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Can Haitian Higher Education Rise from the Rubble?

Harry E. Dumay

Harry E. Dumay is associate dean for finance and chief financial officer at Harvard University’s School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. He also serves as an external evaluator on a three-year US Agency for International Development–funded partnership grant between the University of Massachusetts Boston and the State University of Haiti. E-mail: dumay@seas.harvard.edu.

The January 12 earthquake dealt a devastating blow to Haiti’s already struggling higher education and brought it to a halt. Yet, Haiti is determined to rebuild. In this reconstruction effort, great care must be taken not just to restore what existed but to erect a better system.

Catastrophic Damage

During the 35-second quake, the sole building that housed the University of Port-au-Prince crumbled, trapping hundreds of students and faculty members under its fallen concrete slabs. At the State University of Haiti, the Faculty of Linguistics collapsed: the dean, several faculty members, and more than three hundred students lost their lives. Most buildings at the State University and at private institutions such as the Episcopalian University and University Quisqueya were either destroyed or declared unsafe. To date, the death toll for the university community has not been confirmed. Most institutions cannot predict when activities will resume.

Haitian higher education was already in a precarious state prior to January 12. Lack of access, a weak governance structure, and the absence of a true professoriate constituted three of its many problems.

Lack of Access

Estimated at only 1 percent, access remains at the elite level in Haiti. A comparison with the Dominican Republic, Haiti’s neighbor, is illustrative. Out of a population of 9 million, the Dominican Republic enrolled 174,621 students in 1997. Haiti’s enrollment is estimated at 15,000 for a population of 8.5 million. Even among the students that made it into college, in 2008 78 percent indicated that they could not enroll in their desired concentration.

Dysfunctional Governance

Governance is problematic within the State University of Haiti, first. The rectors, vice-rectors, and deans are all elected by students and faculty members. They feel more accountable to their political constituency than to their leadership. Conscious of their political clout, a few activist students, often manipulated by ambitious faculty members, frequently protest to demand leadership changes. For example, a student strike at the Faculty of Medicine paralyzed all academic activities from April 2009 until the time of the earthquake. Second, governance is also problematic across the higher education system. The State University is mandated to oversee the private institutions that compete with it for students. Some private institutions feel that they are better run than the State University and resent this oversight function. Finally, the lack of appropriate standards and effective supervision has given rise to a number of pseudouniversities.

A Nonexistent Professoriate

The academic profession is not existent in Haiti. The most recent reliable statistic on the entire system dates from 1987 and indicated that 93 percent of professors worked part time and that only 26 percent had a graduate degree. Degree attainment among professors has somewhat improved since then. However, the majority of faculty members still have another full-time job that they combine with as many teaching opportunities as possible to enjoy a decent standard of living.

The Case for Rebuilding

With hundreds of thousands of people still homeless and the hurricane season nearing, is higher education a current priority for Haiti? The Haitian government and higher education officials answer this question in the affirmative. They are determined to rebuild Haiti’s schools for internal as well as external reasons.

Since 1815 when the first Haitian postsecondary institution was founded, higher education has always played an important internal role to form the nation’s elite. The provision of free, public higher education is viewed as one of the government’s responsibilities. In turn, the State University of Haiti and the many private institutions that have sprung up since the 1980s have formed the majority of the country’s professionals, technocrats, and politicians.

During the 35-second quake, the sole building that housed the University of Port-au-Prince crumbled, trapping hundreds of students and faculty members under its fallen concrete slabs.

Achieving economic growth constitutes the other reason why Haitians believe that they must rebuild higher education. Human capital theorists consider education as indispensable for economic progress, because it leads to innovation. Joseph Schumpeter and other development economists assert that innovation yields nonincremental growth, the kind that the poorest countries need to leapfrog out of poverty. The Millennium Development Goals echo those theories by deeming science and technology necessary for the least-developed
countries to prosper. Consequently, Haitians believe that the nation must form its next generation of professionals and innovators in order to be a viable state, one that does not rely on the international community for all its needs.

In the aftermath of the earthquake, many foreign universities and international institutions have expressed an interest in helping. Clearly, it would be a mistake to rebuild within the same framework that existed. Improvement in the areas of access, governance, and the academic profession can ensure that the new system is better than the old.

**Increasing Access**

Some of the national reconstruction plans that are being elaborated already include ideas that could help to increase access. One such proposal is the decentralization of activities away from the capital city. Currently, all the major postsecondary institutions have their main campus in Port-au-Prince. The costs and logistical difficulties associated with relocating to Port-au-Prince have kept college out of the reach of many young people. The decentralization of programs and campuses throughout Haiti would alleviate this problem. Another plan that could potentially increase enrollment is the State University's project to consolidate its previously physically dispersed campuses. Colocation of faculties should permit campuses to avoid duplicating the same general education courses in various units and to offer more flexible schedules, thus, making it easier to accommodate more students.

**Establishing Governance and Coordination**

The State University of Haiti should follow the lead of better-run private institutions and stop electing its officials. An independent university board of trustees should appoint the rector and hold him or her accountable to run the institution. A parallel higher education board in the Ministry of Education should provide oversight to both public and private institutions. The board’s effective coordination of these institutions should involve providing them with incentives to cooperate and share services to benefit from economies of scale. Indeed, no single institution has sufficient resources even for some of the minimal requirements: updated library systems, information technology, and laboratory facilities. It would be a waste of international aid to replicate several suboptimal facilities at various institutions.

**Investing in Full-Time Faculty**

To improve the quality of teaching and introduce research, the system should strive to support more full-time faculty members and ensure their presence on campus. This implies adjusting salaries to enable someone to live decently with just a faculty appointment. How does one accomplish this fiscally? Budget increases cannot be expected in the public system, given the government’s near-bankrupt state. Reductions in administrative expenses should take place and can help but will not provide all the funds needed. As for private institutions, the high level of price sensitivity in Haitian households makes it impractical for them to pass this cost onto students. This is where the international community can help. Aid and collaboration should be aimed at supplementing faculty salaries for meritorious research efforts that advance knowledge and thus benefit the global community of scholars.

**Conclusion**

The Haitian higher education system must be rebuilt. It is the key to the country’s long-term economic independence. Undeniably, that task will be enormous. However, if well done, it could offer opportunities for a significant renewal and serve as a model for reconstruction in other sectors.

---

**The Asian Higher Education Century?**

**Philip G. Altbach**

Philip G. Altbach is Monan University Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

The 2009 world university rankings showed a modest increase in the number of universities in Asia that have entered the top 100—in the Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities from 5 to 6, and in the Times Higher Education/QS rankings from 14 to 16. Commentators immediately referred to the academic rise of Asia and a concomitant decline of the West. Fundamentally, however, academic excellence, research productivity, and reputation, which are mainly what the rankings capture, are not a zero-sum game. The improvement of universities in one part of the world does not mean that institutions elsewhere necessarily decline. Further, the shift to Asia is by no means dramatic. It is in fact a good thing that universities outside the traditional powerhouses of North America and western Europe are improving and gaining increased recognition for their work.
Nonetheless, it is useful to examine Asia’s academic growth if only because the region houses the most rapidly expanding economies in the world, and a number of Asian countries have placed great emphasis on both expansion and improvement in higher education. While it is almost impossible to generalize about so vast and varied a region, nonetheless some realities are relevant for significant parts of the region.

Asia is home to a majority of the world’s private higher education institutions, and the private sector continues to expand in the region. With a few exceptions, the private sector stands at the bottom of the prestige hierarchy. As the economists put it, the private academic institutions are “demand absorbing” and provide access but generally not high quality. The private sector does not contribute much to the improvement of the quality of Asian higher education.

The improvement of universities in one part of the world does not mean that institutions elsewhere necessarily decline.

Asia has a significant high-quality sector. Many Japanese universities are highly ranked. Singapore and Hong Kong have excellent academic systems. Outstanding universities exist in South Korea and Taiwan. China’s top dozen or so universities are approaching “world class.” The Indian Institutes of Technology, although not universities in the traditional sense, are also top institutions. But overall, Asia’s universities do not compare favorably with those in North America, western Europe, or Australia. A number of structural, academic, and cultural factors may inhibit even some of the best Asian universities from rising to the pinnacles of academic quality in the near future and are likely to some extent inhibit the improvement of Asia’s universities in general.

Asian strategies for academic improvement differ. Singapore and Hong Kong have accomplished considerable success simply by building Western universities in Asia by hiring large numbers of nonlocal academic staff, using English, and copying Western norms of academic organization and management. South Korea has sponsored several national campaigns for academic upgrading such as the Brain Korea project. Taiwan has relied in part on convincing Western-educated Taiwanese to return home to improve key universities that have been given extra support. Singapore has strategically invited several foreign universities to open branches and has given them significant financial incentives to do so—although several have failed.

China’s efforts have been the most impressive: a combination of significant infusions of funds to universities identified as top performers, mergers to create institutions with both high quality and economy of scale, and efforts to create an academic environment that rewards productivity.

It is possible, however, that in China and elsewhere in Asia a kind of “glass ceiling” will soon be reached. Financial and other resources combined with some innovative strategies can make progress only so far. Cultural, academic, and historical challenges persist and may well slow the upgrade of Asian universities. The rise of Asian higher education is by no means inevitable, at least in the near future.

**Major Impediments**

An academic culture that is based on meritocratic values, free inquiry, and competition—combined with elements of collaboration and at least some mobility—is central to a world-class university. There is some recognition of the importance of these elements in much of Asia and of the difficulties of implementation and impediments based on historical tradition and other forces.

Relationships are, of course, essential everywhere and in all institutions and societies. But in Asia, personal connections and networks—the Chinese call it guanxi—are still influencing many aspects of academic life, from the admission of students to the promotion of professors and the allocation of research funds. One implication is widespread inbreeding of faculty. Those trained at a university are hired by that institution and typically spend their careers there. This may hinder new thinking and innovation because of common perspectives and an undue respect for academic hierarchy. It may also often be difficult to encourage innovation in this environment. The ties between a former student and his or her mentor might shape departmental or institutional politics and inhibit change or foster factionalism.

**Asian strategies for academic improvement differ.**

Singapore and Hong Kong have accomplished considerable success simply by building Western universities in Asia.

Many Asian universities have a combination of affinity-based promotion policies for academic staff while simultaneously lacking a formal “tenure” system. As a result, many persons appointed to an academic position are in due course promoted without much careful evaluation. Furthermore, many systems in this part of the world do not provide formal protection of academic freedom or a promotion policy that rewards productivity and encourages long-term performance.

Teaching and, to some extent, research often follow quite traditional methods and emphasize lectures with little interaction between students and professors. Professors often simply repeat their lectures and leave little if any time for questions or discussion. Much criticism has been produced concerning traditional teaching in recent years, with a recognition that it does not contribute to either long-term learning or independent thinking. These methods extend to graduate education, as well,
where formality is often the rule, and independent “hands on” work is still not the popular norm.

Hierarchy is very much at the center of academic ties of all kinds. This often means that students are inhibited from the kinds of informal interaction with their teachers as enjoyed by counterparts at Western universities. Junior staff are subject to the methodological and topical constraints of senior professors. Key academic decisions are often in the hands of more experienced professors and are related to the Asian respect for age and to the nature of many Asian societies, although some top universities have rapidly promoted younger professors and have hired a large number of foreign-trained staff.

An academic culture that is based on meritocratic values, free inquiry, and competition—combined with elements of collaboration and at least some mobility—is central to a world-class university.

Academic corruption exists, at least to a limited extent, everywhere, but the problem seems to be endemic in some Asian countries. Reports concerning favoritism in admissions to plagiarism in publication, and falsifying research findings can be found regularly in many Asian newspapers. A study by China’s Wuhan University estimated that $100 million is spent annually for ghostwritten academic papers by academics and students. One of the world’s top medical journals, Britain’s *Lancet*, warned that China will not become a research superpower by 2020 as promised by President Hu Jintao, unless academic fraud is more tightly controlled. Few statistics are available, but anecdotal evidence indicates the problem is fairly widespread, even in some top Asian universities.

In most Asian countries, graduate education is at a relatively early stage—in need both of expansion and of shaping effective programs to provide a research base for Asian universities and the ability to educate the next generation of professors and researchers. Typically, professors who focus their work on post-baccalaureate education tend to be the most research active. Their academic responsibilities emphasize research and the training of small numbers of graduate students. Even many of Asia’s best universities provide more emphasis on undergraduate programs—thus making the emergence of research universities more difficult, although some top institutions, for example in China, have dramatically expanded graduate programs.

