

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 53 FALL 2008

International Issues

- 2 Academic Career Structures: Bad Ideas
Philip G. Altbach and Christine Musselin

Degree Mills: A Silent Crisis

- 3 Degree Mills: The Impact on Students and Society
Judith S. Eaton and Stamenka Uvalic-Trumbic
- 5 When Criminals Control the Ministry of Education
George D. Gollin
- 7 Clipping the Wings of Degree Mills in Nigeria
Peter Okebukola

Internationalization

- 8 Globalization, Internationalization and Rankings
Ellen Hazelkorn
- 10 Internationalization in the U.S.: Slipping Backward?
Kimberly Koch
- 11 The Private Nature of Cross-Border Higher Education
Jason E. Lane and Kevin Kinser
- 13 Jamaica's Policy Toward GATS
Terence Frater

China: Domestic and International

- 14 Transnational Education in China
Robin Matross Helms
- 16 Joint Venture Campuses in China
Osman Ozturgut
- 17 China's Tertiary Education Expansion
Ma Xiaoying and Malcolm Abbott

Indian Trends

- 18 Indian Higher Education Internationalization
Philip G. Altbach
- 20 Caste, Class, and Quality at the Indian Institutes of Technology
Asha Gupta

Countries and Regions

- 21 US Regional Accreditation Abroad
Jean Avnet Morse
- 23 Malaysian Challenges
William G. Tierney and Morshidi Sirat
- 24 Efforts to Reconstruct Afghan Higher Education
Michael Daxner

Departments

- 26 New Publications
- 27 News of the Center

Academic Career Structures: Bad Ideas

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND CHRISTINE MUSSELIN

Philip G. Altbach is Monan University Professor and Director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Christine Musselin is professor of sociology and Director of the Center for the Sociology of Organizations, Sciences Po, and Centre National pour la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, France. E-mail: c.musselin@csnrs.fr.

Successful universities and academic systems require career structures for the academic profession that permit a stable academic career, encourage the “best and brightest” to join the profession, reward the most productive for their work, and weed out those who are unsuited for academic work. We have been struck by the dysfunctional nature of career structures in many countries—with disturbing negative trends—and would, only with a small sense of irony, suggest a ranking for career structures that guarantee to fail to build a productive academic profession. Our serious point is this: without a career structure that attracts quality, rewards productivity, and permits stability, universities will fail in their mission of high-quality teaching, innovative research, and building a “world-class” reputation.

TAXICABS AND NONTENURE TRACK

A few examples will illustrate how poorly designed or badly implemented academic career structures can have a severely negative impact on the profession—and ultimately on the future of higher education. Many look to the United States as the world's leading university system and to the American professoriate as highly productive. The US “up-or-out” tenure system is seen as a rigorous but effective way of ensuring careful selection while at the same time providing a clear career path. While the system has been criticized for downplaying teaching and sometimes imposing unrealistic time constraints on junior staff, it is widely seen as effective. The problem is that fewer than half of new academic appointments in the United States are made on the traditional “tenure stream”; most new appointments are either part-time or full-time contracts. While the situation is somewhat better at the top institutions, this new arrangement makes an academic career impossible for participants of this new system. While this policy may save money and increase flexibility in the short run, it will have a highly negative impact on the American academic profession. The first increasing difficulty involves attracting the most qualified individuals to academe and constrains young researchers while autonomy should be provided at an age when creativity

and innovation are usually at the highest levels.

Argentina may come close to the top rank for irrationality and complexity. Although the large proportion of Argentine academics have low-paid part-time appointments (the original “taxicab professors”), the minority who have full-time appointments face a bizarre career path. If a faculty member wishes to be promoted to the highest academic rank, he or she must submit to a “*concours*” where the position occupied by the incumbent is open to applicants from all over the country or indeed the world. In other words, these academics are not promoted on the basis of their performance but may instead have to struggle for “their” job against other applicants. The only saving grace is that the system is often so inefficient that the *concours* is not organized and the incumbent is promoted anyway. Needless to say, the *concours* system produces immense stress among academics and deters many from entering the profession or from applying to proceed upward in the ranks.

EUROPEAN ANOMALIES

In France, the access to a first permanent position as *maître de conférences* occurs rather early compared with other countries (on average prior to the age of 33 years) and opens the path to 35 to 40 years of an academic career. These recruitments happen after a period of high uncertainty as in almost all disciplines the ratio of “open positions per doctors” has worsened, while the doctoral degree is still not recognized as a qualification by businesses or the public sector. Recruiting a new *maître*

We have been struck by the dysfunctional nature of career structures in many countries.

de conférences thus constitutes a high-stake decision making. But currently university departments have about two months to examine the candidates, select some of them, hold a 20- to 30-minute interview with those on the short list, and rank the best ones. Despite the highly selective process that the first candidate on the list successfully passes, this new colleague is rarely considered as a chance on which to build by the recruiting university. Not only is the salary based on a national bureaucratic scale below the average GDP per capita for France, but new academics are frequently not offered a personal office and may be asked to teach the classes colleagues do not want to offer or to accept administrative duties. The difficult road toward the doctorate leads to a rather disappointing and frequently non-well-remunerated situation, thus undermining the attractiveness of the career.

In Germany, the access to a stable career occurs much later than in France, at 42 on average for a first tenured position as professor. From the doctorate to the professorship, most young academics spend many years in the *Mittelbau*—as postdocs, research assistants, or other positions. Survivors of this long

and uncertain period of apprenticeship become autonomous professors who negotiate the number of assistantships, thus replicating as professors what they experienced in the *Mittelbau*. For sound reasons, a 2002 reform was intended to oppose the negative consequences of the long period of apprenticeship and to increase the institutional control over professors. Merit-based salaries were thus introduced for all new professors. The resources they receive when they are recruited cover three to five years and are renegotiated according to their performance. However, most academics find the new income system less satisfactory than the former. On top of that, the reform creates quasi tenure-track positions for young scholars, who thus become more independent from senior professors.

It is too early to tell if these new positions will lead more easily to professorships as there are currently fewer than 800. This turnabout may discourage academics in the traditional *Mittelbau*, who still experience the control of professors but know that if they themselves become professors the long apprenticeship period may be undermined by an autonomous apprenticeship; professors would also face income conditions that are simultaneously less attractive.

Several European countries—including Germany, France, and Russia—retain a system that requires a second doctoral dissertation to be completed before a person can attain the highest academic rank, thus adding midcareer stress and maintaining an old arrangement that may have worked in the days before mass higher education but is now dysfunctional and widely criticized.

In France, the access to a first permanent position as maître de conférences occurs rather early compared with other countries

CONCLUSION

We are not prepared to offer our mock ranking since it would be difficult to award a top rank to a single impaired academic career system; there is much competition. In fact, global trends indicate that the path to an academic career is becoming more difficult and less attractive. This pattern will not help the improvement of universities worldwide. For an academic system or a university to be successful, it requires an effective, fair, and transparent means of ensuring that an academic career is possible, that a professional and transparent process is attractive for scholars, and that an evaluation system is in place so that merit can be rewarded and appropriate selections made. Scholars entering the profession need access to a clear and achievable career path and assurance that high standards of performance provide career stability and success. Procedures must be rigorous and meritocratic, and institu-

tions must have confidence that only competence will be rewarded. At the same time, evaluation systems must not be overly complicated. Mobility within academic systems is desirable. The various aspects of academic performance—including teaching, research, and service to the university and society—must be assessed, although the balance among these elements may vary according to the mission of the specific institution. Career stability and a guarantee of academic freedom must be ensured. An American-style tenure system performs this role, but there are other arrangements as well. Evaluation systems, of course, need to take into account national traditions and realities. One thing is clear—universities and systems that score high on the dysfunctionality rankings will find it difficult to succeed in a competitive world. ■

Degree Mills: The Impact on Students and Society

JUDITH S. EATON AND STAMENKA UVALIC-TRUMBIC

Judith S. Eaton is President of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, Washington DC, USA. E-mail: eaton@chea.org and Stamenka Uvalic-Trumbic is Chief, Section for Reform, Innovation and Quality Assurance, Division of Higher Education, UNESCO, Paris, France. E-mail: s.uvalic-trumbic@unesco.org.

Degree mills are impeding the efforts to assure quality in higher education—a significant national issue for some time and now an international concern. In response, the US-based Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) recently joined with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to bring together an informal group of higher education and quality assurance/accreditation leaders to focus on degree mills.

THE TRAITS OF DEGREE MILLS

Degree mills are spurious or even fraudulent providers of higher education and training, offering degrees and certificates that may be considered bogus. At first glance, a degree mill frequently looks like a typical college or university, with publications (either print or electronic) displaying attractive campus facilities, logos that appear steeped in tradition, and a list of impressively credentialed faculty. Closer attention, however, often reveals that the so-called “campus” is just a post office box, the logo has been borrowed (and cleverly modified) from a well-known institution, and the list of faculty contains individuals who “may” be teaching at some point but are not in fact permanent professionals affiliated with the operation.

Without a single, commonly accepted, definition, most mills

share certain characteristics. Their degrees can be purchased. Little if any class attendance (onsite or online) is required. Few assignments are required of students, and graduation requirements are minimal. The decision to award a degree may involve disproportionate reliance on personal resumes or life experience, neither of which may be well documented. The degree mill may not have appropriate state licensure or authority to operate. The name of the operation may have been chosen to misleadingly resemble a well-known and highly regarded college or university. To reinforce their credibility, some mills misuse international organizations—such as UNESCO or the World Health Organization—falsely claiming accreditation by these bodies. Reliable evidence of quality, commonly through the achievement of accredited status from a recognized accreditor, may be lacking.

To reinforce their credibility, some mills misuse international organizations—such as UNESCO or the World Health Organization—falsely claiming accreditation by these bodies.

Older site- and mail-based delivery methods of degree mills once meant that such providers could operate only regionally or nationally. Now, however, degree mills aggressively use Web-based delivery, enabling them to function internationally with great ease. The export of degree mills tends to be dominated by developed countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia; and import is often dominated by unsuspecting and unwilling, mainly developing, countries.

How many degree mills are operating is hard to gauge, and all estimates of their numbers and scope of operation need to be treated with caution. The financial scope of the degree mill enterprise may range from at least one-half billion to billions of dollars annually.

THE PERILS OF DEGREE MILLS

The harms caused by degree mills are so socially significant that all actors involved in higher education have a stake in discouraging the existence of such questionable providers. The stakeholders include not only students but also employers and government, as well as colleges and universities.

Students, whether deliberating seeking an easy path to a degree or genuine victims of misleading degree mill advertising, are endangered because these often expensive credentials are fraudulent and in many cases useless. Students and parents in developing countries, attracted by the opportunity of a foreign and more portable degree, are a particularly vulnerable group. All too frequently, the credentials cannot be used for obtaining employment or upgrading employment status. Credits from a degree mill do not readily transfer to a legiti-

mate institution. If a baccalaureate degree is proven to be fake, it cannot be used for entry to graduate school.

Employers are hurt when they unknowingly rely on make-believe degrees as evidence of the competence of the employees they hire. An employee with such a degree is, at the very least, an embarrassment. At the extreme, such a person is a danger to others, especially when the bogus credential purports to affirm expertise in areas such as nursing or engineering. Lives are at stake.

Government suffers when millions of taxpayer dollars are used for student grants and loans to pay the tuition costs of a degree mill or when the government-as-employer provides tuition assistance to its employees who “attend” degree mills. Government (i.e., the taxpayer) is also obligated to sustain the cost of enforcing regulations to fight degree mills—such as the fraud investigations conducted over the years in the United States by the Federal Trade Commission and the General Accountability Office.

Colleges and universities are harmed because their legitimate efforts to provide quality higher education are undermined. When degree mills capture and minimally transform the names of reliable higher education providers for their own questionable use, they cause confusion and doubt among prospective students and the public. Public suspicion of degree mills spills over on legitimate providers of higher education, compromising the efforts of reliable institutions to sustain public trust and serve the public interest.

The harms caused by degree mills are so socially significant that all actors involved in higher education have a stake in discouraging the existence of such questionable providers.

NATIONAL POLICIES

Since the 1990s, a number of countries have taken significant action to contain degree mills: publishing lists of legitimate institutions, promulgating laws to prevent the establishment of degree mills, shutting down mills that have managed to establish themselves, and sustaining ongoing public information and awareness campaigns. At the recent meeting, mentioned earlier, of higher education and quality assurance leaders concerning degree mills, individuals from Nigeria, Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States all spoke of sustaining several of these practices.

