

International Higher Education is the quarterly publication of the Center for International Higher Education.

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through *International Higher Education* a network of distinguished international scholars offer commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, and Russian. Links to all editions can be found at [www.bc.edu/cihe](http://www.bc.edu/cihe).

---

#### RANKINGS AGAIN

- 2 "Anchoring" the World University Rankings  
Nicholas A. Bowman and Michael Bastedo
- 3 Rankings: Does What Get Counted Get Done?  
Ellen Hazelkorn

---

#### INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

- 5 English and the Rest: Understanding the Languages of Science  
Jorge Balán
- 7 Is There a Future for Branch Campuses?  
Philip G. Altbach
- 10 What International Students Think about US Higher Education  
Patricia Chow

---

#### THE MIDDLE EAST

- 12 The Arab Spring: A Higher Education Revolution Yet to Happen  
André Elias Mazawi
- 13 Egyptian Private Higher Education at a Crossroads  
Daniel C. Levy and Manar Sabry

---

#### AFRICA FOCUS

- 15 Partnerships in Africa  
Damtew Teferra
- 17 Research Networks in Africa  
Piyushi Kotecha
- 19 International Lessons for African Higher Education and Economy  
Pundy Pillay

---

#### FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION: ECUADOR AND ARMENIA

- 20 Who Benefits from Free Tuition?  
David Post
- 22 "Free" Public Universities: Too Much of a Good Thing?  
Mateo Estrella
- 24 Reforming Higher Education Financing in Armenia  
Arthur M. Hauptman, Levon Barkhudaryan, and Sergey Balasanyan

---

#### COUNTRIES AND REGIONS

- 25 Student Services in China  
Karen D. Arnold and Hong Zhu

---

#### DEPARTMENTS

- 28 New Publications
- 31 News of the Center

# “Anchoring” the World University Rankings

NICHOLAS A. BOWMAN AND MICHAEL BASTEDO

Nicholas A. Bowman is assistant professor, at Bowling Green State University, Ohio. E-mail: [nbowman@bgsu.edu](mailto:nbowman@bgsu.edu). Michael Bastedo is associate professor, at University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. E-mail: [bastedo@umich.edu](mailto:bastedo@umich.edu). This article is adapted (with permission) from Higher Education, *Anchoring Effects in World University Rankings: Exploring Biases in Reputation Scores*; more can be read about their rankings research at <http://www.umich.edu/~bastedo>.

Indeed institutional leaders are quite concerned about their position in rankings and league tables. They believe that many constituents within and outside of higher education rely on international or national rankings to reveal which universities are “good” or “great.” If this is true, then these rankings may become virtually synonymous with institutional reputation over time.

It is suspected that rankings might influence reputation through a phenomenon known as the anchoring effect (or anchoring-and-adjustment heuristic). That is, people often rely on some starting point when making judgments for which the answer is ambiguous, such as estimating the number of jelly beans in a jar. For example, people who are initially asked whether the number of jelly beans is higher or lower than a high number (e.g., 2,000) will generally provide higher estimates for the exact value than those who are initially asked whether it is higher or lower than a low number (e.g., 100). Research has demonstrated that these anchoring effects can occur even among experts in a variety of important, real-world settings, such as assessing real estate values and determining the length of prison sentences.

Until less than a decade ago, the reputations of diverse universities throughout the world were also characterized by considerable uncertainty. While many people would have agreed that Oxford and Harvard are in the top 10, where should the University of Melbourne or Tsinghua University be ranked? And which of these two schools is “better”? Therefore, the introduction of *Times Higher Education Supplement (THES) World University Rankings* in 2004 provided a natural experiment to consider the effect of rankings on the decision-making processes of reputational arbiters around the world. After the first set of *THES* rankings, people who wanted to identify “top” schools—or to see where their own institution stacked up—had a formal list that they could peruse. When asked to identify top schools in future surveys, some reputational raters probably referred to the list directly; and others who had seen the

list previously may have reported more favorable ratings for the institutions at the top of the *THES* rankings.

## EXAMINING ANCHORING EFFECTS ON UNIVERSITY REPUTATION

To explore empirically whether the early *THES* world university rankings provided an anchoring point for subsequent assessments of institutional reputation, this article examines the first three years of the *THES* rankings and the corresponding reputation ratings, which were provided by a variety of academics worldwide (e.g., faculty, administrators, lecturers).

Three hypotheses were supported by the data. First, consistent with anchoring theory, the initial *THES* rankings were associated with increases in reputational assessments. Thus, the academics who were asked to provide reputation

---

**It is suspected that rankings might influence reputation through a phenomenon known as the anchoring effect (or anchoring-and-adjustment heuristic).**

---

ratings in the second and third years of the survey appear to have been influenced—whether consciously or unconsciously—by the first year of rankings. Furthermore, the relationship between rankings and reputation was much stronger in the second year of the survey than in the first year, which means that rankings and reputation became more closely aligned in a very short period of time.

We had no reason to anticipate that the opposite pattern would occur (namely, that reputation would lead to improvements in rankings), and we did not find such a link. This “non-finding” supports the interpretation that rankings cause improvements in reputation, not vice versa.

Because the first year of rankings is particularly informative for potential raters (by providing a novel formalized hierarchy among institutions), we expected that the effects of rankings on reputation would be strongest for the first year of rankings than for the second year. Indeed, the first year of rankings was associated with increased reputation in the following two years, but the second year of rankings had no significant effect.

## CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

One of the many uses of rankings is to provide useful information to consumers as they make decisions about college choices. For many years, there has been concern about the

use of rankings based on equity and validity. The reputation assessments of the rankings have come under particular criticism, much of it well deserved.

Our research provides fuel for many of these concerns. It seems highly likely that the anchoring effects we found are influential across ranking schemes worldwide, as this is based on a well-established psychological effect. When also considering the fact that the differences between rankings and reputation are becoming vanishingly small over time and that rankings are stable over time, it is difficult to maintain the fantasy that reputational scores are independent from the rankings themselves.

Engineering effective reputational surveys is a difficult proposition. As mentioned earlier, one of the major issues is that respondents are asked to rate colleges about which they have little first-hand knowledge, and there are long-time lags between changes in quality and subsequent reputation. Therefore, one solution would be to ask respondents only to rate universities about which they have deep knowledge. Unfortunately, this will likely generate a conflict of interest: Universities generally have the deepest knowledge of their closest competitors, and these institutions compete for higher rankings.

---

**The academics who were asked to provide reputation ratings in the second and third years of the survey appear to have been influenced—whether consciously or unconsciously—by the first year of rankings.**

---

Indeed, manipulation of reputational surveys may be a major problem with some college-rankings systems. An organization that conducts college rankings must have specific criteria for identifying survey responses that show evidence of manipulation, and it must ensure that informants have deep knowledge of the institutions they rank. Moreover, sampling a large sample of faculty from many diverse institutions and from a wide range of academic fields would improve the validity of the survey results. And because reputational surveys are likely here to stay, it is important to use empirical research to make them as informative and unbiased as possible.

Simply eliminating reputational surveys is not the answer. Our “objective” measures of institutions—like those used in the *Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities*—are not strong enough to provide a real sense of academic quality. In addition, the more that objective mea-

asures are weighted, the more likely it is that institutions will simply purchase the Nobel prize winners and highly cited scientists that they need to rise in the rankings, with fairly negligible improvements in academic program quality more broadly.

Finally, there is simply a demand for knowledge about institutional reputation, and someone will be there to provide it. It is better to encourage those who seek to do it well than to leave it to those who will do it poorly.

We think the new World University Rankings are a step in the right direction. By asking people to rate programs in their own discipline, it is more likely that the ratings will be valid and reliable. Academics keep tabs on one another quite well in their own area of interest, and rankings should take advantage of that. With sociologists rating sociologists and physicists rating physicists, you have the best chance of ascertaining a professional consensus about program quality. ■

---

## Rankings: Does What Gets Counted Get Done?

ELLEN HAZELKORN

*Ellen Hazelkorn is vice president of research and enterprise, dean of the Graduate Research School, and head of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland. E-mail: Ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie. This article is based on Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education. The Battle for World-Class Excellence, published by Palgrave MacMillan, 2011. (<http://www.palgrave.com/products/title.aspx?pid=391266>).*

Much of the debate around rankings has focused on methodological problems—which indicators and weightings, the credibility of the statistical process, and why (or why not) inconsistencies arise. There are also complaints about the overreliance on research rather than teaching. Yet, there has been little commentary about the increasing use of quantitative methodologies to drive decision making at the national or institutional level—what I call policymaking by numbers. The same issues arise about performance indicators, in general.

Have rankings accelerated this trend? And, because indicators incentivize behavior, are we measuring what counts or are we doing what gets measured—a classic case of “goal displacement”?

### SELECTIVITY

Student-entry levels are generally considered a good indicator for student achievement, on the assumption that a student's performance is roughly similar throughout their higher education career. For example, US Scholastic Achievement Test scores correlate strongly with graduation and retention rates, future incomes, and graduate school admissions. Other higher education systems and institutions use college-entry scores, preparatory examinations, or secondary school scores for the same reason.

This practice is reinforced by university rankings, such as *US News & World Report* and the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*, which use student entry scores as a proxy for educational quality—worth 15 percent and 9.5 percent, respectively. The greater the number of smart students are admitted, the higher a university can score.

---

**Yet, there has been little commentary about the increasing use of quantitative methodologies to drive decision making at the national or institutional level—what I call policymaking by numbers.**

---

High-ability and second-generation students—the latter from Asian backgrounds (or non-US citizens)—wanting a doctoral, medical, or law degree are especially sensitive to rankings. A virtuous circle is created due to the link between rankings, reputation, and selectivity.

Selectivity is becoming a perverse driver of higher education and student behavior. Universities seek to improve their rank by a range of enrollment management practices—including influencing the number of applications received, while retaining the same number of available places. In this way, the selectivity index rises. Higher education institutions may limit class or cohort size. They may also use higher tuition fees to signal selectivity; that the majority of UK universities have chosen the maximum £9,000 (US\$14,700) tuition fee is symptomatic of this mind-set. Others use financial aid to attract high-calibre students rather than students with the greatest need. Like many US universities, the UK government has encouraged universities to offer “special deals” to high achievers.

### COMPLETION RATES

Today, policy is concerned not just with the number of students who enter an institution but the number who actually complete and graduate within a determined time frame. In this way, responsibility shifts to the institution to ensure

that students progress successfully through the system. *US News & World Report* and the European Union's new *U-Multirank* measure an institution's predictive graduation rate; the latter also measures graduate (un)employability. This aspect is often captured by surveys of employer groups, such as those conducted by *QS World University Rankings*.

However, performance is influenced by many factors, including student socioeconomic profile. Measuring graduation rates may be disadvantageous to lower socioeconomic and ethnically disadvantaged groups or mature students, whose life or family circumstances disturb normal study; while measuring graduation rates can encourage institutions to abandon educational standards.

This may undermine institutions that are working hard to provide widening participation opportunities to new student groups or to students who might use this opportunity to transfer to higher-ranked or other universities. There is already evidence that institutions are abandoning programs aimed at widening access or establishing arms-length colleges, so that the poorer-performance scores do not affect the university's overall ranking. Others, as mentioned above, are changing the conditions of their scholarships.

A major handicap for first destination employment data is the time frame; surveys usually concentrate on the first six to nine months postgraduation, which is inadequate for many types of careers and is unable to distinguish between employment on graduate-level jobs or underemployed. While the time frame may provide useful information during a period of active economic growth, is the information an accurate reflection of educational quality during a recession such as the current one?

### MEASURING RESEARCH

Measuring research productivity and impact through bibliometric and citation data is a widespread methodology for assessing academic and research quality and is a key indicator for various rankings. A related practice is ranking journals, whereby the quality of a journal is determined by its local, national, or worldwide scientific reach. The *Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities* awards 20 percent of its score to just two publications, *Science* and *Nature*; and *SCImago* uses the journals' scientific prestige, the SJR indicator, to rank journals based on citations.

Quantity is correlated with quality—despite normalization for discipline, institution size, and age. This tends to reward larger and older universities and the physical, life, and medical sciences—due to their publishing habits. This means other important sources or publication formats—such as, books and conference proceedings, contribution to international standards or policy reports, electronic formats or open source publications, etc.—are all ignored. Nationally relevant, interdisciplinary, but non-English-language

research is under-reported and undervalued.

Many governments, research agencies, and institutions link this exercise to resource allocation. Not surprisingly, these trends are already producing distortions in research focus and research management: encouraging academics to write journal articles rather than reflective books or policy papers, discouraging intellectual risk taking—favoring the “hard sciences” over the arts, humanities or social sciences, and informing hiring and firing.

#### LESSONS

These brief examples raise questions about the way in which indicators can shape policy decisions and incentivize behavior. Indeed, there is mounting evidence that governments and higher education institutions around the world are using rankings deliberately in this way, rolling them into key performance indicators, to inform targets and award results. In other instances, governments are making profound structural changes to their national systems in order to push a few elite universities into the top 20, 50, or 100 of global rankings.

---

**Measuring research productivity and impact through bibliometric and citation data is a widespread methodology for assessing academic and research quality and is a key indicator for various rankings.**

---

The history of rankings shows measuring the wrong things can produce distortions. The US National Governors Association Center for Best Practice similarly cautioned in 2009 against relying on methodologies that can inadvertently create perverse incentives. This should be a critical lesson for all governments and institutions. ■



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider “following” us on Twitter!