Internationalization is widely recognized as a necessary part of any top university. Many of Asia’s universities have stressed it, but the adversities are significant. What should represent the balance between the local language and English, as the main language of scientific communication? In some universities, professors are encouraged to publish in major international journals—not an easy task in the highly competitive arena of science and scholarship. Some classes are taught in English, but at times with mixed results. The complex issues relating to branch campuses, franchised degree programs, and involvement with foreign universities are multifaceted and not always beneficial for the Asian institutions. Most of the world’s internationally mobile students come from Asia, and many do not return home following their overseas study—although this trend is slowly changing.

The final impediment is the academic profession—at the heart of any university but especially important for a top “world-class” university. For many Asian countries, the professoriate is inadequately paid in comparison to local salaries and woefully remunerated by international standards. Teaching loads are often too high to permit much research to be performed. In many countries, academics are promoted because of longevity rather than for merit. Another challenge is the lack of a tenure system that provides firm guarantees of academic freedom. Professors need both better job protection and more money and at the same time a competitive environment to ensure high productivity.

**The Future of Asian Universities**

While it is very difficult to generalize about Asian countries, some generalizations are possible. Most countries in Asia—with some notable exceptions in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore—are still rapidly expanding enrollments. Thus, competition for public funds for rapidly expanding systems is intense. Top-tier universities often lose out in the struggle for resources. The growing private-sector institutions have no interest in research and will not produce prestigious universities.

In most Asian countries, graduate education is at a relatively early stage—in need both of expansion and of shaping effective programs to provide a research base for Asian universities.

Several Asian countries have undertaken ambitious plans for improving higher education, and some are making impressive progress. China, South Korea, Singapore, and several others have invested heavily in higher education, with the top universities improving significantly. Other countries—notably India, Indonesia, Vietnam, and most of the poorer Asian countries—have a very long way to go.

While there has been impressive progress in some Asian countries and in some sectors of academia, many obstacles remain to achieve world-class status. The struggle is a long one and will require not only resources but also changing deeply entrenched academic practices. But building world-class universities is necessary for Asia to continue its impressive economic progress. Sophisticated research capacity and highly skilled people are needed for Asia’s future.
Reflections on Research Performance Measures and the Rise of Asia

David A. Pendlebury

David A. Pendlebury is a citation analyst at Thomson Reuters. E-mail: david.pendlebury@thomsonreuters.com.

The English poet William Blake wrote of “seeing the Universe in a grain of sand.” That is how I think of the footnote, relegated to the bottom of a page or the end of a text. In this particle of acknowledgment—often overlooked—we can find “the Universe,” or at least a path that leads to “the Universe.”

Citations in the journal literature represent the pathways of communication among researchers. Taken together, they represent a complex network of the exchange of knowledge, as complex as any set of communication connections, whether of telephone calls, links on the World Wide Web, or even neurons and synapses in the brain.

Citations: What Do They Represent?

I have spent the last three decades analyzing and contemplating citations. What do they represent? What do they reveal? Observers express many different opinions. Some say the citations are primarily rhetorical and serve to support an argument. Others say they are mostly shaped by social relationships. But I subscribe to the view that they are, when taken in quantity, reliable indicators—and symbols—of influential ideas.

In the sciences, a professional and even moral imperative exists to cite what is relevant to one’s work. This is “giving credit where credit is due.” The sociologist of science, Robert K. Merton, spoke of citations as “repayments of intellectual debts.” I think that is the most accurate understanding of what citations represent and reveal.

Citation Databases: Information Retrieval and Analysis

Thanks to the invention of citation indexes for scientific journals by Eugene Garfield in the early 1960s, we have citation databases. Thomson Reuters Web of Science database is primarily designed for information retrieval. Citation indexing gives researchers a powerful way to navigate and explore the literature because it relies on the expert judgments and connections made by scientists themselves—not indexers. Such a rich collection of data, now covering the year 1900 to the present and including some 50 million journal articles and three-quarters of a billion citation connections, invites quantitative analysis. And that is citation analysis, one aspect of bibliometrics.

Quantitative Assessment and Peer Review

The most-cited papers and researcher can be identified. One can identify the most influential institutions, nations, and journals. Likewise, the dynamics of research productivity and indicators of influence or impact can be monitored and explored.

Citation analysis, when pursued in concert with traditional peer review, can contribute to a more thorough understanding of research performance—of nations, institutions, research groups, and even individual scientists. Such analysis aids decision making, whether by funders or those with responsibility for promotion. It can also increase fairness in a system of evaluation, since peer review can at times be unfair, owing to biases that even the reviewers may not recognize.

The Rise of Asia

In October and November 2009, I traveled throughout Asia to deliver lectures about citation analysis and the research performance of Asian nations. I met with government and university officials, leading scientists, and journalists.

Japan still strong. In Japan, I listened to concerns about Japan’s declining world share of articles in the journals indexed by Thomson Reuters—from nearly 10 percent in 2000 to 7 percent by 2008. Policymakers expressed worry that Japan’s scientific standing in the world is falling. However, I showed that in terms of impact, or citations per paper, Japan’s performance is the highest it has been in three decades. This illustrates the difference between output and impact. It also illustrates how scientific research has undergone a huge transformation in the last 30 years: globalization.

I have spent the last three decades analyzing and contemplating citations. What do they represent? What do they reveal?

In the early 1980s, the United States was the publication leader in science, with some 40 percent of all articles indexed by Thomson Reuters. By 2008, that number had fallen to 29 percent. Europe saw its world share climb from 33 percent in 1981 to 36 percent in 2008, but even Europe has lost world share since 2000 when it claimed 39 percent. Meanwhile, Asia, as a region, has increased its world share, from 13 percent in the early 1980s to nearly 30 percent today. The calculation of world share is a zero-sum game; if some nations produce papers at a faster rate than others, their share will increase while the latter will decline.

Singapore emphasizes quality. The government of Singapore seeks to create a dynamic knowledge-based economy. Singapore’s investment in research and development is now a remarkable 2.6 percent of the gross domestic product. That is about the same as the United States. Singapore’s goal for 2010 is a 3 percent investment in R&D. Though a small producer, with only a .7 percent world share in the Thomson Reuters
database, Singapore accounts for 1.1 percent of the world’s highly cited papers. This reflects a policy of focusing on and supporting world-class scientists, many of whom have been recruited to Singapore from the United States, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere. Areas of particular strength for Singapore are materials science, engineering, and computer science. Singapore represents an intriguing experiment in emphasizing quality over quantity, and it is already producing good results.

**In the early 1980s, the United States was the publication leader in science, with some 40 percent of all articles indexed by Thomson Reuters. By 2008, that number had fallen to 29 percent.**

**India boosts output.** In India, I discussed the proper use of publication and citation data for evaluation with faculty members at the Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University. The professors were eager for advice on best practices since it was clear to all that quantitative assessment would increasingly affect decisions about funding and promotion. In many nations—and not limited to Asia—rather crude measures and rewards have sometimes been implemented to improve research productivity. It is imperative that any system of quantitative performance indicators be transparent to all, understandable, and fair. For their own sake, scientists need to educate themselves concerning world standards in research assessment, if for no other reason than to guard themselves against uninformed or bad practices by university or government administrators.

Our national indicators for India have shown a spike in output since 2000, from 2.2 percent of the world’s journal literature to 3.4 percent recently. During the last decade, citation impact has also increased in tandem with increased output, which is often not the case (frequently we find that a large increase in output causes citations-per-paper scores to decline). India’s research impact stands at some 44 percent below the world average, but it is improving. The strongest areas for Indian science are, as they have been traditionally, the physical and agricultural sciences.

**China’s remarkable rise.** As impressive as the growth of Indian science is, China takes the prize for its astonishing increased output over the last few decades. In the early 1980s, journal articles indexed by Thomson Reuters that carried a Chinese author address were only .4 percent of the world’s output. That number is now 10 percent, up from 5 percent only seven years ago. Today, China is second, behind the United States, in its production of research articles published in internationally influential journals in the sciences and social sciences. Like India, the influence of Chinese research is below the world average—about 38 percent below the world average, but this statistic began to increase in the late 1990s. China also, like India, places an emphasis on the physical sciences: materials science, chemistry, physics, mathematics, and engineering. These fields, along with agricultural sciences and plant and animal sciences, exhibit relatively high impact. Another phenomenon, discernible in the last few years, is an increasing number of hot papers from China. Hot papers are defined as those published in the last two years that rank in the top .1 percent by citations, taking into account their date of publication and field. China now produces more hot papers than Italy, the Netherlands, Japan, Switzerland, Australia, Spain, or Sweden. China is rapidly becoming a world power in research.

---

**Assessing Four Budget-Balancing Strategies in Higher Education**

**Arthur M. Hauptman**

Arthur M. Hauptman is a public policy consultant specializing in higher education finance issues. E-mail: art.hauptman@yahoo.com.

**Countries around the world that run educational systems and institutions at all levels face serious challenges in responding to cutbacks in government funding. Thus, it is worth considering whether the options open to public higher education in addressing these challenges correspond with those available to public school systems.**

**Public School and Higher Education Systems**

For school systems, government is typically the principal source of revenues for almost all of their budgets. Moreover, new students often are seen as a drain on resources as any growth in students typically is not matched by more public funds. This crisis is especially true during recessions when governments have trouble meeting the many demands on their resources. This explains why public school systems must increase class sizes, cut programs and/or reduce staffing in response to government cutbacks in funding. Public higher education systems and institutions share this characteristic with public school systems.

Yet, in two other critical respects, the economics of public higher education are strikingly different from the pressures that engulf public school systems. One issue is that public higher education has a major revenue source that public school systems do not—tuition fees. This means that increas-
es in enrollments at public colleges and universities will result in more revenues, which may or may not offset the reductions in government funding.

Furthermore, enrollment in higher education is not compulsory, and those trends are far more variable than for public school systems, where the number of students in the short term vary within a relatively small range. Enrollments in public higher education, by contrast, tend to swell during recessions as job prospects are much more limited and more people decide to go back to school rather than stand in the unemployment lines. The question and the challenge for public higher education officials is whether this enrollment growth is viewed as an opportunity or a burden.

**Common Misunderstandings**

These economic realities also lead to conflicts about how public institutions are financed. First, how much institutions spend per student often is regarded as a relatively fixed amount of money. As a result, not enough attention is paid to the effect changes in enrollment can have on per student spending figures. For example, rapid enrollment increases brought about by recessions tend to drive down spending per student as tuition fee revenues do not increase enough to offset the slowdown in government funds.

The economics of public higher education are strikingly different from the pressures that engulf public school systems.

The other misunderstanding that clouds the public discourse on cost recovery is that the debate typically focuses on how tuition fees affect demand—namely, the lower the price the more that people will demand to enroll. But the reality is that tuition fees do not just reflect demand. They are also key in defining supply—the lower the fees, the fewer seats can be provided at any given level of government funding. This (over) emphasis on demand considerations contributes to the view that lower fees will result in more access. But the data suggest the opposite: countries that charge higher fees often have greater levels of participation because of the larger number of seats that are made available.

With these economic realities as context, four strategies are available to public higher education officials in dealing with cutbacks in government funding. One of the four—capping enrollments and cutting costs—is revenue neutral or reducing. The other three are revenue increasing—changing the mix of enrollments, increasing tuition fees for existing students, and increasing enrollments while maintaining fees at current levels. It is worth considering the strengths and weaknesses of each approach and their likely effects on the key indicators on quality, access, and productivity.

**The Four Strategies**

*Capping enrollments and cutting costs* is public higher education’s equivalent of public school systems hunkering down to weather the recession storm. This strategy has the advantage of being budgetarily responsible—that is, making sure the system has enough money to pay its bills. It also holds the best prospect of maintaining quality in the face of cutbacks. Yet, this approach has the tremendous drawback of being politically damaging on key dimensions as it has the painful consequence of reducing access to higher education and cutting staff. Given these realities, a principal question is why public higher education officials would engage in this strategy before fully exhausting the possibilities of revenue enhancement.

*Changing the mix of enrollments* entails increasing the numbers of international (or out-of-state) students who typically pay much higher fees than resident students. The chief benefit of this strategy is that it usually increases revenues more than the costs of providing the education to these students. It also has the potential to increase the quality of the student body to the extent that the nonresident students are as good as or better than the resident students who otherwise would have been admitted. The main drawbacks of this approach are that it is politically damaging and unfair in that access would be denied to a group of students from families who vote and who paid the taxes that allowed the public institutions to exist and grow. It also does little to improve productivity and may well decrease it in the form of higher spending per student.