Other efforts include China's publication of lists of recognized foreign institutions and its requirement that foreign institutions establish partnerships with Chinese institutions to operate. In the United Kingdom, a system of alerts is in place to inform the public about degree mills, coupled with advice about whether government criteria for UK degree-awarding

powers and university title are met. In Nigeria, online degrees from unaccredited institutions are banned and employers are not supposed to accept fraudulent degrees. In Australia, the term “university” is protected.

INTERNATIONAL ACTION

The recent focus on degree mills accompanies work on academic quality as higher education is increasingly internationalized. In *Study Abroad*, UNESCO published the CHEA *Fact Sheet* on degree mills and accreditation mills developed in 2003 as part of its alerts to this phenomenon. UNESCO and the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development issued *Guidelines for Quality Provision of Cross-Border Higher Education in 2005*. The *Guidelines* suggest tasks for the various stakeholders in higher education—to protect quality for cross-border higher education provision to safeguard against degree mills. UNESCO has also recently launched a pilot, Portal on Higher Education Institutions, that provides international access to reliable countrywide lists of legitimate higher education providers (<http://www.unesco.org/education/portal/hed-institutions>). This positive listing makes it clear that institutions that are not included may be suspect.

The international group brought together by CHEA and UNESCO is working on an international effective practices statement to address the problem of degree mills. The group is also exploring additional strategies such as whether a permanent international effort is needed to address rogue providers and the feasibility of an ongoing international campaign to raise public awareness.

This international effort is an ongoing need. Degree mills will continue to be a problem for students, employers, government, and higher education. They put a vital resource of our countries at risk—namely, our extensive, diverse, and highly effective higher education enterprise and the students who are served. ■

When Criminals Control the Ministry of Education

GEORGE D. GOLLIN

George D. Gollin is professor of physics at the University of Illinois and a member of the Board of Directors of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Address: Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA. E-mail: g-gollin@uiuc.edu.

The connection between education and personal economic advantage drives a global market for higher education. But much of the world cannot create additional university capacity

at a rate to match this demand. Diploma mills, businesses that sell bogus degrees to customers in search of easy credentials, comprise the dark response to these market forces. The recent demise of a sophisticated American diploma mill provides some insight into these abominations.

PAYING BRIBES TO GREAT EFFECT

In 2002, Richard Novak traveled to Washington DC to bribe a diplomat. Perhaps his experience as a car salesman in Arizona served him well: he convinced Abdulah Dunbar, the Liberian embassy's deputy chief of mission, to sell Liberian university accreditation to “St. Regis University” for \$2,250, considerably less than Dunbar's original demand for \$4,000. This first transaction opened a conduit through which Dixie and Steve Randock, the American owners of the St. Regis diploma mill, began channeling payments and incentives to Liberian officials.

The recent demise of a sophisticated American diploma mill provides some insight into these abominations.

At that time Liberia was still a year from the end of its bloody civil war. Mean life expectancy was 38 years, and infant mortality was 15 percent. Much of Liberia's infrastructure had been destroyed. Into this desperate landscape the Randocks pretended to insert three universities: St. Regis, Robertstown, and James Monroe. Their Web sites invited customers to contact Dunbar in Washington or Andrew Kronyanh at Liberia's embassy in Ghana, for verification of the schools' legitimacy. All three mills claimed to be in Monrovia; a doctored campus photograph showed a beautiful building in a pastoral setting. But this was really Blenheim Palace, birthplace of the very English Winston Churchill.

HIJACKING THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Dunbar was dismissed from the Liberian embassy in June 2003, complicating his task of vouching for St. Regis. The Randocks sent Novak and Dunbar to Africa two months later “with the specific intent to carry out the appropriate tasks placing [Dunbar] into the appropriate Liberian political office.” The Randocks successfully achieved their ends: Dunbar was returned to Washington a few months later as the embassy's chief of mission.

By the end of 2003 the Randocks had come to control the Ministry of Education's list of recognized colleges and universities, as well as the content of the Liberian embassy's Web site. Through their officially sanctioned “National Board of Education,” they sold Liberian accreditation directly to other diploma mills such as “Southern Pacific University” and “American Coastline University.” Liberian officials under their

sway included senior diplomats in at least two embassies, a minister of justice, a foreign minister, two successive directors of Liberia's National Commission for Higher Education, and a number of other diplomats and government officials, including several at the Ministry of Education.

You Too Can Own a University!

The following year the Randocks expanded their product line to include prefabricated diploma mills, pitching them this way: "Do you want to make MILLION\$ by owning your own online school, college or university? . . . OUR EXPERTS CAN HELP YOU DO IT!" They informed prospective customers that their "expert consultants have established long term relationships with the proper authorities, which will substantially shorten the time it would normally take to establish a new school or to gain legitimate accreditation [for] your existing school."

In July 2005, Richard Novak flew to Washington DC to meet with three investors interested in purchasing accreditation and other services for "Randolph Addison Davis Technical University." Four hours into the meeting Abdulah Dunbar (the "proper authority," no doubt) arrived to discuss his fee for services to be rendered. But the investors were actually United States Secret Service agents and RADTU was a ruse.

THE END OF ST. REGIS

A month later federal, state, and local authorities raided the St. Regis enterprise, confiscating computers and degree-making paraphernalia at seven sites in Arizona, Idaho, and Washington state. By then the Randocks had sold thousands of degrees to customers all over the world. They had even appropriated the name "Thomas Carper" (a US senator from the state of Delaware) for the president of St. Regis. And the min-

Four hours into the meeting Abdulah Dunbar (the "proper authority," no doubt) arrived to discuss his fee for services to be rendered. But the investors were actually United States Secret Service agents and RADTU was a ruse.

isterial recognition of many of the "universities" whose names the Randocks printed on diplomas was functionally equivalent to that of the legitimate University of Liberia.

Richard Novak, the Randocks, and five other defendants were indicted in October 2005 on a mix of criminal charges that included mail and wire fraud, money laundering, and bribery of foreign officials. Kenneth Pearson, the St. Regis Web master, was indicted on additional child pornography charges a few months later: the St. Regis servers also held thousands of pornographic images. All eight defendants chose to plead guilty, the last in April 2008, rather than face a jury trial.

Degree-granting authority does not guarantee academic legitimacy. Was St. Regis a legitimate university? Of course not. No classes were taught and none of the Randocks' employees who fabricated transcripts and diplomas for customers had finished high school. The fact that the Randocks had purchased "accreditation" from the same officials who would issue recognition to genuine Liberian universities cannot change this.

But did their Liberian recognition actually invest them with the legal authority to award degrees? Again, the answer is no, since the Randocks sold degrees from Washington state and Idaho (rather than Liberia) and had never been licensed by either Washington or Idaho. The situation would have become more complicated if St. Regis had relocated its servers and administrative infrastructure to Liberia or Ghana. It still would have been a diploma mill, but it might have been able to operate in compliance with Liberian law.

Possession of degree-granting authority issued by an appropriate government agency is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for a school to be legitimate.

We have a problem of similar shape in the United States, where degree-granting authority stems from individual states with varying standards. For example, Alabama's Department of Postsecondary Education sometimes issues private school operating licenses without adequate attention to the practices of those schools. One organization with such a license claimed "accreditation" from an accreditation mill run by the school's owner; his accreditation mill also issued credentials to bogus medical schools. A few years before obtaining an Alabama license, he had partnered with the Randocks' organization so that his clients would receive diplomas from his school and also from St. Regis.

Possession of degree-granting authority issued by an appropriate government agency is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for a school to be legitimate. Any international agreement that governs recognition of academic degrees across borders must be robust to problems arising from the distinction between legitimacy and legal compliance.

This is not a simple, static issue. The changing circumstances that can threaten to destabilize countries such as Chad and the Central African Republic make their governments targets for the operators of diploma mills. And the pressing need for increased higher education capacity in the developing world creates a market that is hugely attractive to diploma mills. It will be the task of the international higher education community to develop the vetting and database tools necessary to address this. ■

Clipping the Wings of Degree Mills in Nigeria

PETER OKEBUKOLA

Peter Okebukola is Chairman of Council, Crawford University, Nigeria, and immediate-past Executive Secretary, National Universities Commission. E-mail: pokebukola@yahoo.com.

The Nigerian higher education system, with 297 institutions (universities, polytechnics, and colleges of education) and enrolling over 3.5 million students, is the most expansive in Africa. Highly respected in the past, the system is now sadly paled among other quality-depressing factors by activities of degree mills. Persons who want certificates at any cost and lack the basic entry requirements for admission into available spaces in approved institutions make up one of the pools from which degree mills draw their students. The other source is the candidates leftover after an admission season. In 2008, it is expected that about 80 percent of the over one million candidates who sat for the Universities Matriculation Examination will fall into this category. Holders of degrees from these bogus institutions are decried by employers in the private and public sector for their poor knowledge and skills in the fields they claim to have tertiary-level education. Attainment of the Nigerian vision of being one of the top 20 economies by 2020 will be compromised by the injection of such poor-quality graduates into the economy. Herein lies the distaste for and the *raison d'être* for government's clampdown on degree mills.

Four major institutional arrangements qualify as degree mills in the Nigerian context. These establishments constitute unapproved satellite campuses of local and foreign universities, unapproved subdegree institutions serving as affiliates of approved universities, unapproved programs run in universities, and online courses offered by rogue foreign providers. From 1995 to 2001, these "pollutants" produced annually about 15 percent of total university "graduates" in Nigeria. Between 2001 and 2004, a sharp drop in output occurred, followed by a slight rise between 2005 and 2006. By 2007, the activities of the National Universities Commission (NUC), the regulatory agency for the universities, induced a significant drop in the number of institutions and their enrollment. Sustenance of the momentum of the NUC clampdown is expected to reduce the activities of degree mills to nonsignificance.

IMPOSING RESTRICTIONS

In the past 9 years, a flurry of activity has been directed at eradicating the degree mills—seven of which are noteworthy. First, by 1999, a national policy was enacted by the National Council

on Education. This highest policymaking body directed the closure of all local and foreign satellite campuses. Policy enactment turned out to be a good initiative in ridding the higher education terrain of degree mills.

The second strategy is enforcement and application of sanctions. Not until 2001 did NUC enact enforcement of the policy on closure. In a dramatic national raid, NUC, backed up by the force of the antiriot wing of the police under orders of the inspector-general, took steps to close the illegal campuses. The success rate was about 90 percent since some campuses that initially terminated operations reemerged clandestinely to run their programs. Between 2002 and 2005, the number and vigor of the degree mills declined perceptibly.

The third action is the establishment and enforcement of the carrying capacity of approved programs—the maximum number of students that available resources can support in the production of quality graduates. This regulation ensured that universities do not overenroll through illegal degree-mill operations. As sanctions, overenrolled programs are decertified by NUC.

Four major institutional arrangements qualify as degree mills in the Nigerian context.

Fourth, NUC is partnered with the Department of State Services—Nigeria's secret service—in locating, arresting, and prosecuting operators of unapproved universities and satellite campuses. The fifth strategy is public disclosure in national electronic and print media of the names of illegal tertiary institutions placed in the national media by the executive secretary of NUC. Potential students, parents, and employers have started to shun these institutions. With dwindling clientele, such institutions are expected to fade into oblivion.

Since 2007, as a major stride against degree mills, NUC has directed all approved universities to make full disclosure of their programs. The commission followed up with resource verification leading to granting of formal approval where minimum academic standards for setting up programs are met. These programs will be listed in the Directory of Approved Programmes in the Nigerian University System. Since online and cross-border programs are yet to be backed up for recognition purposes by any national policy or law, the publication of the directory, as a seventh strategy, will screen out degree mills from institutions at which potential students would desire enrollment.

ARE WE WINNING THE WAR?

On May 5, 2008, NUC announced the closure of 10 illegal universities. This thinned the ranks of the degree mills and signaled others in the ignoble league that NUC was close at their heels. In addition, the May 2008 mop-up accreditation of pro-

grams was another edge to the NUC sword for eliminating degree mills.

In the last three years, the National Youth Service Corps Scheme into which university graduates are fed has stepped up its regime of screening out products from bogus institutions and unapproved programs. Together, these efforts have translated into an estimated 70 percent success rate in the war against degree mills.