## English and the Rest: Understanding the Languages of Science

JORGE BALÁN

*Jorge Balán is a senior research scholar, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University. E-mail: jb3369@columbia.edu.*

The dominance of English in international academic publications has increased manifolds during the last few decades. The vast majority of indexed science journals, including those previously published in other languages, have shifted to English; less marked among traditional players has been the change from French and Russian. Journals prefer English to acquire a broader international authorship and readership and to reach higher impact (number of citations). English-language journals have increased the proportion of authors from non-Anglo countries—although proportionally their communities are underrepresented—while non-English-language journals have become mostly national or regional in scope.

Yet, the number of scientific publications in languages other than English keeps growing even more rapidly as the scientific communities in non-Anglo countries (for instance, in China, Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, southern Europe, and Latin America) expand and diversify. The proportion of all scientific periodicals worldwide that are published in English is actually declining. However, the vast majority of high-impact journals are in English. Medicine is a good example of both trends: the development of a central core of the most important medical journals worldwide published almost entirely in English and indexed in the US National Library of Medicine’s database, Medline; and the rapidly expanding peripheries published in other languages, serving continuing medical education or research on the delivery of care within the local national health systems. These peripheries include formerly dominant languages in the world of medical research, such as German and French, and many others. Communities of professionals and scientists use the prevailing national languages to communicate among themselves, with policymakers, and with clients. English is the main global lingua franca of scientific communication, but there are many other languages of a national or international scope—such as mandarin Chinese or Bahasa Indonesia, among the former, and Spanish or French, among the latter.

English dominance and the distinction between central and peripheral languages are less marked in the social sci-

ences and the humanities. A smaller majority of international indexed journals are published in English, and social sciences and humanities-based indexes differ markedly in their language coverage. Many journals offer now translated versions of articles in English, side by side with original versions of articles in other languages. In several countries, notably China, English-language journals are now published as a venue for previously published articles in the national language. Much less common in social sciences and humanities is the shift of journals to English, although it has increased in some disciplines, such as psychology. In many of these fields (e.g., literature, history, and anthropology) books are still more important than journal articles. Books are published first in the national language; few are eventually translated into English or other languages.

---

**The proportion of all scientific periodicals worldwide that are published in English is actually declining. However, the vast majority of high-impact journals are in English.**

---

Social sciences and humanities scholars are under pressure to publish in English, in order to become internationally visible and to contribute to the global ranking of their countries and institutions, measured through indexed publications of high impact. However, these scholars are counterbalanced by the pressure to reach rapidly growing domestic academic and policy communities. In many countries, internationalization and language policies run in opposite directions, the first favoring English and the other a national or regional language.

#### **COSTS AND RISKS OF INTERNATIONAL (ENGLISH) PUBLICATION**

The underrepresentation of non-native-English-speaking scholars in international English journals attests to the many disadvantages encountered when compared to native-English-speaker authors. Most cited problems relate to the costs in time and effort, since typically non-native researchers in all disciplines need more time to turn their papers in English, often relying on professional translators. International indexed journals often request authors to have papers reviewed by native speakers in order to turn them into a “standard” English-language version. Research on science journals found striking differences in acceptance rates for

non-native compared to native authors as well as longer processes of revision and resubmission, adding to the costs and lowering the productivity of researchers who are non-native-English speakers.

Scholars in elite universities in developing countries, such as China, usually report cross-pressures. On the one hand, publication in English for an international audience, preferably in international indexed journals, is supported by academic administrations focused on international rankings. On the other, publication in the national language is required to reach domestic audiences and obtain greater legitimacy in public opinion and policymaking circles. Domestic English-language translations offer a chance of dual publication but lack the prestige of international indexed journals.

In the Arab world, according to Sari Hanafi, the main dilemma faced by social scientists is to publish globally and perish locally versus to publish locally and perish globally. Elite universities, where teaching is often conducted in English or French, assess faculty productivity in terms of academic publications in international peer-reviewed journals using international standards. Local or regional publication, in Arab or other languages, does not count for promotion, thus drawing research away from those issues that might be deemed important by local or regional audiences. National public universities, on the other hand, are locally oriented—faculty members publish locally, in Arabic and thus perish globally. This segmentation by language and domestic/international focus seems to affect entire disciplines, such as economics and psychology, throughout the developing world.

---

**The underrepresentation of non-native-English-speaking scholars in international English journals attests to the many disadvantages encountered.**

---

#### **INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITIES AND THE REST OF THE WORLD**

Many universities in western Europe, East Asia, or the Middle East are now considering themselves truly international in that their student body and their faculty come from all over the world. These international universities tend to teach in English or, specifically, in some variety of English—often a “lingua franca” that departs in significant ways from “normal” academic English as practiced in the English-speaking countries. Furthermore, the adoption of

English as a language of instruction does not preclude the use of other languages for interaction out of the classroom. Scandinavian researchers, for instance, have been studying the uses of many languages, in and out of the classroom, in international universities within the region. Many have also noticed that lingua franca English has notorious differences between countries and regions, so that international universities in the Netherlands, Singapore, or China may actually differ considerably in the languages used in different settings or from “standard” English. Since international universities are meant to be part of the world of international research, where publications are dominated by English, a pressure still exists toward standardization in the written language. In the United States and the United Kingdom, manual styles have been prepared to guide international doctoral students writing their dissertations in English—in conformity with a way to present theory, methods, data, and conclusions. Should these standards be adopted by international universities in non-English-speaking countries, the diversity associated with language and cultural tradition would be lost.

The vast majority of universities and academic programs outside English-speaking countries, which are enrolling a growing student body, conduct their everyday activities in the national or local languages. This is the case both for undergraduate and professional education. English is becoming the preferred second language for a majority of students worldwide, but it is not the language in which they are educated or trained for the professions embedded in national realities. With few exceptions—in scientific disciplines and mathematics—at the graduate level, a majority of the bibliography used by those students tends to be in the national languages, either original or in translation. Last, but not least, the increased use of the Internet for academic purposes also is reflecting the growth of languages other than English in the world of electronic communication, until recently dominated by the English language.

#### CONCLUSION

Languages other than English are here to stay in the world of higher education and research. Globalization requires, in order to be effective, a greater effort in translation, so that access to the many varieties of scholarly production becomes more effectively available to readers worldwide. Certainly, translation into English is a means to expand accessibility both in English-speaking countries and elsewhere. ■

## Is There a Future for Branch Campuses?

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

Branch campuses seem to be the flavor of the month or, perhaps, the decade. Universities, mostly but not exclusively from the developed and mainly English-speaking countries, have established overseas branches worldwide—mainly in developing and emerging economies. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education counted 162 branch campuses in 2009, with American universities accounting for 48 percent of the total. No doubt, the number of branches has increased significantly since then. The Arabian Gulf has received a great deal of global attention since several countries have welcomed—and paid for—branch campuses, as part of their higher education growth strategies. For example, Education City in Doha, Qatar, currently hosts six American universities and one from Britain. Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, and other Gulf countries have additional branch campuses of foreign universities. Singapore predates the Gulf as a higher education hub.

Given this boom in branches, several fundamental questions need to be raised: what are branch campuses? Are they sustainable over time? What unique service do they render to students and the academic community?

#### WHAT IS A BRANCH?

There is no generally accepted definition. Most observers seem to agree that an “international branch campus” is an entity pertaining to a university whose primary location is in one country, which operates in another and offers its own degree in that country. Upon successful completion of the course program, fully undertaken at the unit abroad, students are awarded a degree from the foreign institution. This definition excludes joint-degree programs, twinning arrangements, overseas campuses serving students from the home university, degree franchising, and other international ventures. In a few cases, branch campuses offer the opportunity for students at the branch to study at the home university for part of their program, and some offer “study abroad” facilities for students from the home campus.

This simple definition must be considered in a fundamental way. Are the students at the overseas campus receiving essentially the same educational experience as they would experience on the home campus? Is the quality of instruction equivalent? Are the professors from the home

campus? Are the facilities broadly equivalent—taking into account that it would be impossible to duplicate New York’s Washington Square campus in Abu Dhabi? In other words, is a student experiencing the same, or close to the same, education as at the home campus? It is not enough to put a university’s name on the degree. The actual quality and at least a semblance of the academic experience and culture at the home campus must be provided for a branch campus to deserve to offer a university’s degree. Anything less “dilutes the brand” and should not be called a branch.

#### QUESTIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY

With a few exceptions, branch campuses have been established fairly recently, so that there are few clear lessons to be drawn yet from limited experience. Still, a number of questions concerning sustainability must be asked.

---

### **Are the students at the overseas campus receiving essentially the same educational experience as they would experience on the home campus?**

---

*Enrollments.* Will branch campuses be able to enroll students of the same quality as their home-campus students over time? A number of problems in this respect are already evident. The University of New South Wales, for example, closed its branch campus in Singapore in 2007, after less than a year—due to low enrollments. Most of the American branches in the Gulf are reportedly under enrolled. In that region, particularly, it is unclear whether there are a sufficient number of young people with the requisite interests and academic accomplishments fill the existing branch campuses, not to mention new ones.

Some of the branches see possibilities for enrollment from the Indian subcontinent, with its large population of underserved students. Yet, a recent survey showed that prospective Indian students prefer to study in the United States rather than at an American branch campus in the Gulf or, for that matter, in India itself. They would like the full experience of American culture and, perhaps, the possibility of staying in the United States to work following graduation. However, studying at a branch campus provides neither of these opportunities. Data from China indicate that students are not willing to pay US-level tuition at branch campuses of American universities in China, and they worry about the quality of faculty and programs.

Branch campuses in the Gulf are counting on significant numbers of female students from the region, assuming that many families will not want to have their daughters studying in the West but would prefer a regional institution—although 21 percent of Saudi Arabian students abroad, largely in Western countries, are women. Clearly, the assumptions are faulty. Furthermore, the small population base in the Gulf means that the numbers of students with high-academic qualifications are limited. To make matters even more complicated, both the branch campuses and local universities often need to provide up to a year of preparatory study for many students before full admission is possible—due to a combination of inadequate English-language skills and inadequate secondary school preparation. For selective universities, like Carnegie Mellon or New York University, it is highly questionable whether the pool of qualified candidates will be large enough to become sustainable over time.

While hard data are impossible to obtain, some reports have revealed that most branch campuses have not as yet met enrollment targets. Enrollments are hard to predict and depend on many variables, including changing political and social circumstances. It is not clear how the current unrest in the Middle East will impact the branch campuses in the region. As more branch campuses are established in educational hubs worldwide, there will be increased competition among them.

*Faculty and staff.* A branch campus requires home campus faculty to provide a real academic experience of the sponsoring university. This does not mean a few faculty members just fly in for “intensive” weekend courses. Will branch campuses be able to lure faculty members, for a semester or longer, from the home to an overseas campus? Residential faculty are necessary. Moreover, temporary adjunct faculty located in the region or local residents with doctorates awarded by the main campus of the university will not suffice. Home campus faculty must be willing to teach at the branch for a year or more. Again, the idea of a branch campus is to replicate the academic and other experience of the home university. Similarly, key administrators and support staff in student affairs and other areas must belong to the home campus to provide the spirit of the home university or at least have experience at the home campus.

Experience shows that it is quite difficult to convince home campus faculty to teach in an overseas branch campus for extended periods of time, even when salary and other benefits are attractive. Yet, even once the small group of internationally minded faculty and staff have volunteered to go abroad, convincing others to go is all but impossible. Uprooting working spouses and children is not easy. Research-



active faculty—especially in the hard sciences, where laboratories at the branch cannot match those at home—will also be reluctant to leave their labs.

*Funding.* Branch campuses of prestigious universities receive generous start-up funding from host countries, institutions, property developers, or other entities. Typically, little up-front investment is provided by the home university and in some cases, such as the Gulf, hefty subsidies. However, significant nonmonetary expenses include the time spent by a myriad of administrators and faculty for planning, negotiations with host governments and institutions, and other aspects. Developing curricula, implementing personnel policies, and working with a variety of stakeholders all involve time—and, indirectly, money.

Sustained funding as the branch campus develops is another challenge. Most universities do not want the branch to be a drain on home campus resources, and indeed some institutions expect overseas ventures to earn a

---

**While hard data are impossible to obtain, some reports have revealed that most branch campuses have not as yet met enrollment targets.**

---

profit. For public universities, legal requirements on public funds are an added challenge, given restrictions on spending public funds overseas. Branch campuses may be under considerable pressure to “break even” quickly. Where there are sponsors with deep pockets, as in the Gulf, pressures will be less intense, but the branch campuses will eventually need to be financially sustainable.

While there are little if any data available, it seems that the most financially successful branch campuses are those sponsored by less-prestigious universities and other educational providers, which offer programs that are inexpensive to provide and have a ready interest abroad. Quality standards are often low, and careful attention is given to the “bottom line,” with little regard for local relevance.

A quality-branch campus, even if it is small and specialized, requires careful financial planning in a context, which includes many variables that are difficult to measure or predict. The cost of coordination and administration at the home campus, direct instruction, maintaining appropriate enrollment and income levels, and other variables are extraordinarily difficult to forecast.

#### ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Worries have been raised about academic freedom at branch campuses. Although key leaders and relevant agreements guarantee academic freedom, many faculty are worried. What happens, some say, if a faculty member at a Dubai branch invites an Israeli speaker, or one in China invites the Dalai Lama or writes an op-ed highly critical of the authorities. How will authorities in countries without a stellar academic freedom record handle the branch campuses?

