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US Higher Education and the Current Recession

David W. Breneman
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A review of the past four recessions, prior to the current one (1973–1975, 1980–1982, 1990–1991, and 2001–2003) reveals that on balance higher education in the United States weathered each of these economic storms reasonably well (Chronicle of Higher Education, October 10, 2008). But most observers agree that the current recession, officially announced as having begun in December 2007, is a different breed, with disconcerting similarities to the Great Depression of the 1930s. In particular, the current recession appears likely to become long-lasting, is global in nature, originated in the financial sector, has rendered relatively ineffective monetary policy, and is accompanied by sharp drops in consumer and investor demand. After years of neglect, Keynesian economic policy is being reintroduced via aggressive fiscal actions designed to increase aggregate demand in the economy. A prolonged depression seems unlikely for the world, since the country has learned from the mistakes made in the 1930s. However, the economic outlook is cloudy at best, with conditions likely to be more severe than in other post–World War II recessions. What might the current crisis mean for higher education in the United States?

Early Signs of Difficulty

While no definitive evidence has yet been revealed, early warning signs abound. Most state governments are experiencing a sharp drop in tax receipts. Thus, as states must operate with balanced budgets, expenditure cuts are being reported daily. In recent days, for example, the states of Washington, Nevada, Texas, Oregon, Idaho, and South Carolina have announced cuts in state appropriations to public colleges and universities ranging from 10 to 36 percent, and few states, if any, will avoid such cuts. While state support for public higher education has been declining as a share of institutional revenues for more than two decades, the severity of the current cuts may push public institution leaders to reduce enrollments, which they are normally reluctant to do. For example, California State University and the University of California system have recently announced plans to reduce entering undergraduates by several thousands of students. The new round of state cuts will prompt yet higher public tuitions, further dampening demand.

In past recessions, enrollment rates have actually jumped, as the opportunity cost of forgone earnings for the newly unemployed declines. While not yet definite, such an enrollment surge may not be happening this time around—in part because institutions are reluctant to keep expanding when revenues drop but also because of the rising student charges and uncertainty about the economy. The United States has been on a borrowing binge fueled by low interest rates for several years. Moreover, the economic downturn includes an unwinding of unsustainable debt levels, both in families and in businesses. Higher education has become more dependent on debt to cover student bills, but not only is the credit market now harder to tap but increasing numbers of would-be students may be reluctant to borrow more for higher education.

This phenomenon may particularly affect potential graduate and professional students, including those who might otherwise embark on PhD programs. The drop in state support and falling endowment levels have sharply reduced the number of new tenure-track positions being filled this year. Adding to the costs of college and university budgets will also be the drop in number of retirements, as many academics have experienced a 40 percent drop or more in the value of their defined contribution plans. Rather than retire and open up a position for a new PhD at a lower salary cost, many academics will now stay on well into their 70s.

Both public and private universities have highlighted private fund raising and the building of sizable endowments in recent years as a way to diversify revenues. Numerous universities have reported endowment losses of 25 percent or more in 2008, as virtually all asset classes have fallen in value. The logic of limiting spending from endowments to roughly 5 percent annually means that either less must be drawn from this source or spending will increase to unsustainable long-term levels. It is also unclear whether major donors will be able or willing to continue to provide substantial new gifts at previous rates in the current climate.

Prospects

Much depends on what happens in 2009 and whether the fiscal stimulus developed by the Obama administration will recharge the economy. However, a prolonged recession and slow recovery may provide the context in which institutions will reexamine their policies and practices and bring an end to some of the extravagances that critics of higher education have railed against for years. Many outlays have been driven by competition for status and prestige, as well as to provide students with accommodations, services, and facilities approaching a luxury level. If families are forced to scale back in their spend-

Higher education has become more dependent on debt to cover student bills, but not only is the credit market now harder to tap but increasing numbers of would-be students may be reluctant to borrow more for higher education.
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Based on the statistics of the Ministry of Education, in 2009 higher education graduates will include more than 6.11 million in China, while in 2002 the total number comprised only 1.45 million. However, the employment rate of graduates in 2008 consisted of less than 70 percent. The increasing number of graduates seeking employment has been challenging for the Chinese government. The current economic crisis will surely deteriorate the condition further. Very likely, in 2009, close to 2 million graduates may not find jobs—many of whom are postgraduates, even doctoral graduates.

Causes of Employment Problems

Several factors are responsible for the dire situation of Chinese graduates’ employment. The massive expansion of enrollment since 1999 is one issue. At the end of the last century China’s exports were badly influenced by the Asian financial crisis that began in 1997. China’s economic growth declined sharply, while at the same time domestic demand was not high enough to maintain the momentum of economic growth. To increase domestic demand the central government of China reduced interest rates dramatically for saving accounts. Yet this measure proved noneffective in getting people to increase their spending. In 1999, the Chinese government was encouraged to stimulate domestic demand by increasing higher education enrollment. This policy was accepted by the government. By 2008, the new enrollment of students in universities rose by about 6 million, providing Chinese universities close to 24 million students in total.

Very likely, in 2009, close to 2 million graduates may not find jobs—many of whom are postgraduates, even doctoral graduates.

While enrollment expanded, enrollment has not been carefully matched with student employment prospects. Before 1978, China adopted a centrally planned economic system. Beginning in 1978, a market economy was introduced into China, and the country opened its door to foreign investment. But this market-oriented policy was not adopted in China’s higher education. Even today the new enrollment of students at almost all levels (with the exception of a small number of private colleges) is first arranged by universities and colleges and then approved by governments at various levels, often without a survey of market needs. With demands in the job market changing constantly, the tension created by the gap between the supply of graduates and the demand of employees has intensified. Consequently, too many graduates have majored in accounting, Chinese language and literature, law, and computer science, whereas jobs related with these fields are limited. At the same time, many companies cannot find qualified employees working in specific technical fields.

The major economic crisis that originated in the United States in 2008, also affects China. Amid the global financial crisis, China’s economy has started declining in a surprising speed since summer 2008. Tens of thousands of foreign-invested companies in the eastern provinces of China, such as Guangdong and Zhejiang, collapsed, and millions of people lost their jobs. Employment in China has receded. Fewer positions are available for graduates and will be limited in 2009 and the next few years. For instance, in a job fair held by Donghua University, more than 30,000 graduates competed for 1,700 positions provided by foreign firms.

Measures by the Chinese Government

The Chinese government has taken some measures to try to solve the crisis of graduates’ employment. The Chinese government hopes that injecting a huge investment into the economy will create jobs and relieve much of the pressure of grad-
uates’ unemployment. However, some experts predict that building infrastructure will only provide manual jobs for ordinary workers and will thus benefit college graduates much less.

Another measure is to expand postgraduate enrollments. The Ministry of Education plans to expand enrollment of master’s degree students by 5 percent and doctoral students by 1.7 percent. Given the job decline, many graduates choose to study further. This year, 1,246,000 undergraduate degree holders will be taking the postgraduate entrance exams. Yet, expanding postgraduate enrollments cannot solve the problem of graduates’ employment; the trend can only offer some relief to or postpone the current employment pressure. In fact, in recent years the employment of master’s degree graduates has become problematic.

Diverting graduates to the rural area is a third measure. However, a vast gap exists in terms of developmental level, opportunities, and living conditions between urban and rural areas. Thus, most graduates prefer to work in cities. To encourage the graduates to go to the countryside, the government has come up with policies such as preferential treatment when graduates (after two-years service) apply to become government officials or extra points are added to their scores in the examination for graduate study. These policies are not attractive as given the low salaries graduates can earn in these areas of the country.

**Conclusion**

Recently, the Ministry of Education has been calling for the whole society, including overseas Chinese, to contribute ideas to improve Chinese education overall. Promoting creative and vocational education has been raised as a way of providing new graduates with creative education and job skills to meet the needs of the market and face the challenges of a changing world in the decades to come. Perhaps this approach constitutes a more fundamental strategy that will eventually solve the problem of employment of university graduates, but the impact will take many years to become apparent.

---
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In the United States, socioeconomic mobility has declined over the past three decades, with lower-income levels and wage and benefit losses among many middle-income families. Of course, the current global financial downturn might only extenuate this divide in the United States and throughout much of the world—despite the best efforts and plans of national leaders, including President Obama.

A number of national studies have pointed to highly selective and elite US private and public universities becoming less accessible to lower-income students. The general assumption, minus any good analytical studies, views students from lower-income families as doing well in academic performance and sense of belonging at these universities than their more wealthy counterparts.

**Disaggregating Institutions**

A closer look at first-year students in a group of highly selective public and private universities tells a more nuanced story. Our study, “The Poor and Rich,” focusing on low-income undergraduate students who receive federal Pell Grants (generally for students with less than $40,000 of family income), found considerable differences in the presence of low-income students among selective universities. Further, the findings challenge the prevailing notion that low-income students have significantly less-satisfactory experiences and outcomes than their more wealthy peers—at least in highly selective universities.

On issues of affordability and access, foreign as well as many US observers of American higher education often fail to disaggregate its network of colleges and universities. We tracked the presence of low-income students among a group of 32 public and private selective higher education institutions, including the eight Ivy League institutions and flagship state universities. With some key caveats, public universities are generally much more accessible to low-income students—despite the claims of private institutions that they effectively provide generous discounts in tuition rates and financial aid.
A stark difference exists between the East Coast Ivy League and the University of California (UC)—the latter with some 180,000 undergraduates, the nation’s largest and arguably most prestigious public research university system. Collectively, only 11 percent of students in the Ivy League are low income compared to 31 percent in the UC system. The UC campuses of Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles each have more Pell Grant students than all the 8 Ivy League institutions combined. Cultural, demographic, and regional differences partly explain why selective private institutions have relatively small numbers of low-income students, in addition to generally much lower tuition among public institutions and the greater availability of financial aid relative to cost.

For instance, UC draws the vast majority of its students from a demographically diverse California population, many of whom are low income and more than half with recent immigrant backgrounds. UC is not only more accessible than a far-away elite university; it welcomes community college transfer students as part of its mandate to serve the people of California.