CONCLUSION

Degree mills thrive on fertile grounds provided by a combination of desperate students and easy-profit-seeking providers. While efforts are under way in Nigeria to make the terrain as difficult as possible for the duo, we cannot guarantee that Nigeria will become a degree-mill-free zone in the shortest possible time. The increasing number of candidates who fail to secure university admission and who want to obtain university degrees at all costs makes such an assurance unrealistic. Hope, however, rests on the conviction that NUC will sustain its clampdown on degree mills, indeed, with increasing vigor. ■

Globalization, Internationalization, and Rankings

ELLEN HAZELKORN

Ellen Hazelkorn is professor, Director of Research and Enterprise and Dean of the Graduate Research School, Dublin Institute of Technology. She is also Director of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit, Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland. E-mail: ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie.

Within days of each other, *Times Higher Education* published two articles (July 3, 2008 and July 10, 2008) and the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (July 11, 2008) published one about how domestic demographic shifts across Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries could cause a near doomsday scenario for, in this case, UK and Japanese higher education. UK universities were urged to “buckle up for a rough ride,” while the latter paper told tales of how Japanese universities were responding to escalating competition by “sending recruiters out to high schools, holding open houses for prospective students, building swimming pools and revamping libraries, and recruiting more foreign students.” Stories of what the *Daily Yomiuri* calls the “scramble for students” or the *Economist* calls the “battle for brainpower”

are increasingly common as higher education moves center stage in the geopolitical contest for an increasing share of the global economic market. Indeed, the battle for talent now complements more traditional struggles for natural resources. Government policy aims to offset domestic demographic shifts with internationalization—once seen as a policy of cultural exchange. Global competition is reflected in the rising significance and popularity of rankings that attempt to measure the talent-catching capacity of higher education institutions.

The following observations are based on an international

Countries with high levels of international students benefit from the contribution they make to domestic research and development, while those with low numbers find it “more difficult . . . to capitalize on this external contribution to domestic human capital production.”

survey of higher education leaders in 2006 and interviews at higher education institutions in Australia, Japan, and Germany during 2008.

HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION POLICY

Internationalization has become both a university and a government priority—not just because it is seen as a sign of global competitiveness but also because it serves as a way to ensure the capacity to participate in world science. According to the OECD, countries with high levels of international students benefit from the contribution they make to domestic research and development, while those with low numbers find it “more difficult . . . to capitalize on this external contribution to domestic human capital production.”

Previously protected by geography from the full effect of competition, Japan's 726 universities now face considerable pressure. According to census statistics, the number of 18-year-old Japanese has fallen to 1.3 million in 2007 from 2.05 million in 1992. The figure is likely to drop to 1.21 million by 2009. According to the *International Herald Tribune* (June 21, 2007), nearly a third of the nation's four-year universities were unable to fill all of their openings, and others have now closed. The government has set a target of increasing the number of international students from the current 100,000, to 300,000 by 2020.

Germany faces similar demographic challenges, with the greatest impact expected after 2015. The federal government predicts that even with 200,000 immigrants a year, Germany's population will shrink from today's 82.5, to 75 million by 2050. International student recruitment is now seen as vital as the number of students entering higher education and then matriculating from undergraduate to postgraduate falls. The government had anticipated restricting matriculation to only

50 percent of the cohort; but due to such small numbers, the idea was dropped.

Australia faces a converse difficulty. Education is a \$12.5 billion export industry—half in higher education—the third-largest Australian export after coal and iron ore, a point of much celebration and much consternation. The former reflects the significance of higher education for the economy, but it also reveals Australia's overdependence on international students at a time when student-exporting countries—such as Singapore, China, and Malaysia—are rapidly expanding their own higher education systems. Australia has the highest proportion of international students in higher education (17.3%), which exceeds the OECD average of 6.7 percent, although its proportion of international students in advanced research programs (17.8%) lags behind competitive universities by up to 50 percent. This difference is now critical, because PhD students are seen, by all governments, as a talent metric vital for economic development and innovation. Accordingly, changes have been made in student visa requirements to allow easier transition to permanent residency.

RANKINGS AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Australia, Germany, and Japan provide good illustrations of how global rankings have become a powerful weapon in the battle for talent. On a simple country comparison, 2 Australian universities are in the top 100 on the Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities or 8 in the Times QS Ranking of World Universities in 2007. Germany had 6 and 3, respectively, and Japan had 6 or 4 universities, respectively. Despite this record, there is concern in all three countries about the ability to maintain competitive attractiveness.

Australia, Germany, and Japan provide good illustrations of how global rankings have become a powerful weapon in the battle for talent.

International students, especially postgraduate students, are savvy consumers of global rankings. Almost without exception, all international students interviewed for this research indicated they used rankings to short-list institutions, sometimes within an identified country. For example, they “might know about Australia, but not where in Australia to go.” Institutional rank transmits social and cultural capital that resonates with family, friends, and potential employers. It grants self-pride and peer-esteem. This is particularly true for Asian students—the prime recruitment target—who may seek employment in their home country upon graduation. One student explained:

at my university, I have a colleague who graduated from Columbia University and she's holding a very high position at the university now. They did not tell me frankly but I could read their minds that if I am lucky enough to

graduate at this university I could not be as highly appreciated as the one who graduated from Columbia University.

While there is a growing international undergraduate student market, most of these students are spending either a semester or year abroad as part of their program of study. Nevertheless, even here, their decisions are often influenced by reputational factors.

In turn, higher education institutions and their governments are developing sophisticated marketing and recruitment strategies to woo high-achieving students with attractive financial and scholarship packages

REPUTATION, VISIBILITY, AND BRAND

Higher education leaders and their admissions offices are very clear that rankings form a vital part of strategic positioning. A high rank enhances visibility and helps create brand. Higher education leaders, at all levels in the popularity stakes, commented that rankings made their institution better known, both nationally and internationally, in keeping with rankings among international students, recruitment agencies, and other higher education institutions interested in forming partnerships. While some institutions vie for a high rank, many others find just being mentioned beneficial—helping to overcome local bias or tradition.

In turn, higher education institutions and their governments are developing sophisticated marketing and recruitment strategies to woo high-achieving students with attractive financial and scholarship packages, often with other benefits (e.g., financial assistance and access to particular facilities, etc.). According to the 2006 international survey, almost 50 percent of institutions used their rank for publicity purposes—on their Web page, in speeches; at new faculty, student orientation, or international meetings; or when lobbying government:

those who are looking at their institution on an international scale are fully aware of the potential of these ratings, rankings, evaluations to attract students, to attract faculty and so on and it is also commented in . . . the newspapers, in comments in the media and so on. . . .

At the same time, institutions use rankings to help select prospective postgraduate students.

Yet, readying higher education for an influx of international students is not simple. In Germany and Japan, this means transforming programs and activities into English—even when, as in Japan, over 92 percent of foreign students come from Asia, of which 60 percent are Chinese and 15 percent Korean. Most Japanese universities are focusing on postgraduate activities, initially in science and technology fields.

Institutional flexibility allowed under new “incorporation” legislation permits universities to offer distinctive tenure arrangements and salary packages to entice internationally competitive scholars. At one university, exceptional scholars can earn up to twice their baseline salary based on performance. Knowledge of Japanese is not required because these scholars will teach at the postgraduate level, with international or internationally minded students. New facilities include more dormitories, world-class laboratories, and international student services and amenities. At a time when university budgets are being reduced by one percent annually, many Japanese higher education leaders are worried.

IMPACT ON FUNDING INTERNATIONALIZATION

Competitiveness and funding are common themes in all countries—to make higher education institutions attractive academically, research-wise, and physically—and thus draw international students and faculty. There are two main policy regimes. Germany and Japan are unapologetically using marketing and rankings to create greater vertical (reputational) and horizontal (functional) differentiation, concentrating “excellence” in 10 and 30 world-class universities, respectively. This will probably involve closing down some regional and private universities. In contrast, Australia—with its newly elected social democratic government—wants to “brand Australia” with a “diverse set of high-performing, globally focused” higher education institutions. Because rankings and similar benchmarking assessments do influence institutional behavior and performance, the policy choices are critical.



Internationalization on US Campuses: Slipping Backward?

KIMBERLY KOCH

Kimberly Koch is a program associate at the American Council on Education's Center for International Initiatives. Address: ACE, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036, USA. E-mail: kim_koch@ace.nche.edu.

Faced with unprecedented economic integration and globalization, one might expect to see higher education institutions redoubling their efforts to internationalize their campuses. In reality, internationalization efforts at US colleges and universities are uneven at best.

In May, the American Council on Education (ACE) released a report that summarizes the findings of a 2006 survey of US

colleges and universities on their policies and practices in furthering internationalization. Titled *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2008 Edition* and written by Madeleine F. Green, Dao Luu, and Beth Burris, the report is the second in a series, following a 2001 study. These reports are the only comprehensive source of data on internationalization in US higher education institutions. In 2006, ACE surveyed 2,746 institutions and received an overall response rate of 39 percent. The report highlights the 2006 data, comparing it with information gathered in 2001 when possible. The publication reports the findings for all respondents as well as by institutional type (doctorate-granting universities, master's colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, and associate's colleges). The data emerging from the study were often surprising and suggested the need for campus leaders to refocus their efforts toward internationalization, although a few encouraging trends emerged.

LOW PRIORITIES ON MOST CAMPUSES

The survey data indicate that formal institutional commitments to internationalization are lackluster. In 2006, just 39 percent of institutions made a specific reference to international or global education in their mission statements, and 34 percent listed it among their top five strategic priorities (although that is up from 28% in 2001). Forty-four percent had a task force that worked solely on advancing internationalization efforts, and slightly more than half (52%) reported that they assigned a visible role to internationalization by highlighting international or global education programs and opportunities in their recruitment literature. Only 23 percent had a separate plan that addresses institutionwide internationalization. Although mission statements and strategic plans are only one piece of internationalization efforts, the articulation of explicit goals and development of reinforcing strategies to meet those goals are critical to affecting broad and deep change.

LIMITED REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATES

In the past five years, the intensification of global trade and heightened attention to national security have raised awareness in the United States about the need for more Americans to be able to speak a language other than English. Despite this imperative, ACE's study found that required language study is far from universal. Only 23 percent of all institutions surveyed had a foreign-language admissions requirement, an increase of only 2 percent from 2001. Institutions were also less likely to have undergraduate foreign-language graduation requirements for all or some students in 2006 (45%) than in 2001 (53%). Less than one in five (16%) had a foreign-language graduation requirement for all undergraduate students in 2006.

Furthermore, ACE found that fewer institutions required a course with an international or global focus as part of their general education requirements in 2006 (37%) than in 2001 (41%). Among institutions with such a requirement, the proportion with a “non-Western” course requirement dropped

from 62 percent in 2001 to 50 percent in 2006. It is important to note, however, that there are major differences in these findings by institutional type. More than half of doctorate-granting, master's, and baccalaureate institutions had such general education requirements; and 50 percent of doctorate and master's colleges and universities with such a requirement required two or more courses with an international focus.

The survey data indicate that formal institutional commitments to internationalization are lackluster.

LOW NUMBERS OF BRANCH CAMPUSES AND PROGRAMS

Despite expanded media coverage on the establishment of high-profile branch campuses in the Middle East and the implementation of degree-granting programs with partners in China and India, few US institutions actually offer such programs. The ACE survey found that 8 percent of all responding institutions offered such programs abroad, with doctorate-granting institutions being the most likely to do so. Approximately two in five of those institutions with programs abroad offered some or all of them through branch campuses. The majority of degree programs abroad were offered in China (40%) or Western Europe (30%); and in the field of business/management (64%).

IT'S NOT ALL BAD NEWS . . .

From 2001 to 2006, ACE saw a dramatic increase in the proportion of institutions that offer study-abroad opportunities—from 65 percent in 2001 to 91 percent in 2006. More institutions are also offering internships abroad (31%, 9% increase from 2001), international service opportunities (24%, 11% increase from 2001), and field study abroad (29%, 7% increase from 2001). Additionally, ACE found that institutions are signaling their support for education abroad by creating guidelines to ensure that undergraduate students can participate in approved education-abroad programs without delaying graduation. Sixty-six percent of institutions had such guidelines in 2006, up from 56 percent in 2001. Still, the proportion of students participating in such programs remained low. Twenty-seven percent of institutions reported that no students who graduated in 2005 had participated in study abroad, and 46 percent indicated that less than 5 percent of their 2005 graduating class had done so.