#### HOME CAMPUS POLITICS

Branch campus initiatives are typically proposed by top university management and not by the faculty or students. They may be seen as a way of boosting the university’s global image, contributing to internationalization, earning income, or a way to address other institutional strategic goals. The larger academic community is seldom involved in either planning or executing the branch campus initiative. Indeed, it is often hard to convince the faculty and students that branch campuses are worth the additional work, risk, and commitments required. Without faculty “buy in,” success is difficult. Reports of significant campus grumbling at New York University have been published, and campus opposition was cited as one of the reasons for the failure of Michigan State University’s branch campus in the Gulf.

---

**A quality-branch campus, even if it is small and specialized, requires careful financial planning in a context, which includes many variables that are difficult to measure or predict.**

---

Most recently, criticism at Yale University concerning that university’s partnership with the National University of Singapore, due to concerns about academic freedom and other issues has emerged in the media. International ventures have frequently been subject to considerable complaints in Australian universities as well, with members of the academic community criticizing commercial motivations and opposing straying from the university’s core academic mission. Press reports concerning virtually all branch campus initiatives have featured disputes between administrators and segments of the faculty.

#### OVERSEAS UNCERTAINTIES AND CHANGING POLICIES

The 21st century is the age of globalization. It is also an era of political instability and the transformation of national policies and priorities in many parts of the world. Branch

campuses operate in a national context. The current Arab Spring political and social unrest is an example of how drastically and unpredictably political circumstances change. It is impossible to know how the political and social transitions in the Middle East will affect branch campuses in the medium and long run.

The current debate in India—one of the world's largest potential student markets—about government policies relating to branch campuses and other foreign higher education initiatives—is yet another example of how unpredictable this environment can be. The terms and conditions of international involvement will be dramatically altered; and the practical aspects of how these policies will be implemented, in a country famous for opaque regulations, will only emerge over time. Branch campuses are vulnerable to changing and sometimes unstable environments.

#### DIFFERING EXPECTATIONS

Experience shows that at times conflicting expectations of the sponsoring university and the host country or sponsor can result in serious problems. Contractual agreements may be interpreted alternatively—sometimes leading to conflicts among participating parties or even the closure of the branch. A number of these conflicts resulting from differing or interpretations of agreements are, even in this early stage of the branch campus phenomenon, already evident. The problems may be exacerbated when one side—usually the host country—is investing the bulk of the funds.

#### A BUBBLE?

Obviously, numerous and fundamental problems are facing branch campuses. Even if the basic concept is viable, the risks are substantial. If one accepts the enthusiastic comments and the range of plans and start-ups, there may be a bubble in the making. A necessary episode to recall is that 20 or more American universities rushed to Japan in the 1980s to start branches, but only 2 survived. Exactly the same kinds of misunderstandings, insufficient advance planning, unrealistic expectations on both sides, and cross-national confusion that can be seen today led to the failure of most of the Japanese ventures.

The lesson—caveat everyone! ■

## What International Students Think about US Higher Education

PATRICIA CHOW

*Patricia Chow is on the staff of the research and evaluation department, at the Institute of International Education, New York. E-mail: iieresearch@iie.org (for more information or a copy of the complete report).*

According to the *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*, in 2009/10, the United States hosted a record high of 691,000 international students from over 200 places of origin. While the United States does not practice a national strategy for the recruitment of international students, strategies implemented by other host destinations, both traditional and emerging, are creating a competitive global environment for recruiting top talent from around the world. In recent years, many host countries have ramped up efforts to internationalize their academic institutions, and students around the world are now choosing to study abroad in a much-wider variety of destinations.

To comprehend the concepts of potential international students around the world about US higher education—the Institute of International Education, in cooperation with the US Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and EducationUSA, conducted a series of perceptual and attitudinal surveys in 11 key original places. The following research questions are explored: Why do students from other countries wish to study in the United States? What course of study do they intend to pursue? Do they prefer the United States to other key destinations? What barriers do students face who wish to study in the United States? The Institute of International Education began surveying students in Vietnam and India in 2009; followed by Mexico, Thailand, and Hong Kong in spring 2010; Brazil, Germany, Turkey, and the United Kingdom during summer 2010; and Nigeria and South Africa in fall 2010. A total of 9,330 valid responses were received.

#### PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

The majority of respondents worldwide (55%) were female; 35 percent were current high school students; 40 percent were undergraduate degree students (or had completed an undergraduate degree but no graduate degree); 15 percent were graduate students; and 10 percent had another academic level, including nondegree students and students at two-year colleges or technical schools.



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider "following" us on Twitter!

### PREFERRED STUDY DESTINATIONS

The most popular first-choice destination chosen by respondents worldwide was the United States, with 75 percent of prospective study-abroad students listing the United States as their first-choice destination in an open-ended question. The United Kingdom was the next most popular first-choice destination, with 8 percent of the total, followed by Canada (5%) and Australia (3%).

The preferred destinations chosen by respondents reflect the existing patterns of global student mobility. Currently, the United States hosts 20 percent of the 3.3 million students worldwide who are pursuing higher education outside their home countries. The United Kingdom has the next-largest fraction, with 13 percent of the total, followed by France (8%), Germany (7%), China (7%), Australia (7%), Canada (4%), and Japan (4%) (Project Atlas, [www.iie.org/projectatlas](http://www.iie.org/projectatlas)). While Spain does not figure among the top eight host destinations worldwide, it is a popular study-abroad destination for students from Latin America.

---

**Why do students from other countries wish to study in the United States? What course of study do they intend to pursue?**

---

### IMPRESSIONS OF KEY HOST DESTINATIONS

The majority of students rated the United States more positively than other potential destinations in most of the areas surveyed. This was expected given that the students were prospecting study in the United States; however, the magnitude of the preference was quite large in many cases. For example, over three-quarters (76%) of respondents worldwide perceived the United States to have a wide range of schools and programs, as compared with 35 percent for the United Kingdom and 28 percent for Canada—the host destinations with the next-highest percentages. Similarly, over three-quarters (76%) of respondents worldwide also perceived the United States to have a high-quality higher education system, as compared with 50 percent for the United Kingdom, 33 percent for Canada, and 31 percent for Germany—the host destinations with the next-highest percentages. In addition, over two-thirds (69%) of respondents worldwide felt that the United States welcomes international students, as compared with 42 percent for Canada, 34 percent for Australia, and 33 percent for the United Kingdom—the host destinations with the next-highest percentages.

The United States was also perceived to be a host destination with many scholarship opportunities and good stu-

dent support services by over half of respondents (59% and 57%, respectively). This is a significantly higher proportion than the other host destinations received (22% and 30%, respectively, for Canada—the next highest). However, 60 percent of respondents worldwide felt that tuition in the United States is expensive—the highest among all of the host destinations. Only the United Kingdom was roughly

---

**With regard to language, Japan was rated a host destination with a significant language barrier by the highest number of respondents worldwide, at 97 percent; followed by Germany and France, with 56 percent each.**

---

comparable, with 51 percent. In addition, 49 percent of respondents felt that the United States had difficult or complex student visa procedures and also the highest of any of the host destinations. Only 23 percent of respondents felt that the United Kingdom had difficult or complex student visa procedures—the host destination with the next-highest percentage. The United Kingdom was rated a host destination with a high cost of living by the highest number of respondents worldwide, at 54 percent, followed by the United States with 45 percent, Japan with 34 percent, and France with 33 percent.

With regard to language, Japan was rated a host destination with a significant language barrier by the highest number of respondents worldwide, at 97 percent; followed by Germany and France, with 56 percent each.

The results of the survey indicate that despite not having any national policies designed to attract students from other countries, the United States remains well-positioned in the international student marketplace—with various “pull factors” (causing students to choose a specific destination over others) attracting students to the United States. Among these, the high quality and diverse range of US higher education institutions predominate. The perception that the United States is a welcoming country for international students is also significant. However, “anti-push factors” (roadblocks for students who otherwise might wish to study internationally) also exist, with cost predominating. The difficulty of obtaining a student visa is also a negative factor, although it is not perceived to be as great a barrier as cost and varies by country. ■

---

# The Arab Spring: The Higher Education Revolution That Is Yet to Happen

ANDRÉ ELIAS MAZAWI

*André Elias Mazawi is professor in the Department of Educational Studies, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. He is also affiliate professor, at the Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Educational Research, University of Malta, Malta. E-mail: Andre.Mazawi@ubc.ca.*

For let Philosopher and Doctor preach  
Of what they will, and what they will not—each  
Is but one Link in an external Chain  
That none can slip, nor break, nor over-reach.  
—Omar Khayyam (translated by Edward Fitzgerald)

The overthrow of the Tunisian and Egyptian rulers, following widespread demonstrations for regime change—subsequently, spreading from Algeria to Yemen, as well as to Libya, Syria, Jordan, and Bahrain—has raised hopes for a new political dawn across the Arab region. Likened to a “volcano” by some observers, protest movements call for new forms of citizenship and for the establishing of new bases of state legitimacy. Commentators refer to a long overdue “political spring.” Others invoke the notion of a “renaissance” or a renewed “Arab awakening.” Others, still, refer to a watershed of “revolutions” ushering in new forms of politics, attuned to questions of human rights and public participation. In response, reform initiatives have been frenetically introduced by ruling elites in their attempts to contain and navigate the ensuing legitimacy crisis. At this juncture, one wonders how do the unfolding political upheavals across the Arab region and the reform initiatives introduced by besieged ruling elites affect state–higher education relations more particularly?

## HIGHER EDUCATION AND REGIME LEGITIMACY

Higher education institutions in the Arab region play a key role in upholding a regime’s self-projected image of benevolent rule. They provide access to educational credentials to younger generations of high school graduates, particularly those originating from less-established socioeconomic strata and who desperately seek entry into structurally confined labor markets. Equally, they secure stable civil-service jobs to academics and intellectuals, affiliated with the middle and middle-upper classes. The latter represent a mount-

ing political force, disposed to engage a range of political ideologies not always aligned with regime orthodoxy. Not least, they offer ruling elites a space from which they can recruit or co-opt state ministers, senior professional cadres, and policymakers from among the professoriate.

Ruling elites regulate appointments to leadership positions within higher education institutions. Some “reforms” were undertaken in view of limiting faculty and student participation in governance and containing opposition groups. For instance, in Egypt, law 142 of 1994 added deans to the list of senior university officials who are appointed by the minister of higher education. Consequently, university councils included members who were largely ministerial appointees, with little (if any) space left for nonappointed voices, such as faculty members and students.

## CONTRADICTORY OR COMPLIMENTARY POLICY AGENDAS?

The state’s involvement in the political subordination of higher education occurs alongside policies that seek to realign higher education with labor market “needs,” through increased accountability and economic liberalization, in an attempt to foster innovative academic and administrative leadership capacities and improve governance. Egypt’s Higher Education Enhancement Project (funded by the World Bank), and Syria’s Quality University Management and Institutional Autonomy framework (as part of the European Union’s Tempus Project) are pertinent examples. Policymakers also invoke the low ranking of universities on international university lists as an additional “evidence” to justify higher education restructuring.

Thus, political subordination and economic liberalization feed on each other. On the one hand, the state’s political subordination of higher education institutions subverts the emergence of an authentic academic leadership and emphasizes authoritarian modes of decision making. On the other hand, reforms seeking to promote the economic contributions of higher education introduce layers of accountability and new conditions of academic work, without ensuring academic freedom or questioning existing authoritarian modes of governance. Viewed as part of the building of a so-called “Arab knowledge society,” liberalization reforms (part of fiscal restructuring schemes) introduce new forms of higher education provision—such as private, international, and for-profit institutions, in an attempt to create alternative options to state-sponsored higher education. This has been the case, for instance, in Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan, and the smaller Gulf Cooperation Council states—differences between these contexts notwithstanding.

Ruling elites and policymakers reconcile these ostensibly contradictory policy discourses by limiting discussions on higher education to issues associated with “human capi-

tal.” Emphasis is placed on measurable indicators of higher education performance, in terms of engaging labor markets, employability, and economic returns of graduates. At the same time, the political contexts under which higher education institutions may best thrive are neglected. Thus, questions pertaining to faculty and student participation in higher education governance, and their effects on the fostering of a research culture, are left entirely unattended—fuelling resentment, alienation, and disillusionment in relation to both the state and higher education institutions, alike. The subordination of higher education institutions further erodes the public respectability these institutions have traditionally enjoyed. It also lays bare—as sociologist M’hammed Sabour has shown in *The Ontology and Status of Intellectuals in Arab Academia and Society*—the marginality of the academic, who very often lacks the capacity “to speak truth to power” from within institutional platforms without risking the regime’s retaliation and reprisal.

---

**It is not yet clear what configurations of state higher education relations would emerge out of the current political contestation.**

---

With an overwhelming reliance of the Arab state on foreign consultancies and imported know-how, higher education institutions are further limited in their capacity to productively engage development challenges or contribute to the indigenization of knowledge through viable context-based approaches to research—particularly in the fields of the social sciences and education. Paradoxically, while the restructuring reforms preceding the current wave of regime contestation have expanded higher education opportunities beyond recognition, often over quite a brief period of time, these reforms have nonetheless exposed the reliance of both the state and higher education institutions on precarious visions of modernity and globalization.