In contrast, private institutions seek a national pool for students, have very few transfer students, and tend to be biased in their admissions policies toward students with certain academic characteristics, like high standardized test scores and certain financial and cultural profiles. A number of public universities enroll relatively low numbers of low-income students as well, correlated with their regional draw of students. The case of the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Virginia (with only 12, 11, and 8 percent, respectively, of their students with Pell Grants) have initiated efforts at privatization that includes enrolling largely wealthy out-of-state students to bring in more tuition income.

New Initiatives
To mollify criticism regarding their low number of low-income students, a number of high-profile private and wealthy universities and colleges have recently initiated “progressive” tuition rates, in which upper tuition costs are lower for lower-middle-income students. Yet this change still looks like too little too late.

In the coming years the income profiles of students at Ivy League and many other selective privates are likely to change only marginally. The recent dive in the endowments of these institutions will probably make them even less able, and willing, to provide adequate financial aid to bring in more low-income students. Furthermore, their impact on providing access to the less wealthy is limited, in part because most students attend public colleges and universities. The 50 “best” liberal arts colleges in the United States, for example, enrolled collectively less than 0.6 percent of all Pell Grant enrollees in 2006.

Perhaps the most effective policy for low-income students in the United States would require not institutionally derived aid but, rather, increases in thus far inadequate federal grants and loans. Thus, elite public and private institutions might become within the grasp of a low-income student.

The US government needs to rethink and expand financial aid to low- and middle-income students as their numbers grow. The US Department of Education recently estimated that demand for Pell Grants exceeded projections by some 800,000 students; total applications for the grant program are up 16 percent over the previous year. Fortunately, as part of its economic stimulus plan the Obama administration is taking some steps in the right direction by proposing an additional $8 billion to be added to the Pell Grant’s current budget of $15 billion.

Academic Performance
How do lower-income students perform academically and in other gauges of engagement when compared to more wealthy students? We explored this issue by using a unique data set that combines more than 57,000 responses from a spring 2006 Census survey of all undergraduates in nine UC campuses with institutional data.

This survey is part of a larger Student Experience in the Research University Project and Consortium that we have developed with colleagues, including all the UC campuses, an initial group of six other universities of the Association of American Universities, and soon some international partners. The purpose is to develop new information on students to promote institutional self-improvement and scholarly exploration. Knowing more about the socioeconomic background of students and their experiences and academic performance is a major frontier not yet competently explored by most universities—in the United States and globally.

In our Poor and Rich study, we found that low-income (“poor”) students at the University of California generally fare as well academically as high-income (“rich” with family income above $125,000) students. At the same time, three in every four Pell Grant recipients are either first- or second-generation immigrant students and one in every three has at least
one parent with a four-year college degree, suggesting the need to rethink the assumption that “low-income” students are also “first-generation college-going” (and vice versa).

At the same time, Pell Grant recipients at UC have only slightly lower GPAs than their wealthy counterparts; this is true in math, science, and engineering and in humanities and social science fields. Poor students at UC generally have the same levels of satisfaction with various aspects of their undergraduate experience (e.g., overall satisfaction and quality of advising received) and in their sense of belonging within a campus community as rich students.

We also found some small but intriguing differences across UC campuses with poor students less satisfied relative to their affluent peers at those campuses with smaller proportions of lower-income students. Having a “critical mass” of low-income students may be extremely important in retaining and boosting their academic performance, and therefore we might see different results among, for example, the Ivy League campuses.

Without an equivalent data source to the survey Student Experience in the Research University Project and Consortium at other US universities currently, we sense that the increased presence of immigrant groups and their relatively high academic performance will grow as a phenomenon across the nation, as well as in Europe and other relatively open societies that depend economically on in-migration.

We also think it relatively safe to say that, in the case of the United States, public institutions will remain the primary entry point for middle- and lower-income students. Indeed, there may be a further market shift in which demand increases significantly for public institutions in light of significant shifts in the economic status of families during the current economic crisis—that is, if public universities gain the funding to take on growing enrollment demand.

---
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In 1955, Eugene Garfield, the founder of the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI, now part of Thomson Reuters), introduced his ideas to create “citation indexes for science.” Garfield addressed the use of cited references in a scholarly paper as descriptors of the “molecular unit of thought” of the author. The basic challenges of traditional subject-based indexes were, as he pointed out, that human indexes cannot anticipate the infinite number of possible scientific approaches each scientist may take and that those indexes were required to be familiar with the subject matter. Compared to human indexing, the recording of all cited references in a given paper is a mindless task. Therefore, it can overcome those challenges while maintaining the interlinking relationship of literature by making proper references from one to another. The citation index was proposed as an information retrieval tool to trace the development of a particular topic over time, through cited references.

The first edition of the Science Citation Index was published in 1965 in five volumes with 102,000 source articles from 613 journals, and the cited references yielded 1.4 million items. As technology advanced, the citation index evolved from print format to microfiche, to compact disc, and to the Web database. Today, the Web of Science® database indexes more than 10,000 journals of natural and social sciences and the arts and humanities. Its depth of coverage has been expanded to cover the period from 1900 to the present. In 2008 alone it indexed more than 1.6 million records with 41 million cited references. Over 20 million users in 90 countries use Web of Science.

Citation Indexes for Quantitative Analysis

While the original motivation in creating citation indexes was to enhance the retrieval of scientific information, the inventor and his supporters foresaw more purposes—as monitoring the growth and structure of scientific activities or measuring the significance of someone’s research indicated by citation impact. The ever-growing scale of scientific research, as well as its interdisciplinary nature, sometimes hampered objective and fair research assessment, even when done by a field expert.

Moreover, what was once considered as a time-consuming exercise—to capture a sizable body of scholarly literature and index all the cited references—turned out to be a cost-effective enterprise accelerated by the advancement of information technology and computing. The bibliometric study, where publication and citation counts are the basic units, became widely adopted to complement human judgment in assessing scientific research outcomes of countries, institutions, and researchers.
Regional Citation Indexes and the Global View

It was only in recent years since the 1990s that citation indexes and bibliometric research drew the attention of Asian countries. By that time, bibliometric applications had been widely exercised in Western countries for the purpose of measuring scientific output and research performance. The need for citation indexes to cover non-English literature was a natural response from Asian research communities, as the ISI citation indexes focused on internationally recognized “high-quality” journals, the majority of which were written in English. The lack of complete coverage of scientific literature was not necessarily an argument against the original citation index Garfield had envisioned. Rather, it was created as a “starting point” for virtually all researchers working on any given topic in any field.

When adopted for research evaluation purposes, however, the pressing need became obvious to adequately supplement what was already provided by ISI with locally collected materials. Especially in the regions where scholars publish not only in English but also in their local language, there has been a growing demand of indexing local journals to form their own citation indexes.

These regional citation indexes are available in China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan. Recently, in those countries where English is more commonly used, such as India, there is discussion of the benefit of creating their own versions of citation indexes.

The bibliometric study, where publication and citation counts are the basic units, became widely adopted to complement human judgment in assessing scientific research outcomes of countries, institutions, and researchers.

Globalization of Scholarly Research

In 2005, ISI (then Thomson Scientific) reported the United States’ declining share of the world’s science output. This trend had been observed since the early 1990s and the US share has since been surpassed by the European Union countries’ output share. The output share from the Asia Pacific region has shown a steady rise since the early 1990s, and it has been predicted that, at that prevailing rate, the Asia Pacific region would likely outstrip the share of the United States by 2021. In fact, by 2007 Asia Pacific accounted for 28.62 percent of the total number of papers published in the world, while the US share came down to 30.93 percent from what was once 39.14 percent in 1987.

The overall number of papers published in most countries has been increasing, even as the percentage share from each may have fluctuated. These fluctuations can be caused by many factors, each of which may have influenced another. One obvious pattern is an increasing frequency of research involving international collaboration, resulting in many authors contributing to a paper from diverse locations around the globe.

Conclusion

While having been motivated primarily to satisfy the research assessment needs of the local scientific community, regional citation indexes have now inspired a global audience to seek scientific collaboration with them. Garfield’s citation index has stimulated many groups to create additional options to expand what was originally envisioned as the Web of Science.

Beyond the transformative role of citation indexes in information retrieval, the citation counts have ushered in a new era in research performance assessment. One that demonstrates quality, as implied by citation impact, is more important than mere quantity of output. The regional citation indexes will reveal which institutions, people, and papers have had an influential place in moving science forward at the local level.

Wolves in Chancellors’ Clothing
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Software engineers realize that their new operating systems will be deployed into a perilous networked environment. Aerospace engineers build their jets with an eye toward unexpected thunderstorms and engine failures. These professionals understand that scrupulous attention to system integrity in hostile environments is part of the design process for any complex system.

The higher education community, however, has not yet evolved a similar professional culture: our organizational structures can be naïve, unintentionally opening new channels for substandard degree providers to misrepresent their legitimacy. We would do well to learn from our engineering colleagues who build systems that are expected to come under attack.

Pay-to-play and the US Medical Licensing Exam

The Foundation for Advancement of International Medical Education and Research maintains the barrier between the United States Medical Licensing Exam and students from non-US medical schools. Only graduates from schools in the foundation’s International Medical Education Directory can take
The exam. The directory is compiled from information provided by national ministries of health. But without an independent means to verify received information, the directory can be no more accurate than its input data.

The American owners of the “St. Luke School of Medicine” took advantage of the catastrophic civil war in Liberia to claim, without governmental challenge, to be training medical students in Monrovia. (They weren’t.) In 2004 the Liberian government declared St. Luke to be operating illegally. In 2005 US embassy personnel in Liberia visited St. Luke and found “no evidence of anything resembling a functioning, credible medical school.” Even so, St. Luke remained in the International Medical Education Directory database at least through 2005, entitling its customers to sit for the licensing exam.

The “University of Science Arts and Technology” pretends to teach medicine in Montserrat and sports an imaginary pseudonym named the “Medical College of London.” The owner holds an MD from a diploma mill, while the “dean” also works for the St. Luke School of Medicine. In spite of this, the “university” retains its directory listing.

The International Medical Education Directory suffers the linked problems of unreliable input information and inadequate investigative capacity. The Foundation of International Medical Education and Research could develop an early warning system that would raise flags for further action. A mechanism to receive unsolicited expert information, in combination with sensible metrics for reliability (“is the country in the throes of a horrific civil war?”) would improve the directory’s accuracy.