Institutions are also increasing opportunities and funding for international research and travel for faculty members. In 2006, 58 percent of institutions supported faculty to lead study abroad programs, compared with 46 percent in 2001. Similarly, the proportion of institutions supporting faculty travel to meetings abroad rose from 40 percent in 2001 to 56 percent in 2006. Appreciably more institutions offered funding

for faculty to study or conduct research abroad in 2006 than in 2001 (39%, compared with 27%). More institutions offered opportunities for faculty to increase their foreign-language skills (36% in 2006, up from 16% in 2001). Both ACE's experience working directly with institutions and the literature on internationalization show that faculty play a leading role in driving campus internationalization. Institutional investments in faculty international experiences, therefore, can have a significant impact on internationalizing the curriculum.

The data show that US institutions are making slow and uneven progress toward comprehensive internationalization. Although survey data present an incomplete picture, there is ample evidence that institutional policies and practices have not yet caught up with the rhetoric of internationalization. Overall, internationalization does not permeate the fabric of most institutions; it is not yet sufficiently deep nor as widespread as it should be to prepare students to meet the challenges they will face. ■

The Private Nature of Cross-Border Higher Education

JASON E. LANE AND KEVIN KINSER

Jason Lane is assistant professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, SUNY. Kevin Kinser is a PROPHE collaborating scholar and associate professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, SUNY. E-mail: jlane@albany.edu; kkinser@albany.edu.

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

Many observers have noted that the relatively easy international mobility of students, faculty, and curriculum facilitates the growth of cross-border higher education. Equally important, new foreign providers are encouraged in many countries by a policy environment that supports private-sector involvement in education. Private higher education institutions, especially for-profit providers, are clearly interested in the cross-border market. Still, public-sector institutions have been and continue to be significant participants in cross-border higher education. When abroad, however, these public institutions nearly always operate and are legally recognized as private entities. Indeed, most foreign operations are supported primarily through tuition and fees and typically do not receive funding from either the home or the host governments.

NONENDEMIC ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

In ecology, an endemic organism is the native inhabitant of a unique and often geographically constrained environment. In a similar way, public institutions are endemic to a particular policy environment defined by state borders. However, cross-border public higher education, by establishing locations outside of its native political and financial home, exists apart from its home environment. This introduces something new into the host country and establishes nonendemic academic institutions in cross-border higher education.

Rather than expanding in their own environments, institutions from developed nations are moving into the less-regulated and less-competitive environments of developing nations.

We first used endemism as a way to describe domestic cross-border activity within the United States. In a little noticed phenomenon, many public, state-supported institutions such as Central Michigan University and Troy University (Alabama) have established campuses outside their home state. These educational organizations are regulated as private-sector entities in the new state, while experiencing almost no oversight from the home state. This regulatory disparity means that it is often easier for a public institution to pursue new markets in the private-sector environments of other states than within their native state environment.

Similar activity seems to be occurring with cross-border higher education internationally. Rather than expanding in their own environments, institutions from developed nations are moving into the less-regulated and less-competitive environments of developing nations. As Daniel C. Levy has long noted, the private sector of most countries have limited regulations, and governments often do not anticipate growth of the private sector. This trend makes it difficult to predict how the entry of a new nonendemic institutional type will affect existing educational structures, policies, and capacities.

Indeed, countries actively encourage foreign institutions to offer higher education within their borders without making a policy distinction between public or private institutions. The Dubai International Academic City, for example, recruits public institutions from other countries to open programs in Dubai, and those programs are being authorized to operate as autonomous private entities. The impact of these foreign institutions on existing regulatory frameworks in the emirate is uncertain, but they may herald the unanticipated consequences of emerging new institutional forms in other countries.

REGULATION IN THE CROSS-BORDER ENVIRONMENT

In cross-border education, foreign organizations may also disturb the existing policy environment and throw out of balance the regulatory mechanisms in the host country. As in the Dubai case, cross-border policies may regulate foreign state-sponsored entities as if they were fully private, nongovernmental organizations. In fact, foreign academic institutions remain at a competitive advantage to their true private-sector colleagues because of their public-sector connections at home. Even with firewalls to prevent state funds or other resources to directly support cross-border activities, such as with many Australian universities, the campus can benefit from brand recognition of the home campus and the existing administrative support structure of the home campus. Further, their association with a recognized government provides a level of credibility and perceived quality assurance (whether true or not) of which privates may not benefit.

Cross-border regulations may assume that foreign academic institutions, as public-sector entities, have home government endorsement of their cross-border activities. In reality, though, such organizations can complete international collaborations and commitments with little government oversight, especially in the vast majority of cases where no government resources are at risk. We found this occurring in our study of US domestic cross-border activity, and anecdotal evidence suggests this can be true in international efforts as well. These cross-border campuses can fall through the cracks of quality-assurance regulations, with both governments assuming the other (or some entity within the country) is providing oversight, but neither actively engaging in such a way.

In cross-border education, foreign organizations may also disturb the existing policy environment and throw out of balance the regulatory mechanisms in the host country.

Agreements between the host country and the foreign organization may not consider the ability of the home government to assert its authority over any cross-border activity, whether or not state funds are directly involved. The host country is allowing an agency of a different government to operate within its borders, while treating it as a private-sector nongovernmental organization. Participation in a foreign country may have domestic political concerns that contradict the ostensibly private nature of the cross-border activity. For example, the home government may question the propriety of state higher education involvement in the capacity building of a foreign country. The home government could go so far as to restrict or force redesign of the type of curriculum delivered, out of fear for national security or aiding a global competitor.

NEW QUESTIONS

Thinking of cross-border higher education as a private enterprise in the traditional sense oversimplifies the true nature of the organizations. Even though they operate in the private sector and are regulated as private entities, as extensions of a public government, many cross-border endeavors raise new questions about the role and operation of these institutions. Are such institutions truly independent institutions? To what extent does a home government's political agenda affect operations of the cross-border activity? As research continues in this arena, such questions need to be further investigated in order to provide a more robust understanding of this phenomenon. ■

Jamaica's Development Goals and GATS Commitment

TERENCE FRATER

Terence Frater holds a PhD in comparative education from the University of Toronto. E-mail: tfrater@oise.utoronto.ca.

Jamaica, a small developing Caribbean nation that ranks among the most indebted countries worldwide is plagued by high rates of violent crime, unemployment of over 13 percent, migration of its graduates estimated at over 70 percent, and one of the lowest per capita GDP in the region. It is felt that higher education—a sector particularly linked to knowledge creation, social mobility, and economic growth—can play a pivotal role in the country meeting its development needs and overcoming its social and economic deficits. This is the sector currently most associated with trade liberalization and experiencing the greatest level of expansion across national borders. Jamaican higher education originated in the 1830s with the creation of teachers colleges and theological colleges and has since expanded into a diverse and complex system of public and private universities, colleges, and other institutions, which includes a growing number of cross-border providers from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada.

The urgency to create more effective policy mechanisms for the sector and to become more competitive in navigating the complexities of emergent global accords became more acute for Jamaica with the changed geopolitical dynamics at the end of the cold war and the growing endorsement of free trade. However, the creation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)—the services agreement of the World Trade Organization (WTO)—together with liberalization trends in education raised specific concerns that developing countries

like Jamaica would be unable to implement higher education policies related to their development goals.

JAMAICA'S GATS COMMITMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In 1994 Jamaica was among a number of developing countries to include higher education in its GATS Schedule of Commitments. In doing so, it assumed legally binding obligations in the sector and subjected policy initiatives to the governance of the WTO. Interviews with Jamaican politicians, in both government and opposition, and senior education and trade policymakers revealed negotiators were able, without consultation, to set a higher education agenda based on their own experience and beliefs dealing with other sectors of the economy. No process existed at the time to trigger dialogue between negotiators and education stakeholders. The GATS commitment appeared largely affected by a culture of liberalization and free trade, together with a sense of the need to expand access to higher education.

Jamaica is not unique in this regard. Around the globe, education stakeholders reacted rather late to trade liberalization trends occurring in the sector. They considered it a “public good,” isolated from the marketplace. Consequently, trade negotiators were instrumental in crafting GATS commitments based on their own rationale—that is, contributing to economic growth, expanding access, and enhancing quality.

Jamaican trade policymakers suggested that GATS presented opportunities to position the country's higher education sector as an export industry. They proposed marketing the country's internationally recognized English-language higher education system to Latin American students, similar to how Australia and New Zealand marketed their system to Asian

Jamaican trade policymakers suggested that GATS presented opportunities to position the country's higher education sector as an export industry.

students. These policymakers also regarded the emigration of Jamaican graduates as contributing positively to the economy in the form of remittances. They were less concerned about potential threats from liberalization and the WTO.

Education stakeholders, however, were ignorant of the initiative until it surfaced in public debate almost 10 years after coming into force. They regarded the GATS commitment as a threat to both equity in higher education and introducing safeguards to maintain the quality of the system. Additionally, they were greatly concerned about the presence of foreign providers and the potential of foreign credentials to exacerbate the migration problem. Nonetheless, the potential of the commitment to expand access to higher education was embraced.

Politicians in both government and opposition were also caught by surprise and questioned the capacity of the negotiators to have crafted without dialogue a higher education com-

mitment based on a coherent education or development strategy. They were concerned about Jamaica's freedom to regulate the sector to meet its development goals. Government officials spoke of the "knowledge divide" separating rich and poor countries and recounted the daunting task, when attending international forums, of negotiating with countries vastly superior in human capital and financial resources. Still, neither politicians nor trade and education stakeholders suggested withdrawal of the commitment. Therefore, they called for greater dialogue to ensure Jamaica's interests could be safeguarded and the role of higher education in the development process preserved.

CONCLUSION

Jamaica now recognizes that education policy must objectively engage and balance the social and economic dimensions of knowledge creation and national development. This process requires dialogue between stakeholders in all relevant sectors, to align the country's development strategy with models for public policy and government's role in managing the system. Policymakers admitted the absence of a coherent framework to harness the opportunities and navigate the threats posed by GATS on higher education. There was no process in existence that might have inspired and supported the type of dialogue necessary between the education sector and trade negotiators. The challenge that Jamaica now faces is how to reconcile its GATS commitment of higher education with its development goals. ■

Transnational Education in China: Challenges, Critical Issues, and Strategies for Success

ROBIN MATROSS HELMS

Robin Matross Helms is an international education consultant in Washington, DC. E-mail: robin.m.helms@gmail.com. This article is based on a report written by the author for the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (<http://www.obhe.ac.uk/>).

Over the past decade, China has become an increasingly popular market for transnational education ventures. Through creating student exchanges and twinning programs, to building study centers and establishing full branch campus-

es, higher education institutions and organizations worldwide have eagerly sought to capture a share of the lucrative and expanding Chinese market.

As more institutions have tried their hands in the Chinese market, however, reports are suggesting that to establish and operate a successful campus or program in China is often easier said than done. Regulatory, cultural, and logistical challenges abound—from understanding national, provincial, and local requirements, to establishing effective partnerships and building networks, to finding an appropriate campus and classroom equipment.

To gain a clearer picture of the prospects for transnational education providers in China, the pros and cons of entering the Chinese market, and the challenges involved, the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education commissioned a report on the experiences of three different institutions with successful operations in China: Missouri State University and the Stanford Center for Professional Development, based in the United States; and CIBT School of Business and Technology Corporation, based in Canada. Leaders of each institution were interviewed about key issues, critical challenges, and strategies for success.

REGULATORY ISSUES AND ACCREDITATION

The regulatory environment for transnational education ventures in China consists of a web of interrelated national, provincial, and local regulations and policies, which are interpreted and applied with varying degrees of consistency. The institutional leaders indicate that three regulations are most critical for foreign providers. First, all degree-granting transnational programs must operate in cooperation with a Chinese partner institution. Second, profit generation cannot be the driving objective of such ventures (the regulation itself is not entirely clear, but this appears to be the dominant interpretation). Third, transnational providers are subject to a variety of provincial and local regulations—often best handled by the Chinese partner institutions.

Chinese regulations also state that programs operating in China must be accredited by the relevant accrediting body of the parallel program on the home campus. The institutional leaders emphasized the importance of actively engaging with accrediting bodies—that is, by inviting them to visit the China operations and maintaining transparency, to ensure that the accreditation and academic reputation of the home institution are protected.

