show that they are committed to being clear and consistent about their mission and goals, and employ continuous quality improvement. ■

US Accreditation: Bridging the International and National Dialogue Gap

JUDITH S. EATON

Judith S. Eaton is president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, a nongovernmental institutional membership organization that provides national coordination of accreditation in the United States. E-mail: eaton@chea.org.

Throughout this decade, international conversations about higher education have been punctuated with significant attention to accreditation and quality assurance. Whether the subject is expanding access to higher education, the need for global competitiveness, or the imperative to create knowledge

economies, there is a sophisticated understanding of the relevance of robust quality review to the success of these endeavors. Central and often dominant in these deliberations is accreditation as practiced in the United States, its operation and accomplishments.

Yet, something is missing—a major oversight—in the international dialogue when it turns to US accreditation. There is little attention to the concerns, criticisms, and challenges to accreditation as practiced in the United States. However, while the international conversation proceeds, there is a robust US national dialogue underway focused almost exclusively on the limitations of accreditation, with an image of accreditation as an enterprise under siege.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONVERSATION

While international colleagues are not, quite appropriately, seeking to imitate what is done in the United States, they are looking for effective practices and insights that they might glean from the long and extensive history of US accreditation. The sheer scope of US activity—with 19 active institutional accreditors and 62 active programmatic organizations—is impressive to many. Typically, questions are raised about whether and how this extensiveness and diversity can sustain appropriate and aspirational levels of quality.

There is a robust US national dialogue underway focused almost exclusively on the limitations of accreditation.

The international conversations also focus on US accreditation's strong embrace of core educational values, perhaps its most attractive feature. Colleagues are aware that advocacy for institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and the centrality of institutional mission is fundamental to US accreditation, assuring a firm foundation for the historically strong academic leadership role that colleges and universities have played over the years. Colleagues often note that, at least to date, control of accreditation has remained in the hands of higher education itself, run by independent, nongovernmental bodies created for this specific purpose. This is in contrast to the government-dominated control of colleges and universities typical of many other countries.

THE NATIONAL CONVERSATION

In contrast, the concern and criticism characterizing the US national conversation has been driven by the changing expectations of US politicians and policymakers as well as an informed segment of the private sector that has made accreditation a subject of ongoing national debate. This last sector includes, for example, organizations of trustees of colleges and universities, philanthropic organizations, and research institutes—in the tradition of a strong US civil society.

During the past two years, the concerns and criticism have been most powerfully expressed through a nationwide Commission on the Future of Higher Education. This body of educators, business leaders, and policymakers, appointed by the US secretary of education, has been a source of unprecedented and sustained federal and national criticism of accreditation, challenging both accreditors and the higher education community. These concerns about the role of accreditation are levied in a climate in which the demand for higher education is great and the price of higher education even greater, engendering considerable anxiety about access and value for money.

CONCERNS AND CRITICISMS

As led by the commission, the national conversation is overwhelmingly about accreditation's perceived limitations as these relate to student achievement, transparency, student mobility, and operating structures. Accreditation is viewed as lacking accountability in promoting and enhancing student achievement. It is charged with neglect of the rigor of undergraduate education and an inability to provide comparable data about the quality of institutions and programs. Students and the public, for example, cannot use accreditation to easily compare the relative strengths of institutions and cannot turn to accreditation (e.g., to explain the decline in the standing of the United States internationally).

Accreditation is criticized for allegedly failing to meet current transparency expectations in the world of the Internet, the Web, search engines, and instant information about almost any topic. Accreditation reports are not routinely made public, nor do accreditors regularly supply detailed information to the public about the strengths and limitations of the institutions they review.

There are also charges that accreditation is a barrier to student mobility among college and universities, standing in the way of student advancement through transfer of credit at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. While more than 60 percent of students obtaining a bachelor's degree attend at least two institutions, there are fault lines in the student mobility system, especially between two-year and four-year institutions and between for-profit and nonprofit institutions.

The national conversation also includes questions about the ongoing effectiveness of the current structure and operation of accreditation as these were forged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Does it make sense to continue the geographically based accreditation represented by the regional (institutional) accrediting bodies that dominate US accreditation? Do these regional configurations currently limit the options for individual colleges and universities seeking an institutional accreditation? This, in turn, leads to a concern that accreditation is not adequately subject to market forces that some believe can, through enhanced competition, strengthen quality. Are there too many programmatic accreditors, with the 62 active organizations mentioned above? Is this contributing to a fragmentation in the professions?

JOINING THE TWO CONVERSATIONS

The international conversation about quality assurance and accreditation that tends to focus on the strengths of US accreditation can benefit from at least some additional attention to the national conversation of concerns and criticisms in the United States. Awareness of US concerns can assist quality assurance leaders in other countries in assessing the value of their own ongoing initiatives. Understanding these concerns can provide an early alert to developing countries that are in the preliminary stages of establishing their own quality assurance organization and structure. At the same time, the US national conversation can benefit from awareness of the international conversation—a reminder of accreditation's strengths and usefulness, a view that is lost in the current national dialogue. ■

The Private Financing of Higher Education

RYAN HAHN

Ryan Hahn is a research analyst at the Institute for Higher Education Policy. Address: 1320 19th St., NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036, USA. E-mail: rhahn@ihep.org; Web site: www.ihep.org/gcpf.