FEAR OF LITIGATION
Accredited US universities host Web sites in the “.edu” top-level domain. The Colorado-based EDUCAUSE, a nongovernmental organization that focuses on information technology in higher education, has managed this domain under contract with the US Department of Commerce since October 2001. New .edu domains are only issued to accredited postsecondary institutions. However, domains issued before October 2001 are “grandfathered”: registrants are not required to hold institutional accreditation. About 2,400 of the approximately 7,000 existing .edu domains belong to organizations that would not qualify for the domain today. One is held by a firehouse. Dozens belong to diploma mills.

The St. Luke School of Medicine uses www.stluke.edu, “Southern Pacific University” holds www.spuni.edu, “Adam Smith University” uses www.adamsmith.edu, and so forth. Sometimes diploma mills tout their .edu domains as attestations of legitimacy. In 2004, the St. Regis degree mill declared: “it is virtually impossible for a ‘bogus’ college or university to obtain a web address with an ‘.EDU’ suffix. Colleges are thoroughly scrutinized before domain naming authorities will grant an EDU domain name.” (But it should be noted that Saint Regis never obtained a domain through EDUCAUSE, instead using the Liberian domain, saintregis.edu.lr)

EDUCAUSE will not review the grandfathered domains, eliminating those that do not meet the current standards. The organization’s logic includes the complexity of the task and the potential cost of litigation from the owners of diploma mills. EDUCAUSE posts no meaningful disclaimer on its Web site explaining that an .edu domain is not a reliable indicator of legal authority to issue degrees. Even the vile St. Luke School of Medicine retains its .edu domain.

Perhaps a Department of Commerce directive to reevaluate (or eliminate) the grandfathered domains would give EDUCAUSE adequate legal cover. The current situation is unsatisfactory.

FRENCH PROBLEMS
French universities can award academic credit for life experience. The VAE (Validation des Acquis de l’Expérience) program is improperly identified by some diploma mills as legitimizing their degree-selling activities. Examples include “Ecole Supérieure Universitaire Robert de Sorbon,” as well as “Ecole Supérieure Universitaire Adam Smith.” These disreputable businesses incorrectly claim that French law grants them degree-awarding authority.

The French Ministry of Education describes the regulations governing VAE, but says little to warn of abuses by unrecognized degree providers.

The French Ministry of Education describes the regulations governing VAE, but says little to warn of abuses by unrecognized degree providers. A “blacklist” of VAE diploma mills would do much to solve the problem.

MISLEADING BUSINESS LICENSES
Some jurisdictions do not control use of the words “university” or “college” in the names of enterprises receiving business licenses. Diploma mills display images of these licenses on their Web sites, misidentifying them as guarantees of academic legitimacy. “Concordia College and University,” run from Belgium, does this with its Mississippi business license. Southern Pacific University uses its Delaware papers to similar effect.
Higher education associations’ government relations staff should discuss regulatory protection of the terms “university” and “accreditation” with legislators.

Open Lists into Which Bad Things Crawl
The United Kingdom’s Department for Innovation, Universities, and Skills maintains “white lists” of recognized postsecondary institutions. But the department’s Web site also directs visitors to the “UK Register of Learning Providers” with “information sources on education and training organizations. . . .” No quality assurance is implied by inclusion in the register, and no controls are imposed requiring legitimacy of entities listed.

Two years ago, “Marquess College London” announced it had “registered as a learning provider” with the Register of Learning Providers. However, Marquess (now called “St. Simon’s College, London”) is a diploma mill run by individuals with close ties to “École Supérieure Universitaire Robert de Sorbon” and “St. Regis University.” Marquess/St. Simon’s uses its insertion into an uncontrolled government-identified list to foster an illusion of legitimacy.

National agencies that allow unrecognized entities to appear on their rosters, even when no recognition is implied, provide cover for degree mills.

National agencies that allow unrecognized entities to appear on their rosters, even when no recognition is implied, provide cover for degree mills. Simon’s uses its insertion into an uncontrolled government-identified list to foster an illusion of legitimacy.

Two years ago, “Marquess College London” announced it had “registered as a learning provider” with the Register of Learning Providers. However, Marquess (now called “St. Simon’s College, London”) is a diploma mill run by individuals with close ties to “École Supérieure Universitaire Robert de Sorbon” and “St. Regis University.” Marquess/St. Simon’s uses its insertion into an uncontrolled government-identified list to foster an illusion of legitimacy.

National agencies that allow unrecognized entities to appear on their rosters, even when no recognition is implied, provide cover for degree mills. The UK Department for Innovation, Universities, and Skills should not associate itself with any unscreened list of postsecondary organizations.

Nongovernmental organizations make the same mistake, sponsoring unfiltered lists and community blogs. Sloan-C, an online learning consortium, opened its membership in 2005. The owners of St Regis immediately injected a half-dozen unsavory “schools” into Sloan-C and placed the Sloan-C logo on their Web sites. Sloan-C restricted its membership and removed the list of members from public display, eliminating the problem.

Concordia College & University penetrated unprotected blogs at the University of Illinois, EDUCAUSE, Syracuse University, Michigan Technical University, Boston College, and the Citadel. Concordia uploaded advertising material and then posted links to the blogs, identifying them as indicators of recognition. Most of the schools responded as soon as they became aware of the problem.

Paying Attention
Effective quality assurance is a complex challenge for international higher education, even in an ideal world of honorable participants. Attracted by the world’s enormous annual expen-
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The Bologna process, originated in 1999 by the secretaries of education of 29 European countries and joined later by 17 more, has included ambitious aims: a unified European higher education area with comparable bachelor’s and master’s degrees, enabling students to move freely and without bureaucratic hurdles between universities.

The goals appear laudable, and the efforts to reach them in the last decade proved enormous. The resulting gains in transparency and the move toward competence deserve the praise received by the Bologna process these days. At the same time, however, many Europeans will be disappointed with Bologna—particularly in self-perceived front-runner countries like Germany and Austria. Focusing on these two countries, this article will analyze issues of disappointment.

Implementation Management
To guarantee comparability of degrees across subjects and countries, Bologna’s aim is to encompass all academic disciplines. However, some of the most popular study programs have refused to switch to the new bachelor’s and master’s degree system. The nonparticipating fields include law and medicine—in Germany and Austria as well as in other European countries. In France, the grandes écoles, the traditional cadre universities for the political and business elite, try to avoid Bologna entirely.

The official 2010 deadline for the implementation in all participating countries will by no means be met. As a case in point, in Germany, 35 percent of all freshmen still begin their studies in the “old” degree system (Magister, Diplom, or Staatsexamen). The Bologna process required universities to change their administrative and curricular structures fundamentally and to document these in tens of thousands of papers, reports, and module descriptions. Many universities, however, have not received significant additional funding, fac-
ing instead financial stagnation or budget cuts. Hence, universities were often compelled to design new structures with insufficient planning and assessment.

### The Risks of Self-Proclaimed Goals

These difficulties may typify teething problems and could be resolved in the coming years. However, even a fully implemented Bologna system may not meet all its intended effects. For example, no hard data have yet guaranteed a positive or negative impact of Bologna on student mobility. But many aspects of the process raise concerns.

Many university professors have displayed a kind of conservatism in the form of favoring traditional degree structures. To ensure that students do not learn less than their longer educated predecessors, the entire content of a five-year Diplow or Magister program is compressed into the new three-year bachelor’s program. This has left students with little time to plan and prepare for time abroad.

According to a report by the European Universities Association (EUA), 47 percent of higher education institutions stated that some students face problems with the recognition of their credits gained abroad. A course in economics taken at one university might not be recognized elsewhere because the course descriptions do not match. Even if module descriptions adequately correspond, the country-specific application of the European Transfer Credit System (ECTS) leads to a different assessment of the courses, further complicating mobility. The EUA admits that while almost 75 percent of all European universities are using the new system, “incorrect or superficial use of ECTS is currently still widespread.”

Apart from student mobility, the Bologna process was considered in Germany as instrumental for tackling one of the most crucial problems of higher education—high dropout rates and comparatively long periods of study, especially in the humanities and social sciences. However, in a 2007 study by Berlin’s Freie Universität, the university had to admit that these goals could not be attained. Dropout rates soared. In 2006, for example, more than 30 percent of geography students in the new bachelor’s program had left after the second year. In the still existing Diplow program the dropout rate for 2006 was 6 percent. This reflects the national figures in Germany. The dropout rate in the German higher education system overall has increased to 21 percent. In bachelor’s programs, the rate is 30 percent. The problems are also reflected in the number of students in need of psychological or stress counseling, which has gone up since Bologna’s kickoff.

### A Missed Opportunity

Which qualifications and skills will be critical in the 21st century? What knowledge should a 22-year-old university graduate possess today? These questions should have been asked during the planning phase of the Bologna process. However, in many participating countries—particularly Germany and Austria—the opportunity to develop a new vision of education, before reform implementation, was unfortunately missed.

Many US universities discuss these questions on a regular basis, to address the challenges posed by a changing world. The 2004 report of the curriculum review task force of Harvard College suggested that students should learn the tools to go out into the world and “lead productive lives in national and global communities”—not too far from the concept of the founding fathers and mothers of the Bologna system. The task force actually contemplated which specific tools could be used for this objective. Why have so many European countries not seized the moment to start such a debate?

A major crisis is that German professors usually do not regard undergraduate education as significant. And why should they? Professors’ advancement and tenure status are entirely dependent on their research performance. No incentives for good teaching exist for professors or for universities themselves. The government-funded excellence competition two years ago selected nine “Excellence Universities”—according to their research proposals. With this neglect of teaching, the Bologna process is still perceived as a bureaucratic burden imposed on underfunded institutions and not as the incentive for a creative process in each individual university.

### No Time for Fatigue

Overtretched human and academic resources have led to a “Bologna fatigue.” After years of countless committee meetings related to the reform, professors, administrators, and students have become weary. One of the greatest dangers facing the Bologna process is slowing down or even stopping.