*Increasing tuition fees for existing students* is perhaps the most tried and true response to reduced levels of government support for higher education. It is the most direct and obvious way for institutions to balance their budgets by increasing cost-recovery rates. A further benefit includes being able to maintain quality at current levels or improve them. However, access is likely to be reduced for students who cannot afford the higher prices, especially if not enough financial aid is provided to offset the tuition-fee hikes. It also does little if anything to reduce costs per student or increase productivity.

*Increasing enrollments while maintaining current tuition-fee levels* often seems to be the least utilized of the four budget-balancing strategies, despite the advantage both of increasing access and improving productivity. Critical questions needed to be addressed in considering whether to utilize this strategy are: Will enrolling more students lead to lower quality? Do current fee levels cover the marginal cost of enrolling more students? Do institutions have the capacity to accommodate additional students?
The answer to these three key questions will differ in the short term (using existing capacity) and the long term (potential for expanding capacity); but if current fees are greater than the marginal cost of enrolling more students, this strategy makes economic sense. The fact that so few systems around the world are choosing this strategy in the face of much more painful choices may mean that officials determined that quality would be compromised and/or marginal costs are higher than current fees. Or it may be that institutional rigidities, lack of a fundamental understanding of marginal costs, or political considerations led to decisions that were unjustifiable on the economics.

Institutional or system officials obviously must decide how to respond to government cutbacks in funds based on their own set of conditions. However, the potential benefits of increasing cost-recovery rates by adding numbers of students rather than, or in addition to, raising tuition fees should be an important consideration in their decision making.

Impact of the Financial Crisis on Higher Education in the United States

Roger L. Geiger

Roger L. Geiger is distinguished professor of higher education at Pennsylvania State University. E-mail: rlg9@psu.edu.

The economic crisis of 2008–2009 brought precipitous declines in almost all classes of financial assets and a contraction of economic activity that was, for a time, compared with the Great Depression. Colleges and universities were forced to adjust to a variety of shortfalls in anticipated revenues, but deeper structural changes were virtually impossible. Now, midway into the 2009–2010 academic year, longer-term perspectives, rather than panic predictions, are possible. In the short term, conditions have not proved to be as bad as feared; but the current crisis has made it far more difficult to address the long-term weaknesses of American higher education.

Endowment

The wealthiest colleges and universities, normally immune to the tempests besetting other institutions, suffered significant financial damage in this crisis. With all classes of financial assets plunging, their diversified portfolios of alternative investments were hit from all directions. The losses of 2008–2009 will be felt for years to come, and many institutions have announced permanent budget reductions of 10 percent. Cuts of this magnitude can only be achieved by firing people, since salaries comprise roughly three-quarters of university expenditures. Institutions have also instituted hiring freezes and cancelled building plans. Still, these “hardships” should be put in perspective.

The wealthiest colleges and universities, normally immune to the tempests besetting other institutions, suffered significant financial damage in this crisis.

The fall in endowment values had the greatest impact on the wealthiest institutions, since they support a larger share of their budgets with endowment income. Before 2008, these same institutions had experienced the greatest prosperity of their storied histories as a result of the investment booms of the late 1990s and 2003–2007. Their prosperity induced considerable extravagance, especially in amenities for undergraduates. However, these institutions also uphold the highest standards of US science, scholarship, and graduate education. To date, the possible compromise or decline in these areas has not been revealed, although future investments are another matter. Harvard, for example, has placed plans for its new science campus on hold. Stanford will not fill 50 open faculty positions and also halted construction projects. Thus, the research capacity of the nation’s most distinguished universities will be frozen for some time.

Still, the immediate picture has brightened somewhat. The stabilization of financial markets, the apparent end of the “official” recession in the United States, and some recovery in US and international financial markets all promise some mitigation of the downturn. Still, selective private colleges and universities have become more dependent on student tuition.

The States and Public Support for Higher Education

One higher education official lamented: “every source of revenue coming into the state has decreased.” States, unlike the federal government, must cover their expenditures with revenues, and that has meant rescissions (taking back funds already appropriated) and reductions in higher education appropriations. In six states, rescissions during FY(fiscal year)2009 took back from 8 to 24 percent of state funds. But everyone knew that allocations for FY2010 would be disastrous, although as it turns out, they were not quite that bad. The Obama stimulus package contained over $50 billion to replace state cuts in education funding, including higher education.

Public universities in many states have faced severe cuts in appropriations. California, with the largest and most admired system of public higher education—and a dysfunctional legis-
lature—has been the poster child for the Great Recession. The University of California, the Cal State university system, and the community colleges all suffered 20 percent cuts in state funding. Other states experiencing decreases of similar magnitudes include Washington, Hawaii, Arizona, and South Carolina—all places where the state has provided the majority of funding for public higher education. Cuts of this size are unprecedented and can only be accommodated by diminishing quality and/or services.

Recession economics teaches that a revival of state tax revenues is virtually the last element in a recovery. States will face further budgetary squeezes next year. Unfortunately, many of the stopgap measures or budget gimmicks used to cope with this year’s crisis will be impossible to duplicate. Also missing will be stimulus funds, which many states chose to expend in full for FY2010 in order to soften the blow. Hence, shortfalls for FY2011 promise to be even more severe.

Public universities in virtually every state have resorted to substantial increases in student tuition. As these hikes do help to buttress revenues, this trend is good news, at least for university budgets. However, public tuitions have been rising steeply, especially since 2000. Increases of 9 to 10 percent for 2009/10 will increase public tuitions by around $400 to $500. California will add another 30 percent hike. More students will require larger student loans to meet these fees.

States have been underinvesting in their colleges and universities for many years. Disinvestment has been most evident at the multitude of regional public colleges and universities that provide open access to perhaps one-half of four-year college students. The same can be said of community colleges, which enroll one-third of postsecondary students. Hence, the compromises and sacrifices being made this year and next are superimposed onto years of retrenchment.

Enrollment Patterns

The economic downturn has caused students to downgrade their educational aspirations and educational spending. Thus, students have opted for public universities instead of private ones, for regional institutions instead of flagships, for two-year instead of four-year, for commuting instead of attending a residential college. This race to lower costs has increased demand for places at regional public universities and community colleges at a time when their resources are being reduced. In California the response has been to limit enrollment. By one estimate, the three systems will reduce enrollments by 300,000 (or 15 percent) by 2011, with most of this attrition occurring at community colleges. However, nationally, community college enrollments jumped substantially in fall, 2009. That sector is particularly well suited to serve financially strapped or career-minded students. The Obama administration has emphasized this role by proposing a special appropriation for community colleges, although such federal funds would be small compared with cuts in state appropriations.

Longer-Term Consequences

US universities are recognized for excellence in all aspects of academic research and graduate education. Yet, American higher education has a far more equivocal record in recent years for educating young people in keeping with a knowledge society and a democratic polity. The United States no longer leads the world in the proportion of young people graduating from college, as it did until late in the 20th century.

Selective colleges and universities have been able to raise their prices consistently more than the cost of living (consumer price index + 3% annually, since 1980) because demand rose as they increased quality. The availability of financial aid and the practice of differential pricing (tuition discounting) made this strategy far more effective than it could have been in isolation. These practices simultaneously broadened the market for high-quality education (increasing demand) and bolstered quality as well by ensuring the recruitment of top students. A likely decrease in overall demand for high-cost, selective colleges could destabilize this model. The endowment losses suffered by these institutions have translated into long-term budget cuts. These institutions, particularly the not-quiteso-wealthy institutions, will be looking to raise more revenue from student tuition, which means granting less student aid. At the same time, less-wealthy students will be leaving the applicant pool, but not the wealthiest. Anecdotal evidence has already reported a perceptible shift from merit to ability to pay.

In the open sector of higher education, the lack of financial resources weighs down completion rates and extends time-to-degree. High prices have a demonstrable impact, particularly for students from the two lowest-income quintiles. They are more reluctant to take on debt and have resorted to growing amounts of part-time work. Institutions in this sector must accommodate students with weaker academic preparation. Most likely, these last two factors interact, as large classes, part-time teachers, and unavailable classes take the greatest toll on
weaker students. The majority of American college students are probably affected to some extent by these conditions. Unfortunately, these market conditions also seem to feed upon themselves, largely through the disinvestment in public higher education and the steep stratification in the effectiveness of precollege education.

A comparison of college participation rates in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries found that educational expansion was reducing the discrepancy between the highest and lowest income groups everywhere except in the United States. Here, college attendance by the wealthy has actually increased more since 1980 than gains among low-income groups. Furthermore, attendance at selective college and universities is more socially skewed, and graduation from college is still more socially skewed. Before 1980, American higher education, on balance, consistently provided opportunities for social and economic advancement, but since that date it appears, on balance, to be generating social reproduction.

Conclusion
The economic downturn of 2008–2009 will exaggerate the fundamental problems facing American higher education and make them more difficult to address, let alone reverse or attenuate. The downward ratchet in attendance decisions will make the selective sector more socially exclusive. Conversely, enrollment pressures at open-access institutions, even while public funds to support those institutions are being withdrawn, seem destined to compromise quality.

Academic research and graduate education have endured the crisis better than other sectors, but here the danger lies in the not-too-distant future. The most distinguished universities, which largely support scientific excellence, have ceased to expand their research capacity, and this strategy has ominous implications. Federal research funding has been artificially inflated with stimulus funds. This has buoyed academic research for the current year or two, but cutbacks almost certainly lie in the future. If public support for research declines in the way public support for higher education has, the future will indeed be bleak.

The Competition for International Postsecondary Education Students

Madeleine F. Green and Kimberly Koch

Madeleine F. Green is vice president for international initiatives at the American Council on Education. E-mail: Madelein_Green@ace.nche.edu. Kimberley Koch is former ACE program associate. A longer version of this article is available at <http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/ciipubs/ace/SizingUptheCompetition_September09.pdf>.

In 2007, there were an estimated 2.8 million internationally mobile students, up from 1.8 million in 1999. Those numbers are expected to continue to increase. The global marketplace for internationally mobile students has led nations to compete with one another by developing a variety of policies and strategies to attract these students. This article highlights the goals and recruitment efforts made by the top five destination countries, in order of their share of the international student population.

United States
The United States continues to be the world’s leading higher education destination. Nearly 672,000 international students studied in the United States in 2008/09. The vast majority of these students come from Asia. Since 2002, India has sent the highest number of students to the United States, followed by China, South Korea, and Japan.

In the United States, the majority of recruitment efforts are conducted by individual institutions. Unlike other countries, the United States has no coordinated national strategy or targets. At the national level, the US Department of State’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs sponsors EducationUSA, a network of professional educational advisers and education information centers that promotes US higher education worldwide and offers international students information on the application process, admissions requirements, potential scholarship funding, visas, and everyday living in the United States. EducationUSA maintains a Web site, produces brochures in six languages, and operates 450 advising centers around the world. Additionally, the bureau funds overseas regional and national educational advising coordinators to organize conferences and adviser training and serve as a resource on national and regional trends.

Institutions compete with each other to attract international students. Some colleges and universities partner with other institutions to promote higher education in their state or region. Study Philadelphia, for example, is the result of the
Campus Philly partnership among 20 institutions, and Study Wisconsin is a marketing campaign conducted by 36 colleges and universities in that state.

**United Kingdom**

In 2007, the United Kingdom hosted 351,470 international students. International student enrollment has risen during the past decade, although with some slowdown in that growth in recent years. This slowdown may be attributable to the growth of English-language programs in Europe (which have roughly tripled since 2003) and to the limited capacity of some UK institutions with high international student enrollments to absorb additional students. In spite of new, more stringent visa requirements, the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service in June 2009 reported a 12 percent increase in the number of international undergraduate applications from the same time the previous year.

The targets for 2011 . . . include recruiting an additional 100,000 international students and doubling the number of countries that send more than 10,000 students per year to the United Kingdom.

In 2006, then Prime Minister Tony Blair launched the second in a series of international education initiatives (PMI2), which aimed to “secure the U.K.’s position as a leader in international education.” The targets for 2011 set by the initiative include recruiting an additional 100,000 international students and doubling the number of countries that send more than 10,000 students per year to the United Kingdom. The plan targets 24 countries and focuses on improving the reputation of UK higher education and further education sectors through marketing campaigns and the development of partnerships. The Education UK brand was developed for the PMI2 and uses the slogan “Innovative. Individual. Inspirational.” A network of British Council offices located in more than 100 nations markets the UK higher education sector to potential students using this brand and offering information on scholarship opportunities.

**Germany**

Recent trends in Germany’s international student recruitment demonstrate a move toward greater regional recruitment and less emphasis on the global market share. Enrollment from non-European countries has remained steady, while enrollment of students from Europe has grown. According to UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) data, Germany hosted 206,875 students in 2007, about 8 percent of the total global international student enrollment.