PARTNERS

The three institutional leaders judged identifying an appropriate partner institution as an important aspect of any China venture. Key factors include the potential partner's reputation and geographic location (i.e., with sufficient demand for higher education and enough students able to pay foreign tuition rates). In addition, the management style of the partner should be an important consideration. Partners must be flexible,

“open-minded,” and willing to make necessary accommodations for the foreign program.

The primary role of a Chinese partner is to provide facilities including classrooms, dormitories, cafeterias, and office space, as well as operational support by, for example, obtaining relevant licenses and handling inspections. However, the institutional leaders recommended maintaining ultimate control of the academic components of their programs, to protect the reputation and accreditation of the home campuses.

The leaders noted that partnerships are often the sector in which the greatest challenges arise in their China ventures. Negotiating and management styles may be quite different, linguistic nuances may be lost in translation, and exchanging documents for review may call for significant logistical coordination. Taking time to build solid relationships with partners, establishing open lines of communication, and meeting regularly face-to-face can help mitigate these issues.

FACULTY

All three institutions employ both foreign (usually American or Canadian, generally from the home institution) and Chinese instructors. The participation of foreign faculty is a key special advantage for transnational programs and the main reason that many Chinese students enroll. However, the institutional leaders noted the often insurmountable challenge of finding well-qualified foreign faculty who are willing and able to live in China for extended periods of time. Issues such as maintaining a research program and family commitments prevent even faculty for whom the idea of living in China is appealing from doing so.

Each of the three institutions has found a creative solution to this problem—staffing arrangements that involve foreign faculty without requiring them to be on-site for extended periods. In general, these plans involve a combination of limited face-to-face classroom time in China, supplemented by videoconferencing and e-mail contact with students. Chinese course assistants may also participate, which can lend a local perspective to the curriculum and course content.

CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY

In all three cases, “Western-ness”—in terms of curriculum, language, and teaching methodology—is a key factor that differentiates the programs from their local competitors. Institutions considering China ventures should carefully evaluate their own strengths and specialties and create a market “niche” for themselves by developing relevant programs and curricula; programs of the Stanford Center for Professional Development, for example, capitalize on the knowledge and reputation of particularly accomplished Stanford faculty in engineering and environmental policy. English-language instruction is also essential; one of the institutional leaders speculated that many students in the institution’s program consider the tuition to be money well spent just for the English instruction they receive, even if they ultimately fail to attain a

degree.

The three institutions employ Western pedagogical techniques in their China programs, although the leaders noted that this often presents a significant challenge for instructors and students, at least initially. Because the pedagogical approach generally employed in Chinese classrooms centers around lecturing by the instructor and memorization and repetition on the part of students, asking students to suddenly go from “sitting passively listening” to engaging in active class discussion and debating with their colleagues and instructors can take students far out of their comfort zone. All three leaders noted that Chinese students can and do adapt to Western pedagogical techniques but may need time and help to do so; as one of the leaders suggested, it is critical to create environments in which “it is safe to challenge the teacher” and colleagues.

The regulatory environment for transnational education ventures in China consists of a web of inter-related national, provincial, and local regulations and policies.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

In 2006, the Chinese government made a decision to rein in higher education growth; it is speculated that tighter regulations and a less favorable attitude toward foreign providers will likely follow. Nonetheless, it seems clear that plenty of opportunities still exist. One of the institutional leaders interviewed estimates that overall only 20 to 30 percent of demand for higher education in China is currently being met. In comparison to other untapped markets, such as India, China has a solid infrastructure for growth in this sector, along with an expanding middle class—the key demographic for education ventures. In this leader’s opinion, it is unlikely that the Chinese education market will saturate for some time.

Ultimately, only time will tell the impact of foreign providers on the Chinese higher education system; government policies and attitudes, moreover, will undoubtedly continue to vary. Based on the experiences of the three institutions profiled in this report and others trying their hands in the Chinese education market, however, it seems clear that certain ventures will most likely succeed and flourish in the Chinese context: projects that capitalize on the strengths of the home institution form solid partnerships with reputable Chinese institutions, are genuinely committed to providing high quality programs, and have the patience to persevere through many challenges. ■

Joint-Venture Campuses in China

OSMAN OZTURGUT

Osman Ozturgut is coordinator of advising and teacher certification, Division of Teaching and Learning, College of Education, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Saint Louis, Missouri, USA. E-mail: osmanhoca@hotmail.com. He has taught in four different private universities in China.

In the mid- to late 1990s, the Chinese government endorsed Sino-foreign education cooperation for modernizing and expanding the Chinese higher education system to better serve the developing market economy. The decree released by China's Ministry of Education in 2003 approved 721 jointly run educational institutions in China. Activities range from codeveloped new institutions to a foreign degree franchised to an existing Chinese university.

The Chinese government emphasizes that such foreign higher education institutions should provide foreign educational resources of excellent quality. However, with almost no program evaluations or strict accreditation measures, the quality of such programs has been placed under question. Most of the programs approved by the Beijing government are also accredited by the accreditation agencies in those universities' home countries—with, however, almost no ongoing oversight on the quality of these programs.

CURRENT ISSUES

Among the Chinese students who study at such joint-venture branch campuses, most possess strong financial resources but have only earned low scores from the Chinese National University Entrance Examination. Students who are not admitted into any Chinese university must look for other alternatives. Such joint ventures provide the perfect opportunity with relatively easy admissions standards. The only requirement is that students present a high school diploma and pay the tuition fee.

After being admitted, students who cannot provide proof of English-language proficiency are placed in intensive language-training programs for half a semester during (at most) one academic year. Expecting students with such limited training to read and comprehend the English-language textbooks on international business, human resources management, and other fields is unrealistic yet financially remunerative for these Sino-foreign joint ventures. These Western institutions, which fear causing Chinese students to lose face (and thus losing the tuition-based revenues), are allowing the students to graduate basically without English-language skills—let alone without substantive competency in their major fields.

These factors raise questions concerning the value of for-

eign diplomas from so-called prestigious Western universities. In addition, with some branch campuses now utilizing local teachers for the instruction of transferable college classes in Chinese, not all students need to learn English.

Concerning faculty members teaching at such institutions, the major issue involves the difficulty of finding qualified and experienced foreign instructors willing to come to China to teach, even for a semester. Such joint ventures provide rather low-end salaries, without adequate health coverage or opportunities for tenure. Foreigners coming to teach in China include mainly retired instructors coming for a paid holiday, inexperienced instructors seeking some practice before entering “real” academia, or people who cannot find a decent job elsewhere. While other legitimate reasons may exist for professors coming to China, most of those who stay for more than a year lack job prospects in their home countries or are retirees hoping to make China their home. And for some, it represents a more humanitarian commitment: bringing the best of the West to a developing country.

The quality of teaching on joint-venture campuses has become a serious concern. The foreign teachers described above have almost no training on cross-cultural communications skills, teaching experience, or in some cases any academic qualification whatsoever. The qualifications and skills ordered for teaching English in China are simplistic: be a native from an English-speaking country and look white (Western). If you meet these demands, long-closed doors in China are opened to you with all the psychological, social, cultural, and financial benefits. You can pretend to be your most

Among the Chinese students who study at such joint-venture branch campuses, most possess strong financial resources but have only earned low scores from the Chinese National University Entrance Examination.

favorite character, enjoy a great culture, and put some money aside for your student loans and car payments. However, truly qualified instructors find it rather discouraging when asked by the administration to make allowances when the students “cheat,” “sleep during class,” “miss the majority of their classes,” or “do not turn in homework.” That is to say, giving transferable college credit for inferior work has been a norm on these joint-venture campuses.

CONCLUSION

Of course, some institutions in China do seek to provide the highest-quality education they can—facing the challenge of low levels of English-language skills among Chinese students and the sociocultural, political, and financial pressures faced

when operating such ventures. Peking University, Nanjing University, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Fudan University, and Tsinghua University (to name a few) have established several partnerships with foreign universities, mainly at the post-graduate level.

With the increasing number of Sino-foreign universities in China, institutions are pursuing rather aggressive marketing strategies to recruit students. Some administrators are lowering the admissions criteria. Instructors are cutting their expectations in classrooms. If on-site administrators and instructors fail, home campuses would blame them, mostly unaware of the sacrifices that are being made to operate such programs.

These joint ventures may not be successful and profitable in the long run. Some joint ventures are failing to provide quality instruction. It is not necessarily something they can correct, given the lack of English-language skills of students and political and sociocultural challenges. I highly recommend that such joint-venture campuses stop recruiting, graduate their current students, and leave China if they are concerned with the quality of the education being provided. ■

China's Tertiary Education Expansion

MA XIAOYING AND MALCOLM ABBOTT

Ma Xiaoying is lecturer in the English Department, North China Electric Power University, Beijing, China. E-mail: amxiaoying@126.com. Malcolm Abbott is research associate at the Centre for Research in International Education, 28A Linwood Avenue, Western Springs, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: mjabbot@kpmg.com.au.

In recent years, China's tertiary education sector has experienced considerable growth. In 2006 23.4 million students were enrolled in tertiary education in China (public and private, full time and part time), making it the world's largest system. Despite this rapid growth, China's tertiary education sector is no larger than in a range of other countries with a similar level of development. It is therefore possible that China's tertiary education sector will continue to expand for some years to come.

INCOME LEVELS AND POPULATION SIZE

In 2007 it was estimated that China had an average per capita GDP of \$5,300—making it a country with an average level of income higher than India (\$2,700) and Indonesia (\$3,700) but lower than South Africa (\$9,700), Thailand (\$7,900), and

Brazil (\$9,700). China's population has a median age (at 32.7) higher than that of many developing countries, although lower than most developed countries. In addition, although the proportion of China's GDP that is generated by the agricultural sector is similar in proportion to that of other developing countries (just over 10%), the proportion from the industrial sector is high and services sector correspondingly low.

The participation rate (enrollment ratio) of young people studying at the tertiary level rose from 6.4 percent in 1999 to 21.6 percent in 2006.

Expansion in the economy and incomes relates to increasing numbers of people who wish to study. The development of the economy also creates a greater demand for graduates. The shift of the population into the industrial sector involves a call for engineering and related skills. The growth of the services sector will probably further extend this demand for graduates and stimulate a change in the composition of tertiary education toward business, information technology, and related qualifications.

The rise in incomes in China and demand for experts means that the number of graduates is expanding at a more rapid rate than in most developing countries. This has raised some concerns about the quality and employability of graduates. A shortage of well-trained graduates could hinder the growth of the Chinese economy and prevent the country from developing more sophisticated industries. While China produces about 600,000 new engineers every year, nine times as many as the United States, the pool of 1.6 million young engineers in the country includes only about 160,000 with practical and language skills to work for a multinational corporation. Despite strong growth in the number of graduates, it will be hard for China to develop service-based industries. Compared to many countries, therefore, the Chinese tertiary education sector faces some difficulties associated with too rapid expansion.

PARTICIPATION RATES

The participation rate (enrollment ratio) of young people studying at the tertiary level rose from 6.4 percent in 1999 to 21.6 percent in 2006. In effect Chinese tertiary education was transformed in a very short time from an elite to a mass education sector. At the same time the enrollment ratio in secondary education grew at a slower but still steady rate, rising from approximately 62 percent in 1999 to 76 percent in 2006. This rate is still lower than the secondary education participation rate in developed countries such as the United States (95%), Japan (100%), and Hong Kong (85%) but fairly typical of developing countries and at a similar level to that of Malaysia (70%), Columbia (82%), and Thailand (78%).

The inference is that this rate will probably continue to rise

if China's growth and development continues and if the country makes the full transformation from developing to developed country. On the whole it can probably be expected that the secondary education enrollment rate will continue to rise at a fairly steady rate to reach approximately 90 percent before leveling off.

ENROLLMENT LEVELS

Tertiary education enrollments vary widely across countries, but in the Chinese case still appear fairly low compared to most other countries. The Chinese figure of 21.6 percent is not only below that of developed countries (i.e., Japan 57.3%, the United States 81.8%, and Hong Kong 33%) but is also below that of many developing countries (i.e., Malaysia 39%, Columbia 30.8%, and Thailand 45.9%). It would thus appear likely that China's tertiary education sector will continue to grow in size in the future, perhaps not as rapidly as in the past but nonetheless at a fairly steady rate. Perhaps the only factor that will constrain this growth is the aging of the Chinese population.