Undoubtedly, Bologna has introduced much progress and momentum into higher education in Europe. Still, much needs to be accomplished. A solution of mobility obstacles and persistently high dropout rates will need to involve a better system of supervision and counseling for students, especially at the transition from secondary school to university. When students are expected to graduate after three years, universities should have the responsibility to guarantee a highly structured and effective introductory phase. To achieve this, Europe has to consider a potential move to four-year bachelor’s degree programs. All this; however, only makes sense if all European countries embed it in a profound discussion of the aims of higher education. A “great curriculum debate,” as former Harvard president Derek Bok called it, needs to start right now at every European university.
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The 2007 report of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), “Review of Tertiary Education in Poland,” summarizes in rather unflattering words the state of internationalization of Polish higher education:

“There is no national policy to stimulate activities directed towards internationalization . . . [and] no clarity about any legal instruments that might need to be put in place to foster the internationalization of the system. . . At the same time, internationalization is very limited in scope.”

As the report confirms, the main problem of internationalization in Poland is a lack of coherent national strategy. The involvement of the government in the process is very limited. To make Polish tertiary education more international, attempts have been undertaken by higher education institutions themselves or in cooperation with specialized nongovernmental organizations. These bottom-up initiatives no longer appear sufficient.

The Polish higher education system is already suffering inconvenient outcomes. With only 15,695 international students, 0.71 percent of a 2 million student population (3,986 from Ukraine, 1,805 from Belarus, 1,039 from Norway, 749 from the United States, and 354 from China), Poland has one of the lowest number of international students among the countries of the OECD. Within Erasmus, the European exchange program, for every three Polish students who go abroad only one exchange student travels to Poland.

The Czech Republic, with a population four times smaller (about 10 million) and comparable with Poland in other areas, is ahead not only in percentage but in absolute numbers as well. Twenty-six thousand foreign students in the Czech Republic constitute over 8 percent of the total student population. The proportion in the Erasmus exchange is 3.2 in favor of outgoing students.

Promotion, Stupid!

Certain trends have kept Polish higher education institutions from attracting foreign students. Only a limited number of good programs are being taught in English. Poland lacks world-class centers of academic excellence. The two best Polish universities rate only among the 400 lowest institutions in the academic ranking by Shanghai Jiao Tong University. Last but not least, the OECD report states that Polish institutions “have no strategy for attracting foreign students [and] typically they have not developed a proactive policy for international marketing.”

In Germany, the main role in promotion of international higher education is played by DAAD—an organization with a 300 million euro annual budget; the United Kingdom and France also have agencies engaged in international education—the British Council and CampusFrance. The only organization in Poland that serves a similar function is the Perspektywy Education Foundation, a nongovernmental organization. Perspektywy receives no public funds and relies solely on the support of universities. Polish authorities do not seem fully aware of the importance of the internationalization process.

The Bologna Process

External pressure for change has increased since Poland became a member of the European Union in 2004. The implementation of the Bologna process started five years earlier, and Poland was a co-signer of the Bologna pact establishing benchmarks for the creation of the “European higher education area” in 1999. The most significant policy involved introduction of the three-cycle system (bachelor’s/master’s/Ph.D), the European Credit Transfer System, and implementation of mobility programs.

In preparation for the new international requirements, Polish higher education started some serious reforms. Based on the European education programs for academic staff, a buildup of expertise on internationalization of universities is under way. Polish higher education institutions have become more active internationally.

Milestones

The formula determining government funding of a university has been changed to include an incentive to internationalize. Consequently, universities started to integrate internationalization into their agenda. This approach had been preceded by the Perspektywy Education Foundation, which included internationalization issues in the Polish university ranking. At present, the level of internationalization influences university rankings by about 10 percent.

In May 2005, the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland and the Perspektywy Education Foundation established the Study in Poland program with the aim to strengthen internationalization. A consortium was created of the 40 best universities interested in internationalization. This
program has undertaken the organizing conferences and professional workshops and publishing handbooks and studies of important education markets. Study in Poland has promoted Polish higher education in China, India, Vietnam, Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and the United States, as well as in Spain, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France. During the period since the program started, the number of foreign students in Polish higher education institutions increased by 30 percent.

The ruling political party, Platforma Obywatelska (liberal), in its 2007 election program declared support for internationalization of higher education in Poland and for the Study in Poland program. As yet no steps have been taken in this direction, but lobbying efforts are in progress.

The Future
The Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland has affirmed that, to become truly international, Polish higher education institutions will need to activate the field of transnational education, enact policies to attract international students and academic staff, and develop international curricula. Without greater understanding of the international higher education landscape, the process of marginalization of Polish schools will continue. Because of the centralized nature of the public system, funding will be needed to ensure internationalization.

Double- and Joint-Degree Programs: Double Benefits or Double Counting?
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In the current landscape of higher education, international joint-, double-, and combined-degree programs perform an important role and will likely rise in numbers and influence in the coming years. This internationalization strategy brings important benefits to individuals, institutions, and national and regional education systems. Regarding these programs, interest is expanding, but confusion is also rising about what they characterize and entail.

For many academics and policymakers, double- and joint-degree programs are welcomed as a natural extension of exchange and mobility. For others, they are perceived as a troublesome development leading to double counting of academic work and the thin edge of academic fraud. A broad range of reactions exist because of the diversity of these program models, the involvement of different types of institutions, the uncertainty related to quality assurance and qualifications, and the ethics used in designing the academic workload or new competencies required for the granting of a joint, double, multiple, or combined degree.

Proposed Working Definitions
A plethora of words are used to describe these programs—double, multiple, trinational, joint, integrated, collaborative, combined, concurrent, consecutive, overlapping, conjoint, parallel, simultaneous, and common. These terms convey different meanings among people within and across countries, complicating the situation. The following definitions may provide clarity and common understanding: A joint-degree program awards one joint qualification upon completion of the collaborative program requirements established by the partner institutions. A double-degree program awards two individual qualifications at equivalent levels upon completion of the collaborative program requirements established by the two partner institutions. A combined-degree program awards two different qualifications at consecutive levels upon completion of the requirements established by the partner institutions.

Benefits
Collaborative-degree programs can lead to a deeper and more sustainable relationship than many internationalization strategies and create such academic benefits as innovation of curriculum, exchange of professors and researchers, and increased access to expertise and research networks. Students are attracted to double degrees for enhanced career opportunities, an international study and life experience, and the perception that “two degrees for one” means decreased workload and tuition fees. At the national and regional level, they are seen to contribute to increased status, competitiveness, and capacity building.

Challenges
The benefits of joint-, double-, and combined-degree programs
are numerous and diverse but so are the problems. Different regulatory systems, academic calendars, credit systems, tuition and scholarship schemes, teaching languages and approaches, and examination requirements create only some of the technical requirements to be met by the participating institutions.

National and university regulations and customs differ among countries and present challenges for the design and implementation of international collaborative programs—regulations preventing students from enrolling in more than one university at a time, laws requiring students to spend their last year or semester at the home university, or practices mandating the recruitment and selection of students. Nonrecognition and limitations on the number of courses or credits taken at a partner university raise additional barriers. Dissimilar academic years can create problems for student mobility but may provide more opportunities for faculty exchange. Evaluation requirements and procedures often present obstacles to double-degree programs.

Much of the concern rests with the double counting of the same course credits and workload for two or more qualifications.

Quality assurance and accreditation constitute fundamental factors, but national accreditation systems do not exist in all countries or may differ enormously. Some bodies focus on the program and others on the institutional level; many concentrate on inputs, and others look at process or outputs. Currently, the best-case scenario involves the completion of accreditation by each partner institution in the double-, joint-, or combined-degree program. Certain professional programs are evaluated by international accreditation agencies like ABET or EQUIS, but currently institutions are more likely to have their home programs accredited than the double- or joint-degree programs. A relevant issue concerns whether national, regional, or international accreditation is the best route for international collaborative programs.

Recognition of the qualifications from the various collaborative programs forms the most vexing issue. Only a few countries, although the numbers are rising, allow a domestic university legally to confer a joint qualification in partnership with a foreign institution. The student would get a formal diploma from one university and an unofficial certificate from the other, or others, indicating that it was a joint collaborative program. For some students, the international nature, rather than the qualification, of the academic program composed the most significant aspect. For many though, this is not the case as credentialism is increasingly relevant for students and their careers.

Employers, academic institutions, and credential evaluation agencies must be aware of the granting and recognition of double or multiple qualifications. Some double, multiple and combined degrees are perceived as more “legitimate” than others, but this impression is difficult to prove. Much of the concern rests with the double counting of the same course credits and workload for two or more qualifications. This has led to the “two for the cost of one” label for double degrees. Cost in this case is not only measured in monetary terms but also student workload.

The diversity of models used to determine the completion requirements for double- and multiple-degree programs is problematic. No clarity exists on whether requirements are based on (i) the number of completed courses and credits, (2) the student workload, or (3) required outcome and competency. These three approaches lead to different explanations and arguments to support the legitimacy of the double and multiple degrees awarded. Many would argue that attributing the same course workload toward two or more degrees from two or more institutions in different countries devalues the validity of a qualification. Others believe that if students meet the stated learning outcomes and competencies required for a qualification the credential is legitimate. This logic infers that double and multiple degrees, based on a set of core courses or competencies, are academically legitimate; and it is the process for recognizing these qualifications that requires more attention than the completion requirements per se. Both arguments have validity, but the variety of program models prevents a clear resolution to the question of perceived and actual legitimacy.

The higher education sector must work out a common understanding of joint, double, and combined programs and iron out the academic issues concerning working in different national regulatory frameworks, cultures, and practices. A rigorous debate on the vexing questions of accreditation, recognition, and legitimacy of the qualifications needs to take place to ensure that international collaborative programs and their awards are respected and recognized by students, higher education institutions, and employers around the world.
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During the 2007/08 academic year, the number of international students in the United States reached a record high of 623,805, a 7 percent increase over the prior year and the first significant increase since 2001/02. Students enrolling for the
first time at a US campus often represents a more sensitive measure of growth than total enrollment, and these new enrollments increased 10 percent this year, to 173,121 students. The Institute of International Education annually surveys approximately 3,000 accredited US higher education institutions on various aspects of international educational exchange and has collected data on international students in US higher education in the form of the Open Doors project since 1954.

For the eighth consecutive year, India was the leading place of origin of international students in the United States, with 94,563 Indian students in 2007/08.