The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) operates in 64 offices worldwide. DAAD is an intermediary organization between German higher education and government agencies. According to its Web site, the service “offers higher education institutions the opportunity to become actively involved in Germany’s foreign cultural, education and research, and development cooperation policies.” The agency works in five areas: scholarships for foreign students to study in Germany, scholarships for Germans to study abroad, the internationalization of German universities, the promotion of German studies and the German language, and educational cooperation with developing countries. DAAD helps institutions recruit international students through information and advertising campaigns, using the “Study in Germany: Land of Ideas” slogan to attract students and managing a “Research in Germany: Land of Ideas” campaign to attract international postdocs and faculty.

**France**

The French share of international students has remained steady since 2000, at approximately 8 percent. Seven of the top 10 sending countries to France are francophone, and francophone students make up about 32 percent of the total international student population in France. In 2007, UNESCO reported 246,612 international students enrolled in French higher education.

When the annual number of international students began decreasing in France in 1994, the government began to think more strategically about promoting the French higher education system.

When the annual number of international students began decreasing in France in 1994, the government began to think more strategically about promoting the French higher education system. EduFrance was established in 1998 as a national agency to promote French higher education abroad and was replaced by CampusFrance in 2006. CampusFrance currently has 100 offices in 75 countries. The agency assists international students throughout their student experience, from navigating the application process through the students’ returns to their home countries. Additionally, CampusFrance organizes promotional events (education fairs, forums, thematic visits, university tours) throughout the year in cooperation with French higher education institutions.

**Australia**

In 2007/08, education services were the third-largest export revenue category in Australia. International students make up almost 20 percent of total higher education enrollments in the country. In 2007, Australia hosted 211,526 international students, a 15 percent increase from the previous year.
As an English-speaking country, Australia has traditionally been an important destination for students from the Asia-Pacific region. Australia has led “Study in Australia” campaigns with the slogan “Live. Learn. Grow.” The newest version of this marketing campaign, “Study in Australia 2010,” includes a A$2.8 million drive to support the international education sector. The plan includes a focus on six key markets: China, India, South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand, although Australia Education International officials note that they will continue to reach out to other emerging markets such as Brazil. AEI has 25 offices in 17 countries that serve both as outreach centers for potential students and as the international student market research center for the government.

Conclusion
The competition for international students is heating up. Regional strategies are growing. Europe is intensifying its efforts to create an attractive European higher education area; Singapore is established as a regional hub. Other nations such as Malaysia and Japan have set national goals for international student numbers. The Gulf states are also intensifying their efforts to become regional hubs. Trends and vigorous national efforts suggest that US pre-eminence is no longer a given and that international students have many choices.

Recent Trends and Issues in International Student Mobility
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International students in the past months have reached the headlines in the news around the world. We have seen intensive coverage by the media of presumed (and later questions for their accuracy) racist attacks on Indian students, which threaten the success story of the increased number of students from India studying in Australia and their contribution to the economy.

More emphasis is now being placed in the media on the contribution international students make to national and local economies. NAFSA: Association of International Educators estimates that foreign students and their dependents contributed, in the 2008/09 academic year, approximately $17.6 billion to the US economy. For Australia, it is the fourth export product after coal, iron, and recently—as a result of its sharp increase in price—gold.

The fact that these figures are becoming so dominant in the debate about international students relates to the shift from social/cultural and academic to economic rationales in international student recruitment, which is increasingly evolving in a multinational industry.

Tuition Fees
The dominance of income generation in the drive for international students has been present in the United Kingdom (early 1980s) and Australia (mid-1980s), when the concept of differential, cost-related tuition fees for international students was introduced. Until recently, this was not a factor in continental Europe and the United States—with the exception of the public sector, where inner and outer state fees (also for international students) always have existed. In Canada, other factors such as immigration policy and development cooperation were more dominant in their recruitment policy.

The policy of nondiscrimination between international and local students on tuition fees has survived for a long time in continental Europe. Only in recent years, countries like Denmark, the Netherlands, and Slovakia have introduced full-cost fees for non-European Union (EU) students, as is also the case for Malta and Ireland. Sweden and Finland are considering this option as well. Five German states have introduced tuition fees, which have increased the cost of study in those parts of the country for international students. Other countries, though, like Austria—where the introduction of tuition fees was revised during election time in 2008—have no plans to introduce higher fees for national and/or international students.

Increased Global Competition
While in northern Europe tuition fees for international students are introduced and in the United States and United Kingdom increased, one can see two other trends in international student circulation. First, there is increased competition for international students to the traditional top countries: United States, United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Australia. That competition is coming from other industrialized countries such as Canada, New Zealand, Japan, and continental Europe but also from emerging economies such as China,
Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, South Africa, and the Middle East—also still the dominant sending countries. With local increasing capacity in higher education, especially at the undergraduate level as well as increased foreign presence in the sector, they compete for students from their region with the traditional recipients. In Malaysia and the Middle East, the Islamic education is also used as an attractive alternative for the increasing anti-Islam attitude in Europe and the United States. The Global Education Digest of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) in 2009 observes that students are increasingly staying within their region of origin. This is in particular the case for Latin America and the Caribbean (11% in 1999, compared to 23% in 2007) and in East Asia and the Pacific (from 36 to 42%).

Recruitment of Top Talents
A second visible trend is a shift from massive recruitment to selected recruitment of top talents, students who not only are invited to study but also to stay and work. Accounting for this shift, skilled migration fills the needs of the knowledge economy and replaces the shrinking educated labor forces in the graying societies of Northern America, Europe, Australia, and Japan. At the same time, countries like China also need these talents to serve their economies. John Douglass and Richard Edelstein of the Centre for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, in their report Whither the Global Talent Pool, in 2009, estimate that the United States needs to double its international student enrollments from 625,000 in 2008 to 1.25 million in 2020, in a time of increased global competition. Japan—after the completion of an earlier target of 100,000 international students—has set a target of 300,000 by 2020; Malaysia set a target of 100,000 international students in the coming years; Singapore 150,000 by 2015; and Taiwan 30,000 in the coming four years. Taiwanese President Ma Ying-jeou justified this target by stating: “It is urgently important to make local universities and colleges internationally efficient so as to recruit more students from other countries to help Taiwan sharpen its competitive edge,” as well as a reference to the fact that Taiwan has the lowest birthrate in the world.

Brain Drain
Disadvantages are suffered by people who do not have a chance to study at all or to go abroad and escape from the poor conditions in their home country; and countries at the end of the chain, who see their small elite of educated children go away and never return. The global competition for talents has placed the issue of brain drain again on the agenda. Countries like Vietnam recognize this problem. In December 2009, the Vietnamese government organized chat sessions with Vietnamese students abroad (currently about 50,000) to stimulate them to come back after their studies instead of staying away. Other countries open their higher education to private foreign providers by lack of public funding. But those at the far end of the chain can only survive by development aid: bringing in academics from the developed countries to fill the gaps created by the brain drain to these countries—a strange, costly, and ineffective way to complete the brain circle.
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As we are often reminded, the United States remains the number one international study destination for intelligent students from across the world—in particular from India, China, and Korea, the big three sources of international students globally. In the long term, little doubt exists that US higher education will remain extremely attractive to foreign talent—due to the academic quality of a large number of its research universities; the legacy of a relatively open society for immigrants; and America’s still-brilliant, if slightly tarnished, reputation as a land of opportunity.

However, a closer look at shifting higher education markets and at the possible impact of the evolving global recession provides a more nuanced perspective for policymakers. In sum, there are already signs that the world market for student talent is shifting to the benefit of the United States’ competitors, and in bad economic times we may find that shift accelerating.

Currently, the United States remains a good performer in attracting the world’s growing cadre of international students to its graduate and professional schools, although it could do much better, and its once-dominant position is eroding. Yet, it is an underperformer at the first-degree level, when compared to its competitors. Perhaps most importantly, the United States lacks a strategic approach to capitalizing on the global pool of mobile students.

So what has changed? Two macrotrends help explain the shift: growing demand and increased competition.

**Demand—The Short and Long of It**

The global demand for higher education is creating a surge in the number of students seeking an international experience in higher education. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development estimates 155 million students in tertiary education worldwide, a number doubled over the last 10 years, with huge increases in Asia and across Europe, especially. More students are seeking to study outside their home countries. Between 1975 and 1990, the number of international students grew from some 600,000 to 1.2 million; by 2000 the total was 1.9 million, and in 2006 it reached 2.9 million.

Although the full impact of the global recession will not be felt until the next academic year, surveys completed by the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, based on data collected on fall 2009, show that number of international students in US graduate programs remained flat after five years of growth. Decreases were especially significant in the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) fields and in business.

We surmise that the long-term trend will involve a large expansion in the number of international students, fueled in part by overall population growth and in part by the changing needs of the global labor market. The open question is how those students will distribute themselves.

**New Competitors**

Developed and developing nations are improving their higher education systems, seeking to raise the international profile and attractiveness of their universities, and integrating higher education into their domestic and foreign policy initiatives. Consequently, new competitors for international students have emerged in a market once dominated by the United States and a select group of largely English-speaking nations. From 2000–2006 the US market share of all international students dropped from 25 percent to 20 percent. Meanwhile, most European Union nations and countries such as Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and Japan have retained and, in some cases, expanded their market share of international students. The United Kingdom, France, and Germany continue to attract large numbers of international students; and relative newcomers with high growth in the past decade include Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the Netherlands, Japan, and China.

Competition has increased given the relatively recent recognition that international students, by paying their full freight or more, are a real or potential profit center, subsidizing native students (most nations cap tuition for native students but not for international students). In the United Kingdom, for example, international students now produce some 10 percent of the entire income of the higher education system, while in Australia they fund some 15 percent of all income for the national universities. New Zealand also relies heavily on international students to support its national higher education system; Japan is attempting to follow a similar path.

Evolving notions of workforce development is another important key factor. Canada and the Netherlands, for
instance, are openly using higher education to attract and retain highly educated immigrants. They—along with Japan, New Zealand, Australia, and most of Europe—are all experiencing declines in population and are thus recruiting and enrolling more international students as a means to remain economically competitive.

**Market Complexity**

With the evolving global knowledge economy and the attendant demand for highly educated professionals, serious consequences would be created by not meeting the emerging global market for talent, particularly in the STEM fields. Indeed, since 1977 the many more doctorates awarded to foreign students on temporary visas has led to the overall growth in the number of conferred doctorates in the sciences and engineering in the United States.

Over the past decades, international students who gained a doctorate increasingly chose to stay in the United States. As more students came to the United States, more of them stayed and entered the job market. Their presence has markedly influenced technological innovation and the overall competitiveness of the US economy.

But this past success story also indicates vulnerabilities in the ability of the United States, and other major national providers like the United Kingdom, to continue to be dominant. Citizens of China, India, South Korea, and Taiwan secured about 20 percent of all doctorates in the United States in 2007. In a sign that this pattern may be unsustainable, the United States and other developed economies with mature higher education systems are experiencing the new phenomenon of declining stay rates.

**Thinking Strategically, Acting Globally**

The market for international students is only one dimension of the larger problem of adapting the university to globalization and the global economy. The United States lacks key components of an international strategy for its higher education sector and has assumed that its premier position in past decades will simply be retained. We do not think in that direction and do believe the Obama administration needs a much more proactive strategy at the national, state, and institutional level to recruit foreign students.

Here are some of our recommendations to US policymakers. First, the Obama administration needs to elaborate a national policy on higher education as a critical national resource in the global economy that must attract talented students and scholars from abroad and prepare Americans to be competent professionals and leaders in an international context.

We also urge the development of national strategic goals for international student enrollments at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and link them to broader policy objectives in areas such as foreign relations, national economic development, and educational attainment. We suggest a goal to double international student enrollments in the United States to 1.25 million by 2020, with emphasis on increasing the percentage of undergraduate students and on public-sector institutions.

Much greater flexibility in visa policies is required and other strategies to improve both recruitment and “stay rates” for foreign nationals and reassess national security needs. Fourth, and a related recommendation, is the real need to increase financial aid for foreign students via grants, scholarships, loans, and paid work.

The federal government, along with smart state and local governments, can greatly support marketing US higher education internationally, with the goal of creating a more friendly and supportive environment for students to apply and enroll in US universities and colleges. The real need is to improve the availability of information within an international market often crowded with multiple, often profit-minded ventures.

And finally, the US strategy should include an effort to diversify the national origin of international students to anticipate new markets for talented students in the future. The United States is, in short, too dependent on only a few major providers of international students.

**Conclusion**

More and more competitors in the global higher education market for talent are providing financial resources to subsidize and support foreign students, via grants, scholarships, loans, and allowing for paid work. This, in turn, and without strategic initiatives at the federal and state levels, will influence the attractiveness of the United States, where tuition rates are, generally, much higher.