In recent years, cost sharing has been on the rise. Tuition has been introduced in countries such as Australia, China, Germany, and the United Kingdom. Likewise, where charging tuition was already the norm (e.g., Canada, Japan, and the United States) students have faced a substantial rise in tuition. While the growth of cost sharing has been swift, the financial mechanisms to facilitate this cost sharing have not developed as quickly. In a handful of countries, the growth of mechanisms such as bond issuances, private equity, and philanthropy have marked an increased role for private finance in higher education, but these mechanisms have not been widely adopted. Both students and institutions continue to face credit constraints on worthwhile educational investments. If greater cost sharing is to achieve what its proponents claim it can—namely, greater efficiency, equity, and access—private finance will have to play a greater role in overcoming these credit constraints.

BOND ISSUANCE AND SECURITIZATION

One way that higher education can tap private capital markets is through the issuance of bonds. A university can issue bonds on a public exchange, and over time investors are repaid the original capital plus some interest rate. This interest rate reflects the risk that the institution will fail to meet its obliga-

tions—in other words, that it will default. The likelihood of default, in turn, is determined by the financial health of the institution, rather than by the specific project for which money was borrowed. For example, a university may want to raise funds to build a new business school, but it will have to issue bonds that carry a high interest rate if many of the university's other operations are struggling.

In 2001, the Hungarian Ministry of Finance established the Student Loan Centre (SLC), a nonprofit company that by August 2007 had issued loans to 234,000 students amounting to 142.8 billion Hungarian forints (about US\$780 million). To fund the scheme, the SLC issues bonds backed by a state guarantee. The scheme appears to have helped boost enrollments. According to data from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, enrollment at the tertiary level increased between 2000 and 2005 by 42 percent. This compares favorably to other eastern central European countries. In the same period, Slovakia and the Czech Republic both saw an increase of 33 percent, and Poland saw an increase of 34 percent. However, it is still difficult to judge if the SLC will be financially sustainable in the long run since default rates on the student loans have not been established.

In a very different part of the world, universities, rather than the state, are taking steps to draw on private finance. A handful of Mexican universities have received credit ratings, including Universidad de las Americas de Puebla, Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo Leon, Universidad Autonoma del Camen, and Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla. Credit ratings are necessary for these universities to issue bonds because they help investors judge the likelihood of default. This trend is not limited to Mexico. In August 2007 Moody's, one of the major credit-rating agencies, issued a report on its methodology for rating public universities outside the United States. Moody's has already issued ratings for universities in Canada and the United Kingdom and expects that public universities in France, Germany, Italy, and elsewhere are likely to seek ratings in the future.

In a handful of countries, the growth of mechanisms such as bond issuances, private equity, and philanthropy have marked an increased role for private finance in higher education.

Securitization, a more recent financial innovation, can help deal with risk more effectively in some situations than the types of bond issuances described earlier. In particular, securitization has helped finance the growth of government-guaranteed and private loans in the United States over the last 10 years. During a securitization, student loans—issued by a commercial bank, nonprofit organization, or any other institution—are bundled together and placed in a legally independent trust.

Risk is no longer assessed based on the overall financial health of the bank or nonprofit organization but solely on the likelihood of default of the student loans. While the United States has the most experience with this process, it is not entirely alone. The British government has securitized student loans three times, in 1998 and again in 1999, and most recently in 2007 by the former chancellor and current prime minister, Gordon Brown. The off-loading of these assets onto the private market has helped free up public funds for other pressing needs, including additional student loans.

Securitization, a more recent financial innovation, can help deal with risk more effectively in some situations than the types of bond issuances described earlier.

PRIVATE EQUITY

Private equity has recently taken an interest in investing in higher education. In contrast to bonds, private-equity finance is not raised through a public exchange like the New York Stock Exchange or the São Paulo Stock Exchange. Instead, a private-equity firm provides funds to a company in exchange for a direct stake in its future profits. Companies that utilize private equity are often small and have a high potential for growth.

In 2005, Banco Pátria, a major Brazilian private-equity firm, formed a private-equity fund called the Fundo de Educação para o Brasil (FEBR). FEBR served as an investment vehicle in Anhanguera Educacional S.A. (AES), a private, for-profit education company that required additional capital to expand its operations. AES wanted to build new campuses in small and midsize cities in southeastern Brazil. The company offers a low-cost education—average tuition stood at reais \$503 in mid-2007 (approximately US\$261)—for underserved, lower-income students in fields like engineering and business. In addition, AES spends 10 percent of its annual gross revenue on scholarships, taking advantage of government tax incentives to promote access. The strategy has proven highly successful, with enrollment nearly doubling, from 23,366 students in mid-2006 to 46,001 students by mid-2007. AES was successfully floated on the Brazilian stock market in March 2007.

PHILANTHROPY

While the term private finance is usually associated with the profit motive, philanthropy also falls under this term. Philanthropy has a long history with higher education. Nevertheless, the growing demands of higher education have spurred a search for greater efficiency and accountability in higher education philanthropy. One of the most interesting recent developments is the combination of philanthropy with

profit-driven finance. Philanthropists with this approach hope that their money can achieve greater efficiency in the pursuit of the same goals as more traditional philanthropy.

While it is too early to say whether this approach is viable, an example from Indonesia illustrates the possibilities. The Sampoerna Foundation worked with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Bank Internasional Indonesia to establish a risk-sharing facility that provides loans on subsidized terms to Indonesian students and parents. The Sampoerna Foundation provided an initial cash reserve covering potential first losses, while Bank Internasional Indonesia provides the loans and the IFC provides additional risk sharing on any losses in excess of the initial cash reserve. As of September 2007, 12 Indonesian institutions of higher education have agreed to participate in the loan program. If the scheme succeeds, it will serve as a valuable demonstration to banks in Indonesia and elsewhere that student loans can be profitable.