International Student Origins—2007/08
For the eighth consecutive year, India was the leading place of origin of international students in the United States, with 94,563 Indian students in 2007/08. The People’s Republic of China remained in second place this year, with 81,127 students, and the Republic of (South) Korea remained in third place, with 69,124 students. All three countries experienced large increases this year, as did two other top-sending countries in Asia: Vietnam and Nepal. The number of international students from Asia increased by 10 percent overall this year and accounted for 61 percent of all international students. The number of students from the Middle East also increased this year (11 percent), driven by a large increase (25 percent) from Saudi Arabia, the result of a Saudi Arabian government scholarship program launched in 2005. Enrollments from Latin America saw a slight decline (less than 1 percent), despite a 7 percent increase from Mexico. Africa also saw a slight decline of less than 1 percent. Both Europe and Oceania saw small increases this year, following declines the previous year. This year marks the first increase from Europe since 9/11, although the current total still remains far below the peak of 95,697 students in 2001/02.

Student Profile—2007/08
As has been the case since 2001/02, international graduate students outnumbered international undergraduate students in 2007/08. Forty-nine percent of enrolled international students were graduate-degree students, 43 percent were undergraduate-degree students, and 8 percent were nondegree students. The number of nondegree students grew 12 percent over the past year, driven by large increases from China, India, and Vietnam.

Almost two-thirds (62 percent) of all international students are self-funded, with 82.5 percent of undergraduates and 77 percent of nondegree students paying for their education with personal and family funds. At the graduate level, about half (46 percent) are self-funded.

One-fifth of all enrolled international students in the United States are studying business and management, the most popular field of study for international students. The science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields are also very popular, and together account for 40 percent of all enrolled international students.

Changes since 2001/02
After 9/11, the number of enrolled international students in US higher education experienced its first decline after nearly 50 years of increases. While the overall enrollment numbers have now rebounded, substantial shifts have appeared in the composition of the international student body. With some exceptions, the general trend has been extended largely toward the top countries of origin (now exceeding pre-9/11 levels), accompanied by declines from many predominantly Muslim countries and places outside of Asia.

While the total number of international students in the United States has advanced 7 percent since 2001/02, the number of students from Asia rose 17 percent during the same period. This movement is attributable to large increases from India, China, South Korea, Nepal, and Vietnam, and these increases have completely overshadowed substantial declines from other major Asian countries of origin—including Japan, Indonesia, Thailand, Pakistan, and Malaysia.

While undergraduate enrollments increased 25 percent, graduate enrollments rose 16.5 percent.

The picture from the Islamic world is similarly nuanced. There was an average decline of 15.5 percent in the number of students from predominantly Muslim countries studying in the United States in 2007/08 compared to 2001/02. However, this drop raises the number of students coming to the United States from several countries in the Muslim world, most notably Saudi Arabia, which saw a 77 percent increase during this period, despite seeing a loss of 46 percent between 2001/02 and 2004/05. A similar trend was seen for North Africa: although there was a 31 percent loss between 2001/02 and 2007/08, this past year the number of students from North Africa grew by 4 percent, the first increase since 2001/02.

Other world regions saw mostly moderate declines of students in the United States between 2001/02 and 2007/08: from Africa a 5.5 percent decline; from Europe 12 percent (despite an increase of 1.5 percent this year); and from Latin America 6 percent. North America (comprised of Canada and Bermuda) and Oceania saw increases during this period of 9 percent and 3 percent, respectively.
Changes since 1981/82
The number of international students in the United States nearly doubled between 1981/82 and 2007/08 (from 126,299 to 623,805). But while undergraduate enrollments increased 25 percent, graduate enrollments rose 160.3 percent during the same period, and as a consequence, the proportion of undergraduate students has declined.

Among the top places of origin, students from Iran in 1981/82 comprised the largest cohort of international students in the United States, followed by students from Taiwan and Nigeria. These top three places of origin accounted for 25 percent of all international students in the United States in 1981/82. Since then, not only have the top places of origin shifted, a clear trend has appeared of greater concentration from the top places of origin, with the current top three places accounting for 39 percent of all international students in 2007/08.

Conclusion
While there has been enormous growth in the number of international students in the United States since 1981/82, it is also clear that the students come from different countries and are enrolled at different academic programs than their peers from the past, as changing economies and political situations at home, as well as the changing landscape of higher education around the world, have created both new opportunities and barriers for internationally mobile students.

Authors’ Note: Open Doors has received support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the US Department of State since 1972. The opinions expressed in this article are entirely those of the authors.
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In 1992, Bill Clinton was elected president of the United States in considerable part by emphasizing the importance of the economy. His mantra—“It’s the economy, stupid!”—focused this point. For higher education, the mantra should be “it’s the faculty, stupid.” In fact, no university can achieve success without a well-qualified, committed academic profession. Neither an impressive campus nor an innovative curriculum will produce good results without great professors. Higher education worldwide focuses on the “hardware”—buildings, laboratories, and the like—at the expense of “software”—the people who make any academic institutions successful. Look at the often-criticized rankings. What do they measure? Numbers of Nobel prizewinners, the research productivity of professors, grants obtained by faculty, and the quality of the students are central. Budgets and facilities are less important in the rankings.

Almost everywhere, the faculty is forgotten in the rush to cope with ever increasing enrollments and in the midst of deepening financial problems. If higher education is to succeed, “It’s the faculty, stupid!” must be a central rallying cry for universities worldwide.

It is depressing, but quite essential, to examine the status of the academic profession worldwide. A few examples will illustrate global realities. One issue involves the fact that the academic profession is aging in many countries. In much of the world, half or more of the professoriate is getting close to retirement. In many countries, too few new PhDs are being produced to replace those leaving the profession, and many new doctorates prefer to work outside of academe. Too few incentives for advanced doctoral study and an uncertain employment market for new PhDs, along with inadequate financial support in many fields, deter enrollment and ensure that many students drop out of doctoral programs. Countries with rapidly growing higher education systems are especially hard hit. Vietnam, for example, requires 12,000 more academicians each year to meet expansion goals, and only 10 percent of the academic profession currently hold doctoral degrees.

Global examples of the current state of the academic profession will illustrate contemporary deteriorating realities. These examples are chosen to highlight widespread realities.

The Rise of the Part-Time Profession

To be most effective, professors need to be truly engaged in teaching and research. They must have full-time academic appointments and devote attention exclusively to academic responsibilities and to the universities and colleges that employ them. The full-time professoriate is a dying breed. Latin America is the homeland of the part time “taxicab” professor, rushing between teaching jobs or between class and another profession. Except for Brazil, in almost all Latin American countries up to 80 percent of the professoriate is employed part time. Paid a pittance, they have little commitment to the university or to students. It is not surprising that there are almost no Latin American universities among the top 500 and little research productivity. In the United States, only half of newly hired academics are full time on the “tenure
track”—scholars who can hope for a career in higher education. The rest are part-time “contingent” faculty who are paid poorly for each course and have few benefits. A new class of full-time contract teachers has grown in recent years as a way for universities to ensure flexibility in staffing. Traditional tenure-track academic appointments tend to be most common in the upper-tier colleges and universities, thus increasing inequalities in the academic system as a whole.

In many countries, universities now employ part-time professors who have full-time appointments at other institutions. Many eastern European countries, China, Vietnam, Uganda, and others are examples of such a higher education sector. Academic salaries are sufficiently low, and the universities expect that faculty will earn extra funds to supplement their own incomes and in some cases to subsidize the university’s own budget. At some Chinese universities, professors are expected to practice consulting and outside work as part of their academic duties. In other cases, universities set up additional degree-granting colleges and ask the faculty to perform extra teaching at those schools, enhancing university revenues and individual salaries at the same time. It is also the case that professors at state universities in much of the world help to staff the burgeoning private higher education sector by “moonlighting.”

The decline of a real full-time professoriate is undermining high-quality higher education. If professors cannot devote their full attention not only to teaching and research but also to maintaining an academic culture, working with students outside of the classroom, and participating in the governance of their universities, academic quality will decline. As the British say, “penny wise and pound foolish.”

The Bureaucratization of the Professoriate

In years past, even if academics were not well paid, they held a good deal of autonomy and control over their teaching and research as well as their time. This situation has changed in many academic systems and institutions. In terms of accountability and assessment, the professoriate has lost much of its autonomy. Assessment exercises and other accountability measures require a lot of time and effort to complete. The pressure to assess academic productivity of all kinds is substantial, even if much of that work is in fact quite difficult or impossible to accurately measure. Much criticism has been aimed at the British Research Assessment Exercises, which many claim has distorted academic work.

Universities have also become much more bureaucratic as they have grown and have become more accountable to external authorities. Heavy bureaucratic control is deleterious to a sense of academic community and generally to the faculty’s traditional involvement in academic governance. The power of the professors, once dominant and sometimes used by them to resist change, has declined in the age of accountability and bureaucracy.

What Is To be Done?

It is not difficult to identify the path to a restored academic profession—and thus successful higher education systems. The academic profession must again become a profession—with appropriate training, compensation, and status. This means that academic programs to provide master’s and doctoral...
degrees must be significantly expanded. The rush toward part-time teachers must be ended and, instead, a sufficient cadre of full-time professors with appropriate career ladders appointed. Salaries must be sufficient to attract talented young scholars and to keep them in the profession.

In a differentiated academic system, not all professors will focus on research—typically the gold standard in terms of prestige and status. Most academics mainly teach, and their workloads should reflect this. It would also be impossible to return to the days of unfettered autonomy and little if any evaluation of academic work. Yet, accountability and assessment can be done in ways that are appropriate to academic work rather than punitive exercises.

If there is any good news in this story it is that more professors enjoy what they are doing and feel a loyalty to the profession. The 1992 international Carnegie study of the academic profession found surprisingly high levels of satisfaction, and the 2007 Changing Academic Profession global survey found the same result. Despite their problems, academic life has significant attractions. The challenge is to ensure that the academic profession is again seen by policymakers and the public as central to the success of higher education.

In the current environment, the popular press as well as some university administrators and many government officials are happy to criticize professors as the root of academe’s problems. In fact, the opposite is the case—the professors are the root of the unprecedented success of higher education. There is always room for improvement, but professor bashing will lead to neither reform nor greater productivity.
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The emergence of the knowledge economy poses dramatic challenges for developing nations that have to struggle to insert themselves in a highly competitive market. Colombia’s case illustrates this situation.