#### **RECONSTRUCTING HIGHER EDUCATION FROM WITHIN**

It is not yet clear what configurations of state higher education relations would emerge out of the current political contestation. Nor is it clear whether and how the contestation witnessed so far would affect higher education governance more particularly. What is clear, however, is that for the generative capacities of higher education to flourish, both the state and civil-society groups and movements must

recognize that the political, cultural, and economic roles of higher education institutions cannot be approached separately.

What is equally clear is that academics need to turn their research tools inward, by critically unpacking the foundations of the higher education structures in which they work and by critically reflecting on their implication with state power. Such a critical engagement would help reclaim not only the centrality of academic work in development but would also connect the academic workplace with community engagement and social transformation. The prospects of this reclaiming are not solely contingent on governance reforms for greater faculty and student participation or on the overthrowing of despotic regimes, as important as these are. These outlooks are primarily contingent on the arduous struggle of academics involved in building an inclusive “knowledge culture” and in constructing a knowing self for whom the “capacity to aspire” and the capacity to differ are inalienable rights, which no regime nor other forms of power can “slip, nor break, nor overreach.” ■

---



---

## Egyptian Private Higher Education at a Crossroads

**DANIEL C. LEVY AND MANAR SABRY**

*Daniel C. Levy is distinguished professor and director of the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, NY. E-mail: dlevy@albany.edu. Manar Sabry has worked in international and Egyptian policy agencies. He holds a PhD from the University at Albany. E-mail: msabry@buffalo.edu.*

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

The revolution that toppled the Mubarak regime opens the door to uncertain political, economic, and social futures. These futures will condition higher education outcomes. One important development to scrutinize is the fate of private higher education. Will the private sector see continued growth or be constrained by political populism or take some different course altogether? Revolutions have often been antithetical to private higher education.

The Egyptian Revolution comes amid a period of national and general regional growth of private higher education. Indeed, the Middle East is the last region to establish the private sector across the breadth of its countries. Apart from a few precursors such as the American University in Cairo, the private sector is basically a creation of the last two decades. Egypt first allowed private universities through a 1992 law. As in many matters—social, cultural, and political—Egypt can be the most influential country in trends in the Arab region.

#### PRIVATE SIZE AND GROWTH

Reflecting their recency, private universities' share in Egypt is still small. They have just 4.2 percent (2010) of the country's nearly 1.8 million university enrollment. However, that level is more than double its share over the last five years, while the number of private universities has risen to 20 out of the country's 39. Several of these private universities are new and not yet tallied in enrollment, but they hold potential for private-sector growth. The private sector already maintains some 83 percent of nonuniversity enrollment. Although these total enrollments are short of half a million, the private nonuniversity share is so high that, all in all, the private universities account for 19 percent of Egyptian higher education enrollment.

---

### The Egyptian Revolution comes amid a period of national and general regional growth of private higher education.

---

Such a private share is below the global private higher education proportion of 31 percent, but not unusual for the Arab region. Although nonuniversity private higher education existed in many Middle East countries, until the 1990s public education was the norm in all countries except Lebanon. But the private sector—including private universities—has spread to almost all Arab countries, though enrollment varies by country. The private share reaches 66 percent in Bahrain and 55 percent in Lebanon, 36 percent in Jordan, 28 percent in Oman, and 21 percent in Yemen. But Syria, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, and Tunisia are among countries with under 10 percent private at least on the university side.

On the other hand, gauging private enrollment in Egypt and many other Arab countries is confounded by the phenomenon of “private” students in public universities. In

effect, the budget for public higher education fails to meet the heavily increasing demand for higher education, but political or constitutional commitment to free education prevents universities from charging tuition fees to increase revenues. One outlet is growth of private institutions. A second is the fee-paying students in “parallel programs” in public universities. Preferring public universities for their quality, status, and legitimacy, many students who fail to make the regular quota are willing to pay substantially more than their student counterparts within the same public institutions. These parallel programs have been under attack for their low quality and charges often leveled against private universities, as well.

In Egypt, the parallel programs have recently been abolished. This does not represent a revolutionary attack on any private higher education, however. In fact, the decision was made in the Mubarek administration and carried over by the interim government.

#### REGULATION

But what policy might be directly challenging private higher education? The interim government has not done much but, to the chagrin of the opposition, has done rather little in higher education overall. The just-appointed minister, former vice president of graduate studies and research at Cairo University, has also been a vice president at the British-related private university and a consultant to its French counterpart. This seems no portend of imminent anti-private higher education policy. What might happen next under an elected government is of course speculative, but some general perspectives are worth considering.

For one thing, there is no sign of a revolutionary attack on private higher education, in general. The idea of that sector is accepted (except on the Marxist left). Furthermore, the private sector is not high on any party's education agenda, at least for the time being. Most of the reform rhetoric about higher education is vague, cherishing ideals of “justice,” “equity,” and “transparency.” Nonetheless, such ideals often lend themselves to regulations that undercut private higher education, even if without hostile intent.

Prior to his appointment, the new minister had spoken of the challenges facing private universities, regarding the low qualifications of admitted students. He emphasizes the need for explicit admissions criteria as well as research and graduate study. But the question is how to accomplish appropriate admissions criteria and maintain or expand enrollment? Additionally, research is rarely a major undertaking in private higher education outside the United States. In fact, regulations already on the books deal with admissions scores, maximum enrollment, and minimum percentages of full-time faculty. Yet, a vital question for the

private sector is often how (and how much) such regulations are *enforced*. The minister also calls for private higher education to rely less on public university professors.

What will public policy insist upon as far as private distinctiveness from public? On the one hand, the new minister says private universities should be distinctive, not “duplicating” public ones and thus offering new programs—perhaps an unfriendly view to the idea of direct intersectoral competition. On the other hand, given revolutionary concern with equity and the privileged social background of most private higher education students, regulations about access cannot be ruled out nor can caps on the amount of tuition rises. Already evident is a public policy orientation to discourage for-profit private higher education, the installation of which is popularly associated with the Mubarak regime’s cronyism with business. Again, the new minister encourages the expansion of nonprofit private universities. Notions of appropriate participation might conceivably also lead to regulations about representation on university bodies.

Regulation will of course not be the only determinant of private higher education’s prospects. Will broad public policy swing much away from the capitalist road that had brought wealth but heightened inequality? Will economic growth resume, with the favorable prospects it held for private higher education expansion, or will today’s economic uncertainty cloud the prospects? ■

---



---

## Partnerships in Africa in the New Era of Internationalization

**DAMTEW TEFERRA**

*Damtew Teferra is the founding director of the International Network on Higher Education in Africa at the CIHE. E-mail: teferra@bc.edu.*

One of the popular approaches to revitalize higher education in Africa and the buzzword of the sector is currently partnerships. To be sure, higher education in Africa has always been an international affair, owing to its history and trajectory; and, thus, this development may not appear surprising. This article analyzes emerging trends in higher education partnerships in Africa and explores opportunities and challenges, based on recent developments and past experience.

### MARKETPLACE OF HIGHER EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS

It was once thought that Africa would become less attractive to the rest of the world with the cessation of hostilities between the Cold War–era rivals. In 20 years, that prediction proved to be wrong as the contemporary economic and (geo)political realities have prompted the re-engagement of both “historical” and emerging powers regarding Africa.

As part of that larger global reality, higher education in the region has also reignited interest globally—including the European Union, the United States, Canada, China, India, and Brazil. The snapshot of some of these partnerships follows.

*Africa-US higher education initiative.* In July 2007, a group of universities, based in the United States and Africa, came together to launch a partnership initiative to strengthen African higher education’s capacity to contribute in priority-development areas. The 2010 US Omnibus Appropriations bill commits US\$15 million for the partnership (<http://www.aplu.org>).

*Canada–Africa higher education partnership.* The Association of African Universities (AAU), in partnership with the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), has launched “Strengthening Higher Education Stakeholder Relations in Africa.” This plan’s three components include: Strengthening African University Outreach, University-Industry Linkages, and Strengthening AAU Stakeholder Relations working in partnership with AUCC (<http://www.aau.org>).

*Southern Africa–Nordic partnerships.* University cooperation between Southern African countries and Nordic university cooperation (SANORD) is a partnership of 25 research-led higher education institutions from Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden; and institutions in Malawi, South Africa, and Zambia. SANORD aims to advance multilateral academic collaboration between institutions in the Nordic countries and the Southern African regions, addressing challenges of innovation and development (<http://sanord.uwc.ac.za/>).

*European Union–African Union partnership in higher education.* The European Union and African Union are partnering, in different schemes, to vitalize the higher education sector in Africa. These include the launching of the Intra-ACP Mobility Scheme, what is now called the Nyrere Consolidated Scholarship Program, Harmonization and Tuning Project, and the PanAfrican University Initiative.

*Scandinavian partnerships.* Partnerships between Scandinavian and African universities is probably a most sustained and impressive cooperation. Norway and Sweden in particular have committed a large sum of funds for several decades, even when support for higher education in Africa was out of favor. At a National Seminar on Norwegian Sup-

port to Higher Education in Tanzania in Dar es Salaam, in November 2010, it was reported that NORAD granted in excess of 750 million NOK.

*The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).* For more than two decades, DAAD has also been a significant player of university partnerships in Africa. Currently, there are more than 35 partnerships with one or more African partners. Additionally, five new African centers of excellence and five new international centers of excellence with participation from African universities are supported. A new partnership approach enables the collaboration of DAAD and the German University Association with university associations and higher education regulators on the development of quality-assurance systems (<http://www.daad.de>).

---

**This plan's three components include: Strengthening African University Outreach, University-Industry Linkages, and Strengthening AAU Stakeholder Relations**

---

#### THE "HISTORICAL" PARTNERS

Guided by a variety of objectives and interest, numerous university cooperations between Africa and its other "historical" partners now exist. These include the Austrian Partnership Program in Higher Education and Research for Development (APPEAR), the University Commission for Cooperation with Developing countries (CUD, Belgium), the Irish African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (IAP), the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), and the United Kingdom's Education Partnerships for Africa (EPA).

#### THE EMERGING PARTNERS

Emerging economic and political powers—such as, Brazil, China, and India—are also engaged in a host of university-development support, as well as the capacity-building effort in Africa. Russia and other former eastern bloc countries are also throwing themselves into the act, after two decades of absence from educational engagement in the region. South Africa, the regional powerhouse, is also striving to establish university partnerships with other African countries.

#### INTERNATIONALIZATION AS INSTRUMENT OF CAPACITY BUILDING

Needless to say, partnerships are vital for capacity building in teaching, learning, and research. Joint-research activities play an important role in fostering research capacity, nurturing research culture, pushing the frontiers of knowledge, as well as benchmarking quality. Meticulously developed long-term, joint-research partnerships have shown successful results.

In Ethiopia, for instance, interuniversity cooperations sustained through the support of the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and the Flemish Interuniversity Council–University Development Cooperation (VLIR-UOS), in Belgium, have had impressive results. A large pool of PhDs produced; numerous programs have been developed; and sustainable capacities have been put in place. The same is true for Tanzania through NORAD support. Many agree that such results would have simply been impossible without the financial, logistical, and human resources made possible through long-term joint commitment.

#### NURTURING THE GOOD AND UPROOTING THE BAD

When capacity building in the context of university cooperation is often invoked, the perceptions are that the southern partners are the predominant, if not the sole, beneficiaries of cooperation. Even more disenchanting is that this per-

---

**The European Union and African Union are partnering, in different schemes, to vitalize the higher education sector in Africa.**

---

ception is often internalized by the southern partners. Yet, while their benefits have not been clearly, and explicitly, documented, the northern partners also gain from the partnerships in many ways.

Even without regard to the immediate and visible benefits, the know-how to address such problems generates institutional and national knowledge capital for the north. In the current global realities, where the global is local and the local is global, the mutual benefits from such cooperation should not be underestimated and, for sure, not overlooked.

While the modality and scope of partnerships—to become specific higher education partnerships—are diverse, complex, and numerous, these practices, however, are not always successful; nor are they effective. In many cases,



partnerships do not simply live up to expectations for a number of reasons: from paltry financial resources to weak logistical support, from poor planning to substandard execution, from bad policy to cumbersome guidelines, and from unstable leadership to inconsistent follow-up.

### CONCLUSION

With the declaration of higher education as a vital development tool, multilateral and bilateral regimes, foundations, and other development partners now favor the support of the sector, though still with constrained enthusiasm as the latest African Commission Report (2010) indicates. However, prevalence of competing donor-driven agendas, lack of sustainability, unpredictability of donor resources, poor harmonization, and weak coordination and management still hamper this development.

As the number of institutional partnerships grow, their impact on institutional resources (time, funding, and infrastructure) and institutional dynamics (cohesion, complementarity, and priorities) may be considerable. This may be particularly so in countries with few “partnerable” institutions, in a region that tends to attract more development support.

Finally, it is imperative that the marketplace of partnerships discoursed in the region is guided by well-informed, responsible, and pragmatic stakeholders in the south and the north. At the end, it is in the best interest of all the stakeholders, both in the north and the south, to have a sustained impact and meaningful outcome in the reengagement with Africa. ■

---



---

## The Value of Research Networks in Africa

PIYUSHI KOTECHA

*Piyushi Kotecha is chief executive officer of the Southern African Regional Universities Association. E-mail: piyushi@sarua.org.*

Much of the discourse around higher education in the southern African region promotes the imperative of a knowledge economy. However, participation in today’s globalized economy requires significant investment in capacity and systems needed to generate, use, and share knowledge.