THE FUTURE OF PRIVATE FINANCE

Given that cost sharing has become a permanent feature of the terrain of higher education, private finance in its many forms will need to become a regular partner of higher education. Yet private finance presents its own risks, most recently demonstrated by the student loan scandal in the United States that involved commercial lenders. What steps can be taken to create a successful partnership between private finance and higher education? While the answer is complex, two elements are crucial. First, there must be wider sharing of information across institutional and geographic lines. Private investors

Private finance presents its own risks, most recently demonstrated by the student loan scandal in the United States that involved commercial lenders.

need reliable information about profitable investments, and higher education administrators must become more familiar with the intricacies of private finance. The second factor is legislative reform, to promote and regulate private finance. Many countries will have to address the tax treatment of philanthropy, the regulation of securitization, and the governance of public-private partnerships. When these issues have been addressed, private finance will be able to play a key role in ensuring that greater cost sharing promotes, rather than undermines, equity and access in higher education.

Author's note: This article summarizes The Global State of Higher Education and the Rise of Private Finance: www.ihep.org/Pubs/PDF/Global_State_of_Higher_Education.pdf.

Higher Education Finance in Ghana

FRANCIS ATUAHENE

Francis Atuahene is academic adviser and graduate student supervisor at Western Illinois University. Address: 216 Olson Hall, Macomb, IL 61455, USA. E-mail: FAuahene@wiu.edu.

Higher education in Ghana has suffered a myriad of challenges such as accessibility, affordability, faculty recruitment and retention, and a deplorable state of infrastructure due to general poverty and macroeconomic instabilities of the country. However, the diminishing financial resources and the growing demand for participation remain the biggest threat to higher education in Ghana.

Statistics provided by Paul Effah, the executive secretary of the National Council for Tertiary Education in Ghana indicate that in 2000 the higher education budget was \$23,870,359, which constituted 12 percent of the total government education discretionary budget distributed among five public universities and eight polytechnics. This state of affairs has adversely affected higher education in the country. As a result, each year over half the qualified applicants seeking entrance to universities and polytechnics do not obtain admission, due to limited academic facilities.

CREATION OF AN EDUCATION TRUST FUND

Cognizant of these quagmires and realizing the impact of higher education on national development, the National Union of Ghanaian Students proposed the establishment of a special education trust fund. The government supported this proposal in August 2000, and Parliament passed the Ghana Education Trust Fund bill (GETFund) by raising the already existing value-added tax by 2.5 percent. The objective is to provide financial resources to support educational institutions, provide assistance to genuinely needy and academically talented students, generate monies to support the student loan scheme, and financially support research and development. Initially, the GETFund was projected to generate about 200 billion cedis (US\$54 million) annually. By 2007, this amount has more than quadrupled. It represented 0.34 percent of gross domestic product in 2003, and it is projected to increase to 0.81 percent in 2008.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE GETFUND

The GETFund is having a robust impact on the development of universities and polytechnics in the country particularly in areas of infrastructure, which have over the years remained a huge challenge for universities. Institutions at all levels are undergoing a period of renaissance and rapid face-lifting.

Faculty research and development and the promotion of post-graduate studies have been the key focus of the management of the fund. The GETFund has created a scholarship scheme and the Student Loan Trust Fund to improve accessibility at the tertiary level. It has also contributed immensely to the improvement of vocational and technical education in the country by financing the establishment of 20 resource centers and modern equipment to enhance practical skill training. In 2004, for example, the GETFund provided about 224 billion cedis (US\$24,328,467) to finance the transformation and improvement of capacities in the universities and polytechnics through infrastructural development.

Data from the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning show that these developments have increased admissions at the universities from 40,673 to 53,895 between 2002 and 2003. At the polytechnic levels enrollment increased from 18,459 in 2002 to 23,717 in 2003. Additionally, the GETFund supports the expansion and development of distance education as a means of expanding access. Accordingly, enrollment has risen from 750 in 2002 to 3,618 in 2003. The minister noted "the increase was supported by an allocation of 839.3 million cedis from the GETFund to facilitate the coordination of distance education in the two main providers of this service, the University of Cape Coast and the University of Education, Winneba." Additionally, over 60 faculty members at tertiary institutions are being sponsored for further studies under the GETFund's Manpower Development Scholarship Scheme.

The diminishing financial resources and the growing demand for participation remain the biggest threat to higher education in Ghana.

ANALYSIS OF THE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Despite these great strides, the implementation of the GETFund has also faced some challenges. Alleged misappropriation of the fund has been recorded since its inception. In 2004, the president of the National Union of Ghanaian Students filed a complaint against the government about the transition of the 2.5 percent value-added tax to the GETFund account. A case like this not only impedes the transparency of the fund but also hinders its sustainability. To some degree the GETFund, with its independently appointed board of trustees, is politicized. Even though the board is independent, the administrator who oversees the management of the fund is appointed by the government. But the question is can we entrust public funds to a private entrepreneur? However, the role played by parliamentarians provides control over the management of the fund. Yearly disbursements are subject to strict parliamentary approval, which in essence reduces the autonomy of the board of trustees.