Colombia’s government planning is focused on 2019, its 200th anniversary of independence. Policymakers concentrate on their country’s movement into the knowledge economy as well as the role researchers and highly skilled workers play in that process. However, the country’s current reality of academ-
Teachers at private universities usually do not possess tenure, and the majority are hired through contracts of less than a year. These contracts tend to be renewed, but an institution can decide not to renew a contract without notice or paying severance. As in public universities, teachers at private universities can be hired on hourly based contracts, part time or full time; other positions are also possible but less frequent. Private institutions possess greater flexibility to negotiate faculty salaries; for this and other reasons, salary information in private institutions is limited and difficult to study.

**Facility Qualifications**

The minimum requirement to become a professor at a public university is a bachelor’s degree. However, occasionally, people without such a degree are hired. There is no specific regulation on the minimum academic degree for private university faculty, but in general teachers have at least a bachelor’s degree. Some exceptions may be found in technical institutions and programs associated with the arts. In 2005, about 1.86 percent of Colombian higher education teachers had qualifications below a bachelor’s degree; 36.7 percent had a bachelor’s degree; and 61 percent had a postgraduate degree, including 3.3 percent holding a doctoral degree.

**Looking Toward 2019**

Colombia’s development plan includes research and the production and application of knowledge as important components in most sectors. The draft of the education sector’s 2019 strategic plan includes the goal of acquiring at least 30 percent of full-time-equivalent faculty with a doctoral degree, starting with a baseline of 8 percent of these teachers holding such a degree.

Colombia will have to create a flexible environment in public universities, improve faculty members’ stability at public and private institutions, and consider competitiveness as a goal for researchers. Low salaries, precarious working conditions, and weak academic communities do not make a strong case to attract the best and the brightest to academe.

At present, just 10 years away from 2019, the country should evaluate whether it will import foreign talent to improve its research capability. Given that salary plays an important role, the country should evaluate the convenience and viability of creating competitive salaries to attract Colombians and foreigners who have earned the desired qualifications to push the development plan forward. Faculty remuneration should be determined in light of the nation’s vision and not only under the scope of the salaries’ impact on the country’s budget.

---

**Problems in China’s Private Universities**

Osman Ozturkut is the 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.

After approval by the Beijing government, private universities began appearing in almost every major province in China. If obtaining any education is seen as the main goal, it would seem fair to say that these private colleges are providing great opportunities—given that they are accepting students with lower Chinese University Examinations scores and filling the enormous need for higher and continuing education in China. However, a focus on the quality of education (including facilities, equipment, and teaching and administrative staff) raises concern that the private colleges are not nearly as effective as even second-tier Chinese public universities.

Successful examples of private universities do exist in China (see Jing Lin and Ruth Hayhoe, “China’s Private Universities: A Successful Case Study,” International Higher Education, no. 51) that are certainly providing high-quality education. However, these schools may be the exceptions, and today there are many more not-so-successful private universities in China. This article by no means intends to undermine the teaching and administration at effective institutions but attempts to provide a starting point for discussing the future of such private universities in China.

**Instructors and Administrators**

The instructors at private universities mainly constitute younger faculty members with bachelor’s degrees and limited teaching experience. They teach 16 to 20 hours a week, with the remaining time left for chatting with other instructors, given the absence of research or professional development opportunities. The instructors usually stay at these institutions for only one or two semesters before moving on to their “real” jobs at public universities. They are paid an average salary of 4,500 RMB (around US$550) a month and are provided a studio apartment on campus. While they pay their instructors salaries similar to those of private universities, public universities also provide job security and prestige.

The top management of the private institutions includes
largely people from the business world with aggressive marketing experiences. Vice presidents may change three or four times during an academic year. Lower-level managers also frequently undergo shifts of positions or are transferred to different departments.

Party representatives are given executive vice president positions, with other executive management positions being filled by employing relatives. These executives, with minimal or nonexistent educational experience, vie these universities as highly profitable businesses. For example, at a relatively renowned private college in Southern China, a former party secretary was hired as the executive vice president; and brothers, sisters, children, and cousins were given highly responsible jobs.

Living and Learning Conditions
Facilities provided for these students, who pay around 12,000 RMB (around US$1,750) for the year, are similar to the facilities at public universities. Students are offered mediocre living quarters in a six-student dormitory room, which includes no furniture other than a desk and stool for each student, two hours of hot water a day, no TV, and very slow (given a trend all around China) and time-limited Internet access. Student cafeterias, grocery stores, and bottled water services are usually owned and run by owners of the universities, leaving students with no other options regarding what they should eat and how much they should pay. Students may not be allowed to use cash on campus and forced instead to use school-issued debit cards, onto which they must first place a minimum of 50 RMB at a time. This initiative is of course a matter of convenience and security, among other benefits; but the lack of a refund policy for the money unspent is a rather aggressive business strategy. Moreover, students are charged extra for Internet access, hot water usage, and electricity—occasionally three or four times more than what the Electricity Bureau charges the school—even before they use it and, again, without a refund policy. Most of these universities are located outside city centers; and with little public transportation available, students are left with no choice but to stay on campus.

Humble and desperate Chinese students, socially outcast by lower examination scores, are still willing to pay top dollar for living in mediocre quarters and being taught in classrooms without climate control (brutally hot during the summer and freezing cold during the winter) by unmotivated and inexperienced young faculty members. It should be noted that the students at these private universities receive the same living conditions offered at a public university, which charges students less than half as much as private institutions. Paying a higher tuition fee should certainly ensure better living and learning facilities, in addition to providing a global and competitive education.

Conclusion
The relatively low ranking of private colleges and the thus rather negative public perception of the graduates of such schools cause students to be treated as helpless customers with nowhere else to go. Recruiters make promises during recruitment fairs, focusing entirely on parental satisfaction but ignoring the needs of these students. Students go unheard, unable to complain due to the cultural barriers of losing face and disapproving their parents and relatives. Local chat rooms, while providing a platform to voice their opinions, are not significant tools to promote change in China’s private universities.

These students are paying high prices and deserve better education and treatment. Instead of using the desperation of these students, China’s private universities need to open their eyes to the reality of aggressive competition, from foreign joint-venture universities or other private universities. The examples in this article are based on my teaching experience at four different private colleges and universities in China, each of them with an average student population of 20,000. One of these institutions has recently been designated by the Beijing government as among “China’s Top Ten Privately Managed Educational Institutions.” These institutions should start offering more services with better training to make their students more marketable in the real world.

Again, if any education is better than no education, even these problematic private universities provide useful service to China. However, with the need for more colleges and universities in China, the low-end private universities should start focusing on giving quality education and good living conditions to students who are paying high tuition fees.

Taking a Closer Look at the OECD Tertiary Statistics

Arthur M. Hauptman

Arthur M. Hauptman is a public policy consultant based in Arlington, Virginia and specializes in higher education finance issues. E-mail: art.hauptman@yahoo.com.

The statistics that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development regularly reports on tertiary education in its annual Education at a Glance publication are increasingly used to compare the performance of OECD coun-
tries. However, the many problems with how some of the key indicators are calculated and reported can limit their utility in producing international comparisons. Much of the data is either incorrect or misleading.

As a result, a number of the key data elements regularly collected and reported upon by OECD require a serious reconsideration, including: enrollment ratios; persistence rates; the lack of connection between enrollments and attainment rates; spending per student figures; and financial commitment—the share of GDP devoted to tertiary education.

One problem is that the OECD enrollment ratios include older students and overseas students in the numerator but not in the denominator; this tends to overstate participation.

**Enrollment Ratios**

Participation rates traditionally constitute how tertiary education systems are compared internationally. Martin Trow used them more than three decades ago to develop his typology of higher education systems as elite, mass, and universal. The OECD calculates enrollment ratios—its version of participation rates—by dividing all students enrolled by the population of traditional college age in a given year. Several problems with this approach do limit its utility as a measure of participation.

One problem is that the OECD enrollment ratios include older students and overseas students in the numerator but not in the denominator; this tends to overstate participation in countries with large numbers of these kinds of students. In that way, the OECD enrollment ratios for some countries can occasionally equal or even exceed 100 percent.

In addition, the number of students reported to OECD as enrolled often does not cover all students actually in tertiary programs because of data collection limits. For example, most trade school students enrolled in the United States are not in the OECD tertiary enrollment figures. Similarly, in Canada many community college students are not listed in the OECD figures because federal data collectors for various reasons do not report all enrollments in provincially run community colleges. In some OECD countries, some or all further-education students are not counted as tertiary.

Perhaps most important, counting currently enrolled students fails to reflect those individuals who have already completed their tertiary studies. For example, 23-year-olds who complete their undergraduate degree at age 22 are not included in statistics on currently enrolled students aged 18–24. Yet clearly these students should be included in any reasonable measure of participation.

**Persistence Rates**

OECD reports two types of persistence rates—completion rates and graduation rates. Completion rates compare the number of degrees awarded in one year with the number of students who begin a program at a typical amount of time beforehand. The other OECD-reported measure of persistence—graduation rates—divides graduates in one year by the population at the typical age of graduation.

Like enrollment ratios, both these persistence rates are proxies because most OECD countries do not track how many students in a cohort complete their program of study (although OECD admiral is trying to collect cohort rates from a number of member countries). Also as in the case of participation, the proxy nature of the OECD-reported persistence rates often means that they do not measure what they purport to measure. It also can send confusing signals about where countries rank. Take New Zealand—on completion rates, it ranks near the bottom of all OECD countries, just ahead of Hungary, the United States, and Italy and just behind Mexico. But when graduation rates are calculated, New Zealand is one of the leaders, ranking third among OECD countries.

**Enrollment and Attainment Statistics**

The growing reliance on using attainment rates as reported by OECD to compare countries is a very positive development as these statistics tend to be collected consistently across countries through labor force surveys and reflect measures of both access and success. However, an examination of the OECD enrollment and attainment data reveals a large disconnect between the two measures. Although Canada has the highest attainment rate for subbachelor’s degrees, the number of students reported as enrolled in those programs simply could not generate the attainment rates that OECD reports. A major cause of this disconnect is that OECD enrollment figures are generated from reports by institutions, whereas the attainment data come from surveys of workers who are asked about the highest degree they have attained.