At some stage in the future the tertiary education sector's growth will slow down. Until that happens, however, it would appear that a combination of strong growth of the Chinese population and rising participation rates in education will continue to drive expansion of the system.

The rapid growth of the tertiary education sector in China over the past few years can be expected to continue for some years to come.

NUMBERS OF STUDENTS STUDYING ABROAD

Based on data from 2006 the largest number of students studying outside of their country of origin (not including intra-European Union students) are from China. Students study abroad for reasons such as desire to emigrate, attraction to more prestigious institutions, and lack of educational opportunities in their own country. It is difficult to infer much from the figures except to say that although Chinese students study abroad in large numbers they do not do so at any particularly high rate compared to that of other countries. The ratio of Chinese higher education students abroad compared to Chinese students in higher education in their home country was 0.38 percent of students in the 15-to-25-year age group. This figure is not particularly high compared to most other countries (i.e., Japan 0.82%, Hong Kong 7.59%, Malaysia 1.84%, Thailand 0.45%, and Indonesia 0.16%). It would be expected, therefore, that in the future Chinese students will remain the largest group of national students studying abroad unless there is some dramatic change to the rates of countries like India and Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

The rapid growth of the tertiary education sector in China over the past few years can be expected to continue for some years to come. This trend will not fully prevent problems of the quality of graduates, the appropriateness of their qualifications, and the related issue of employability. The second main point is that while growth in Chinese student numbers studying abroad may not remain as great, most likely in the future they will constitute the largest national group studying abroad. ■

Indian Higher Education Internationalization: Beware of the Trojan Horse

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is Monan University Professor and Director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, USA. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

India's parliament is often accused of inaction or long delays. The case of the Foreign Education Bill, bottled up for two years because of disagreements in the ruling coalition government, may be a case where delay is a good thing. India's higher education policies are of crucial importance for the country and also of great relevance for the many foreign universities wishing to set up shop. The Indian press reports that 40 international universities have sought land from the government of Maharashtra in the Mumbai-Pune-Nashik area to establish campuses. These trends provide just one indication of the tremendous foreign interest in the large and lucrative higher education market in India. Some foreign universities are already working in India, mostly in collaboration with Indian partners.

India might be the world's largest single market for foreign universities. The country has a significant unmet demand for higher education access—currently only 10 percent of the age group attend university—half the proportion in China and well below the rate in most rapidly developing and middle-income countries. Further, India has a huge unmet demand for high-quality higher education. The number of places available in India's very small top sector—the Indian Institutes of Technology, the Indian Institutes of Management, and similar institutions—is tiny when compared to the demand. Thus, foreign institutions see a tremendous opportunity for lucrative growth in the Indian market.

REASONS FOR CAUTION

Some stakeholders who see higher education simply as a tradable commodity that can be bought and sold internationally favor opening borders without restriction for educational products of all kinds. The for-profit higher education companies, many private universities, the international testing companies, and increasingly some universities and government agencies in the exporting countries—such as the United Kingdom and the United States—have this perspective. People who are convinced that higher education is more than a commodity have much to worry about in the rush toward importing and exporting universities and academic programs because the idea of academic work as preparation for citizenship, preparation for critical thinking, and similar “public good” goals often get swept away by the importers and exporters. The traders are interested in selling products in immediate demand, such as management studies, and not in sustaining research universities, enhancing access and equity for underserved communities, and the like.

Why do foreign universities and education companies such as Laureate Education Inc. wish to enter the Indian market? The motivations are complex but very important to understand. One goal is clear—everyone who enters the Indian market wants to extract profits—mostly by offering academic programs in fields that are in high demand. With very few exceptions, foreign providers are not interested in investing in high-cost academic infrastructures such as science laboratories and research facilities. They wish to minimize the investment and maximize the profit, like any corporation. Some countries, including the United Kingdom and Australia, have a national policy to earn profits from higher education exports. Thus the British Council and similar organizations assist British educational institutions to maximize their export potentials. The British Council is no longer mainly in the information business but rather is focused on export promotion.

The United States differs in some respects but essentially follows the British and Australian pattern. The United States has no national higher education policy. Higher education policy is mainly a responsibility of the 50 states, and no state has declared higher education an export priority. Unlike the United Kingdom or Australia, the United States has a strong private higher education sector, and the private universities and colleges have been most aggressive about overseas exports. It is likely that the largest number seeking to enter the Indian market will include low-end private schools seeking to earn a profit.

The for-profit sector is also much stronger in the United States than is the case elsewhere. The two largest players are Laureate Education Inc. and the Apollo Group (owners of the University of Phoenix and other institutions). Laureate's strategy is either to purchase existing universities outside the United States (they own 29 universities and postsecondary institutions on three continents) or to establish new schools. Laureate started a university in Andhra Pradesh, a state friend-

ly to foreign providers, but pulled out when the regulatory environment seemed too complex.

The top American private and public universities—20 percent or so of the total of more than 3,000 colleges and universities—have complex motives for entering the Indian market. For the most part, they are genuinely interested in internationalization, and see India as an important player, economically and educationally, in the 21st century. They are concerned with their “brand image” and wish to expand it in one of the world's major higher education markets. They may use their Indian outposts to recruit bright Indian students, and academic staff, to come to the United States for studying. Their Indian branch campuses will provide a place where their own students and faculty can study and do research. And, of course, in most cases the universities will seek to earn money from the programs offered in India.

The problem for India is the myriad of institutions at the bottom of the American academic hierarchy, both for-profit and nonprofit. These players are likely to concentrate on entering the Indian market, with one essential reason for being in India—to earn money. While many of these institutions will

Some stakeholders who see higher education simply as a tradable commodity that can be bought and sold internationally favor opening borders without restriction for educational products of all kinds.

offer respectable academic programs, some will try to cut corners. Vetting and regulating these institutions will not be easy. There will be no help from the highly regarded American accrediting system. So long as an institution is accredited (and US accreditation measures not high quality but rather the minimum standard), there are no official guidelines concerning institutional quality. These schools will offer the programs in India that they feel will attract students and may well have little commitment to either a long-term presence in India or to maintaining good quality.

THE ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS ABOUT BRANCH CAMPUSES

As India carefully considers its policies concerning allowing foreign institutions into the country, a number of central issues must be addressed. What is the motivation of the foreign institution? Is everything about the foreign branch transparent and open? What is the status of the foreign institution in its own country? Is the foreign institution capable of offering the same quality in India as it does at home, and is that quality deemed of an acceptably high standard in the home country? Is the foreign institution able to deliver its programs in India using its own faculty, and does it have appropriate infrastructures such as libraries, e-learning facilities, and laboratories to deliver the programs it proposed? Is the foreign

institution able to sustain its academic offerings over time in India?

Allowing foreign institutions to set up shop in India is not the only road to the internationalization of Indian higher education. Twinning programs, joint degrees, exchanges of students and professors, sharing of curriculum, and other relationships are possible and more likely to ensure that essential Indian control over Indian higher education is maintained.

So far, India's main contribution to world higher education is the export of students, many of whom do not return. India needs to engage more with the rest of the world, but not at the expense of giving up academic sovereignty. Higher education is not, in the end, purely a commodity to be bought and sold on the international market. Higher education represents an essential part of a nation's patrimony and a key to future prosperity. (This article appeared in *The Hindu* (Chennai, India), July 15, 2008). ■

Caste, Class, and Quality at the Indian Institutes of Technology

ASHA GUPTA

Asha Gupta, is Director of the Directorate of Hindi Medium Implementation, University of Delhi, India. She has been a college principal and professor. E-mail: ashagupta3452@gmail.com.

The Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), established through an act of the Parliament and aided by the central government, have been playing a pivotal role in technological manpower development and research programs. Entrance to the IITs is made through the Joint Entrance Examination. Every year, about 300,000 students appear for just 3,000 seats. Though it is very tough to get admission into the IITs, these institutions remain the most sought after.

A conflict is now under way between the seven IIT directors and the Ministry of Human Resource Development over the June 9, 2008 order asking the institutes to implement a 15 percent quota for the Scheduled Castes, 7.5 percent for the Scheduled Tribes, and 27 percent for the Other Backward Classes in the faculty from 2008/09 academic session. Usually the term Other Backward Classes implies "socially and educationally backward classes." According to the 1931 caste-based census, there are 2,399 backward castes or communities in India.

Though the reservation policy for the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe students at the IITs existed since 1973, the ruling UPA (United Progressive Alliance) government directed the University Grants Commission to extend reservation to lec-

urers and professors in all centrally aided institutions except the minority institutions in 2005. In order to pave the way for reservation, the 93rd constitutional amendment was also passed in December 2005. In January 2006, the Central Educational Institutions (Reservations in Admissions) Act came into force, making it mandatory to reserve 27 percent of seats for the Other Backward Classes in all centrally aided institutions, including the IITs. The June 9, 2008 order extended the reservation to the appointment of faculty as well.

All the IITs provide reservation for these students. They also offer reservation for administrative posts ranging from the most junior employees to deputy registrars. Now they are required to reserve posts for lecturers and assistant professors in science and technology and up to the professor's level in management, social sciences, and humanities.

A conflict is now under way between the seven IIT directors and the Ministry of Human Resource Development over the June 9, 2008 order asking the institutes to implement a 15 percent quota for the Scheduled Castes, 7.5 percent for the Scheduled Tribes, and 27 percent for the Other Backward Classes in the faculty from 2008/09 academic session.

It is hard to imagine, however, that faculty will use the caste factor to get entry into the prestigious and elitist IITs. Though the order was signed by Seema Raj, director of technical education at the Ministry of Human Resource Development on the recommendations made by the standing committee of the IIT Council, many faculty members believe that the order has been thrust upon the IITs by the ministry itself. According to them, matters of such strategic importance should have first been discussed in the IIT Council, but in this situation a decision was made without having consulted the stakeholders. The ministry, on the other hand, has taken the stand that the IITs have been skirting around the reservation policy despite the fact that they were never exempted from it.

RESERVATIONS ABOUT RESERVATION

IIT directors have expressed their dissent against reservation for faculty appointments. They are insisting that the UPA government should revoke its decision. Whereas the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bhabha Atomic Research Center, and the Harish Chandra Research Institute are exempt from reservation—for being "institutes of national importance"—it has been made mandatory for the IITs despite their being of equal reputation, if not more. The question arises why there should be reservation only for the position of lecturers and Assistant Professors at the IITs in the case of science and tech-

nology and why there should be reservation up to professor's level in the case of the humanities and social sciences. These divisions seem to be an outcome of the "enclave mentality" despite the fact that the IITs are now trying to bridge the gap between the sciences and humanities by offering some more interdisciplinary programs at the master's and PhD levels.

The IITs remain a small number of centers of academic excellence amidst the plethora of mediocre higher education institutions in India. Beside the faculty, the IIT alumni and current students have also expressed anguish about the quota for faculty. They believe that the IITs' reputation consists of the excellent teaching by highly qualified faculty. To them, reservation for faculty seems a politically motivated decision that will seriously ruin the interests of the students.

The existing IITs already suffer a shortage of about 900 qualified faculty. The government is now planning to start 10 more IITs and Indian Institutes of Management during the 2007–2012 five-year plan to promote technical and management education in India. Instead of providing incentives to the highly qualified sector, faculty reservation policy is likely to dilute the teaching and research standards.

Supporters of reservation argue that in a caste-ridden and hierarchical society like India it is desirable to find some ways of providing social justice and economic opportunities to all those who were deprived due to social and educational backwardness.

POLICY GOALS

Supporters of reservation argue that in a caste-ridden and hierarchical society like India it is desirable to find some ways of providing social justice and economic opportunities to all those who were deprived due to social and educational backwardness. Reservation policy is usually deployed to win over the support of the marginalized or underrepresented sectors of society. Reservations or quotas are seen as important instruments for affirmative action.

Whereas affirmative action remains open-ended and without any fixed number, reservations or quotas can have any fixed number or percentage. The latter are generally justified in the name of equity, social justice, or democracy. Reservation for faculty positions at the IITs can be seen as a peculiar outcome of deeply entrenched caste-based discriminations in Indian sociocultural, political, and psychological upbringing. As a political corrective, reservation can be seen as a short-term measure but certainly not a panacea. We need to find a balance between equity and quality in the long run. ■

US Regional Accreditation Abroad: Lessons Learned

JEAN AVNET MORSE

Jean Avnet Morse is President of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Address: 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia PA 19104, USA. E-mail: jmorse@msche.org.