Additionally, the newly created student loan scheme will make higher education accessible and affordable to students from lower social economic backgrounds. It offers students the opportunity to contribute and share part of the cost of their education. Unfortunately, the high interest rate is likely to put students into bankruptcy in a country faced with unbridled microeconomic instabilities. Also, while providing needs-based loans to students is an improvement over the previous loan scheme, the question remains how can one assess individuals' household income without reliable data? Moreover, awarding a scholarship to an "academically brilliant" student is a step in the right direction, but how do we ensure fairness in a country where a greater percentage of students are those whose parents can provide them with better pretertiary education in addition to supplementary instruction at home?

CONCLUSION

Despite these challenges, the GETFund is making significant contributions toward higher education development in Ghana in infrastructure, student development, faculty research, and staff support. In 2007 Parliament approved an estimated amount of 582 billion cedis (US\$63,210,571) by the GETFund to overhaul infrastructure and equipment at the higher education level. It has become one of the richest sources of funds complementing government's budgetary allocation to higher education. However, to sustain the fund for posterity, its sustainability needs to be ensured not only by maintaining transparency but also by providing a legislative instrument to increase the autonomy of the board and improve management efficiency. In summary, the GETFund has the potential for replication in other developing countries facing similar challenges. ■

Higher Education under a Labour Government

MICHAEL SHATTOCK

Michael Shattock is a visiting professor at the Centre for Higher Education Studies, Institute of Education, University of London. E-mail: M.Shattock@ioe.ac.uk.

The Labour Party's victory in the general election of 1997, fueled by the slogan "Education, Education, Education," was greeted with a wave of popular enthusiasm. For higher education the financial stringencies imposed by the Tories were expected to be significantly alleviated. Labour inherited the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry

into Higher Education (the Dearing Report), which had been jointly commissioned by the two main political parties to keep higher education from becoming an election issue. These recommendations included a new deal on the financing of students—an issue at the heart of the report. Under the Tory period from 1979 to 1997, the unit of resource (i.e., government funding per student) had been reduced by 45 percent as student numbers rose but were funded at marginal cost only. The best that can be said after 10 years of Labour is that the government has stabilized state funding per student at the 1997 level. The expected uplift occurred only in the area of research; this policy has favored research-intensive universities over the rest. More seriously, the Dearing recommendations on student finance were not accepted, and thus a student fee was introduced. However, the benefit of what should have been an increase in university funding was transferred back to the government in a compensating lower recurrent grant.

Five years later the pressure on university finance forced the government to set up an in-house working party of ministers and civil servants—rather than the more ponderous national commission approach—which produced a white paper, *The Future of Higher Education*. This document was altogether more radical and controversial than the Dearing Report, proposing a much higher student fee (£3,000) coupled with income-based loans funded by the government. Coming at a time when the government was already under fire for its allegedly neoliberal approach to the management of its welfare state inheritance, the proposals aroused serious opposition from within its own party within the House of Commons and were only approved in a knife-edge vote by a majority of five. The concessions wrung by opponents included an agreement to review the level of fees in 2009/10 and the establishment of an Office for Fair Access to ensure that access was preserved and that universities committed enough of their increased fee income to bursaries for economically disadvantaged students. Applications for university places dipped slightly in 2005/06, the year before the introduction of the new fee structure but bounded back in the following year, seemingly justifying the government's approach, though the long-term impact of student debt on the economy still needs to be evaluated. The introduction of the new fee levels reinforced the marketization of UK higher education but also brought new and welcome funding into the system. This did not apply in Scotland, however, as the Scottish devolved government rejected fees to the consternation of most Scottish universities, which foresaw an alarming gap emerging between their funding and the rest of the UK university system.

WIDENING PARTICIPATION

From the beginning of its term, the new government sought to demonstrate its commitment to widening access to higher education. The prime minister publicly envisaged the age participation rate rising to 50 percent; in practice it remains stuck

at 43 percent in England, although the 50 percent figure has been reached in Scotland. A prime objective, following the Dearing Report, **has been to encourage a larger proportionate across for lower socioeconomic groups.** A major cause célèbre was created when the chancellor of the exchequer highlighted the case of a girl from a northern state comprehensive school who had excellent qualifications being turned down by Oxford but accepted and given a scholarship by Harvard. (It was later established that the Oxford college that rejected her had a good record of accepting candidates from state schools and that the decision was simply a reflection of the severe competition for places.) Complex league tables were produced to indicate the expected levels of lower socioeconomic students' enrollment in individual university intakes, and funding levels were adjusted to provide an incentive for widening participation.

This approach has had little effect, however. There is no evidence of discrimination in university selection procedures, and it is beginning to be recognized that the problem lies in the schools and in the wider economic and social policies pursued by this and previous governments. One-third of children are born into families whose earnings fall below the poverty line, and the Rowntree Trust has shown that children from poor homes are a year behind their peers when they begin school

The introduction of the new fee levels reinforced the marketization of UK higher education but also brought new and welcome funding into the system.

and two years behind at age 14. In 2000 the secretary of state launched a new initiative for the award of two-year "foundation" degrees aimed at improving the skills base. The proposal has only produced modest numbers, and the decision in 2006 to offer further education colleges (nonuniversity postsecondary institutions) the power to award the foundation degree without reference to universities is likely to depress its status further.