The past three years have witnessed unprecedented improvements in telecommunications infrastructure in the South African Development Community region, bringing

the goal of a knowledge economy within closer reach of SADC’s 15-member countries and their research and educational institutions. However, without concerted support for the creation of research and education networks that connect nation states with each other and the rest of the world, the full opportunities presented by recent technological developments are unlikely to be realized.

### CONNECTIVITY: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

At the end of 2007, only three of the 15 SADC countries—Angola, South Africa, and Mauritius—had access to a single international submarine cable known as SAT3/SAFE. The international bandwidth of most SADC countries was still below 100 megabits per second (Mbps), while landlocked countries—such as Malawi, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, and the island nation of Madagascar—had no external fiber connectivity at all.

By 2010, however, the region had access to three submarine networks and now has the potential to benefit from lower connectivity costs. All countries, with the exception of the Democratic Republic of Congo, had high-capacity-fiber connections to their neighbors and onward, to the rest of the world. All countries had over 100 Mbps, with South Africa registering several gigabits of international fiber connectivity—a first in Africa.

The future continues to look highly positive: by 2012 it is envisaged that all SADC countries will have fiber connectivity to at least two networks at competitive prices, and the region will be connected to Europe by at least six submarine cables.

Broadly speaking, improved information and communications technologies mean that universities and researchers gain more ability to access global research facilities, collaborate with experts in the continent and the world, conduct complex research and, essentially, build, store, and share their own knowledge bases. In the SADC region, in particular, this tendency gives countries the opportunity to participate in emerging regional research facilities—such as the Square Kilometre Array radio telescope—or take advantage of high performance computing facilities being established in South Africa.

However, without national research and education networks, which constitute the building blocks for an inclusive regional network, the full benefits of the telecommunications liberalization currently sweeping through Africa are unlikely to be realized.

### NETWORKS: NATIONAL AND REGIONAL ASSETS

Studies in Europe support the idea that national research and education networks are a national asset for economic growth and prosperity (<http://www.serenate.org/publications/d21-serenate.pdf>). Not only are such practices a fun-

damental source of innovation, allowing researchers to pursue complex research; but they provide a fast and widespread technology transfer to society and industry—unlocking the potential of theoretical research to produce both social benefits and commercial applications. These networks are considered vital national assets that support research, innovation, and collaboration in all fields, with direct contributions to knowledge production and advancement in the areas of education, health, environment and climate, biotechnology, and science and technology.

---

**The past three years have witnessed unprecedented improvements in telecommunications infrastructure in the South African Development Community region.**

---

At a regional level, not only do networks improve the academic and research project by linking academics and researchers across borders, but they can be a powerful economic tool. In Africa, in particular, where the costs of telecommunication remain relatively high, they have the potential, as argued by Duncan Martin in a 2010 Southern African Regional Universities Association's report, to play a role as "a non profit-seeking aggregator of [educational] institutions' buying power." He goes on to state that national research and education networks have "ever-widening opportunities" to deliver more bandwidth at lower costs, by becoming operators themselves and by developing their own infrastructure—where this makes economic sense.

In the context of relative scarcity in the region, pooling facilities and resources to achieve an efficient, high-speed, interconnected regional network with a conducive policy environment would give all countries the chance to reap benefits.

#### CHALLENGES FOR THE SADC REGION

All countries in Europe, North America, and (to a large extent) Asia, Latin America, and North Africa have established national research and education networks. Yet, the SADC region lags behind significantly, with only two functional national networks—in South Africa and Malawi—while most other SADC countries have networks in formation only.

The challenges facing SADC countries are not insignificant: they range from limited national telecommunications facilities to poor-campus infrastructural facilities.

There are also problems associated with a lack of coherent policies, strategies, and plans for research networking at all levels—as well as the absence of national regulatory frameworks in which to promote cross-border connectivity.

Lack of government investment is another challenge. Greater commitment from individual SADC-member states is needed to stimulate the operation of the networks in each country and enable relevant stakeholders to focus on the promotion of cross-border links through the regional network.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF LEADERSHIP

Studies suggest that in the developed world, high-speed connectivity for academic and research purposes has, in the main, been the product of direct government intervention and support. The establishment, based on South African government funding, of the South African National Research Network—with Gigabit-speed connectivity for academic and research networking—shows what is possible when forward-thinking leadership intersects with innovation. Already, this network is linking major universities in South Africa's Gauteng province, thus accelerating cutting-edge research and development.

---

**The future continues to look highly positive: by 2012 it is envisaged that all SADC countries will have fiber connectivity to at least two networks at competitive prices.**

---

Other developments serve a potential impetus for the development of a regional network in Africa and the operationalization of nascent national research and education networks. These procedures include the establishment of the Ubuntunet Alliance, recognized by the European Union as a possible operator of a regional research and education network, comprising cross-border links between national research and education networks in eastern and southern Africa. The West and Central African Research and Education Network—a regional research network for west and central Africa—has also been formed.

Also encouraging is the recent interest by the European Union, through the AfricaConnect Project, in providing stimulus funds for African research and education networks operation. AfricaConnect is a poverty reduction program that aims to harness the potential of information and communications technologies for sustainable development of the region

**QUO VADIS?**

Ideally, the development of regional networks should be part of a broader cross-border regional program for information and communications technology in higher education. Such an ambitious and wide-ranging project requires support and investment—not only from national governments but from the private sector, donor community, and the regional higher education sector itself. It is only in bringing together such role-players that the region is likely to take tangible steps toward realizing its ideal of full participation in the global knowledge economy. ■

---



---

## International Lessons for Africa's Higher Education and Economy

**PUNDY PILLAY**

*Pundy Pillay is professor of economics and public finance at the Graduate School of Public and Development Management, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. He has been head of the Policy Unit in the South African Presidency. E-mail: pillayp@mweb.co.za and pundy.pillay@wits.ac.za.*

What possible lessons can policymakers draw from the higher education and economic development experience of Finland, South Korea, and North Carolina (US)? This article contends that African countries should focus on the following areas: economic and education planning; high-quality schooling; institutional differentiation; the role of the state; regional development; and cooperation and networks.

**ECONOMIC AND EDUCATION PLANNING**

All three systems illustrate the benefits of maintaining a close link between economic and education planning. Likewise, in Finland, policy decisions were taken to focus on the development of a knowledge economy. In South Korea, the government has been unashamedly interventionist in both sectors to promote overall social and economic development. North Carolina does not hold a formal state government-induced planning in either the education or economic sectors. However, a close working relationship exists between the education and economic bureaucracies in the state government, the private-business sector, and public higher education institutions—to achieve the education and training, as well as research and innovation objectives, necessary for economic and broader development.

**HIGH-QUALITY SCHOOLING**

Both the Finnish and South Korean models show how crucial high-quality schooling is for the development of a high-quality higher education system. Unlike in Finland and South Korea, the quality of schooling (and of higher education) in North Carolina varies substantially across the state.

**INSTITUTIONAL DIFFERENTIATION**

A dual/binary higher education system can be effective in meeting national development goals and has been developed in varying degrees in the three systems. In Finland, the two higher education subsectors have fundamentally different roles. In South Korea, there is clear functional differentiation between colleges and universities. In North Carolina, the postsecondary sector—including universities and community colleges—is appropriately differentiated to cater to the differing needs of the population and the economy. However, with little differentiation within the university sector, almost all of them aspire to becoming “world-class” research institutions.

**THE STATE'S ROLE**

The Finnish system demonstrates that the state through its role—inter alia, in funding—can ensure the development of a higher education system that is appropriate to the country's needs. In South Korea, the state has chosen to play a much more dominant role in the development of the schooling system—compared to higher education, which is largely private. In North Carolina, the role of the state is that of a facilitator and a serious funding source. As a facilitator it has driven important partnerships with the private-business sector and higher education institutions.

**REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

In Finland, universities and polytechnics spread over the entire country in collaboration with one another and with local government and business to ensure greater equity in regional development. South Korea is now addressing regional development through such initiatives as the New University for Regional Innovation.

**COOPERATION AND NETWORKS**

The Finnish system is characterized by a high degree of consensus building and cooperation between stakeholders in the higher education system—including institutions, government, public-funding agencies, and the private sector. This has been a key factor in stimulating efficiency and effectiveness in the distribution of resources and the development of appropriate education and research outcomes.

In Korea, the hand of government is clearly “visible” in all components of the education system, including oversight of the private sector. Historically, an important net-

work has been the collaboration between the relevant government ministries, the public-research institutions, and the large private-sector companies (*chaebols*)—with respect to research and development. Increasingly today, universities, particularly the large public institutions, are becoming an important fourth component of this group, as they develop their research and development capacity.

The North Carolina case study shows how effective relationships can be developed between the higher education system, on the one hand, and government, the private-business sector, and civil society broadly, on the other—to promote economic, social, and environmental development. None of these affiliations have been legislated, but they have come about through a common commitment to the development of the state.

---

**A dual/binary higher education system can be effective in meeting national development goals and has been developed in varying degrees in the three systems.**

---

From the above, there are several important reasons why policymakers in sub-Saharan African countries should take note of the relevance of higher education for general development and economic development, specifically. The relationship between higher education and economic development is incontrovertible. Through its education and training as well as research functions, higher education can enable countries both to raise economic growth rates and increase participation in the knowledge-based economy. In the globalizing world, African countries do not need to base their economies solely on the production of primary commodities and manufactured goods, requiring skills provided by primary and secondary education. It is possible for developing/poor countries to focus likewise on the production of value-adding goods and services, requiring skills provided by the higher education system. The advantage of the latter strategy is that it can raise growth rates much more rapidly—enabling, *inter alia*, the government to expand the provision of economic and social services to people trapped in poverty.

China and India provide the best current examples of how developing countries have abandoned traditional patterns of economic development that characterized the growth paths of today's industrialized countries. To enable countries to develop a component of the knowledge economy within their borders requires the development of a pro-

ductive higher education system. Obviously, this practice is limited by resource constraints and intersectoral competition for resources (e.g., schooling, health).

#### CONCLUSION

The case for African policymakers to undertake higher education seriously is a strong one from a development perspective. In this regard, consideration must be given to the following factors: (1) improving access to and quality in schooling; (2) linking education and, specifically, higher education to economic development policies; (3) ensuring clear institutional differentiation to enable optimal utilization of limited resources and more efficient attainment of development goals; (4) committing to the development of an equitable higher education system in terms of gender, socioeconomic status, and region. ■

---

## Who Will Pay and Who Benefits from Ecuador's New Free Higher Education?

#### DAVID POST

*David Post is professor of education policy at Pennsylvania State University and editor of Comparative Education Review. He spent 2009/10 as a visiting researcher at FLACSO (Latin American School of Social Sciences), Quito, Ecuador. E-mail: post@psu.edu.*

Who benefits from “free” higher education can be a touchy question. Structural adjustments and conditioned World Bank loans forced many countries to scale back on investment in public goods, and many defenders of public subsidy made arguments centered on social equity. Subsidies of universities do have spill-over benefits for society—citizenship, trust, the arts, and locally relevant research. But an empirical question, difficult to avoid, is which groups of children most benefit from subsidy to higher education when they enter the workforce.

Ecuador has become the latest testing ground for the attempt to use higher education to reverse decades of racial and social inequality through its prohibition—following a new constitution in 2008—of fees for all public education (including public universities). Equity was the main reason for making education “free” for university students. But the preliminary results of this experiment are not encouraging: so far, those who have been most rewarded by the suspension of fees are members of groups that were already advantaged and likely to attend.

### FULL FAMILY COSTS OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

Reasons are not difficult to fathom. Universities are expensive for families in Latin America and in much of the world, not because of the fees they charge. This was especially not a barrier for public universities in Ecuador prior to 2009, because universities used a sliding scale based on income. Instead of direct fees, the biggest expense comes from the years of sacrifice by families when they encourage their children to study and eventually to pass competitive entrance exams, as opposed to working to support the household economy. In recent years, although about 80 percent of each birth cohort entered secondary schools, there was a large dropout rate among the poor. Only about half of each cohort finishes secondary schooling and is thus eligible for “free” university attendance.

---

**Ecuador has become the latest testing ground for the attempt to use higher education to reverse decades of racial and social inequality.**

---

The elimination of student fees at public universities in Ecuador expresses the ideals enshrined in the 2008 Constitution. Article 356 (unofficial translation) states:

Public higher education will be free through the undergraduate level. Admission to public higher education institutions will be regulated through a system of evaluation defined under the law. . . . regardless of whether public or private, equality of opportunity in access is guaranteed, as well as equality in persistence, mobility, and exit, with the exception of the fees charged by private higher education.

But the translation of good intentions in public policy is complicated, and ideals often produce unintended consequences.

### A LOOK AT THE DATA

If one examines Ecuador’s 2001 population census, together with more recent nationally representative household employment surveys, one can detect a growing gap in access by race, income, and home language. For example, among those born in 1990, university attainment rates were only about 5 percent for those self-identifying as “Black” and 8 percent for those self-identifying as “indigenous.” The rates were about 20 percent for those who described themselves as “mestizo” and 25 percent for those who were “White.” These gaps have not been accurately measured until now. It

is worrisome that the gaps seem to be growing, and it was to reverse such trend that the constitution declared that public higher education would be free of direct costs to students

Despite an admirable goal, if one analyzes surveys conducted a year after the suspension of user fees, it is possible to observe a widening gap in access to Ecuador’s public universities, following the suspension of fees: there is a growing attendance gap between the more-privileged and less-privileged populations of the country.