Eventually an initiative will be working to encourage more international students to come to the United States and to promote joint programs and activities among US and foreign universities—probably in 2010, and after other major domestic policy issues are, to some extent, addressed. If so, the timing is right. A tremendous opportunity is afforded by the new Obama administration to offer a larger strategic vision and an enhanced sense throughout the world that the United States is once again a more friendly and active participant in world affairs. The president and his administration need to more fully incorporate what is one of the nation’s chief assets—its universities and colleges—into its new, emerging foreign policy vision.
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In 2008/09, 671,616 international students were studying at US colleges and universities, an 8 percent increase over the previous year, according to the Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange published by the Institute of International Education. IIE surveys approximately 3,000 accredited US higher education institutions annually on various aspects of international educational exchange and has collected data on international students in US higher education since its founding in 1919.

IIE published the results of its first international student census for academic year 1948/49 under the title of Education for One World. Only 25,464 international students were reported that year, less than 4 percent of the total in 2008/09. Canada was the top sending country in 1948/49, with 4,197 Canadian students studying in the United States that year. In contrast, in 2008/09, India was the top sender, with 103,260 Canadian students studying in the United States in 2008/09. The number and proportion of students from Canada and India remain the only two countries that have figured among the top 10 places of origin each year since 1948/49.

TRENDS BY WORLD REGION

Sixty years ago, the distribution of incoming international students was more evenly spread out among the world regions than it is today. Students from Asia comprised the largest group at 26 percent, followed by Europe and Latin America (23 percent, each), North America (17 percent), the Middle East (7 percent), Africa (3 percent) and Oceania (slightly less than 1 percent). Today, students from East, South, and Southeast Asia not only comprise the largest regional group, they also outnumber students from all other regions combined.

The 415,000 students from Asia accounted for 62 percent of all international students in 2008/09. Four of the top five places of origin overall are in Asia (#1 India, #2 China, #3 South Korea, and #5 Japan—Canada is #4). Recent rates of increase, especially at the undergraduate level, indicate that China may be poised to retake the position of top place of origin, which India has held since 2001/02. Particularly large increases were seen by two other top-sending Asian countries: #9 Vietnam (46 percent) and #11 Nepal (30 percent).

The number of students from Asia has increased 28 percent over the past five years, 48 percent since 1999/2000 and more than 60-fold since 1949/50. In the decade between 1979/80 and 1989/90, the proportion of international students coming from Asia rose from 29 percent to 54 percent. Actual enrollment totals rose from 45,710 to 127,620, spearheaded by large increases from China, following normalization of relations with the United States, and by large increases from Japan, South Korea, India, and Taiwan, all of which remain among the top places of origin today.

While the actual number of students from Europe grew steadily through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, the proportion of international students in the United States from Europe has declined from over 20 percent in the early years of the Open Doors survey to 13 percent in 2008/09. Enrollments from Europe grew by 4 percent to 87,648 in 2008/09, reversing the declines seen in the years immediately following 9/11.

Similar to Europe, enrollments from Latin America have also followed an overall upward trend, but have not kept pace with the large increases in students coming from Asia. As a consequence, the proportion of students from Latin America in the United States fell from over 20 percent in the 1940s and 1950s to 10 percent in 2008/09. Mexico is the top place of origin in the region, with 14,850 Mexican students studying in the United States in 2008/09. The region as a whole saw a 5 percent increase in 2008/09.

The number of students from Africa increased by 4 percent to 36,937 students in 2008/09, 6 percent of the world total. The number and proportion of students from Africa rose in the late 1970s and early 1980s, fueled by large enrollments from Nigeria during the oil boom years. At its peak in 1982/83, there were 42,690 students from Africa in the United States, about 13 percent of the world total. Nigeria is still the top place of origin in the region, with 6,256 students in the United States in 2008/09. The 29,140 students from the Middle East currently comprise 4 percent of the total international student population in the United States. Enrollments from the Middle East also soared during the oil boom years, peaking at 81,390 students in 1980/81—about 26 percent of the international student total, led by enrollments from Iran, the top place of origin overall between 1974/75 and 1982/83. Saudi Arabia is currently the top sending country in the region, with 12,661 students in the United States in 2008/09.
Students from North America (29,697 from Canada and 410 from Bermuda) comprised about 5 percent of all international students in the United States in 2008/09. Canada was the top place of origin of international students in the United States from the beginning of the Open Doors survey until 1971/72, when it was surpassed by India. The 5,053 students from Oceania still comprise slightly less than 1 percent of the overall international student total. The proportion of students from Oceania in the United States has never exceeded 2 percent. Enrollments from Australia increased 18 percent in 2008/09 to an all time high of 11,042 students, accounting for 63 percent of the regional total.

Recent Trends
As has been the case since 2001/02, graduate international students outnumbered undergraduate international students in 2008/09, but by a smaller margin than in previous years. While the number of undergraduates increased 11 percent over the past year, driven by large increases from China (61 percent), Vietnam (56 percent), Nepal (38 percent), and Saudi Arabia (31 percent), graduate enrollment increased only 2 percent. Recent rates of increase indicate that undergraduate international students may once again outnumber graduate international students in the near future.
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Over the past two decades, an increasing number of governments have recognized their higher education sectors as important to their economic development. In part, this recognition has prompted governments to adopt innovative, albeit sometimes untested, higher education development policies. Of late, many of these policies have been focused on the development of private higher education, where it had often been an underutilized tool in national strategies. One of the more prominent developments in this policy arena, particularly in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, is the increasing interest by government officials to reposition their region as an “education hub.” In its most recent assessment of cross-border higher education, the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE) highlights the notable increase in “hubs” over the past decade, and identifies seven currently in existence and five more in development.

As an evocative metaphor, education hub has great rhetorical power that likely contributes to its adoption by both the media and policymakers. The widely used slogan encompasses several different types of strategies, almost all of which incorporate the development of private-sector institutions and often include international branch campuses (regulated as private entities); but, the term lacks a commonly acknowledged operational definition. For example, in the OBHE report, hub sites mentioned a lack of commonality across multiple dimensions including size, number and type of institutions, and students enrolled.

While some governments enact policies with the goal of becoming a hub, others use the phrase to give greater definition to an existing agenda. Even more, the level of government involvement can vary (e.g., cities, states, nations). Hubs can include different combinations of domestic institutions, international branch campuses, and foreign partnerships. For example, in the early 1990s, the Australian city of Adelaide used the phrase “education city” (a variant of the hub lingo) to describe its new focus on education, specifically for recruiting foreign students from Southeast Asia to attend local universities. More recently, Qatar’s “Education City” is comprised of six branch campuses of American universities. Elsewhere, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand have all developed different policies intended to boost their respective reputations as a Southeast Asian education hub, while in East Asia, South Korea and Hong Kong use similar language to describe dissimilar activities.

Assumptions and Reality
In this article we focus on the strategies used by entities that self-identify as educational or academic hubs. We examine four assumptions in the emerging discourse about educational hub strategies. By beginning now to disentangle the rhetoric from reality in the current discourse, we hope to provide greater clarity for ongoing policy and scholarly analysis.

Assumption 1: institutions in educational hubs exist in close proximity to each other.
Reality: in some intended hubs, institutions may be located anywhere in the country. In others, hub institutions are within walking distance of each other. The first arrangement reflects what we call an Archipelago hub, where institutions are dispersed throughout a state or nation with no geographic concentration of academic efforts. The second arrangement is what we call the Acropolis hub, which brings together several institutions in one location. This latter form has recently been used to recruit institutions to establish branch locations in
places such as the Dubai International Academic City and Qatar Education City. Governments seeking to develop education hubs may adopt Archipelago or Acropolis strategies or a combination of both. In Malaysia there are at least two Acropolis hubs, along with several foreign branch campuses dispersed in Archipelago fashion throughout the country.

Assumption 2: education hub is primarily a governmental strategy.

Reality: Although establishing educational hubs requires government involvement, many Acropolis and Archipelago hubs involve, and are sometimes supported by, quasi-governmental and nongovernmental entities as sponsors or partners. In the case of Dubai International Academic City, most foreign and domestic institutions rent space in buildings owned by TECOM investments, which supports shared facilities such as the Student Hub and the Food Court. In Malaysia, following an Archipelago strategy, foreign institutions have been required by law to partner with a locally owned company, often a property developer who takes legal responsibility for building and maintaining the facilities. Of course, governmental bodies themselves may also take a leadership role, as in the case of Malaysia and the Iskandar Regional Development Authority. On the other hand, some intended hubs are distinguished by government policy that more directly frames and guides the initiative, led by central ministry-level government officials as part of economic development plans. This is the Singapore case.

Assumption 3: education hub and education city are interchangeable concepts.

Reality: All education cities are designed to be education hubs, but not all education hubs are designed as education cities. The phrase “education city” refers to the Acropolis strategy used to develop an area into an educational hub. Nations may seek to become educational hubs, without creating an educational city. Indeed, development of a hub is usually supported by a broad policy agenda of a government to become a regional or international destination for education. The agenda may or may not include developing an education city. For example, until very recently Malaysia pursued the goal of becoming an education hub without building an educational city (this has changed with the development of Iskandar and Kuala Lumpur Education City). However, the intent remains for the nation, not just the capital and Johor regions, to be the educational hub. Similarly, Thailand’s goal to become a regional hub for education in Southeast Asia does not foresee the development of any education cities to achieve that goal.

Assumption 4: education hubs are driven by excess domestic demand for higher education.

Reality: Whereas the literature on the recent growth of private higher education suggests that new institutions mostly aim to absorb growing demand for higher education within a nation, education hubs represent a supply-side argument for developing private higher education—if you build it, they will come. The creation of educational hubs, in part, is meant to attract focus to the nation’s education sector and to build interest from foreign students, faculty, and institutions to become part of the local higher education marketplace. In fact, both the Middle East and Southeast Asia/Oceania have experienced increasing competition among governments to become the regional education hub, with the hope of emerging as the destination of choice for students throughout their region.

Conclusion

The emergence of educational hubs is part of a larger evolution in the international higher education marketplace, whereby countries are turning to their private higher education sectors to increase their global competitiveness. Whether focused on capacity-building foreign institutions or encouraging the expansion of domestic institutions, the private sector in many emerging economies is seen as a strategic asset in the race to attract new students, build a more robust knowledge economy, and supply the country with more knowledge workers. However, the popularity of the phrase and its metaphorical impressions may contribute to the nuances of strategy and policy to be overlooked. Many governments are interested in creating educational hubs, the resources required to support such endeavors, and the international competition likely to be fostered because of it. Thus, it is important for scholars to focus on the various policy approaches and implementation strategies countries are using, rather than letting the metaphor muddy the discussion.
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Internationalization has not only transformed higher education in three decades but it has undergone major changes itself. This is especially true for cross-border education. Recently, cross-border education has grown in scope and scale with competition and commercialization becoming critical drivers. The numbers of branch campuses, double-degree programs, and franchise and twinning arrangements have increased as well as the recruitment campaigns for international students and faculty. The most recent development is the race to create successful and competitive regional education hubs.

The concept of hub is currently very popular—almost trendy. Countries are trying to position themselves as hubs for finance, communication, transportation, manufacturing, fashion, and education. Cities are doing the same thing. But to date, a regional education hub does not include a definition, requirements, even characteristics, or an assessment of what makes a hub successful and sustainable. Education hub is a label being used to describe a number of new and very different initiatives by countries in the Middle East and Southeast Asia that are trying to position themselves as regional centers of excellence in education.

Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates, created Knowledge Village in 2003 and more recently the Dubai International Education City. These linked initiatives aim to attract foreign branch campuses to offer education and training to international students who will be job ready for the burgeoning service and knowledge economy in the Gulf states. Foreign education institutions and companies are colocated in an economic free zone with attractive financial and tax benefits. Qatar has taken a different approach, inviting and sponsoring six American institutions and one UK university to offer their full-degree programs and qualifications to Qatari students and regional students. The project is totally financed by the Qatar Foundation and thus is a model difficult to replicate, but it aims to position Qatar as a regional source of high-quality education and to help prepare the country and region for a knowledge-oriented society and economy. The Global School House Project in Singapore is well known and has attracted a number of foreign universities and international students in order to position itself as a regional education hub for both education and research. Malaysia, Hong Kong, Bahrain, and Botswana have declared their aspirations and plans to be regional education hubs and have set ambitious goals for international student recruitment.

Categories of Hubs

These initiatives have some commonalities but also differ significantly in goals, rationales, sponsors, and activities. The generic term regional education hub does not recognize their different approaches and objectives and thus needs to be broken down into three different categories.