STRETCHING THE SYSTEM

Perhaps the most surprising result of the Labour government's policies has been the **widening gap between the "best" (a word incautiously used in the white paper) universities and the former polytechnics that were given university status in 1992.** Adherents of the Dearing Committee's proposals believed they were advocating a "compact" between the higher education system and the government under which the concession of more accountability and the system's pursuit of a social agenda was the quid pro quo for a stable funding regime and the maintenance of institutional autonomy. Whatever private assurances were given, the government, once in office, has not seen it this way. By 2003 when the white paper was published, the government had become convinced of the need for "world-

class" universities rather than a world-class system and, against the advice of the Funding Council, initiated an intensification of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). In addition, the government has invested considerably in research and research infrastructure. Both actions benefited the most-research-intensive universities at the expense of a layer of research-active universities (the so-called "squeezed middle") and, of course, of the new universities. The white paper canvassed the idea of "teaching only" universities, and a number of higher education colleges that previously lacked degree-awarding powers have now been upgraded to university status. The result is a system much more polarized than before, with the exponentially growing gap between the most successful of the Russell Group (the self-selected club of research universities) and the stragglers in the Coalition of Modern Universities (which comprises most of the former polytechnics), in terms of research excellence, academic quality of intake, and financial sustainability. This leaves the lower-ranked institutions that have a high dependence on "access students" impoverished and at some financial risk from fluctuations in the student market. Whereas many of the most research-intensive universities have reduced their dependence on the Funding Council to below 30 percent, some of the newer universities are dependent on them to the tune of 70 to 80 percent.

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONISM

If one leg of the so-called Dearing compact was funding, the other was autonomy, and here there are signs that the UK tradition of a hands-off relationship with government is fraying at the edges. The Funding Council claims continuity with the old University Grants Committee in acting as a "buffer," but increasingly it is being marginalized on larger issues. The decision to create foundation degrees and later to give degree-awarding powers to further education colleges, and the intensification of the RAE, referred to above, are examples of ministerial fiat. The proposed revision of the RAE from a peer-reviewed to a metrics-measured system was announced by the chancellor of the exchequer, suggesting that the Department of Education and Skills itself, let alone the Funding Council, was in control of the agenda. When in 2007 the department was split and a new Department of Innovation, Universities and Science was created, it might have been hoped that the new secretary of state would adopt an advocacy role for higher education. However, his early arbitrary decision to stop the funding of students taking a second first degree, an important function for an institution like the Open University, suggests that the new department will marginalize the Funding Council yet further. The new president of Universities UK—the representative body of UK universities—Professor Trainer, an American, is quoted as saying that "In my native country, the USA, even in the state universities there is nothing like the degree of intervention in institutional management and the working life of academics that we still experience in this country." It is worth adding that the single most dramatic ministe-

rial intervention, the creation of the e-university, widely hyped as a farsighted initiative, collapsed under a mountain of debt some four years later.

CONCLUSION

There is, of course, another side to the story. Internationally, the higher education system is highly successful: international student numbers have risen by more than a third since 1997, and the United Kingdom remains in spite of competition the second most popular destination after the United States for international students; in research, the United Kingdom's share of world citations also places it second only to the United States; Cambridge, Oxford, and Imperial College are to be found in the top 10 in world-ranking systems; within Europe, the United Kingdom collaborates more than any other country with China. Perhaps more significant, the newly introduced national Student Satisfaction Survey shows UK students to be overwhelmingly satisfied with the education they are receiving. How far this performance reflects historic or inherent strengths, rather than any actions by government in the last 10 to 15 years, is hard to assess, but it is certainly true that within European higher education the United Kingdom is now seen as a sometimes uncomfortable trendsetter. Perhaps the most striking feature of any account of UK government policy toward higher education is the extent it represents a continuation and extension of policies initiated by its predecessor government's last decade. While there are danger signs in unwise ministerial interventionism, as a consequence of its size, its cost, and its economic importance higher education has become a legitimate object of public policy in a way that was barely conceivable two decades ago. Inevitably there is disappointment with a government that seemed to promise so much, but perhaps higher education should congratulate itself that the results have been no worse. ■

European Students in the Bologna Process

MANJA KLEMENCIC

Manja Klemencic is a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for European Studies at Harvard University and former secretary general of ESIB—the National Unions of Students in Europe. E-mail: m.klemencic.01@cantab.net.

The task of establishing a European higher education area, the so-called Bologna process, has led to massive systemic changes in European higher education and has also dramatically altered the dynamics of European higher education poli-

cymaking and, especially, the role and influence of various interest organizations. The student constituency across Europe has been widely supportive of the process and vocal in demanding Bologna reforms to be implemented at their respective higher education institutions. One of the student organizations in Europe has played a particularly visible role in the Bologna process. ESIB (the National Unions of Students in Europe), which has been renamed ESU (European Students' Union [www.esib.org]), has taken active part in the Bologna process, ensuring that student interests were reflected in its policies. At the same time, ESU used the process to upgrade its visibility and role in European higher education policymaking in general.

THE EUROPEAN STUDENT CONSTITUENCY AND THE EUROPEAN STUDENTS' UNION

The student constituency active on the European level can be categorized in three main groups of student organizations: *discipline-based* (e.g., AIESEC [Association of Economics and Business students] and ELSA [European Law Students Association]); *political and religious* (e.g., EDS [European Democrat Students] and JECI-MIEC [International Young Catholic Students-International Movement of Catholic Students]); and *interdisciplinary organizations* (e.g., Erasmus Student Network [network of students taking part in Erasmus

Since its creation in 1982, ESU massively expanded its membership and today acts on behalf of 45 National Unions of Students from 34 countries.