Consider two findings from these analyses. First, we can consider postsecondary access depending on the language spoken by a child’s parents. Using the 2009 surveys alongside those from 2008 and 2007, we can estimate with high-statistical certainty the percentages of Ecuadorians in each language group who entered a public university in 2007 (just before the constitutional reform), in 2008 (the year of the new constitution), and in 2009 (the year after “free” public education arrived). Only 4 percent of college-age children whose parents spoke an indigenous language were in public universities in 2007, and this increased only to 5 percent by 2009, with “free” tuition. By contrast, in 2007, the college-going rate was 13 percent for those whose parents spoke only Spanish, and their rate increased to 17 percent by 2009. Consequently, the gap between groups is greater now than in 2007. Second, consider a simple indicator of family poverty. Ecuador uses a sophisticated metric of income and household welfare to define which households are qualified to receive a monthly supplement of US\$38. From 2007 to 2009, one sees a slight increase in the rates

---

**How could Ecuador level the playing field? Most important, Ecuador would need to invest resources to improve the quality of its basic education.**

---

(from 4% to 7%) of children going to a university whose mothers received the Human Development Bond and who thus could be considered “poor.” This is the good news. But the greatest beneficiaries after 2008 were not this population. There was a much *bigger* jump in attendance among children whose mothers did *not* receive the Human Development Bond: from 16 percent to 24 percent. Again, the gap between poor and middle-class children grew larger.

### REDUCING THE OPPORTUNITY GAP

Those most likely to forego employment and finish secondary education are children whose parents do not speak indigenous languages, those who are mestizo or white, those

with upper-income fathers, and those with highly educated mothers. For this reason, the beneficiaries of “free” university education will necessarily come from the most-advantaged populations of Ecuador—unless the quality of primary and secondary education improves, allowing more disadvantaged children access to higher education. How could Ecuador level the playing field? Most important, Ecuador would need to invest resources to improve the quality of its basic education and keep all students in school until they are eligible to attend university. This is, in fact, a possible outcome of constitutional reform because, in addition to free public university, the constitution also suspended user fees in primary or secondary schools. If the government is now able to improve the quality of primary and secondary education, then more children from poor families and with indigenous roots will persist to graduation. Eventually they will become eligible for the benefits of free public higher education. But where will the money come to improve basic education, if so much is needed to replace suspended student fees? Eliminating fees for all current university students (in the absence of means testing or financial aid for the neediest families) places an enormous new financial responsibility on the government and forces it to spend money for higher education that could have been used to improve basic education. To avoid this perverse consequence, Ecuador should institute a transparent, needs-based system of finance assistance and pay for the fees only of those students who cannot otherwise afford to attend—rather than continuing to subsidize its most-advantaged populations. ■

---

## “Free” Public Universities in Ecuador: Too Much of a Good Thing?

MATEO ESTRELLA

*Mateo Estrella is dean at the Universidad de Cuenca, Ecuador. E-mail: mateo.estrella@ucuenca.edu.ec.*

Many observers would envy Ecuador’s public universities, following adoption of a new governing law and the 2008 Constitution, which abolished all student fees. But its 25 public universities are in the odd position of getting too much of a good thing. Elsewhere, advocates for public universities lament a trend toward marketization and priva-

tization and decry shrunken financial contributions from government. Higher education in Ecuador is about to find out if the recent reforms could be problematic, as strings tighten that have just been attached to universities under a bold experiment. There is a particular worry about the threat to university autonomy. Although the higher education system in Ecuador is still in the process of consolidation and growth, this article offers a general view of where it is moving in response to presidential and legislative initiatives.

### AUTONOMY, THE MARKET, AND THE 2008 CONSTITUTION

Ecuador’s first governing Law of Higher Education dates back only to 1938; and it contains—alongside the principle of autonomy—provisions for cogovernance and academic freedom. Revisions of the law in 1946, 1982, and 1990 configured the system of higher education including the establishment of the principle of self-government by the system of higher education institutions as a whole. The overall system conducted allocating the annual budget provided by the central government. But the pendulum has swung away from this no-strings-attached autonomy, because critics objected to growth of higher education that was unplanned and detached from national development goals.

In 2007, Rafael Correa assumed the presidency as an “outsider” to Ecuadorian politics, thanks to broad public support to change the system. In 2005, this economics professor at the private San Francisco University (with a 2001 PhD from the University of Illinois) had been briefly appointed as Ecuador’s minister of the economy. In his first presidential campaign he presented himself primarily as an intellectual with experience in the university.

The underlying higher education dilemmas facing President Correa were the same facing other Latin American nations, where decades-long, haphazard growth of higher education (especially private) denied government leaders one of the tools they believed could shape civil society, harness education to development goals, and preserve their own political power. When President Correa amply won a run-off election in 2007, he proclaimed a “Citizen’s Revolution” that was inspired by “Socialism for the 21st Century.” One of his first proposals was to convene a Constitutional Assembly that would prepare a new constitution (subsequently approved in a national referendum).

### TRADING SUBSIDY FOR QUALITY CONTROL BY THE GOVERNMENT

The 2008 Constitution promulgated many changes: expanding presidential power, changing land-tenancy rights, natural-resource management, and laws about communications media. But, among these many profound changes

in the state-society relations, one of the most expensive has been the reform of higher education.

Until 2008, the student fees of Ecuador's 25 public universities were low compared to the country's 38 private universities. In 2008, most public universities charged a maximum of about US\$800, using a scale based on family income. Though relatively modest, these fees covered a significant share of operating budgets. Student demands for particular programs helped justify and finance them. But student fees were constitutionally eliminated beginning in 2009. Today, public universities must depend almost

---

**Although the higher education system in Ecuador is still in the process of consolidation and growth, this article offers a general view of where it is moving in response to presidential and legislative initiatives.**

---

exclusively on annual, supplemental appropriations from the central government, which has begun directly to underwrite university budgets without regard to student enrollments or demand. As yet, Ecuador has no formula linking numbers of students to appropriations, and it is unclear whether increases in appropriations will follow growing numbers of students.

#### **UNDECIDED: UPCOMING HIGHER EDUCATION PLANNERS**

Ecuador's 2010 law establishes a secretary of science, technology, higher education, and innovation. This is in itself innovative in a country where higher education has been autonomous and insulated from political power. The dependence of higher education on national policies and the need of universities to report to a central administrative body is a sharp break from the total autonomy that prevailed in the past. The new secretary has responsibility both for managing financial appropriations to public universities and for linking postsecondary education to the national planning.

#### **THE PERIL OF TOTAL FINANCING**

Despite some positive consequences of the government's direct control of higher education planning and funding, pervasive doubts exist in public universities about their future. One problem relates to graduate education in Ecuador. All approvals for new programs now require approval from

the Ministry of Higher Education. The procedures for approving new graduate programs have been stalled. Another concern involves the daily relationships between the secretary and the universities, especially in regard to the stability of their finance. There is a need for alternative measures to overcome the budgetary limitations imposed by the free education. Although the "Socialism of the 21st Century" has rejected a market-driven enrollment model, it is not yet clear what criteria the government will use to decide the numbers of students who can enroll with full financing in particular universities and which programs will receive approval for expansion (or be targeted for closure)? Naturally, the government seeks to align such basic and (now expensive) decisions with the national development plan and with primary and secondary education. Finally, universities have little ability to plan for construction and renovation of buildings, facilities, and laboratories.

#### **FINAL CAVEAT: THE PRIVATES**

In Ecuador, private universities are a key part of the higher education system, and several are considered highly effective. But there are many credentialing, "storefront" businesses, as well. In the last official accreditation process, of the 11 universities ranked in the highest category, 7 were public and 4 private. By contrast, of the 26 institutions ranked in the lowest category, only 2 were public and 24 private.

---

**Today, public universities must depend almost exclusively on annual, supplemental appropriations from the central government.**

---

The future of top-private universities depends on their own abilities, because they do not have the same budget constraints as do the public universities. They create (and take advantage of) market pressures and opportunities, thereby moving the overall system of higher education even further from state control.

If quality in public higher education declines as a result of reduced funding, the middle class may exit public universities just as they already have departed from public primary schools. In any case, the grand bargain of total subsidy will impose severe constraints on Ecuador's ability to invest in other areas of the education system.

Ecuadorian higher education was a long static system prior to the constitutional reform, and it required change. However, a comprehensive vision for the future of univer-

sity education is lacking. “Free” public education will not help transform teaching institutions or broaden their mission to include research or national development. ■

## Reforming Higher Education Financing in Armenia

ARTHUR M. HAUPTMAN, LEVON BARKHUDARYAN, AND SERGEY BALASANYAN

*Arthur Hauptman is public policy consultant—based in Arlington, VA, specializing in higher education finance issues. E-mail: hauptman\_a@yahoo.com. Levon Barkhudaryan is vice rector of the Armenian State Economic University and was twice minister of finance of the Republic of Armenia in the 1990s. Sergey Balasanyan is an educational finance expert and member of the higher education financing strategy preparation group.*

To understand Armenian higher education today, it is necessary initially to recall the breakup of the Soviet system in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when the new Armenian government undertook many reforms in all aspects of its education system—including higher education. Reforms in higher education in the mid-1990s included allocating public funds as lump sums to universities (instead of the line-item budgeting used before). In addition, legislation in 2004 provided Armenian universities with a high level of autonomy in their operations.

Several trends in the past two decades serve as a primary stimulus for further reforms. Student enrollments in Armenia’s public universities have grown substantially since 2003, but fee-paying students accounted for this entire increase as the number of full scholarship recipients hardly changed at all. As a result, tuition-fee revenues now account for more than 80 percent of education funds in Armenian public higher education. This growth is unsustainable, which represents an underlying motivation for the sector’s new financing strategy.

### CURRENT FINANCING STRUCTURE

Armenia’s funding model, similar to the kind widely used in the former Soviet-bloc countries, has two key characteristics: dual-track tuition fees and public allocations to universities, based on quotas where the government decides each year the number of specialists that the country needs and awards scholarships via universities for this task. The amount that the government allocates for scholarship recipients is based on normative cost figures that typically are

well below the average spending per student. This is why fees from students not receiving scholarships are used to subsidize the scholarship recipients and represent most of the revenues that universities receive.

While enrollments have grown, the amount of state funding for higher education has declined over time, both in real terms and on a per student basis. Most observers believe that, as a result, the quality of both instruction and research has deteriorated significantly because of underfunding from public sources and the absence of the effective quality-assurance process.

### MAIN PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

Armenian higher education faces key challenges that are similar to those facing many other countries. These include: inadequate access and equity, uneven quality and relevance, and low levels of productivity.

*Inadequate access and equity.* Although enrollments in Armenian higher education have increased rapidly in recent years, participation rates remain substantially below international averages. In addition, access is uneven. Low-income students and those from rural areas are several times less likely to enroll in Armenian higher education than students from more well-off families and those from the cities.

*Low quality and relevance.* There are many reasons to be concerned about the uneven quality of Armenian higher education. One is that current quality-assurance procedures are not in line with recognized European practice. Another is that there is much corruption in the classroom. Lack of relevance is also a major concern in Armenia. While the current employment situation and the job prospects of graduates have improved somewhat, the structural mismatch between the profile of graduates and labor-market demand is apparent. Less than one-third of university graduates are currently employed, and their salaries are only slightly above the earnings of nongraduates.

*Low productivity.* A striking statistic regarding Armenian higher education is the low level of student/faculty ratios. The average student/teacher ratio is less than 10 to 1 in Armenian higher education, less than two-thirds of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-based average. Analyses of the student/teaching staff, student/nonteaching staff ratios, and tuition fees also show an inverse correlation between student/teaching (nonteaching) staff ratios and tuition fees.

### DESIGNING A FINANCING STRATEGY

To meet these challenges, a higher education financing strategy is being developed in Armenia. These reforms will be designed to increase participation, reduce inequality, improve quality and relevance, and raise overall productivity



of the sector, as well as achieving greater conformance with the Bologna process.

*Performance-based payments to institutions.* A key reform is to move toward a more modern funding system based on either outputs or outcomes. A system is proposed in which the government annually would pay public and private institutions for each graduate who receives a degree. To be most effective, the amount of payment would be based on a revised cost norm that more accurately reflects current and projected labor market conditions and to qualify for payments. In addition, the degrees awarded would need to conform to strengthened quality-assurance provisions and Bologna process specifications.

*Scholarships based on merit and need.* To increase the efficiency of a new performance-based structure, it is proposed that the current system of scholarships and stipends be replaced with a new scholarship program—based on both merit and need. The specifications of such a new program might include merit-based criteria similar to those currently used to identify scholarship recipients, need-based criteria based on official-government measures, and easily verifiable criteria such as family electric bills to determine who is poor.

---

**Armenia's funding model, similar to the kind widely used in the former Soviet-bloc countries, has two key characteristics: dual-track tuition fees and public allocations to universities.**

---

*Student loans.* One instrument often used to increase the accessibility of higher education consists of student loans. In Armenia, a pilot program for master's degree students in relevant fields of study may be initiated as part of the new financing structure.

*Competitive innovation fund.* To encourage universities to raise the quality of their instruction and to implement much-needed innovations, the government plans to create a competitive fund.