The student hub is the most focused and prevalent type of education hub. The key aspect is the recruitment of international students to the country for the purposes of internationalization of domestic higher education institutions, revenue generation, and building an international profile. In this scenario it is primarily local higher education institutions that are recruiting the students to their individual campus, although in some cases foreign branch campuses are involved. A national recruitment strategy and requisite policies are in place, but for the most part individual institutions are recruiting students to their own campus and programs. The goal is to reach a national targeted number of international students and to build a reputation as a welcoming place for international students to get a high-quality education.

The education and training hub differs from a student hub in that more than international students are being recruited, with the involvement of different rationales and expectations. Foreign universities are invited to set up satellite operations in the form of teaching centers or branch campuses. International private training and education companies are also encouraged to offer academic programs and professional development opportunities aimed at international and national students. The driving key objectives are to educate and train students to be skilled labor or knowledge workers for domestic and regional companies, to provide increased access to education and training for both international and domestic students and locally based employees, to demonstrate “best educational practice” by foreign education institutions, and to establish geopolitical status in the region. In some cases, the majority of education and training institutions and companies are located in one geographic area to share facilities and promote collaboration among themselves and with industry.

The knowledge and innovation hub broadens its mandate beyond education and training to include the production and distribution of knowledge and innovation. Foreign research institutes and companies with major research and develop-
ment activities are also encouraged to establish a base in the country and to collaborate with foreign and local universities and training companies to create a critical mass of talent and expertise. The primary objectives are to help build a knowledge- and service-based economy, to educate and train skilled labor, to attract foreign direct investment, and to increase regional economic competitiveness. Collaboration among the key players—foreign and local industries, research centers, education institutions, and companies—is a key factor to building a knowledge and innovation hub.

**Progressive Development or Quantum Leap**

A preliminary look at their stated rationales and planned or existing activities shows that the majority of the seven countries (Qatar is the exception) make the recruitment of international students a central feature of their efforts. Ambitious targets, and in some countries major policy changes, are in place to drive the process of becoming a regional student hub. Four countries—United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Malaysia, and Singapore—have attracted a substantial number of foreign universities or companies to provide increased access to education and training for local and international students.

But this line of thinking presumes a progressive growth from student hub to education and training hub to knowledge and innovation hub; this may be a limited view or incorrect assumption. Is it possible to leap frog from a student hub to a knowledge hub, or is it feasible to start from the get-go as a knowledge and innovation hub? From an education perspective, it is safe to say that no countries currently function as a knowledge hub, although perhaps an economist or trade specialist would have a different view.

Regional education hubs are important new developments, but are they just a fad? Are they more rhetoric than reality? Probably not, but to make education hubs achieve their goals and be sustainable requires substantial planning; policy preparedness; physical, technological, and human infrastructure; and investment by the sponsoring countries. *Education hub* should not be merely a self-subscribed label used to achieve economic or geopolitical advantage in the region. With too much at stake, further work is needed in analyzing this complex and important new development in cross-border education.

---
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University governance provides the essential framework within which teaching and research take place. In the United Kingdom, with its historic tradition of university self-government, governance issues have mostly been concentrated around questions of internal academic and student representation in decision taking. However, with an expending system that consumes an increasing level of state resources, the growing interest of the state in universities’ economic contribution and in institutional financial accountability has led to a parallel growth in state interest in university governance processes. Nevertheless, university governance has rarely attracted much public or media attention. The technical (though important) differences between the traditional constitutions of the pre-1992 universities with their commitment to “shared” governance between the council (the governing body) and the senate and the dominance of the board (the governing body) and the chief executive (the vice-chancellor) in the post-1992 constitutions have been obscured by the increasing tendency of the pre-1992 universities. The pre-1992 universities have followed the lead of the post-1992 in adopting a more managerial style—appointing rather than electing deans and giving them executive powers and devolved budgets, appointing full-time pro-vice-chancellors with line-management responsibilities, creating senior management teams to run the university—so that to the external eye the two types of constitution seem to be moving in the same direction.

**Strengthening Lay Governance**

This movement has been coincident with the emergence of the Committee of University Chairmen (CUC) (of governing bodies) as a significant force in university governance. First established in 1987 toward making university chairs better informed about university business and as a potentially powerful lobby over funding issues in relation to a Tory government, the CUC was drawn into offering advice on university governance in the mid-1990s. The evidence of governance malpractice, mainly at governing body level, was revealed in a small number of post-1992 universities and colleges. Successive governments, Tory and Labour, have encouraged the view that lay governance is likely to render greater accountability than academic self-governance and may be more sympathetic to an
economic view of higher education than university senates. The CUC has developed its interests from simply guidance on governance to a focus, based on reviews of the conduct of governing body effectiveness, on how to appoint and remunerate vice-chancellors, on key performance indicators for institutions, and on the introduction of performance monitoring approaches. The cumulative impact has resulted in strengthening the role of lay governance and—taken together with the rise of senior management teams—weakening the role of senates, particularly in strategic decision making.

**Smaller Governing Bodies**

Three developments have served to underline the shift in constitutional power. The first has been a long-running concern in some quarters about the appropriate size of the governing body for decision-making purposes. Historically, the pre-1992 universities had comparatively large governing bodies of up to 45 or so members, one-third of whom were academics elected by the senate. Those universities relied heavily on decision making through committee structures, while the polytechnics had governing bodies of between 24 and 12 members, only two of whom were academics normally elected on an institution-wide franchise (and therefore on an academic trades union ticket). This constitution continued when the polytechnics became universities.

Successful governments, Tory and Labour, have encouraged the view that lay governance is likely to render greater accountability than academic self-governance.

The 1997 National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (the Dearing Committee) was sympathetic to the more robust approach of the post-1992 governing bodies and elevated the figure of 24 members to a principle that it recommended the pre-1992 universities should fall into line with. After protracted discussions and the jettisoning of representation from local government communities, most universities reduced their membership to a little over 30. Yet, pressure has continued with a requirement that universities should justify exceeding the figure of 24 in a statement in their accounts, and many pre-1992 universities have consciously moved to this position. Implicitly, what might otherwise seem to be an arcane issue concerns decision-making processes—is the business of governing bodies mostly conducted through committees where academic “experts,” for example, might be expected to be influential, or is it conducted via a full-governing body where lay influence, guided by a chief executive, might be expected to be greater? All this is given greater point by a decision by government that the minimum membership of 12 should be removed so that governing bodies might become even smaller and by implication operate more like company boards without any academic or student representation. A number of universities, including at least one pre-1992 university, are known to be actively considering this model.

This trend in governance potentially also reflects a shift in the relationship between the vice-chancellor and the governing body, particularly with the chair of the governing body.

**Relations between Vice-Chancellors and Governing Bodies**

This trend in governance potentially also reflects a shift in the relationship between the vice-chancellor and the governing body, particularly with the chair of the governing body. In the pre-1992 universities the vice-chancellor, as chair of the senate, would previously have had the role of presenting the senate’s strategic recommendations to the governing body. Now, facing perhaps a self-confident and invigorated governing body, reinforced by accountability requirements laid down by the government, and with his/her performance monitored through appraisal and the governing body’s power to determine his/her salary, a vice-chancellor could be much more the servant of the board, subordinate to its wishes, rather than its leader. This change in the balance of relationship in some universities has been emphasized by a spate of sudden departures of vice-chancellors from their posts: within the last year there has been an abrupt parting of ways at seven universities (both pre- and post-1992 institutions). Most surprisingly, five have been within a year of appointment, suggesting that either the governing bodies (and their head hunters) were at fault in the initial selection or that for whatever reason the relationship between the chair and the vice-chancellor proved to be incompatible. Such events are institutionally destabilizing; but it becomes a matter of wider concern when they occur at Imperial College, one of the United Kingdom’s premier scientific universities.

**Governance, Financial Accountability, and Academic Performance**

The third development has involved one of these seven universities, London Metropolitan University—a large-access-oriented university formed by the merger of two former polytechnics. Here, the university management had submitted incorrect student data to the Higher Education Funding Council, thus inflating its student numbers and its entitlement to recurrent grant. The funding council held the vice-chancellor and the governing body, through its audit committee, responsible. The governing body’s statement of full confidence in its vice-chancellor was met with a demand for his removal, the immediate dismissal of the audit committee, and ultimately, the standing down of the board. Not surprisingly, the funding...
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Ireland’s historic transformation from a country dependent on agriculture and traditional manufacturing to one increasingly based on hi-tech and internationally traded services is the stuff of legend. By 2007, the services sector accounted for 64 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP), while industry accounted for 33 percent and agriculture just 3 percent. Termed the “Celtic Tiger” after similar transformations in Asia, the Irish experience was remarkable to both observers and participants. Tax revenue surged, enabling massive investment in public services and infrastructure. In 2006, the government surplus was 3 percent of GDP.

By 2009, all had changed utterly. The property bubble of recent years was exacerbated by incentives, a narrow tax base, and irregular practices in the banking sector. When the economy faltered, tax revenues and consumer confidence collapsed, exposing a massive public-sector deficit. GDP declined by 9.8 percent during the first six months of 2009 and is estimated to fall by 14 percent by year-end. Government borrowing is likely to rise to 13.6 percent of GDP in 2010, with unemployment at over 15 percent.

Higher education was a beneficiary of the boom and is now a potential casualty of the politically charged and financially challenging environment.

Termed the “Celtic Tiger” after similar transformations in Asia, the Irish experience was remarkable to both observers and participants.

2009 Review of Irish Higher Education

The idea of a review of higher education surfaced in 2007. The aim was to go beyond the 2004 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) report on Higher Education in Ireland, which had arguably been overtaken by the quickening pace of globalization. Announced in February 2009, the review has been tasked with assessing higher education’s fitness-for-purpose, developing a vision and national policy objectives, and identifying “focused targets” for the next five years. It has been asked to consider the number and roles of institutions, governance and accountability, level of resources, and potential for greater efficiency “having particular regard to the difficult budgetary and economic climate that is in prospect in the medium term.”

The state of the economy has introduced urgency into the process. Rather than an 18-month process involving considerable consultation, the final report is now due by December. The review is certainly timely; indeed, Ireland is probably late in tackling many issues. Even if the economy had not nose-dived, the system faces many challenges—inter alia, a binary system constrained by historical circumstances and unresponsive to changing national and global requirements, low levels of internationalization, and weak governance and strategic leadership. At the same time, at the European level, increasing competition, rankings, and the possible emergence of a super-league of universities could be unfavorable to Ireland’s small research community.

Challenges

A big challenge involves the system level. Some observers have viewed the challenge in terms of how many Irish universities are globally ranked according to Shanghai Jiao Tong or Times Higher Education/QS. But Ireland is unlikely to adopt the German, Chinese, or Japanese strategy of concentrating...
resources into a small number of universities. This perspective is not only due to philosophical reasons but also based on the fact that the cost associated with a single world-class university would beggar the entire higher education budget of EUR 1.4 billion. Instead, Ireland is likely to adopt a “whole of country” approach encouraging strategic/regional clustering and/or mergers, especially at research and PhD level. This might involve the introduction of a governance system similar to US state systems to ensure greater coherence, collaboration, and efficiency and avoid duplication.

Another problem is investment. While approximately EUR 3 billion has been invested in higher education and R&D since the late 1990s, Ireland still lags behind its European Union and OECD neighbors as a percentage of GDP. In addition, tuition fees were abolished in 1997; ever since, its reintroduction has been viewed as politically contentious, especially among the middle class, which has been the main beneficiary. Today’s large public deficit dictates that free tuition is no longer tenable; however, any revenue generated is likely only to replace and not increase existing core funding—whatever happens in the future. A major disadvantage, however, is the time lag in actual receipts and the high level of graduate emigration.

**Higher education was a beneficiary of the boom and is now a potential casualty of the politically charged and financially challenging environment.**

Other possible issues include consideration of performance-based funding as part of institutional contracts, a research assessment exercise, a student satisfaction and learning outcome survey, further measures to both widen participation and ensure matriculation across the system, and enhanced internationalization. Academic contracts will not escape scrutiny; attention is apt to focus on the need for greater productivity and performance measurements—albeit tenure is unlikely to be affected.

**The Smart State**

Parallel to the review, two other government initiatives will affect its recommendations and their implementation. In December 2008, the prime minister launched Building Ireland’s Smart Economy. Drawing together a range of initiatives, the policy aims to position Ireland as a knowledge-intensive economy. While promoting higher education reform and restructuring, it endorsed heavy investment to “incentivise multinational companies to locate more R&D capacity in Ireland, and ensure the commercialisation and retaining of ideas that flow from that investment.” As evidence of commitment, in March, the prime minister endorsed a Trinity College/University College Dublin plan to establish an “innovation corridor” with EUR 650 million investment from government, industry, and private funding over 10 years.