Program exchanges), AEGEE [Association des Etats Généraux des Etudiants de l'Europe, which promotes European cooperation among students], and ESU). Most of these student organizations are members of the European Youth Forum (www.youthforum.org), the European platform of national youth councils and European nongovernmental youth organizations, and a prominent player in European youth policymaking.

Only ESU represents democratic and independent student organizations that are elected as the national platforms in their countries. Since its creation in 1982, ESU massively expanded its membership and today acts on behalf of 45 National Unions of Students from 34 countries, representing over 10 million students in Europe. ESU's main decision-making body is the board, which consists of representatives of national unions and meets twice yearly to decide on all policy and internal issues. While ESU has links to representatives of other student organizations, there is no formal channel of cooperation.

STUDENTS' INTERESTS IN THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

While students were not formally included in drafting of the

Bologna Declaration, this situation changed soon after with strong pressure from ESIB and support from some education ministers committed to student participation in European higher education policymaking. During the French presidency of the EU in 2000, the then French education minister, Jack Lang, promised that the policies of ESIB would be presented to the European Education Ministers' Summit and that ESIB representatives will be formally included in the Bologna process. The Swedish government, subsequently taking up the EU presidency, followed up on this promise and included the ESIB delegation to the 2001 Bologna Ministerial Follow-Up Summit in Prague. ESIB's declaration on Bologna issues was presented among the official documents of the Prague summit. The declaration included ESIB policies on issues such as mobility, access to higher education, student welfare, recognition of qualifications, and quality-assurance building on areas covered by the Bologna Declaration.

The student constituency across Europe has been widely supportive of the process and vocal in demanding Bologna reforms be implemented at their respective higher education institutions.

ESIB entered the Bologna process at time when other student organizations were largely unaware of the Bologna Declaration and its implications for the higher education sector in Europe. Awareness was at the time also low among academics, administrators, and individual students. ESIB's contribution to the process was twofold. As the representative organization of students in Europe it sought to upload its policies reflecting student interests into the process. ESIB also coordinated information campaigns, so-called Bologna student days, to provide students with information about the Bologna Declaration so that they could pressure institutions and national governments to take up the reforms.

In a series of policy papers and declarations on issues raised by the Bologna process, ESIB highlighted in particular that the Bologna Declaration failed to address the social implications of the process for students. ESIB reminded ministers that it is the ultimate responsibility of the state to finance higher education and thus ensure equal access and diversity of quality programs. ESIB asked the ministers that the Bologna process should not endorse increases in tuition fees and instead should discuss ways to widen the access to education and respect the principle of education as a public good. ESIB also asked for a system of credits based on workload, a common European framework of criteria for accreditation, and a compatible system of degrees. Alongside the basic principle of free access, a two-tier degree system should guarantee free and equal access to all students. Academic, social, economic, and political obstacles to mobility should be removed, and relevant information should be provided to contribute to the mobility of students, teaching staff,

and researchers. ESIB's final message was that students should be considered full partners in higher education governance at all levels, including the Bologna process itself.

In their communiqués following the Bologna Declaration, the ministers incorporated many of ESIB's messages—most notably that higher education should be considered a public good and public responsibility as well as that students are full members of the higher education community. The issue of student participation in the Bologna process was resolved by including ESIB representatives (together with the European University Association and the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education) in the general structure. Other student organizations, especially the discipline based, subsequently began to participate in the implementation of the Bologna recommendations in cooperation with discipline-based European academic associations and individual higher education institutions. At the same time, ESU remains a formal and active partner in the follow-up structure of the Bologna process.

CONCLUSION

Recognition of ESIB by the Council of EU education ministers was historic as ESIB never before managed to present opinions directly to the ministers, except through the European Commission, with whom it has had a consulting role. With involvement in the Bologna process, ESIB transformed from a "sleeping giant" to a major player in European higher education politics. The recognition of ESIB as the "representative voice of students in Europe" within the Bologna process also had an impact on ESIB's internal structures. Given that issues discussed on the European level coincided with those on the

ESIB highlighted in particular that the Bologna Declaration failed to address the social implications of the process for students.

national and institutional level, national and local unions of students became ever more committed to and involved in ESIB work. This also led to the further professionalization of ESIB in terms of establishing expert committees to deal with specific Bologna issues. The Bologna process has thus unexpectedly also created circumstances that led to cooperation among the student unions and strengthened their resolve to empower ESIB to represent them on the European level. ■

Corruption in Vietnamese Higher Education

DENNIS C. MCCORNAC

Dennis C. McCornac is associate professor of economics at Anne Arundel Community College, 101 College Parkway, Arnold, MD, USA. E-mail: dmc-cornac@aacc.edu.

More than two decades have passed since Vietnam began the transition to a market economy. **The policy of *Doi Moi*, generally translated as *economic renovation*, has fostered major changes in social and economic institutions and highly improved production capabilities and the standard of living.** These positive developments notwithstanding, Vietnam remains a less-developed country, and many of the ills associated with this environment have not been alleviated. Corruption still plagues most sectors of the economy, and in 2007 Transparency International gave Vietnam a dismal 2.6 rating score on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being least corrupt.

CORRUPTION IN EDUCATION

Education suffers pervasive corruption, particularly regarding student and teacher behavior. Bribes for school entrance, exams, and assessment, are just a few examples of practices in both secondary and higher education sectors. Although the issue has come under increased scrutiny by the state media and educational authorities, a review of the literature reveals very little formal research on corruption in education. This can probably be attributed to the unwillingness of both parties to provide accounts of illegal transactions and the extent to which the practices are viewed as corrupt.