*Financing capital expenditures.* A fundamental weakness of the current financing structure in Armenia is that the tuition fees charged to current students constitute the primary means for financing capital expenditures. Thus, current students are paying the full costs of capital for the benefit of future students. Therefore, government should create a capital budget or allow universities to borrow in order to finance capital.

*Strengthening quality assurance.* Recognizing the priority of strengthening higher education quality assurance, a center for quality assurance has been established to develop and approve standards and guidelines for implementing much-improved, quality-assurance activities. It is proposed that both public and private institutions would have to be accredited by the National Center for Professional Education Quality Assurance to receive public funds. In addition, there will be efforts to reduce corruption in the classroom and to require institutions to provide more data, as part of the accreditation process.

*Integrating research and instruction.* Another major shortcoming of the current higher education structure in Armenia involves that most research is conducted in separate research institutes, which prevents most universities from offering a high-quality education experience. One method to improve quality through greater integration of research and instruction is to require research institutes to collaborate with universities, in order to receive public funding.

*Encouraging greater private investment.* To attract greater financial support from the private sector, it is proposed that private institutions be eligible to receive performance-based payments and government funds for scholarships, as well as to qualify for other profit-tax reductions. In addition, tax incentives would help corporations to contribute to scholarships, libraries, and university-based research.

The intent of these reforms is to allow Armenian higher education to move away from outdated and ineffective policies to ones that place it ahead of the trend internationally. ■

---



---

## Student Affairs in China

KAREN D. ARNOLD AND HONG ZHU

*Karen D. Arnold is associate professor in higher education at Boston College. E-mail: karen.arnold@bc.edu. Hong Zhu is assistant professor at the Graduate School of Education, Peking University, China. E-mail: hongzhu@pku.edu.cn.*

Chinese higher education moved rapidly from an elite system to a mass system over the past three decades. Propelled by a markedly larger and more diverse student population and the adoption of market principles in higher education, student-affairs administration is beginning to emerge in new forms in Chinese higher education. Often

translated as “ideological education,” psychological and character development has been part of the Chinese university under the organizational structures and activities comprising “ideological and political education.”

The main purpose of ideological and political education is to prepare college-educated future generations for national development and the maintenance of social stability. Substantively, ideological and political education includes required courses in political theory, history, and doctrine for undergraduate and graduate students across academic majors. Beyond the classroom, it permeates student extracurricular activities and student governance through structures such as the university student union. Organizationally, the ideological and political education profession in Chinese higher education consists of staff and programs in bureaucratic units at the university, school, and department level under each institution’s committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

---

**The main purpose of ideological and political education is to prepare college-educated future generations for national development and the maintenance of social stability.**

---

In 2004, the Chinese government issued “Views on Further Strengthening and Improving Ideological and Political Education for Students in Higher Education.” This document called on universities to prepare professional student-affairs administrators to develop students’ values, beliefs, and moral action. Student development is described as desired outcomes in terms of political orthodoxy and patriotism, in the service of national advancement. This is not a departure from the existing ideological and political education profession in Chinese higher education.

It is no accident, however, that the government directive has emerged at this point in time in response to a number of converging pressures that have ruptured the older indoctrination model of youth formation and made college student services an urgent concern. Most prominent among these pressures is the rapid massification of higher education in China. While the push to increase enrollments has been wildly successful, expanded postsecondary participation has come together with accompanying economic and social conditions, to result in high levels of student dissatisfaction and stress.

#### **WHY STUDENT AFFAIRS?**

In the late 1980s, as part of its larger move to a market economy, China instituted tuition for university enrollment and abolished government job allocation for new graduates. The requirement to find one’s own job upon graduation is problematic because of unclear career pathways and the inability of many graduates to find work in preferred geographic locations. Competition for college entrance via the national examination is a familiar pressure among Chinese youth, but continuing fierce competition and pervasive uncertainty about future career prospects among enrolled students is a new phenomenon. Large numbers of unemployed or underemployed college graduates threaten social stability. Even choosing a career path is problematic because students are frequently barred from entering their preferred academic major and nearly always prevented from changing their specialization. The one-child policy also plays a role in the current student problems. For both parents, status and parental retirement prospects rest on the single child. Having been indulged and protected from uncertainty and obstacles, this generation of cherished only-children might be particularly ill-equipped to withstand these pressures. Nor can students turn to professors for personal support; several empirical studies in China recently concluded that there is little interaction between students and faculty outside the classroom.

Existing university organizational and administrative structures have proven unequal to dealing with this volatile combination of competition, uncertainty, and fragility. In academic work, cheating is endemic. Student suicide has escalated sharply. Incidents of student violence are also on the rise. Untreated mental health problems are common. Although universities have made significant improvements in infrastructure, overcrowded dormitories remain a problem, and students are dissatisfied with campus teaching and extracurricular facilities. Discrimination against students from low social-economic backgrounds is increasing.

In response to these serious student problems, and in keeping with government policy, universities throughout China are establishing new and reconfigured administrative positions and structures charged with nonacademic student services such as career advising, mental health counseling, and financial-aid advising. Universities have established master’s and doctoral programs to train student-affairs administrators. Higher education scholars have begun to conduct student research for evidence-based institutional policy, for instance with Tsinghua University’s large-scale study of student experience at a representative sample of Chinese universities. Peking University is conducting another major research project, a government-sponsored study of student engagement across all higher education

institutions in Beijing. A small but growing scholarly literature on Chinese student affairs consistently points to unstandardized training, poor professionalization, lack of theoretical foundations, and low status of student affairs.

#### POTENTIAL DIRECTIONS

The impetus for student affairs in China is clear. Less clear at this early stage is the shape the profession will take. Structurally, the current administrative system has two separate branches. Student-affairs units that provide student services fall under a general administration branch. The oversight of student development—such as, ideological, political, and moral formation—is organized by the university division of the Chinese Communist Party. The way these separate units might collaborate will play an important role in student affairs.

---

**The main purpose of ideological and political education is to prepare college-educated future generations for national development and the maintenance of social stability.**

---

Conceptually, three relatively separate discussions potentially bear on the question of the trajectory of student affairs. Most obvious is the government call for more effective ideological and political education. This discourse emphasizes organizational direction and guidance of students. Chinese higher education administrators and higher education scholars are also investigating mature models of student affairs, most notably in American higher education. Fundamental questions are raised about whether student affairs should be constituted as student management, student services, or student development. The third and final consideration focuses on advancing its leaders' creative thinking capacities and the related issues of general education and reform in postsecondary teaching and learning. Together, these three discussions have the potential to frame student affairs as both community and student centered, concerned with holistic student development, and connecting academic and nonacademic student experience. Conversely, if these three deliberations remain separate, student affairs may evolve as a managerial function, with limited reach and little philosophical coherence.

It seems clear that more universities will establish professional graduate-degree programs in higher education administration and student affairs. Student-affairs staff

will continue to proliferate, especially in career-advising and student-support areas. The production of empirical research on college students' experience will intensify, along with research on student-affairs professionals and organizational structures. The Chinese government will watch the results of experiments with liberal arts curricula and residentially based education at top universities and will act to spread promising models. Proliferating and ambiguous models of student-affairs goals and professional roles will almost certainly result in a period in which the shape and status of student affairs remain an influx.

#### STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

Chinese higher education already features a strong-cohort model of students who live and study together. Cohort-based counselors, academic department-sponsored activities, and the Communist Party Youth Union umbrella for social activities and leadership development are among other existing structures that foster community and student learning. China will need to develop its own theoretical foundations and professional norms for student affairs. Universities can build on current practices that can be models for student support and holistic personal development. More research is needed to assess how institutional practices and organizational arrangements affect student learning and well-being.

Having expanded postsecondary enrollments so quickly and dramatically, China's emphasis on the quality of higher education has opened the possibility of significant change in how institutions structure student learning and personal development. The recently issued government document "National Education Reform and Long-term Planning Program" emphasizes the holistic development of university students. Such official statements, along with research projects and institutional efforts, point to an emergent student-development movement in China, whose contours are still forming. ■



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider "following" us on Twitter!

## NEW PUBLICATIONS

Albornoz, Orlando. *Breves Notas sobre la Autonomía y la Libertad Académica* [Brief Notes on Autonomy and Academic Freedom]. Caracas, Venezuela: Universidad Central de Venezuela, 2009. 297 pp. (pb). ISBN 980-00-2592-5.

During the last few years, the Venezuelan government has made several attempts to compromise university autonomy. Assuming a critical position toward the Hugo Chavez government, Albornoz tackles the complex topic of university autonomy and academic freedom in Venezuela. With the 20 chapters, this book is part of a trilogy, providing both a historical view and an international comparison. For this book, Albornoz relied on interviews with professors, researchers, and academic leaders (rector and vice rectors) and firsthand knowledge of Venezuelan higher education. The book provides an analysis of the Venezuelan political context for higher education, as well as insights about the implementation of public policy.

Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roksa. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2011. 259 pp. \$25 (pb). ISBN 978-0-226-02856-9. Web site: [www.press.uchicago.edu](http://www.press.uchicago.edu).

In this influential and controversial book, the authors argue that students do not learn enough in most American colleges and universities. Using the Collegiate Learning Assessment, which measures students in their first semester and at the end of their second year, the authors note little improvement in academic skills, critical thinking, and related themes.

Bader, John B. *Dean's List: 11 Habits of Highly Successful College Students*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2011. 269 pp. \$19.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-4214-0081-5. Web site: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

Focusing mainly on American high-prestige colleges and universities, this book points to factors that contribute to the success of undergraduate students. Bader, an undergraduate dean, with the assistance of colleagues from a dozen or more schools,

distills key knowledge. His “habits” include: focus on learning, not on grades, approach the curriculum like a great feast, understand that majors are not careers, work smart and not just hard, learn from diversity, and others. While this book is aimed at students, it will be of interest to those responsible for undergraduate education.

Bank, Barbara J., ed. *Gender and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2011. 434 pp. \$44.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-8018-9782-5. Web site: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

A comprehensive 50-chapter survey of key aspects of gender and higher education in the United States, this volume includes up-to-date analysis. Among the themes considered in this book are coeducational colleges and universities, community colleges, liberal and radical feminisms, college student development, queer theory, administrative leadership styles, students’ rights, athletics, sororities, and many others. Theoretical as well as practical perspectives are included.

Barratt, Will. *Social Class on Campus: Theories and Manifestations*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2010. 238 pp. \$24.95 (pb). ISBN 978-157-9225728. Web site: [www.styluspub.com](http://www.styluspub.com).

Aimed at a student audience, this book provides some basic information on social class in the United States and then focuses on the university campus, as a way of looking at how social class affects students and the university.

Beach, J. M. *Gateway to Opportunity? A History of the Community College in the United States*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011. 192 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-57922-452-3. Web site: [www.Styluspub.com](http://www.Styluspub.com).

This book provides a brief history of the community college concept in the United States, an analysis of some of the literature on the topic and a discussion of the contemporary problems and accomplishments of community colleges in California.

Bhandari, Rajika, Raisa Belyvina, and Robert Gutierrez, eds. *Student Mobility and the Internationalization of Higher Education: Na-*

*tional Policies and Strategies from Six World Regions*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2011. 140 pp. \$39.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-341-9. Web site: [www.iiebooks.org](http://www.iiebooks.org).

Sponsored by Project Atlas, an international effort to track international student mobility, this book features reports for 17 countries in six world regions. Chapters focus mainly on two themes—policies and plans relating to international student populations in the 17 countries and the numbers of students in the country. Current data is provided.

Bowen, William G. *Lessons Learned: Reflections of a University President*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2010. 168 pp. \$24.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-691-14962-2. Web site: [www.press.princeton.edu](http://www.press.princeton.edu).

One of America’s most successful elite university presidents, William Bowen has written a book about some of the lessons of the university presidency. He examines faculty affairs, governance, the role of trustees, strategic decision making, student admissions, fund raising, and other topics. Although the book reflects the American experience, it will be relevant to research universities worldwide.

Bringle, Robert G., Julie A. Hatcher, and Steven G. Jones, eds. *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011. 400 pp. \$39.99. ISBN 978-1-57922-339-7. Web site: [www.styluspub.com](http://www.styluspub.com).

The book offers a framework for research and the development of curriculum, as well as comparisons to past research on study abroad, service learning, international aspects, teaching, and other topics. This volume focuses on the experience of North American students in international service learning, but the last of the book’s four sections examines North American international service learning from a South African perspective.

Chow, Patricia, and Rajika Bhandari. *Open Doors 2010: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of In-

International Education, 2010. 120 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-336-5. Web site: [www.iie.org](http://www.iie.org).

The standard annual analysis of international exchange for the United States, this book provides statistics on the numbers of international students and scholars coming to the United States, where they come from, what and where they are studying, and other useful information. Total international student numbers are up 3.5 percent, to 690,000.

Clotfelter, Charles T., ed. *American Universities in a Global Market*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2010. 512 pp. \$99 (hb) ISBN 978-0-226-11044-8. Web site: [www.press.uchicago.edu](http://www.press.uchicago.edu).

From the perspective of economic analysis, this volume discusses how international forces are affecting American higher education and what may become the longer-term implications of global higher education developments. Among the themes considered are international-student trends in the United States, overseas programs of US universities, current academic trends in China and India, patterns of career changes of US-trained Korean graduates, and others. The chapters are based on detailed data and analysis.