Almost concurrently, the minister of finance established the Special Group on Public Service Numbers and Expenditure Programmes. In July, the policy recommended reductions of over EUR 5.3 billion and 17,000+ jobs across all government departments and agencies. Questioning the role of the Higher Education Authority was always likely, given the popular belief of too many government agencies. But the report went much further, querying major campus development projects, criticizing academic contracts, advocating institutional mergers and amalgamation of all research funding into a single agency, and questioning research programs, the number of PhDs, and specifically the link between science and technology research and innovation. As if to emphasize its point, the report was launched within hours of the deadline for the major competitive research program, worth EUR 300 million in the current round.

**Responding to the Crisis**

In response to the global crisis, many European countries, plus the United States and Australia, have introduced stimulus measures to inflate their economies, including investing heavily in higher education and research. Indeed, the OECD has recently urged countries to “invest in education to beat [the] recession” on the basis that “human capital will contribute to recovery.”

Ireland has adopted the opposite approach. The government wants to position Ireland for the global economic upturn by making it more competitive and attractive to investment through massive cuts in public expenditure and salaries, including restrictions on recruitment. Competitiveness is viewed in terms of reducing costs—pricing “ourselves back into the market,” according to John Fitzgerald of the Economic and Social Research Institute—rather than investment.

**While approximately EUR 3 billion has been invested in higher education and R&D since the late 1990s, Ireland still lags behind its European Union and OECD neighbors as a percentage of GDP.**

Irish higher education, and the current review, is caught in this political cross fire. Whichever agenda wins out, all propositions will be measured against the Ministry of Finance’s criterion of cutbacks and value-for-money. Such questions are likely to find echoes in other countries as they struggle with the aftereffects of the recession. Ireland may provide a “useful” test bed—just as the “Celtic Tiger” presented another model.
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In contrast to the worldwide explosion in private higher education provision, the private sector in western Europe has essentially remained a peripheral one that has not attracted the attention of researchers. The attempts to describe private provision in the emerging body of literature highlight its heterogeneous nature, for while expansion involves a global trend, much variation occurs in state stance and policy and in the nature and purpose of emerging private higher education. In the current debate on the privatization of public higher education, private universities operating within a public system become interesting cases for analysis. The term “private” in this article refers exclusively to “nonstate” or “free” higher education institutions operating within the Italian regulatory framework as nonprofit organizations.

Emergence and Expansion

The persistence of a highly centralized and uniform model of higher education, established at the time of Italian unification, has resisted societal pressures for decentralization and diversification. The Italian Constitution nevertheless provides the conditions for private provision, and alongside 61 state universities there are currently 28 nonstate universities. While the nonstate institutions represent over 25 percent of the sector, they are significantly smaller in terms of enrollment, with around 10 percent of the total student population. The vast majority of the nonstate institutions have come into being in recent decades in response to growth and variety in demand only partially met by the state. Private expansion has occurred alongside public expansion.

The 20th century experienced the birth and intermittent development of the nonstate sector. Until 1990 there were only 7 private universities, but between 1990 and 2000 a further 6 were founded. Since 2000, 15 more institutions have come into existence, 11 of which are distance-education providers set up since 2004. Another phenomenon is the transformation from private to public status of nonstate universities unable to meet the challenges of expansion and rising costs. The increasing financial pressure of this trend on the higher education budget forced the state to reconsider its laissez-faire policy toward spontaneous growth of the sector. Likewise, all new requests, whether private or public, must be authorized within a central development plan.

State Regulatory Framework

A private university initiative seeking to obtain recognition from the Ministry for Education, Universities and Research needs to demonstrate adequate infrastructure, academic resources, and financial capital. After obtaining the legal right of operation as a nonprofit organization, the unit’s degrees must be approved and granted legal validity, awarding them equal status with the state sector. While state recognition brings legitimation, it also restricts autonomy by imposing extensive legislative requirements in curricular content, credit weighting, and academic ratios as well as quality assurance standards and performance measurements on a par with the state sector.

While nonstate universities are governed to a large extent by the national regulatory framework, they remain essentially self-funding institutions, relying almost exclusively on income derived from tuition. In recognition of their public service, they receive a small contribution from the state higher education budget that averages at around 14 percent. Universities supported by local authorities or that offer healthcare through their medical centers will receive a higher proportion of public funds, and those with strong affiliation to a stakeholder community may have access to funding via donations or endowments. They compete on a par with the state universities in bid processes for research funds.

The nonstate universities have less financial accountability by virtue of their funding structure but are bound by national legislation for the hiring of tenured academics, and tend to keep numbers low to reduce fixed costs and enhance flexibility. Tenured staff in nonstate universities represent around 5 percent of the national total, with significant sharing of the academic workforce through the use of contracted staff from the public sector. These universities enjoy greater autonomy in the recruitment of administrative and nontenured academic staff and are independent in the acquisition and maintenance of physical plant. Their internal governance arrangements have more extensive external stakeholder involvement, and decision-making structures are typically more accountable to their sponsoring institutions.

The Italian nonstate sector is heavily regulated through the requirements for legal validity, and its “privateness” or degree of discretionary behavior is significantly reduced, with only minor margins of greater autonomy than the state sector. The Italian stance to private higher education is one of incorporation through a process of standard accreditation to ensure quality across the system but without an equal distribution of funding. As a consequence, the nonstate sector has not brought significant diversity with most institutions coming into being according to a model of “more” or “better” education.

Institutional Profiles

While its educational model may not be highly distinctive, the nonstate sector has flourished over the last 20 years, and insti-
tutional profiles demonstrate variety in age, size, location, academic configuration, ownership, and reputation. For example, the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart is a large, well-established multicampus and multifaculty institution offering all three educational cycles and full research facilities. While it has over 40,000 students and 1,400 tenured staff, the other, much smaller, nonstate universities have only a few hundred students and a handful of staff offering a limited range of education and research services, such as the highly specialized University of Gastronomic Sciences. There is a wide range of disciplines across the sector (including medicine).

While the nonstate universities are based predominantly in the north and center of Italy, with over half of the universities close to or in Rome and Milan, nevertheless a wide geographic spread exists across the country. The profiles of the institutions are also influenced by the different types of ownership that fall into three broad categories: religious (Roman Catholic) ownership or affiliation, local authority institutions, and business groups or individuals (including the recently founded distance-education providers). These categories influence their focus of mission, disciplines, and target groups.

With diversity of reputation, many nonstate universities place emphasis on academic excellence and are well-respected. Yet, some of the more recently established universities are considered less trustworthy, and their ability to meet minimum operational and financial requirements have been questioned both by the sector and the state.

Conclusion
The regulatory framework has traditionally focused on centralization and uniformity, which has led to the emergence of an essentially analogous private sector with a strong sense of public mission alongside service to a specific stakeholder community. It remains peripheral despite significant expansion in recent years in response to growth and variety of demand. Italian nonstate universities are hybrid institutions, accountable to both state and market. Precisely because they are forced to ensure their own financial sustainability, the new conditions of a more competitive international environment should be more conducive to their development. The author’s recent study of three nonstate universities suggested that international and national market pressures are contrasting the power of the state in determining the environment and playing a stronger role in defining institutional direction. As the divide between private and public higher education blurs, Italian nonstate universities successful in exploiting their “privateness” have the potential to become examples of best practice.
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Although Central Asian nations are linked geographically and historically, their higher education systems are following different paths. The five countries—Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan—even at the time of the Soviet Union’s dissolution varied in wealth, natural resources, population size, geography, government control, languages spoken, treatment of nontitular ethnic groups, and existing higher education resources. Since then, they have addressed nation building and the creation of professional elites in different ways and with varied resources and philosophies.

A Clear Example
In August 2009, the most repressive country, Turkmenistan, prevented students from traveling to Kyrgyzstan, the country with the region’s most diverse system of higher education, even physically removing them from airplanes. The focus of Turkmenistan’s wrath was the American University of Central Asia, a locally founded university with Kyrgyzstani licensure and attestation. However, it appeared that the more than 60 students who were refused access to that institution would be allowed to attend the American University of Bulgaria, which has both US and Bulgarian accreditation. However, in early October, Turkmen authorities prohibited students from flying to Bulgaria. Currently, rumors say they will be enrolled in Russian universities.

Turkmenistan—One Extreme
Turkmenistan is at one end of the continuum of diversity, choice, and academic freedom. Its dictator, Saparmurat Niyazov, who died in December 2006, cut higher education from 5 years to 2 and secondary education from 11 years to 9; closed the Academy of Sciences and most libraries, and required that hours of class time be devoted to the
Rukhnama—his meandering and sometimes incoherent thoughts. Although under Niyazov’s successor, Gurbanguly Berdymukhammedov, 5 years of higher education have been restored, additional places have been created in universities (still not as many as in Soviet times), reopening the Academy of Sciences has been promised, and a branch of the Russian Gubkin University of Oil and Gas has begun operations, academic freedom remains nonexistent. Faculty educated under Niyazov have only 2 years of higher education and little knowledge of the world outside. Additionally, payment for admission and grades reportedly is widespread; a dean and several lecturers at the Azadi Institute of World Languages this summer admitted on television taking the equivalent of $119,000 from eight students. Some blogs attribute the August clampdown—originally widespread and later focused on the American University of Central Asia—to officials upset at losing bribes from students who had other options. However, late in September, 47 new Peace Corps Volunteers at the Philadelphia airport suddenly were told they could not enter Turkmenistan, so the concern may be more about keeping out ideas. In mid-October, reports surfaced that Turkmenistan’s natural gas fields held only a third to one half of the amounts claimed just last year. Since the gas revenues are essential in funding Turkmenistan’s development, including education, the future is unclear.

Six Bologna process centers were created since 2007, and Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan were invited to the policy forum at the Bologna ministerial meeting in April 2009.

Kyrgyzstan—Choice or Chaos?
At the other end of the spectrum is Kyrgyzstan, home not only to the American University in Central Asia, but also to two universities founded by intergovernmental agreements: the Kyrgyz-Russian Slavonic University and the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University. In addition, Kyrgyzstan hosts the privately funded Turkish Ala-Too University, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Academy, half a dozen branches of Russian universities, a Kuwaiti university, an Islamic University, the Kyrgyz-Uzbek University, and a campus of the University of Central Asia, founded by the Aga Khan to benefit mountain peoples. The European Union provides TEMPUS, Erasmus Mundus, Erasmus Mundus External Cooperation Window, and European Training Foundation programs. Six Bologna process centers were created since 2007, and Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan were invited to the policy forum at the Bologna ministerial meeting in April 2009.

The American University in Central Asia and Manas University offer four-year bachelor’s degrees; other universities have three-year BAs and two-year master’s; others still offer the five-year Soviet-era diplom and the kandidat nauk (candidate of science). Some universities use credit hours, some use the contact hours, and some use both. Several of this author’s interviewees in the summer of 2009 described the system as kasha—literally “porridge” but also a slang term meaning “a mess.” On the other hand, openness to diversity has advantages for a country with few natural resources, one thus dependent on citizens’ brains and creativity. In fact, in August 2009, after the Ministry of Education adopted regulations on implementing credit hours, the European Credit Transfer System, the Diploma Supplement, and new teaching methods supporting independent work, it reportedly instructed universities to follow their own curricula until national curricula were designed.

Kazakhstan permits private universities, allowed the creation of the Independent Kazakhstan Quality Assurance Agency, and funds the Bolashak program, which sends students abroad.

Kazakhstan—A Mixed Review
Geographically the largest and, due to oil and gas reserves, the wealthiest nation in Central Asia, Kazakhstan is on a self-proclaimed “Path to Europe” invited to the 2009 Bologna policy forum, and soon will assume the chair of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Western-focused universities include the Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics, and Strategic Research, the Kazakh-British Technical University, and a small Kazakh-German University, plus the high-profile “world-class” University of Astana that is being developed in collaboration with University College London. Some universities use credit hours. Kazakhstan permits private universities, allowed the creation of the Independent Kazakhstan Quality Assurance Agency, and funds the Bolashak program, which sends students abroad, with the proviso that they return and work in Kazakhstan. However, some signals are troubling: the much-touted University of Astana has no Web site, and the status of its work is difficult to confirm; the Kazakhstan Institute has cancelled contracts with foreign faculty since the economic downturn; the Bolashak program is pressuring students to finish their degrees quickly and to return home; and some private universities have been closed on short notice. Reform and transparency are, at best, uneven.