As higher education "globalizes," more institutions abroad have sought US accreditation because it offers a non-governmental, mission-oriented model, with trained and impartial evaluators and applied to both public and private institutions. Is such accreditation possible under existing standards? What are the costs and benefits for institutions and students here and abroad?

To answer these questions, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), an institutional accreditor, instituted a pilot project in 2002. Although MSCHE has long accredited US institutions abroad that are chartered in the Middle States region, it had not accredited non-US-style institutions incorporated abroad. MSCHE recognized the need to be sensitive to the notion of "cultural imperialism" while applying US standards abroad, but it insisted that applicants meet the commission's usual standards.

All 9 institutions in the pilot were volunteers. MSCHE also acquires information in the course of accrediting 9 institutions abroad incorporated in our region and the 330 locations abroad operated by 79 of our member institutions in over 50 countries. Some in the pilot have achieved accreditation; others are still in the application/candidacy process. They are located in Canada, England, Chile, United Arab Emirates, Taiwan, British Virgin Islands, and Greece. Some institutions withdrew after discovering the depth and continuing nature of US review and monitoring, which includes a long "candidacy" process. There is currently a moratorium on accepting new institutions.

ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

The first question was whether the commission's mission-oriented standards were sufficiently flexible to accommodate practices abroad. So far, the answer seems to be positive, although some institutions have presented special challenges. To meet the requirement that an institution offers "general education" basic skills, MSCHE accepted precollege learning as equivalent. Some institutions changed their governance structures to meet the commission's requirements of an independent governing board with no conflicts of interest. Financial statements required "translation" into US practices. When academic freedom and free-speech issues have arisen,

MSCHE has required assurances of necessary protections. The commission's standard of student-support services was interpreted in the context of local needs and mission.

The major challenges involved fundamental accreditation standards such as a clear mission statement, specified goals to achieve the mission, planning linked to budgeting, and assessment linked to improvement.

EXTERNAL CONSTRAINTS

The challenges extended beyond accreditation standards. Although MSCHE does not require instruction in English, translation of materials required for accreditation was burdensome. Although senior administrators were often fluent in English, communication by faculty and students with a visiting team was hampered. Staff included multilingual team members when possible.

MSCHE contacts the local quality-assurance agency before it visits a location in a country, but without local expertise, it can be difficult to identify an appropriate agency. Local laws and practices have required flexibility. For example, one government did not license for-profit institutions; the institution had to be chartered elsewhere to meet the requirement of valid degree-granting authority. There is also an increasing problem with European and other countries' three-year bachelor's degrees.

Finally, after 9/11 MSCHE adopted a policy limiting travel to certain areas based on US State Department warnings or advisory statements. This forced us to withdraw from the process of accrediting in one country and led to some creative "virtual" visits through teleconferencing.

CAPACITY OF MSCHE

All of the institutions in the project went through the progressive stages of application and candidacy before becoming accredited. The MSCHE process for new institutions requires repeated visits by staff, appointed consultants, and two visiting teams, as well as biannual review and action by the commission over a period that can extend to five years.

These services and travel required significant staff time. If MSCHE were to accept more applicants, additional staff would be needed to monitor and enforce standards abroad. The need to direct existing staff resources to pressing demands in the United States was an important factor in imposing the moratorium.

If profit for MSCHE were the motive, we would have been very disappointed.

BENEFITS

In response to an MSCHE survey, institutions abroad reported that accreditation made it easier to attract faculty and students, to transfer students' credits and degrees, and to compete with local institutions. In some countries, accreditation was not available for some or all types of institutions.

The accreditation process helped the institution to set inter-

national, mission-centered goals, to develop and implement processes for assessing outcomes, and to use results for improvement. Institutions valued the suggestions of teams, especially in countries where local evaluators were not perceived as sufficiently impartial or experienced. Some noted that they wanted to develop a capacity to offer general education. The benefits to US institutions have not been surveyed, but the commission cited several when the pilot project was initiated, including easier transfer of credits and students.

There should be additional benefits to US institutions as education globalizes. Our members are opening more campuses abroad and soliciting more travel by students in both directions. Europe and other regions are working toward standardizing requirements for institutions and quality-assurance agencies. Ongoing US involvement abroad should help bridge the differences among different systems.

CONCLUSION

There is no perfect solution for establishing international standards that address the issues of countries with different educational systems. US accreditors cannot achieve this goal alone. It may be useful for US regional accreditors to accredit institutions abroad in certain situations—especially for institutions that do not raise the types of difficult issues discussed earlier. US regional accreditors can also help to establish quality stan-

Institutions abroad reported that accreditation made it easier to attract faculty and students, to transfer students' credits and degrees, and to compete with local institutions.

dards abroad by assuring that US-affiliated institutions abroad meet the same standards as domestic locations.

Accreditors might invest their time in projects with broader reach, such as ongoing international efforts by UNESCO, the World Bank, and others to create local quality-assurance systems that suit the needs of each country or region, while still operating within flexible international guidelines. Encouraging local review can produce systems that are accepted locally and that can also offer the quality assurance needed by institutions and students in other countries.

The MSCHE pilot project has been successful in identifying likely areas of similarity and differences among higher education institutions in various countries, and additional information will be gathered as the pilot project progresses. This important first step can serve as the foundation for international cooperation among quality-assurance agencies, and it can provide the agenda for addressing the most significant areas of difference. ■

Challenges Facing Malaysian Higher Education

WILLIAM G. TIERNEY AND MORSHIDI SIRAT

William G. Tierney is Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, University of Southern California, Waite Phillips Hall, Room 701, Los Angeles, CA 90089-4037, USA. E-mail: wgtiern@usc.edu. Morshidi Sirat is Director of the National Higher Education Research Institute, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Level 1, Suite 109, EUREKA Complex, 11800 Penang, Malaysia. E-mail: morshidi@usm.my.

Malaysian tertiary education is a microcosm of the trends and challenges facing all of postsecondary education throughout the world. Privatization is increasing in the public sector. New providers have entered the Malaysian tertiary market. International rankings are a preoccupation of the government and research universities. The cost of education concerns parents, students, and the government. Whether the Ministry of Higher Education should continue to “steer from a distance” the nation's public postsecondary institutions or develop a more decentralized plan is being debated. How to stop the brain drain of talented Malaysian faculty, capitalize on the brain gain, serve the rising number of students who desire a postsecondary education, and provide jobs for an increasingly educated citizenry are issues being debated actively in the press and on the streets.

GROWTH

Public universities in Malaysia are generally populated by traditionally aged student bodies, with about 10 percent of 18-to-24-year-olds attending postsecondary education, whereas the newer private and for-profit institutions have a slightly more adult population. Student participation in postsecondary education has increased over the last 20 years. In 1990, for example, roughly 100,000 students attended public institutions, and last year the number had more than tripled. The total number of students attending postsecondary education is over 700,000; approximately 47 percent of the attendees go to public institutions, and another 46 percent go to nonpublic universities; the remainder study abroad.

Malaysia had six public institutions in 1985, and there are now 20 universities. The ministry has designated four of these institutions as research universities. A concern continues to be voiced about the lack of any universities in the top 100 rankings, with the rankings serving as a proxy for quality. The ministry wants one or two of the research institutions to become “apex” universities, ranking among the world's great research universities. The government's aim is to have at least one of those institutions ranked in the top 100 by 2010.

In addition to public universities, the public postsecondary

education sector also includes polytechnics and community colleges. Malaysia currently has 24 public polytechnics and 37 public community colleges located in all 13 states, with the exception of the Federal Territory. Polytechnics offer certificate and diploma courses and graduated over 85,000 students last year. Community college students are also increasing. One thousand students graduated in 2001 compared to more than 11,000 students in 2006. The ultimate aim of the government is to establish a community college in all 222 parliamentary constituencies. Recently, the government has mandated these colleges to prepare unemployed university graduates for the workplace.

PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

Although public universities have increased in size and number, the most significant growth has been in private universities that either have started in Malaysia or have been imported from abroad. In 1985 only 15,000 students attended a private institution, whereas today over 250,000 students attend a nonpublic university. In the early 1990s Malaysia had approximately 150 private institutions, and last year there were over 500 nonpublic tertiary institutions. The use of the word “nonpublic” is purposeful insofar as the delineation of what counts

The ministry wants one or two of the research institutions to become “apex” universities, ranking among the world's great research universities.

as “private” and/or “for-profit” is not entirely clear. Monash University, for example, is a public institution in Australia that has a campus in Malaysia. Some political parties in Malaysia also have helped start universities. Multiple other providers offer courses and degrees, so what one means by a “private” institution is in flux. Nevertheless, nonpublic institutions account for slightly less than 50 percent of the total student population. The result is that close to 750,000 students are now participating in some form of postsecondary education.

RACE, ETHNICITY, AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Slightly over 52 percent of Malaysians are Malay; according to the state constitution all Malay are Muslim. An additional 26 percent are Chinese (majority are Buddhists), 11 percent are indigenous, and 8 percent are Indian and Hindu. A 1971 law sought to reverse Chinese economic and social predominance and instead promoted a form of affirmative action for a majority of the population—ethnic Malays and other indigenous groups. The result has been a significant increase in the percentage of Malays who attend public universities, with a decrease of ethnic Chinese and Indians who attend. Prior to the implementation of the law, for example, Malay students accounted for less than one-third of the student population,

but by 1985 they were close to two-thirds of all university students. Conversely, the Chinese had been about 56 percent of the student population in 1966, and 20 years later their numbers had shrunk to 29 percent. One by-product of the 1971 law is that non-Malay Malaysians (Chinese and Indians) have started their own private universities, and they account for the largest percentage of students in all private institutions. Since the late 1990s, however, a meritocracy system for entry to public universities has been implemented.

There is an increase in the desire for more academic or individual autonomy, a greater say in the governance of the institution, and an increased role for research.

FUNDING

The government is increasingly desirous of the public universities finding income from other sources than simply the ministry. The corporatization of state-controlled universities since 1987 allowed public universities to find alternative sources of income. Although the ministry still accounts for over 80 percent of all operational funds, the public universities are functioning in ways akin to other tertiary institutions throughout the world. The universities are trying to increase their economic development and research capacities. As with what has occurred in Australia, one fiscal bonanza is international postgraduate students. These students pay full fees. The result is that Malaysia currently has students from over 150 countries and the intent is to increase their representation. The assumption is that a relatively stable and safe Muslim nation has the potential to attract many Muslim students from the Mideast and elsewhere. Further, the language of instruction in many classes is English, which makes the country's postsecondary institutions attractive to English speakers. China is also seen as a country with a great number of students who might be attracted to their Southeast Asian neighbor.

CENTRALIZATION VS. DECENTRALIZATION

The control of public institutions has been in the hands of the ministry throughout the country's history. Over the last decade there has been an increased call for greater institutional autonomy, and the current prime minister has agreed that the universities should have a bit more power. It remains to be seen how much power a vice chancellor and the faculty have and how free they are to set the direction for an institution. The government is in a bit of turmoil right now, having lost its two-thirds majority for the first time in its history. The result is that postsecondary educational reform is not a top priority for the government.

Public universities also continue to increase the number of faculty with a doctorate; no institution has less than 50 percent of the professoriate with a terminal degree. Most of the faculty have received their doctorate from the United Kingdom, Australia, or the United States. There is an increase in the desire for more academic or individual autonomy, a greater say in the governance of the institution, and an increased role for research.

CONCLUSION

As with the rest of the world, education is seen as a key vehicle to increase the wealth of individuals and the economic well-being of society. Even though employment for college graduates is often difficult, the assumption is that a high school certificate will no longer be sufficient for gainful employment. The result is that a great deal of ferment is occurring in the country with regard to the nature, focus, control, and size of Malaysian higher education. In this light, Malaysia is a dynamic example for trying to understand the changes that are taking place worldwide within and across segments of the higher education system. ■

Efforts to Reconstruct Afghan Higher Education

MICHAEL DAXNER

Michael Daxner is professor of sociology and President of the Observatory of the Magna Charta. He was senior international adviser to the government of Afghanistan. Address: Universität Oldenburg, D 26111 Oldenburg, Germany. E-mail: michael.daxner@uni-oldenburg.de.