Deardorff, Darla K., ed. *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2009. 542 pp. ISBN 978-1-4129-6045-8. Web site: [www.sagepublications.com](http://www.sagepublications.com).

This handbook offers a rather comprehensive reflection on the concept of intercultural competence. The first section contributes a theoretical framework for analysis, while subsequent sections offer a more practical examination of the concept's definition and manifestations. Essays written by well-known scholars in this field consider the meaning of intercultural competence within different national and professional contexts and, finally, its importance as an ongoing area of research.

De Wit, Hans. *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalization of Higher Education*. Amsterdam: Center for Applied Research on Economics and Management, Hogeschool van Amsterdam, 2011. 30 (pb) 127 pp. ISBN 978-90-817122-1-7. Orders: [g.konig@hva.nl](mailto:g.konig@hva.nl).

This book is a compilation of nine previously published articles by Hans de Wit, professor of internationalization at the Hogeschool van Amsterdam, the Netherlands, alone or with a coauthor: four of them on trends and issues in internationalization of higher education, three on student mobility, and a new one on research and resources.

Fetters, Michael L., Patricia G. Greene, Mark P. Rice, and John Sibley Butler, eds. *The Development of University-Based Entrepreneurship Ecosystems: Global Practices*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2010. 203 pp. \$99.95 (hb). ISBN 978-1-84980-263-5. Web site: [www.e-elgar.com](http://www.e-elgar.com).

Case studies of university-based entrepreneurial ecosystems on four continents constitute the core of this volume. Seven success factors for such programs were identified. These include senior leadership vision, program and faculty leadership, sustained commitment over time, financial resources, and other factors.

Gallant, Tricia Bertram, ed. *Creating the Ethical Academy: A Systems Approach to Understanding Misconduct and Empowering Change in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, 2011. 225 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-87469-4. Web site: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

Misconduct and ethical malfeasance in higher education are things that academics do not like to consider, but they are unfortunately of significance. Writing from an American perspective, the authors of this volume consider such themes as problems with standardized testing, research misconduct, ethical dilemmas in university governance, and others. The final section of the book discusses ways to enhance ethical behavior and norms in higher education.

George, Abraham, ed. *College Autonomy in India: Performance and Prospects*. Delhi: Authors Press, 2011. 308 pp. Rs. 825 (hb). ISBN 978-81-7273-569-2.

The purpose of this volume is to advocate for the legitimacy and expansion of au-

tonomous colleges in India—undergraduate colleges that are fully independent of the bureaucracy of the universities to which most colleges are affiliated. The authors argue that autonomy will help reform efforts, quality, diversity, and provide new energy to India's higher education system.

Harper, Shaun R., and Jerlando F. L. Jackson, eds. *Introduction to American Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, 2011. 477 pp. \$64.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-80326-7. Web site: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

A discussion of key issues in American higher education, this book is divided into main sections on the faculty, curriculum, teaching and learning, students, organization and governance, and policy. The 25 chapters are reprinted from material published previously.

Hayhoe, Ruth, Jun Li, Jing Lin, and Qiang Zha. *Portraits of 21st Century Chinese Universities: In the Move to Mass Higher Education*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong, 2011. 483 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-988-1785-23-7. Web site: [www.hku.hk/cerc](http://www.hku.hk/cerc).

The core of this informative volume are 12 case studies of representative Chinese universities—three public comprehensive universities, three education-related universities, three science and technology universities, and three private universities. In addition, the authors provide a discussion of some of the overarching concerns of Chinese higher education and the possibility of an emergence of a “Chinese model” of the university.

Hazelkorn, Ellen. *Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education: The Battle for World-Class Excellence*. Houndsmill, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 259 pp \$85 (hb). ISBN 978-0-230-24324-8. Web site: [www.palgrave.com](http://www.palgrave.com)

Focusing on international academic rankings in the context of globalization, this original volume asks university leaders and others in several countries and institutions what they think about rankings and how the rankings shape academic thinking and in-

stitutional and governmental policymaking. The author also discusses in some detail what the main international rankings measure and some of the key issues in the debates about them.

Hermanowicz, Joseph C., ed. *The American Academic Profession: Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2011. 371 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-8018-9978-2. Web site: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

A consideration of some of the central issues facing the American professoriate, this book makes for sobering reading. The challenges it presents are daunting, and well documented by the authors. Among the themes are reforms in teaching and learning, the socialization of future faculty, the professionalization of graduate teaching and mentoring, academic freedom and professional autonomy, and others.

Kezar, Adrianna, and Cecile Sam. *Understanding the New Majority of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Wiley Periodicals, 2010. 133 pp. \$29 (pb). ISBN 978-1-1180-0266-7. Web site: [www.josseybass.com](http://www.josseybass.com).

A majority of American academic staff are no longer on the tenure track. They are part-time or contract appointees—often called contingent faculty. The book discusses this new reality and how it is affecting both universities and the staff members themselves. Practical suggestions for dealing with the new reality are offered.

Macready, Caroline, and Clive Tucker. *Who Goes Where and Why? An Overview and Analysis of Global Educational Mobility*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2011. 154 pp. \$39.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-342-6. Web site: [www.iiebooks.org](http://www.iiebooks.org).

This comprehensive overview of international student flows from the perspective of the host countries provides a wealth of statistical information and some analysis. The book is divided into two parts. The first is a global analysis of student mobility that discusses the direction and some causes for mobility at both the tertiary level and in

secondary education as well. The chapter discusses why students move and how they choose destinations, and it includes brief discussions of the national policies and statistics of 15 main host countries. The second chapter is detailed discussion of the United States as a case study.

Maranto, Robert, Richard E. Redding, and Frederick M. Hess, eds. *The Politically Correct University: Problems, Scope, and Reforms*. Washington, DC: AEI Press, 2009. 326 pp. \$25 (pb). ISBN: 978-0-8447-4317-2. Web site: [www.aei.org](http://www.aei.org).

A conservative critique of trends in American higher education, this book brings together analysts to discuss such themes as the ideological profile of the American academic profession, the problems of conservatives obtaining promotions and administrative positions, the roles of alumni and trustees, and others. The critiques are generally labeled as “political correctness” and argue that liberal and left ideologies dominate American higher education.

Mullen, Ann L. *Degrees of Inequality: Culture, Class, and Gender in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2011. 248 pp. \$50 (hb). ISBN 978-0-8018-9770-2. Web site: [www.press.jhu](http://www.press.jhu).

A case study of students at Yale University and Southern Connecticut State University—elite and nonelite American universities, respectively—this book focuses on student thinking about where to study, attitudes toward their education, and their experiences at school. The stress is on understanding how social class affects decisions and experiences. The author finds that the university experience tends to replicate the social inequalities in society.

Radder, Hans, ed. *The Commodification of Academic Research: Science and the Modern University*. Pittsburgh, PA: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 2010. 360 pp. \$50 (hb). ISBN 978-0-8229-4396-9. Web site: [www.upress.pitt.edu](http://www.upress.pitt.edu).

A consideration of the commodification and ethics of scientific research from a largely critical perspective, this volume provides a

multifaceted discussion of several themes. Many of the contributing authors write from a philosophical background. Among the themes are financial interests and the norms of science, commercialization of biological data circulation, knowledge transfer from the university to industry, the commercialization of academic culture, and others.

Research Institute on Higher Education, Hiroshima University. *Producing Qualified Graduates and Assuring Education Quality in the Knowledge-Based Society: Roles and Issues of Graduate Education*. Hiroshima, Japan: Research Institute on Higher Education, 2010. 80 pp. (pb). ISBN 1978-4-902808-59-9.

Based on a conference concerning graduate education, analyses of trends in global movements in research labor and doctoral students, trends in graduate education in Japan, recent reforms and student development in China, and excellence in graduate education are provided in this book.

Rhoten, Diana, and Craig Calhoun, eds. *Knowledge Matters: The Public Mission of the Research University*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2011. 560 pp. \$75 (hb). ISBN 978-0-231-15114-6. Web site: [www.cup.columbia.edu](http://www.cup.columbia.edu).

The focus of this book is on the public responsibility and role of higher education, in general, and research universities, in particular. Underlying most of the analysis is a critique of the growing privatization and marketization of higher education around the world. Several of the chapters discuss broad themes of the role of research in public universities, the distorting role of rankings, quality assurance, and global hegemony in higher education. Others consider how such realities play out in Russia, several Asian countries, Africa, the United Kingdom, and the American land-grant universities.

Ryan, Janette, ed. *China's Higher Education Reform and Internationalization*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2011. 261 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-415-58225-4. Web site: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

The chapters in this wide-ranging vol-

ume discuss China's higher education internationalization in its various aspects, including Chinese students studying abroad and other themes. Several chapters provide a case study of Chinese students in Australia, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere. Considerable attention is paid to cross-cultural education in the Chinese context. Just a few chapters focus on the impact of higher education reform and internationalization in China.

Saarikaillo-Torp, Mila, and Jannecke Wieters-Jennsen, eds. *Nordic Student Abroad: Student Mobility Patterns, Student Support Systems, and Labor Market Outcomes*. Helsinki: Social Insurance Institution of Finland, 2010. 150 pp. (pb). ISBN 978 951 669 834 5. Web site: [www.kela.fi/research](http://www.kela.fi/research).

Detailed case studies of outward student mobility from the Nordic countries are provided in this book. Among the countries analyzed are Iceland, Faroe Island, Denmark, Norway, and Finland. Such issues as support services, funding, brain drain concerns, and others are discussed.

Shattock, Michael. *Managing Successful Universities*, 2nd ed. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill, 2010. 224 pp. £28.99 (pb). ISBN

978-0-335-23743-2. Web site: [www.openup.co.uk](http://www.openup.co.uk).

A revised version of Shattock's well-known guide to university management, this book focuses on such themes as the characteristics of a successful university, financial management, leadership, governance, entrepreneurialism, retrenchment, and others. While written from a British perspective, this book has wide international relevance.

Sternberg, Robert J. *College Admissions for the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2010. 224 pp. \$23.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-674-04823-2. Web site: [www.hup.harvard.edu](http://www.hup.harvard.edu).

Focusing mainly on elite American colleges and universities, Sternberg argues that the admissions patterns that focus mainly on standardized tests and high school grades do not measure creativity. He provides an alternative admissions strategy, in which students submit standard criteria but provide additional material in open-ended questions that focus on a range of activities and interests.

Sursock, Andree, and Hanne Smidt. *Trends 2010: A Decade of Change in European Higher Education*. Brussels: European Univ. Federation, 2010. 122 pp. 20 (pb). ISBN 978-

90-78997177. Web site: [www.eua.be](http://www.eua.be).

An analysis of European higher education trends in the "Bologna decade," this volume discusses changes in areas such as degree structures, internationalization, student services, building flexible curricula, and others. Data are based on questionnaires and other sources. Recommendations for future action are provided.

Walsh, Taylor. *Unlocking the Gates: How and Why Leading Universities Are Opening Up Access to Their Courses*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2011. 296 pp. \$29.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-14874-8. Web site: [www.press.princeton.edu](http://www.press.princeton.edu).

Online higher education is a rapidly growing phenomenon. This book focuses on case studies of several efforts to provide access to courses and to online access. Several of the case studies, Fathom and AllLearn, are defunct. Others, such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology's well-known OpenCourseWare program and Carnegie Mellon's Open Learning Initiative have provided a new perspective on the topic. Programs at Yale, the University of California, Berkeley, and in India are also discussed.

## NEWS OF THE CENTER

The Center is pleased to announce that *International Higher Education* is now published in a Spanish edition. The Universidad Andrés Bello in Santiago, Chile, has taken responsibility for our Spanish version. *IHE* will soon be available in Spanish in print and online.

Center director Philip G. Altbach will be assisting the Faculty of Education at the University of Hong Kong in developing its higher education program. He will also give a series of lectures in China, including Xiamen University and a group of four talks at key universities in Beijing—Peking University, where he is a Guest Professor, Tsinghua University, Renmin University, and Beijing Normal University. He will also speak at the World-Class University conference in Shanghai, where he will participate in the advisory committee of the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University, which he chairs.

Philip G. Altbach and Liz Reisberg will be traveling to Copenhagen in September, to attend the European Association

for International Education conference and also to participate in meetings to plan the third International Conference and Exhibition on Higher Education in Riyadh, scheduled for April 2012.

Philip G. Altbach, Liz Reisberg, and Laura Rumbley's *Trends in Global Higher Education* has recently been published in an Arabic edition by the Ministry of Higher Education in Saudi Arabia.

The Center welcomes David Stanfield, who joins our research staff. David is pursuing a doctoral degree in higher education at Boston College, as well. He has, most recently, been on the staff of Carnegie Mellon's branch campus in Qatar. Yukiko Shimmi and Iván F. Pacheco continue at the Center. Kaz Obara of Tamagawa University in Japan, Suaad Al-Harthi of Princess Nora University in Saudi Arabia, and Cibele Yahn de Andrade of Campinas University in Brazil are the current visiting scholars.



Center for International Higher Education  
Boston College  
Campion Hall  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3813  
USA

PRESORTED  
FIRST-CLASS MAIL  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
N. READING MA  
PERMIT 258

### 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.**

### EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

### PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

### EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina Kopellias

### EDITORIAL OFFICE

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

**Tel:** (617) 552-4236

**Fax:** (617) 552-8422

**E-mail:** [highered@bc.edu](mailto:highered@bc.edu)

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

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

ISSN: 1084-0613

©Center for International  
Higher Education