**Costs per Student**

Despite efforts to weed out noneconomic costs, the educational-cost figures reported by OECD often include spending outside the educational process. For example, OECD reports that the United States had educational costs of $18,000 per student in 2005 but several recent US reports peg educational costs per student in the United States closer to $14,000, including both public and private institutions. The OECD data also may ignore cultural differences. For example, in some OECD countries such as Spain and Portugal many enrolled students fail to complete their tertiary studies. For example, 23-year-olds who complete their undergraduate degree at age 22 are not included in statistics on currently enrolled students aged 18–24. Yet clearly these students should be included in any reasonable measure of participation.
International Comparisons: What Your Fourth-Grade Math Can Reveal

Clifford Adelman

Clifford Adelman is a senior associate at the Institute for Higher Education Policy in Washington, DC. E-mail: cadelman@ihep.org. The original version of this article appeared in the online Inside Higher Education, December 15, 2008.

It’s not that the latest rhetorical trope in the bad news presentation of US higher education is to say—wherever improvements are acknowledged—“Wait a minute! But other countries are doing better!” and rush out a rash of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) population ratios that show the United States has “fallen” from 2nd to 9th or 3rd to 15th place in whatever indicator of access, participation, and attainment is at issue.

The trope is not new in any country. Want to wake up your local or national policymakers? Tell them someone is down, and that someone is us. For some odd reason, educators everywhere, in countries large and small, love self-flagellation. In the metrics of international economic comparisons, we treat trade balances, GDP, and currency exchange rates the same way.

Except in matters of higher education, the metrics are false, and our use of them both misguided and unproductive. For postindustrial nations, the most visible reports on higher education lead off with OECD population ratios drawn from its annual Education at a Glance, assuming they were passed down from Mt. Sinai as the tablets by which we should be judged. The population ratios, particularly those concerning higher education participation and attainment for the 25–34 age cohort, will serve the preferred tendency of education leaders and policymakers to engage in a national destructive orgy that purposefully neglects some very basic and obvious facts. I urge colleagues from countries outside the OECD not to fall into this trap.

You do not need more than fourth-grade math to see the problems with population ratios, whether you are a large ship or small skiff in the human harbor. None of the reports using OECD data bothers to recognize the relative size of the US ship or the relative diversity of races, ethnicities, nationalities, religions, and native languages that characterize our 310 million residents. They would blithely compare our educational landscape with that of Denmark, for example, a country of 5.4 million, where 91 percent of the inhabitants are of Danish descent and 82 percent belong to the same church. They would exalt Finland in higher education matters, another racially and lin-

students do not regularly attend class. This may be a boon for university finances but not for quality education.

Research is the other major component of OECD-reported spending per student. Here the measurement issue is that presenting research spending on a per student basis, as the OECD does, makes little sense. An elite system would show a higher level of research spending per student, while in a mass system research spending per student would be lower. But this does not accurately reflect a country’s commitment to research. It would be much more sensible to consider research spending as a share of GDP, as various publications (and the OECD) do for the broader category of research and development.

Financial Commitment

In addition to measuring costs per student, OECD also reports financial resources spent on tertiary education as a percentage of GDP. As discussed above in the context of research spending, measuring a country’s financial commitment by what it spends as a percentage of GDP can be preferable to looking at per student spending figures. But as is the case in educational spending, the OECD-reported commitment figures may include spending items for some countries that are not included in the figures submitted by others. Again, to use the United States as an example, it has the highest commitment of all OECD countries by a wide margin; but its leadership comes from its very high level of private resources, which include university hospitals as well as endowments that are not shown or do not exist in data for many other OECD countries. The public commitment in the United States is actually quite modest; it ranks 19th among OECD countries in public resources devoted to tertiary education.

This review of some key OECD statistics for tertiary education suggests that they should be used with great care in comparing the effort and the accomplishments of various countries. It also suggests that in a number of instances we should be trying to develop better measures to compare OECD countries on these and other key variables.

Like enrollment ratios, both these persistence rates are proxies because most OECD countries do not track how many students in a cohort complete their program of study

---
guistically homogenous (bilingual, to be sure, in Finnish and Swedish) country of 5 million, with a population growth rate of 0.1 percent and a net immigration rate of 1 percent (primarily from eastern Europe), where the capacity of the higher education system was expanded by one-third in the 1990s with 11 new polytechnic institutions known as AMKs (for the United States to do something equivalent would require establishing 600 new four-year colleges) and where tuition is fully subsidized. Even so, the median age of entrance to higher education in Finland is 21 years (compared with 19 in the United States), and the median age at which Finnish students earn bachelor’s degrees is 28 years (compared with 24–25 in the United States). Is comparing Finnish and US higher education dynamics a fair sport? That is an obvious rhetorical question. Is comparing any long-established but postcolonial higher education system with newly established postcolonial systems (e.g., Argentina vs. Senegal) a fair sport? That is another obvious rhetorical question.

It’s not that one shouldn’t compare one’s records to those of other countries; it’s just that population ratios are not the way to do it.

Another Demographic Planet
OECO has used census-based population ratios to bypass a host of inconsistencies in the ways its 30 member countries report education data. However, as it turns out, the countries also employ different census methodologies, so the components of the denominator from Sweden are not identical with the components of the denominator from Portugal. Moreover, when ordinary folk who have no stake in education propaganda look at those 30 countries and start asking questions about fertility rates, population growth rates, net immigration rates, and growth in foreign-born populations, they cannot help but observe that the United States lives on another planet. Only 4 countries out of the 30 show a fertility rate at or greater than replacement (2.0)—France, New Zealand, Mexico, and the United States—and of these, Mexico has a notable negative net migration rate. Out of those 30 countries, 7 have negative or zero population growth rates and another 5 show growth rates that might as well be zero. On the other hand, the US population growth rate, at 0.9 percent, is in the top 5. In net immigration through 2008, only Australia, Canada, and Ireland were ahead of us (and we count only legal immigrants). The Migration Policy Institute shows the percentage growth in foreign-born populations in the United States over the past 15 years at 45.7 percent—more than double the rate for Australia and Canada. It is no state secret that our immigrant population is a) young, b) largely schooled in other countries with lower compulsory schooling ages, and c) pushing the US population denominator up. Looking ahead to 2025, Census projections show an increase of 4.5 million in the 25–34 age bracket. Of that increase, 74 percent will be Latino, and another 14 percent Asian. Can you find another country, OECD or otherwise, where an analogous phenomenon is already in the cards? As noted, the United States lives on a different demographic planet.

It’s the Math, Stupid!
More to the point is your fourth-grade math. The European Union projects a decline of 9 million in the traditional college-age population by 2025, and Japan expects its population to drop by 11 percent. Now, what happens to a fraction—and the percentage based on a fraction—when the denominator declines dramatically and the numerator either remains flat, rises slightly, or declines slightly? And, on the other side of that fourth-grade calculation, what happens when the denominator rises considerably and the numerator remains flat or rises slightly? This is a no-brainer: the gap between US bachelor’s degree attainment rates in the target-age-bracket population, and those of most countries with whom we are normally compared by the bad-news bears will continue to expand for as far as the eye can see. Unfortunately, given the propagandistic motivation of the reports that use self-flagellation to gain policy influence (and business), trying to teach basic math and human geography to putatively intelligent adults is like talking to stones. They don’t want to hear it.
pheric levels. That trend will suit the crisis mongerers just fine, except none of it will help anyone understand their own situation or where international comparisons truly matter. And for non-OECD countries where census methodologies and coverage have not fully matured, population ratio comparisons are even more problematic.

And that is the more important point. The numbers do not help us do what we have to do. They steer us away from the task of refashioning the pieces of paper we award into meaningful documents, representing learning that helps our students compete in a world without borders. Instead of obsession with ratios, we should look instead to the action lines of the Bologna process: degree qualification frameworks, a “tuning” methodology that creates reference points for learning outcomes in the disciplines, the discipline-based benchmarking statements that tell students precisely what to expect of their educational journey and the public precisely what learning our institutions should be accountable for. Diplomas Supplements that warrant student attainment, more flexible routes of access, and ways of identifying and targeting for participation underrepresented populations through geocoding.

Slowly but surely, these features of Bologna are shaping a new global paradigm for higher education, and in that respect other countries are truly doing better. We should all be studying the substance, perhaps experiencing an epiphany or two about how to turn the big ship or the small skiffs on which we travel into the currents of global reform.

The Reinvention of Undergraduate Education in Hong Kong

**Martin J. Finkelstein and Elaine M. Walker**

Martin J. Finkelstein is professor of higher education at Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ, USA. He was a Fulbright Senior Specialist in Hong Kong. E-mail: finkelms@shu.edu. Elaine M. Walker is a visiting scholar at Seton Hall University and the University of Hong Kong.

In 2004/05, the government of Hong Kong authorized a major reform of its eight public universities—known as the “3-3-4 reforms.” To be implemented in 2012, the three-year undergraduate degree program, focused exclusively on a profession or academic field, will be changed to a four-year undergraduate degree program, including a substantial component of nonspecialized or general education. While many factors contributed to the government’s action, two overriding factors were a desire to ensure the future competitiveness of Hong Kong in the global knowledge economy and to align Hong Kong’s educational pipeline with those in the Chinese mainland, the United States, and the European Union.

On the face of it, Hong Kong’s 3-3-4 reforms represent another classic case of government imposing far-reaching changes on universities. Two factors, however, distinguish the Hong Kong “experiment” from typical government intervention: first, the mandates encourage distinctiveness in the response of individual institutions according to their missions and history; and second, the universities have received considerable lead time and a modest infusion of additional resources from the government.

The eight public universities funded through the University Grants Committee include three historically research-intensive universities (the English-language University of Hong Kong, the bilingual Chinese University of Hong Kong, and the University of Science and Technology); two former polytechnics (Polytechnic University and City University); the Hong Kong Baptist University (founded by American Baptists in the 1950s and incorporated into the University Grants Committee public system in 1987); Lingnan University (with a focus on undergraduate liberal arts); and the Hong Kong Institute for Education (with a specialized teacher training and master’s level focus).

**Current Developments**

Nearly all the universities have established faculty and administrative task forces within the formal academic governance structure to drive the institutional planning process; and several have established new administrative positions to direct the process. Providing reports to the University Grants Committee is required biennially. While all institutions have focused their efforts on designing a first-year transitional undergraduate experience, most are concentrating as well on a redesign of the major, to promote specific learning objectives—including renewed emphasis on outside the classroom experiences (e.g., internships and service learning off campus) and foreign-exchange study opportunities on the mainland and across Asia and the world.