In 2003 higher education in Afghanistan was made up of 18 universities, with 34,000 students in a country of about 27 million people. Half of the institutions merited the title "university," the rest were just places of postsecondary training. However, the number of highly qualified academic instructors had already grown exceptionally. Returnees from the West, Iran, and Pakistan and graduates from the former Soviet Union challenged the resident faculty who had survived the regimes since 1976, when the 30-year war began.

Today, 20 public universities are registered, 9 private institutions are seeking accreditation, while one (the American University of Afghanistan) has been functional since 2006. There are about 100,000 students enrolled, many more women have been admitted, and from the outside the system seems to be surviving. At a closer look, however, this system is at a critical crossroad.

After 2002, there was some immediate progress under the liberal, well-educated Higher Education Minister Mohammad Sharif Fayez, who is an eminent scholar in comparative literature and knows the West from his exile in Washington, DC. He encouraged local and foreign experts to assist in urgent drafting of legislation. The German Rectors' Conference and the German Organization for Academic Exchange helped to establish a rectors' conference in Afghanistan and UNESCO assisted in drafting a master plan.

There are about 100,000 students enrolled, many more women have been admitted, and from the outside the system seems to be surviving. At a closer look, however, this system is at a critical crossroad.

BACKLASH

Only when President Hamid Karzai refused to sign the law, wanting parliament to vote on the legislation, the misery began. Fayez was dismissed, and his successors were conservative enough to return to prewar legislation or to copy the occupation rules from the Soviet period. The backlash was imminent on all levels, despite considerable international help and the high potential of returnee scholars. The rectors' conference was stopped, student participation and freely elected rectors belong to the past, and the country is about to lose ground again in the international higher education community.

Public higher education is hardly breathing within a restrictive bureaucracy. The former minister Fayez is now the founding president of the American University of Afghanistan. Other private institutions are needed to meet the demand for teachers, midlevel executives, lawyers, and other professionals. Arts and social sciences have yet to be reintroduced or initiated. A research base is required in most disciplines, while the basic equipment is still deficient. Academic freedom, social protection for students and faculty, a sustainable and effective undergraduate coursework, and an interface with international standards are still missing, despite considerable efforts by the US Agency for International Development; German, Japanese and other countries' aid; and some support by the World Bank. Yet, many reformers seek international assistance without the help or blessing of the ministry. Exchanges with foreign universities and some aid programs have become a certain routine. A few campuses are being renovated, but the lack of maintenance and basic equipment continues. The ministry is trying to cut the tiny blossoms of autonomy and accountability within the institutions. There is a mixed situation after five years of reconstruction.

OUTLOOK

Hopefully, the experience of academic freedom and average social and cultural environments of good universities will have a stronger impact on the returning faculty members and some students than the manifold attempts to radicalize the religious and other authoritarian influence at all levels of society in Afghanistan. The facts are simple: higher education is, apart from the new national army and some sectors of business, the only way to escape the vicious circle of poverty, illiteracy, and the war economy. Furthermore, demands for low levels of tertiary education—such as community colleges and undergraduate or professional and vocational training—become stronger by the day. These factors may prove to be the only exit from the Taliban insurgency return or another large-scale exodus of skilled Afghans.

The war zone covers about half the territory but for most people, security is not at the top of the agenda. Most people are concerned with clean water, energy, employment, and education. Of course, the Afghans need well-trained security forces and police for protection. This is why international troops will also be needed for a long time to train local police and the national military. However, secondary education, teacher training, basic expert education in agriculture, technology, social work, and social science are most urgently needed to fulfil all the priorities. Money is needed for dormitories (especially for women), teachers' salaries, teachers' social protection, and for a high level of international participation.

Demands for low levels of tertiary education—such as community colleges and undergraduate or professional and vocational training—become stronger by the day.

The United States bears the biggest part not only of the war against the Taliban and insurgents but also involving civil reconstruction. While US efforts could be better allocated, the rest of the international community must share the task of building Afghanistan's new society. Countries need to disburse the pledges made over the years, less than 45 percent of which have ever been fulfilled. What the country requires is material support and solidarity. ■

New Publications

Alemneh, Teshome Yizengaw. *The Ethiopian Higher Education: Creating Space for Reform*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: St Mary's UC Printing Press, 2007. 241 pp. 60 birr (pb). ISBN 978-99944-999-4-6. Address: POB 2283, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Focusing on the role of higher education in development, this book provides background on Ethiopian higher education and a discussion of contemporary challenges, including access and equity, the role of the state, and leadership and management.

Baker, David P., and Alexander W. Wiseman, eds. *The Worldwide Transformation of Higher Education*. Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008. 347 pp. £57.99 (hb). ISBN 978-0-7623-1487-4. Address: Emerald Publishers, Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BC16 1WA, UK.

A series of research-based essays around the broad theme of higher education transformation, this book includes discussions of world university rankings, corruption, the role of research universities, expansion of enrollments in Korea, and the role of the United States in the global academic marketplace.

Ewell, Peter T. *U.S. Accreditation and the Future of Quality Assurance*. Washington, DC: Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2008. 199 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN Web site: www.chea.org.

A comprehensive and thoughtful overview of the historical development, current status, and future challenges of higher education accreditation in the United States, this publication will be valuable for international readers interested in the complexities of the American accrediting system.

Glazer-Raymo, Judith, ed. *Unfinished Agendas: New and Continuing Gender*

Challenges in Higher Education. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008. 299 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-8018-8863-8. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

A feminist approach to the key issues facing women in American higher education, this book discusses the role of women as professors, administrators, and students. Case studies of the role of women studying mathematics, women on governing boards, women in the college and university presidency, faculty productivity and gender, and other subjects are included.

Gupta, Asha. *Education in the 21st Century: Looking Beyond University*. Delhi, India: Shipra Publications, 2008. 319 pp. Rs. 750, \$40 (hb). ISBN 978-81-7541-406-8. Web site: www.shiprapublications.com.

A wide-ranging discussion of key issues in Indian higher education, this book discusses among other themes private higher education and privatization (several chapters are focused on that subject), the role of technology, vocationalization, and the likely future trends in Indian postsecondary education.

Gupta, Asha, Daniel C. Levy, and K. B. Powar, eds. *Private Higher Education: Global Trends and Indian Perspectives*. Delhi, India: Shipra Publications, 2008. 306 pp. Rs. 695, \$35 (hb). ISBN 978-81-7541-385-6. Web site: www.shiprapublications.com.

This book contains a collection of essays on private higher education in India and in comparative perspective, and about half of the chapters focus on India. Others deal with South Africa, Thailand, the United States, and Japan. Among the themes discussed are quality assurance and private higher education, judicial interventions, and private medical education.

Martin, Michaela, ed. *Cross-Border Higher Education: Regulation, Quality Assurance, and Impact*. Vols. 1 and 2. Paris: International

Institute for Educational Planning, 2007. 331 pp. and 348 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-92-803-1302-9 and 978-92-803-1303-1. Web site: www.unesco.org/iiep.

This comprehensive two-volume set focuses on the broader issues of regulation and quality assurance in cross-border higher education—themes that have not received much attention. The case studies include Chile, Oman, the Philippines, South Africa, Argentina, Kenya, and Russia. These studies highlight both different approaches to regulation and the problems encountered in many countries in dealing with cross-border higher education.

Morley, Louise. *Gender Equity in Commonwealth Higher Education: An Examination of Sustainable Interventions in Selected Commonwealth Universities*. London: Department for International Development, 2006. 150 pp. (pb). ISBN 65-1-86192-761-4. Web site: www.dfid.gov.uk.

A survey of efforts to enhance gender equity in South Africa, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda, this book examines HIV/AIDS education, affirmative action programs, and governmental policies.

O'Neil, Robert. *Academic Freedom in the Wired World: Political Extremism, Corporate Press*, 2008. 312 pp. (hb) ISBN 978-0-674-02660-5. Web site: www.hup.harvard.edu.

With a thoughtful and analytic perspective on key academic freedom issues facing 21st century universities by one of America's most prominent academic freedom scholars, this book discusses the impact of the new technologies on academic freedom, academic freedom in times of crisis (such as after September 11), the rights of academic researchers, the role of the US Constitution and the courts, and related themes. While the discussion specifically focuses on the United States, this book has wide international relevance.

Your Subscriber Profile

Please visit the CIHE Web site to complete your subscriber profile (especially your e-mail and subscription preferences!).

Consider signing up as an "expert" in your field to be included in our new online Experts Database. The database will allow students and colleagues to locate scholars worldwide by their area(s) of research.

The form is available at: http://www.bc.edu/cihe_subscription.

Publications of the Global University Network for Collaboration (GUNI)

The Barcelona-based Global University Network for Collaboration (GUNI) has since 2006 been publishing annual volumes on key themes in higher education. These books are comprehensive and provide worldwide information and analysis. They are based on papers commissioned for the GUNI international meetings, and reflect a variety of perspectives. Three volumes are now available:

Higher Education in the World 2006: The Financing of Universities. 330 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-230-00046-0.

Higher Education in the World 2007: Accreditation for Quality Assurance: What is at Stake? 415 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-230-00047-9.

Higher Education the World 3: Higher Education: New Challenges and Emerging Roles for Human and Social Development. 374 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-00048-3.

All of these books are available from Palgrave Macmillan Publishers. Website: www.palgrave.com. Additional information concerning GUNI can be obtained from the website: www.guni-rmies.net.

News of the Center

CIHE on Facebook

The Center for International Higher Education now hosts a group on Facebook, where we will post announcements about new issues of International Higher Education and notices of other new items and resources such as our Podcast series. We also hope to encourage informal discussions of issues in our field as well as networking among professionals and scholars. Please join us at: <http://www.new.facebook.com/group.php?gid=20040102030>.

New Podcasts

The CIHE Podcast Initiative is pleased to announce the posting of two new "episodes." These installments feature interviews with Kai-ming Cheng of the University of Hong Kong and Hala Taweel of the University of the Middle East Project. The conversation with Dr. Cheng principally explores the importance of social sciences and humanities in East Asian universities. With Dr. Taweel, we learn about her recently completed doctoral research on the academic profession in Palestine. The direct link is: <http://www.bc.edu/cihe/podcast>.

CIHE Initiatives

CIHE director Philip Altbach will be working with the University of Hong Kong's study of the academic profession and will give several talks in Hong Kong in October. He will also participate in the advisory council of the Shanghai Jiao Tong University's Graduate School of Education. In September,

he will speak at the Magna Charta Observatory's conference in Bologna, Italy, and at a conference organized by the Babes-Bolyai University in Cluj, Romania.

CIHE welcomes Kara Godwin as our new research assistant. Kara will be pursuing her doctorate in higher education at Boston College and will be responsible for the Center's Web site and other activities. Elisabeth Hovdhaugen, a professor at the University of Oslo, Norway, has joined the Center as a visiting scholar for the 2008–2009 academic year. CIHE research assistant Harry Dumay, who is also associate dean for administration at the School of Engineering at Harvard University, will be working with the University of Massachusetts-Boston and several academic institutions in Haiti on innovations in management education in Haiti.

We continue to work toward a redesign of the architecture of our widely used Web site. This redesign, under the leadership of Liz Reisberg and with the cooperation of the Boston College IT department, will make our site even more user friendly.

The Experts Database

CIHE is continuing progress on a worldwide directory of experts or scholars to encourage the development of international knowledge networks. The purpose of this directory is to facilitate communication among people who share areas of interest in the field of higher education. By being included in this database, scholars indicate a willingness to be contacted by others (researchers, graduate students, colleagues) who share interests or may have specific questions to ask about listed topics of expertise.

In order to provide our user the most possible accurate information, we want to be sure that the topics listed for each "expert" are areas that a person has either researched or taught and would be able to provide bibliographies or refer someone to sources of information or data. We also include a short summary (90–100 words) either in English or in your original language with complementary information (e.g., credentials, most recent or most important publications, courses taught, academic or professional experience, etc.).

To review the experts database, go to: http://ecsvw537.bc.edu/fmi/iwp/cgi?-db=IHE_Data&-load frames <http://ecsvw537.bc.edu/fmi/iwp/cgi?-db=IHE_Data&-loadframes.> Click on the link "Find Experts." To be included in the database, please complete the form on: http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/form/subscription.htm.

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

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

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

CIHE WEB SITE

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

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

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

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

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**

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