RESEARCH METHOD

The collection of data through a formal survey instrument was not possible due to institutional constraints. Thus, informal surveys were conducted in various classes taught by the author during his teaching in Vietnam over the past decade. The sample size was approximately 150 first-year university-level undergraduate students and 100 first-year university graduate students. In addition, in-depth interviews were carried out with close to 35 students at various levels, 13 teachers, and 5 administrators. These in-depth interviews were conducted in a semi-structured format with a heavy emphasis on open-ended questions.

NORM, RATHER THAN EXCEPTION

The information from students, faculty, and administrators **provides clear indications that corruption in higher education in Vietnam is both rampant and institutional.** Corruptive practices are the norm rather than the exception and foster an environment of distrust and suspicion on the part of those forced to participate in this system.

In the informal survey of classes, more than 95 percent of the students reported they had cheated at least once in a class, and all had observed situations of cheating by other students. Cheating is looked at as being so common that many people involved are of the opinion that not to do so puts them at a disadvantage. Social and peer pressure play a significant role in the decision to cheat, and cheating is looked at as a necessary component of the educational experience. Both students and faculty also commented that cheating is “just part of Vietnamese culture.”

TEACHERS AND EXAMINATIONS

In various interviews, stories were told of corrupt practices by teachers, particularly during testing. During an examination, for example, a woman (not the supervising teacher) appeared in class and instructed the supervisor to allow one of the students to leave the examination. When the student returned he had in his possession a piece of paper, apparently given to him by the woman, containing answers to the test. The answers were also provided to other students, while the supervising teachers did nothing to stop the practice. The student who reported the story, however, stated “I felt very disappointed because I worked very hard studying for the exam, while those who did nothing and cheated received higher marks.”

Faculty members admitted they were lax in carrying out procedures such as careful proctoring of examinations. Institutions either lacked strict policies to deal with these matters, or there was a general consensus that nothing should be done. Stroll down the corridor of a Vietnamese university, and it is not uncommon to observe students openly talking, using cheat sheets, and blatantly copying during tests.

In the informal survey of classes, more than 95 percent of the students reported they had cheated at least once in a class, and all had observed situations of cheating by other students.

THE USE OF BRIBES

Given the low salary level of educators in Vietnam, it is often necessary for professors to engage in corrupt practices. Almost all of the faculty and administrators interviewed admitted receiving payments to give higher grades or to either assist or guarantee a student admission to a university.

A typical example was reported by one individual whose good friend passed the university entrance despite being a poor-performing student who never studied. The poor-performing student later confessed that the headmaster of the university accepted a 100 million dong (US\$6,200) payment from the student's father to guarantee his admission.

A number of students reported on the activities that occur on Teacher's Day, a public holiday celebrated in November

each year. The general practice is for students to go to a teacher's house and give gifts of flowers. However, it has now become more common for the teacher to receive expensive gifts such as cell phones or designer bags, with the expectation of higher exam grades and other favors in return.

The growing economy has only exacerbated the situation as competition for employment opportunities among students has increased and faculty members have a greater need to supplement their income.

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that the Vietnamese higher education system is in need of serious reform. Corruption is epidemic, and actions must be taken to change the environment in which these practices flourish. The recent decision by the Ministry of

Education and Training to adopt new, stricter measures on national exams and the increased media attention on corruption are steps in the right direction. The slogan for the educational reform campaign is "say no to cheating in examinations and achievement chasing in education." Nevertheless, there is not only a general frustration on all sides with the status quo but also concern that the current situation cannot be changed.

If Vietnam desires to obtain an international standard educational system, required reforms are necessary from all parties. Perhaps, most importantly, there must be a monumental change in the attitude and thinking by students, faculty, and parents. Education is a right and privilege that is earned, not a commodity to be sold by administrators and faculty. ■

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Aby, Stephen H., ed. *The Academic Bill of Rights Debate: A Handbook*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2007. 248 pp. \$39.95 (hb). ISBN 0-275-99244-6. Web site: www.praeger.com.

Since 2003, when an "academic bill of rights" was introduced by conservative activist David Horowitz, there has been a debate in the United States about "liberal bias" in American higher education and discrimination against conservative academics. The debate has even extended to several state legislatures.

Albornoz, Orlando. *La Universidad Latinoamericana: Entre Davos y Porto Alegre* [The Latin American University: From Davos to Porto Alegre]. Caracas, Venezuela: Los Libros de El Nacional, 2006. Apartado Postal 209, Caracas 1010-A, Venezuela.

Using two very different visions for development—the World Economic Forum and the World Social Forum—the author analyzes the role of the university in Latin American society, giving special emphasis to the case of Venezuela. Albornoz argues that a "middle point" between the extreme positions of Davos and Porto Alegre can bridge the gap between the practical demands of society and unique role of the university in national development and discourse. (Laura Rumbley)

Bogue, E. Grady. *Leadership Legacy Moments: Visions and Values for Stewards of Collegiate Mission*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2007. 144 pp. \$59.95 (hb). ISBN 0-275-99778-2. Web site: www.praeger.com.

Written as a guide for senior administrators in US universities by an experienced academic administrator, this volume focuses on how leaders can build a positive legacy of their work.

Consejo Superior de Educación, ed. *Educación Superior: Diversidad y Acceso* [Higher Education: Diversity and Access]. *Calidad en la Educación*, 26 (July 2007). Santiago, Chile: Consejo Superior de Educación, Marchant Pereira 844, Providencia, Santiago, Chile.