Uzbekistan—Limited Options
Uzbekistan—known for restricting political freedom under Islam Karimov, president since independence—has a rapidly growing number of professional training colleges, low instructor salaries, insufficient places for the expanding youth popu-
The Goals for Higher Education in Kazakhstan

Joseph Stetar and Kairat Kurakbayev

As part of its transition from the post-Soviet era and in response to the market economy and the effects of globalization, Kazakhstan (with a population of 16 million) has set ambitious goals for improving the quality of higher education. Fueled by enormous oil reserves, Kazakhstan is determined to become one of the top 50 competitive economies of the world in 2012, as indicated in the annual global competitive report published by the World Economic Forum.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan’s public universities suffered from poor resources, low faculty salaries and an outdated choice of specialties. Demand-absorbing private universities filled niches created by the market and witnessed explosive growth. In 1994, the system contained 32 private universities; 10 years later there were 130. In 2000/01, 29 percent of Kazakhstan’s 440,000 students were studying in private universities; by 2003/04 those figures rose to 45.3 percent and 685,000. With the recent introduction of accreditation, 20 private universities have been closed. The strongest privates are the English-language universities, with the North American–style Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics and Strategic Research appearing to be the most preferred private institution. With 57 public and 110 private universities, the higher education sector is overbuilt, and the number of private universities should continue to decline.

An Activist Government Looks Abroad

Seeking to enhance the quality of its higher education sector, Kazakhstan has looked to western European standards for higher education. For example, in 1997, Kazakhstan was the first country of newly independent states to adopt the policy of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, which calls member countries for mutual recognition of qualifications and equivalency of academic diplomas. The Ministry of Education and Science is also working on reforming the higher education system along the general lines of the Bologna process. In this context, Kazakhstan has encouraged the implementation of the European structure of academic degrees (baccalaureate, master’s and doctoral), a national quality-assurance system and a Western-style credit system.
As part of its strategic development plan for higher education, the government has been implementing the State Program on the Development of Education 2005–2010. One key goal of this program is the adoption of a three-tiered degree structure (baccalaureate, master’s and doctoral). Currently both public and private universities offer baccalaureate and master’s programs. In 2005 two public universities, Eurasian National University and Kazakh National University, began piloting PhD programs. As part of this process Eurasian National signed memoranda of agreement with western European, Turkish, Japanese, South Korean, and North American universities. This cooperation has bolstered the quality of postgraduate education and enhanced opportunities for the university’s ENU doctoral students, with the ministry’s support, to study abroad and be supervised by Western professors.

In developing human capital, Kazakhstan has increased its investment in the country’s most talented young scholars. In 1993 the government launched the “Bolashak” Presidential Scholarship Program. With the term bolashak [future], the program is evidence the government believes educating its elite abroad will ultimately enhance national welfare. Approximately 3,000 undergraduate and graduate students, primarily from the urban centers, study abroad every year with the United Kingdom, United States, and Russia the preferred destinations. The program strengthens the state infrastructure as the preponderance of “Bolashak” graduates return to assume key government posts. However, the Ministry of Education and Science understands the program draws too heavily from urban areas, with the rural areas significantly underrepresented.

**Reform Has Spawned Challenges**

Concurrent with these ambitious efforts and reforms the Kazakhstani system of higher education has experienced local and international challenges. For example, continuous issues have arisen with quality assurance. In 2001 rules of state accreditation of higher education institutions were approved, but only 25 percent of the universities passed the first stage of accreditation. In 2006, within the education budget, the share of tertiary education was one of the smallest in the world, at about 0.3 percent. At this juncture, an academic career had only a marginal attraction. For nearly a decade after 1991, university faculty needed to teach at two or more universities for standard-of-living income and supporting their families. At present, faculty salaries are still based on teaching load, leaving most professors disinclined to engage in research and creating a gap with the State Program on the Development of Education 2005–2010, which attempts to expand faculty research.

Not unlike other countries in Central Asia a considerable education inequity exists between the urban and rural areas of Kazakhstan. Universities in rural areas lacking financial support and academic infrastructure have difficulty in providing a high-quality education or recruiting young teachers to work in rural areas. Kazakhstani professors and students, in general, suffer from a lack of up-to-date professional literature as universities lack sufficient funding to subscribe to important European and North American journals. Electronic media resources also appear to be underdeveloped.

Kazakh-language-medium higher education also needs further development. The legacy of Russification has left universities with only a small number of well-rounded specialists who hold an effective command of Kazakh. The absence of Kazakh-written teaching-and-learning materials further complicates efforts to expand Kazakh-medium instruction. The status of Kazakh language needs to be addressed as ethnic Kazakh students begin to form a greater proportion of students in higher education. Another serious issue is English-language competence among students and professors. The ministry and university administrations are exerting pressure to ensure that university faculty hold a sufficient command of English to present at major international conferences and to publish their research in respected international journals.

**The Ministry of Education and Science is also working on reforming the higher education system along the general lines of the Bologna process.**

After the Soviet Union’s collapse Kazakhstan began implementing higher education reform that has greatly accelerated over the last five years. Major steps have been taken to improve the structure and quality of Kazakh higher education as evidenced by the State Program on the Development of Education 2005–2010. However, economic and societal issues—such as student and academic staff mobility, educational inequity between urban and rural population, difficulties in accessing current literature, and a lack of English-speaking academics—have hindered attainment of goals outlined in the 2005–2010 plan.

**Substantial Challenges Remain**

In terms of quality control, a shift is needed in the mindset of some Ministry of Education and Science staff and university management leaders who tend to view accreditation as a tool for greater government control rather than a vehicle for institutional self-improvement. There is an urgent need to develop a culture of institutional accountability and transparency across the universities. Thus, on many fronts, developing the quality of the educational system is critical for Kazakhstan’s efforts to achieve international competitiveness.
New Publications


Women are a growing segment of top leadership in American higher education. This book discusses the various elements of women’s leadership roles and styles. Among the topics are informal learning among women, mentoring women leaders, and the quest for presidential legitimacy.


A broad analysis of globalization and higher education, with a stress on marketization issues, this book examines themes as well as providing some case studies. Themes include the race for human capital, market-driven trends in financing higher education, and others. Most of the chapters discuss how broad patterns of globalization are affecting higher education in national and regional contexts. Among these are considerations of Asia’s role in technological innovation, university and industry in Taiwan, competitiveness and its impact in Europe, management issues in European universities, fee arrangements in England, and other issues.


There is widespread agreement in the United States that doctoral preparation in the humanities and related social sciences is in crisis. Funding for students is inadequate, the doctoral programs themselves face considerable staffing and financial problems, attrition rates are high, and full-time academic jobs scarce. This book is a careful and thorough analysis of these and other problems with an eye toward improving the situation. Among the themes discussed are transition from graduate study to career, attrition issues, doctoral program design, and others. A valuable discussion of lessons for the future is provided. While this book focuses only on the United States, it is relevant to many other countries.


This book provides a wide-ranging discussion of how students engage with university international programs and other international activities, mainly from the viewpoint of British university. Among the themes discussed are internationalization and teacher education, international volunteerism, and students in cross-cultural classrooms, and others. The book is unique in that it looks at the topic from the perspective of how students relate to international initiatives.


The argument in this book is that funding problems are the source of Uganda’s continuing higher education crisis. A thorough analysis of patterns of funding and the implications of shortage is provided. Among the themes discussed are problems of access and equity and how students from more advantaged groups get larger state subsidies, the problems of academic staff, the influence of student power on financing higher education, and the impact of funding shortages on quality. A sustainable model for funding is provided.


This work by Kent Serna and colleagues is part of a larger project called “Alliance for International Higher Education Policy Studies,” aimed at comparing the higher education systems of the three members of the North America Free Trade Agreement—Canada, the United States, and Mexico. The main question for the study was “How do different systems attempt to resolve issues that are common to higher education in all contemporary societies, such as expansion and access, academic preparation, contributions to economic development, and effectiveness and transparency in the use of public resources?” The book consists of seven chapters in which the Mexican part of the study is presented. Chapter one introduces the conceptual framework, including the methodology, key questions, and theories applied. Case studies for the states of Guanajuato, Jalisco, Nuevo León, and Puebla are presented in chapters three to six. (Iván Pacheco)


This handbook is intended to provide a comprehensive discussion of study-abroad issues, mainly from an American perspective. Among the themes discussed are engagement with a global civil society, global citizenship, study abroad and language issues, European perspectives on study abroad, curriculum and global studies, holistic learning and study abroad, and undergraduate research and study abroad.


A case study of how American colleges and universities reacted to the Nazi assumption of power in Germany in the 1930s, this book examines their relationships with German universities at the time. Norwood points out that Nazi ideology came to dominate German higher education and that German academia sought to project a positive image of the new Nazi state. Generally, American universities did not protest or boycott German institutions and conducted business as usual.


Joint- and double-degree programs are of increasing interest globally. More than 80 percent of the universities in the United States and Europe surveyed for this book are interested in pursuing plans for such degrees. A significant number of universities in the
survey report they already have such degrees. This book includes a discussion of such themes as curriculum design, financial issues, strategies, sustainability, student and faculty mobility, and related issues regarding double and joint degrees.


OECD’s annual compilation of statistics concerning education is a valuable source of comparative information relating to member countries and a few additional nations. For higher education, information includes the educational attainment of adults, entry and completion rates for tertiary education, public and private expenditure for higher education, how much do tertiary students pay and what kinds of public subsidies they receive, study-abroad statistics, enrollment rates, teaching staff employed in tertiary education, postsecondary graduate rates, and other data.

**News of the Center**

Center director, Philip Altbach, was given the Lifetime Contribution Award by the Higher Education Group of the Comparative and International Education Society at the annual conference in Chicago on March 2, 2010. The citation notes that the award is given “for a lifetime of profound contribution, leadership and research in comparative and international higher education.” In her remarks, award committee chair Rosalind Latiner Raby noted Altbach’s lasting scholarly impact, global visibility in the field, and his mentorship of younger scholars. The award is given annually at the CIES national conference.

CIHE research associate Laura Rumbley has joined the staff of the Academic Cooperation Association in Brussels, Belgium, as deputy director. ACA is concerned with the internationalization of higher education in Europe. With a recognition of her energy, intelligence, and commitment to the Center and to international higher education, she will be missed by her colleagues. She has also been recently named to the Editorial Advisory Board of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Along with Urbain DeWinter of Boston University, she has just published a chapter in the new volume, *A History of U.S. Study Abroad 1965–Present*, coedited by William W. Hoffa and Stephen C. DePaul and published by *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*. In late April, Laura Rumbley is slated to present at the Russian National Training Foundation’s first international conference in Moscow. The conference is titled “Internationalization of Higher Education: Trends, Forecasts, and Scenarios for the Future.”

Research Associate, Liz Reisberg, will be a presenter at the “New Dynamics of Higher Education” conference in São Paulo at the beginning of April and will remain in Brazil for the rest of the month as a visiting scholar at the University of Campinas. She will be giving seminars on quality assurance and access and equity issues as well as collaborating with colleagues on research in these areas.

The Center is working closely with the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia, on an expansion of our academic salaries study. The new study will include 30 countries and, with the help of HSE’s economics expertise, will grow in sophistication as well. We have also started to work on a Catholic higher education initiative in collaboration with Boston College’s Center for Catholic Education. Our first major activity is a compendium of Catholic postsecondary institutions worldwide. This work is coordinated by research assistants Iván Pacheco and Anna Glass.

Research assistant Kara Godwin is leading work on an exploratory study aimed at mapping the penetration of English as a language of instruction in higher education around the world. Kara Godwin is also coordinating an international symposium at Boston College, cohosted by Amsterdam University College, entitled “Liberal Arts Education: Global Perspectives and Developments.” This half-day event is scheduled for April 14, 2010 and will feature contributions by Henry Rosovsky and Marijk van der Wende. Inquiries about this event should be directed to Kara.Godwin@bc.edu.

The Center has recently completed a revised listing of journals in the field of higher education worldwide that will soon be on the Center’s Web site. Anna Glass has coordinated this project.

Invisible to the eye but important for our work is a major redesign of the architecture behind the CIHE Web site. A new Web site design will make the wealth of hosted resources easier to find. Furthermore, new interactive features will be added as well. This work has been coordinated by Liz Reisberg and Kara Godwin with the help of Boston College’s information technology experts.

**BC_CIHE on Twitter**

We have expanded CIHE’s Web presence Twitter. Now, in addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are tweeting. Twitter provides different kind of forum for staff at CIHE to post information and commentary.

Recent tweets include commentary from the Third International Conference on World-Class Universities in Shanghai, news about activities of CIHE, and responses to items in the news. We hope you will consider “following” us!
THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

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

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

CIHE WEB SITE

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

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

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

Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.