**Academic Staffing Challenges**

Such broad-based curricular redevelopment poses several major challenges: Who will do the curricular development and delivery? What incentives will entice the “best” faculty to
become engaged in these new initiatives at the expense of their research and publication activity? Research intensive institutions will have to create approaches to bring the faculty into this reinvention in a way not viewed as threatening to their long-term career interests. If this approach fails on a sufficiently large scale with the regular research faculty, will new kinds of academic staff need to be recruited to undertake this special general education work?

**Assessment Challenge**

Finally, there is the assessment challenge. The reforms mandated appropriate assessment methods to demonstrate that educational goals are being achieved. How will institutions determine whether the panoply of new courses, internship opportunities, and foreign study is actually achieving the intended outcomes? This question must be answered at multiple levels ranging from the individual academic program, to the faculty, to the institution, and ultimately to the entire higher education sector. These assessments will be vital both as a basis for improvement (or quality assurance) and for determining the costs and benefits of the new educational order. By comparison, the assessment of the research mission has already come a long way.

**New Opportunities**

A number of universities, especially the three focused on research, are using the 3:1:4 reforms as an opportunity to grow—augmenting their academic staffs by 10 to 20 percent and expanding professional staff in the student service area. This hiring expansion provides a stunning (once in a lifetime) opportunity to recast and reform the academic staff in service of a new order.

Over the coming decade, Hong Kong will be a system to watch—a virtual laboratory for the examination of change in higher education that conjoins government mandates with enlightened government support.

---

**New Publications**


An analysis of patterns of migration of high-skill people in the European Union, this volume discusses the circulation of talent, including patterns of return. It also looks at networks, the migration process, the impact on children and families, and the experiences of receiving and sending countries.


The Massachusetts Institute of Technology is a special and unusual university. Its roots are in the development of technical higher education in the United States in the mid-19th century. Rogers, the founder of MIT and its leading thinker, is a unique figure in the history of American higher education. This volume combines a biography of Rogers with a history of the ideas and developments behind the early years of MIT.


A detailed study of international donor assistance for Indonesian higher education, this book discusses how government agencies and international donors interrelated in the process of assistance programs. Dutch programs in Indonesia are the main focus of the study. The results, while relating to Indonesia, have relevance to donor-government relations internationally.


A multifaceted discussion of student mobility worldwide, this volume features chapters focusing on a variety of European countries and Israel. Several comparative analyses are included, as are a few chapters focusing on faculty mobility.


The concern of the authors of this book is
the looming shortage of faculty in many fields in American higher education. Among the themes discussed are the Council of Graduate School’s doctoral completion project, time-to-degree issues, minor access to doctoral study, attracting women to doctoral study (particularly in the sciences), and others. A section analyses the internationalization of doctoral education.


The underlying theme of this book is the increasing lack of clarity between public and private higher education worldwide. In different ways, public higher education is becoming more privatized, and the role of the private sector is growing more complex. Case studies from many countries illustrate these points and provide evidence of both convergence and divergence of public and private sectors.


This book contains a short essay focusing on the regulation of private higher education and such topics as quality assurance mechanisms, rules relating to the establishment of private academic institutions, and other themes. This is followed bynine brief analyses of developing and middle-income countries.


Towns that are dominated by universities are common in the United States, although the model of the “college town” can be found in some other countries as well. This book analyzes a number of American college towns such as Manhattan, Kansas; Nerman, Oklahoma; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and others. The historical development of these towns and their relationships with the university are discussed, as is the more recent growth of high-tech and other research-based industries that have located near these universities.


Civic engagement includes undergraduate students in service learning activities, citizenship development, and campus involvement. This volume examines programs and approaches to civic engagement in higher education. Among the topics discussed are civic engagement and general education, first-year experiences, intercultural competence and civic engagement, measuring civic engagements, and others.


In this extended essay on how demographic and other societal trends, especially technology, are affecting American society and higher education, Keller argues that academic must take these changes into account as well as keeping a focus on its traditional values.


Thedefocus of this book is on how the United States can develop collaborative-based collaboration can take place. The various constituencies of collaborative work in research, management, and programs are discussed with the goal of improving the campus climate for collaborative work.


A highly original study of the peer review process in academe, this book analyzes how decisions are made by review panels of scholars in six academic disciplines. The panels were involved in selecting people for fellowships and research projects. While the study deals with the United States, the author argues that there is considerable relevance for other countries.


A collection of papers from the World Bank’s annual conference on development economics, this volume focuses broadly on economic issues relating to higher education, mainly in developing countries. Among the themes discussed are skilled labor and the international economy, global economic growth and migration, financing higher education in developing economies, and higher education and innovation.


Discussing American academic institutions that are “at risk” of survival because of financial difficulties, natural disasters, enrollment problems, or other severe difficulties, the authors examine how institutions can solve their problems. Themes such as the effective use of data, legal challenges, public relations, and the effective use of leadership are analyzed. Although the book concerns the United States, there is relevance for other countries.


An American study of the use of Facebook for student communication, this book is based on interviews and focus groups with students and illustrates the rapidly changing world of computer-based social networking on campus. The authors stress the importance of understanding student communication patterns for student culture and campus life generally.


The purpose of this volume, which is part of the Association for the Study of Higher Education’s Research Report series, is to analyze current research on key topics relating to higher education. The focus is on the changing working lives of the academic profession in the United States. By examining current
research and analysis, the authors point to key themes such as the attacks on the tenure system, growing pressures for accountability, demographic changes in the professoriate, and others.


The role of elite universities in mass higher education systems is examined in this volume. Too often, research universities are seen as separate from the rest of the higher education system. The book provides case studies of low systems coping with research universities. Among the countries and regions included are Latin America, Germany and its excellence initiative, Norway, the United Kingdom, Poland, and several others. Elite institutions are examined in the US Ivy League, Japan, France, and several other countries.


The results of a conference sponsored by UNESCO’s Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education, this volume focuses on the role of the university in sustainable development. Short chapters discuss quality assurance, community service learning, international service, and participatory research, as well as other themes.


An interim report on the important CAP (Changing Academic Profession) comparative study, this volume includes several overview essays concerning the CAP project and its methodology, and case studies of most of the countries involved in it from all continents.


The Sense Publishers Global Perspectives on Higher Education series:

The Global Perspectives series is edited by Philip G. Altbach and affiliated to the Center for International Higher Education. All of the books in the series are published in paperback editions. There are currently 14 titles available. Most of the volumes are available for US$45 in paperback editions. For further information, contact Sense Publishers. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com. The newest books are:


Eleven of Jane Knight’s key essays on internationalization are included in this book. Among the themes discussed are cross-border higher education, the financial aspects, GATS, and models for understanding internationalization.


The focus of this book is on the research role of universities in Latin America and particularly their contribution to research that contributes to national development. Among the topics considered are intellectual property and the research role, university-industry linkages, academic entrepreneurship, and others. Case studies from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico are included.

Hebe Vessuri and Ulrich Teichler, eds. Universities as Centers of Research and Knowledge Creation: Are Endangered Species? 269 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-90-8790-478-4. Stemming from research sponsored by the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Knowledge, and Research, the focus of this book is the research role of universities. This global perspective on the broad research function of the universities has the underlying theme of the challenges to research in the changing academic context worldwide. Most of the authors argue that the academic environment is less favorable to research, and especially basic and developmentally relevant research. Case studies mainly from developing and middle income countries are included, as well as a few chapters concerning the United Kingdom, Poland, and the Netherlands.
News of the Center

The Center’s partnership with the Shanghai Jiao Tong University’s Graduate School of Education now includes the regular publication of International Higher Education in Chinese as part of the Journal of International Higher Education (Gaoji Gaodeng Jiaoyu), the Graduate School of Education’s new online publication. In addition, CIHE director Philip Altbach serves as chair of the school’s international advisory board. He will participate at the world-class university conference in Shanghai in November and, in October, will participate in a conference on international higher education sponsored by Tohoku University in Tokyo.

The CIHE, in cooperation with the World Bank, is beginning a research project on the development of research universities in developing and middle-income countries. The focus of this research is to understand how research universities can develop and flourish. Case studies will be analyzed. Jamil Salmi, head of the Bank’s higher education program, will be working on this project.

The CIHE’s research on academic salaries in 15 countries (Rumbley, Pacheco, and Altbach, International Comparison of Academic Salaries), has attracted significant attention, including stories in Times Higher Education, the Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Education, University World News, and other publications. We hope to be able to expand this research project in the future.

Laura Rumbley recently completed work on a book chapter with Ben DeWinter on “The Diversification of Education Abroad Across the Curriculum,” which will appear in a special publication of the Forum on Education Abroad entitled “A History of Study Abroad: 1965 to Present,” to be published later this year. She is working on “Internationalisation in the Universities of Spain: Changes and Challenges at Four Institutions,” which will be included in Globalisation and Internationalisation in Higher Education: Theoretical and International Perspectives, edited by Nick Foskett and Felix Maringe.

Higher Education Experts Database

The Center for International Higher Education at Boston College now hosts an expert database that allows visitors to find scholars and practitioners around the world who have expertise in specific areas of international higher education. This new searchable database can be accessed from the CIHE homepage: <http://www.bc.edu/cihe>. For anyone who would like to be listed in the database, there is a form online at: http://www.bc.edu/cihe_form/subscription.htm.

New Podcasts

The newest installment of the CIHE Podcast Initiative is now available (http://www.bc.edu/cihe/podcast). This piece features an interview with Jamil Salmi, coordinator of the World Bank’s network of tertiary education professionals. The conversation with Dr. Salmi centers on his latest book, The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities, which was published by the World Bank in February 2009. There are now a total of 14 original podcasts from 2007–2009 available on our site, as well as two special video supplements and one special audio supplement. We are also working to line up two new interviews in the next several months, one with Dr. David Skorton, president of Cornell University, and another with Dr. William Tierney, Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis at the University of Southern California. The interview with Dr. Skorton will focus on the international dimension at Cornell and US university engagement with Africa and the Middle East more broadly. The discussion with Dr. Tierney will center on his current research on higher education in failed states, such as Afghanistan.
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