This edition of the Chilean Higher Council on Education's biannual publication is comprised of eight monographs, three studies, and six additional articles—all addressing the issues of access and diversity in postsecondary education. The primary focus is on the Chilean context, although Bolivia, the United States, and the European Union also receive attention. *Calidad en la Educación* is now included in Latindex, the regional online information system for scientific journals in Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain, and Portugal. It also appears in CLASE, the database of Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México for scientific and humanities journals in Latin America and the Caribbean. (Laura Rumbley)

Jantan, Muhamad, et al., eds. *Enhancing Quality of Faculty in Private Higher Education Institutions in Malaysia*. Penang, Malaysia: Institut Penyelidikan Pendidikan Tinggi Negara, 2006. 187 pp. (pb). ISBN 98342662-1-9. Web site: www.usm.my/ippn.

Almost one-third of Malaysian students attend private higher education institutions, many of which are new and considered of questionable quality. This book looks at the faculty in private higher education with the aim of understanding their working conditions and improving their quality. Analysis of faculty training, teaching conditions, and related issues is included.

Kell, Peter, and Gillian Vogl, eds. *Higher Education in the Asia Pacific: Challenges for the Future*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007. 245 pp. (hb). ISBN 1-84718-191-0. Web site: www.c-s-p.org.

A potpourri of themes stemming from several Australia-Malaysia conferences, this book features essays on the role of English and English-language teaching, the internationalization of higher education in Malaysia, academic governance in Malaysia, quality assurance in offshore teaching and learning, the role of academic women in Malaysia, and others.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America, coedited by Philip G. Altbach and Jorge Balán, has been published in a Korean translation. It has been published in Chinese by the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press, and arrangements have been made for translated editions in Spanish and Japanese. We have focused on expanding CIHE publications in other languages. *IHE* continues to appear in Arabic as well as some of our other publications, thanks to the Google Corporation. Philip Altbach's coedited book on American higher education (*Giao Duc Dai Hoc Hoa Ky*) has been published in Vietnamese by Nha Xuat Ban Giao Duc in Hanoi, Vietnam. We are working on starting a Chinese edition of *IHE* in collaboration with the Institute of Higher Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University.

Philip G. Altbach gave a keynote paper at the conference on world-class universities at Shanghai Jiao Tong University. He also participated in the Beijing Forum and gave a talk at the Institute of Higher Education at Nanjing University, all in China. He spoke at Seoul National University's annual research conference and at Yonsei University in Korea. In Saudi Arabia he will keynote at a conference on higher education research in the Arab region in February and in Berlin will participate in a symposium on international higher education research for the European Association for International Education.

Liz Reisberg, CIHE research associate, has received her doctorate. Her dissertation on quality assurance in Argentina was successfully defended in December. Gilton Eun Jun Lee, the CIHE's Web expert, also defended his doctoral dissertation in December. Congratulations to Dr. Reisberg and Dr. Lee.

Our Africa Web site, the International Network on Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is currently being updated. We plan on commissioning "editorial essays" from experts to add to the site soon.

The Center has hosted two visiting scholars during the fall term—Jane Knight from the University of Toronto, Canada, and Anthony Welch from the University of Sydney, Australia. Both are 2007–2008 Fulbright New Century Scholars. A day-long symposium on access and equity in higher education was cosponsored by the Center, the Monan Chair in Higher Education, and Fulbright New Century Scholars on November 30, 2007. The event featured talks by Knight and Welch along with Prof. Claire Callender of the University of London, and keynotes from Bruce Johnstone, distinguished professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and the NCS Distinguished Scholar Leader, and by Prof. Bridget Long, Harvard education economist.

NEW CIHE INITIATIVES

Our Center's widely used Web site is now being redesigned and will be available early in 2008. *International Higher Education* will be available online as in the past but with a more sophisticated search to allow researchers to use multiple elements (e.g., author + subject) for more precise searching. The site will not only have a new look but also a better integration of the current sections—International Network for Higher Education in Africa, the Higher Education Corruption Monitor, and the International Higher Education Clearinghouse. Visitors to the site will find navigating and locating information more streamlined.

A new online Expert's Database will enable visitors to the CIHE Web site to search by subject area to identify and locate researchers and scholars worldwide relevant to particular topics.

Watch for an electronic survey to let us know if you would

like to be listed in the Expert's Database and which research areas should be listed for you. If you have not yet returned the profile update form included recently in the *IHE* mailing, send us an e-mail (highered@bc.edu) with your name, institutional affiliation, title, e-mail address, and telephone number. As we add e-mail addresses to our *IHE* subscriber database we will be offering you the option of receiving the newsletter electronically or continuing to receive it in print, or both.

We are expanding our podcast initiative. Check the Web site for new podcasts. We are adding both audio and video higher education programming to the Web site as well.

Did you know that our resources among the most widely used in our field worldwide? When you "google" the topic "international higher education" or similar themes, CIHE resources appear at or near the top of the list of millions of choices. Articles from *International Higher Education* and our other publications are widely cited in the literature on higher education worldwide.

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the *International Higher Education* quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE WEB SITE

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of *International Higher Education* are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles,

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

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

reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science-based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/>.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Salina Kopellas

EDITORIAL OFFICE

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

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-Mail: highered@bc.edu

<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your institutional affiliation, your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, researcher, policy maker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613