

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, Russian, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at www.bc.edu/cihe.

International Issues

- 2 Ten Principles to Guide the Public Financing of Higher Education
Arthur M. Hauptman
- 3 Strengthening Universities Around the World
Elaine El-Khawas
- 5 Anarchy, Commercialism, and "Publish or Perish"
Philip G. Altbach and Brendan Rapple
- 7 New Ways to Rank Universities
Robert Birnbaum
- 9 Lessons from the Past: Medieval Universities and Today
Miri Rubin
- 11 What International Advice Do Universities Need?
Philip G. Altbach and Jamil Salmi

European Student Mobility

- 13 National Policies on Mobility in Europe
Queenie Lam
- 14 Ideas of Student Mobility in Germany
Ulrich Teichler

The Necessity of Leadership

- 16 Investing in Leadership Development: the UK Experience
Robin Middlehurst
- 18 Managing and Leading African Universities
Pius Coxwell Achanga

Africa Focus

- 19 Partnerships in Africa
Damtew Teferra
- 21 Widening Participation in Ghana and Tanzania
Louise Morley

India

- 23 What Does Organized Business Want? A Look at India
Daniel C. Levy
- 25 Kerala: Temples and World-Class Universities
Philip G. Altbach

Latin America

- 26 Heterogeneity and Classification in Chile
Claudia Reyes and Pedro Rosso
- 28 Economic Growth and Higher Education Policies in Brazil
Simon Schwartzman

Departments

- 29 New Publications
- 31 News of the Center

Principles to Guide the Public Financing of Higher Education

ARTHUR M. HAUPTMAN

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

Over the past 20 years, in looking at how public funds are used to finance higher education, I have worked with officials in more than two dozen countries. While I am often asked if certain countries or states have exemplary financing systems that others might emulate, I do not believe any country or state is excellent in all respects when it comes to the use of public funds to support higher education. But a number of principles do serve to define how best to use public funds, in paying both for the support of institutions and in providing financial assistance to students and their families. Ten such principles are described below.

ELECTED OFFICIALS' ROLE

Given that taxpayers provide public funding of higher education, it is relevant that elected officials be responsible for determining how much public funding should be devoted to higher education activities. This role of deciding the amount of funding should not be delegated to bureaucrats or other nonelected officials, because it would represent a breach of public responsibility and accountability.

AN INSTITUTION'S MAJOR ROLE

The process of allocating public funds to institutions should be insulated, as much as possible, from political influences. While publicly elected officials should determine the level of public funding devoted to higher education, they must not play a major role in determining how public funds are distributed to institutions. This division of responsibility speculates that political decisions about allocations are often based more on favoritism than on merit. Thus, buffer bodies that are neither fully governmental nor totally institutional provide a rationale for determining how funds are allocated. Similarly, systems of institutions tend to be better at allocating public funds than government bodies.

INTERLINKING FUNDING, FEES, AND FINANCIAL AID

The effective policies that govern the three components to public financing—funding institutions, tuition fees charged to students, and student financial aid—often are at odds with each other. For example, how institutions are typically funded is aimed at improving quality, while student aid policies are generally intended to provide more access. Policies may work at cross-purposes. Good financing strat-

egies should aim to align policy goals for these three-key financing components. Financial-aid policies, for example, should be tied to decisions on tuition fees. Also, decisions about allocating public funds between institutional support and student aid should be made explicitly at the beginning of the funding process, rather than have student aid funding be a residual decision, as is often the case.

FUNDING FORMULAS

These typical formulas include a cost component that is a major factor in determining how much funds each institution will receive. Most funding formulas use actual costs per student, at each institution, or average costs per student, across the sector, to calculate this cost component. But this approach tends to lead to cost escalation over time, as institutions that spend more per student receive more

Given that taxpayers provide public funding of higher education, it is relevant that elected officials be responsible for determining how much public funding should be devoted to higher education activities.

from the government for doing so. A formula that uses normative costs—how much it should cost per student rather than the actual cost—should lead to lower costs, as institutions have greater incentive to be more efficient in how they spend funds.

DEMAND AND SUPPLY

Fee policies should be designed to recognize both demand and supply side considerations. The traditional view is that tuition fees should be set well below costs, to stimulate demand and maximize access to higher education. But the reality is that low fees may restrict access, by limiting the amount of resources devoted to the sector, and thus the number of seats provided at any level of government funding. Also, low fees tend not to be equitable because higher-income students who constitute most of the enrolled students benefit the most. A better policy is to set fees as a share of the ability of the population, to pay these fees as measured by median family income or gross domestic product per capita. This student-based approach would also limit the adverse effect of raising fees, the most, during recessions.

INSTITUTIONS' RETENTION OF STUDENT FEES

Much attention is paid to the question of who is responsible for setting public-sector, tuition-fee levels—institutional or government officials. Much less attention is paid to whether institutions retain those fees or whether fees are sent to government for reallocation, as part of the funding formula process. Yet, in many ways, it is far more important for institutions to retain fees, so that they have incentives to enroll more students. Otherwise, they will tend to restrict enrollments if they do not receive any additional funds from enrolling more students.

GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF ENROLLMENTS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

One of the typical responses to cutbacks in government funding is for governments and/or institutions to limit their enrollments, to ensure adequate funds per student. While this notion to curtail enrollments may make sense on the surface, it violates important economic principles that suggest the expansion of enrollments until the marginal costs involved in educating more students exceed the additional revenues collected from the additional students. Rather than putting a limit on enrollments, governments should use the targeted level of enrollments as the minimum figure that institutions must enroll.

For example, how institutions are typically funded is aimed at improving quality, while student aid policies are generally intended to provide more access.

NONREPAYABLE AID

Most countries provide nonrepayable sources of aid such as grants, bursaries, or scholarships to a proportion of their students. These policies tend to serve a multitude of purposes, but they may not achieve their goals. There is also a tendency to provide aid to more students to seek to gain political favor with middle-class students. To be more effective, nonrepayable aid should be focused on students with the most financial need and/or those who are the best students. A variant is to base nonrepayable aid on both need and merit so that students, with the highest need and the highest merit, receive the largest amount of nonrepayable aid.

SUPPORTIVE STUDENT LOANS

Student loans have become a feature in dozens of countries

around the world. However, few loan programs work well or are effective in meeting goals, and many also have unacceptably high rates of default. One way to improve student-loan effectiveness is to restrict its use to tuition fees and other charges and to limit or eliminate what can be borrowed to meet living expenses. In countries that lack the resources or the cultural tradition to support student loans, a good alternative is to increase tuition fees for all and then postpone the higher fees for those students who cannot afford them.

STRONG POLICY-ASSURANCE POLICIES

Financing policies often provide powerful incentives for institutional officials or students, in certain ways that will maximize the amount of funding they receive. These incentives can often lead to shortcuts, with regard to quality. Strong quality-assurance processes are therefore needed to ensure that public funds are spent wisely. The need increases, when governments do not control the operations of institutions or when aid is provided to students on a voucher basis. Thus, to curb market abuses, higher education sectors that rely on private institutions typically require more quality assurance than when public institutions are the dominant providers of higher education.

CONCLUSION

In sum, I contend that if countries and states adhere to the 10 principles listed above their financing systems will be more effective in meeting important policy goals for higher education. ■

Strengthening Universities Around the World

ELAINE EL-KHAWAS

Elaine El-Khawas is professor of educational policy at George Washington University, Washington, DC. E-mail: elkhawas@gwu.edu. This article draws on a recent publication, P. G. Altbach and J. Salmi, eds., The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2011 (available at <http://worldbank.org>).

Across the world, university leadership has been transformed in response to calls from government and international organizations, for more effective governance. These requests reflect a broad consensus that countries must improve their national productivity and that univer-

sities play a critical role in developing the skills for global competitiveness. A less explicit, underlying concern is that traditional university governance—deliberative decision making, leaders elected from among academics—cannot meet today’s demands. In country after country, universities and tertiary systems have responded—with top leadership that is appointed and governing boards that include representatives of business and other external groups. Rectors are often appointed from the outside and expected to bring prestigious contacts, research achievements, or knowledge of competitors. Leadership has become more strategic and proactive policy.

This process is a significant change, but has it made a difference? Are administrators more effective?

This process is a significant change, but has it made a difference? Are administrators more effective? Have they made good decisions and set ambitious goals that will contribute to national prosperity? Or, is this only a structural change—rearranging the furniture, so to speak? Some evidence is found in a World Bank study, *The Road to Academic Excellence*, which highlighted progress by eleven universities, despite differences in their resource levels and external constraints. The study suggests that stronger leadership can make a difference. Several patterns emerged: strategic priorities being implemented; changes in university culture, to become more nimble and results oriented; and systematic monitoring of steps toward higher achievement.

STRATEGIC LINKS

One striking pattern is the degree to which these universities address national needs for social and economic development. Links to business and industry are strong at most of these institutions, with research and development centers, liaison offices, and incubators—such as, those at the National University of Singapore and at Pohang University in South Korea. The Indian Institute of Technology network, in India, expanded its research and consultancy and strengthened its ongoing education programs to meet alumni and employer needs, for high-skill technology. The University of Ibadan established a Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation and obtains annual revenue to help build capacity in Nigeria’s oil and gas industry. Other universities, including the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, established themselves as advisers to government ministries.

Consistent with their ambitions to build global reputations, most of these universities adopted a strong outward orientation. They sought international partnerships, joined global scholarly networks, and prodded their academics to conduct research to meet international standards. Shanghai Jiao Tong University extended this initiative to students, organizing study tours, summer training at foreign universities, and dual-degree programs.

INSTITUTION-WIDE CHANGE

Stronger leadership enabled these universities to implement large changes needed to pursue transformative goals. Under traditional governance, new ideas were too often debated but not acted upon or innovation occurred only on the periphery. Instead, these universities announced priorities affecting the whole institution, based on long-term goals. Many directed growth to certain programs and limited other programs. The National University of Singapore identified academic programs to grow and others to be capped. It established performance-based salary increases and gave start-up funds to newly hired academics. The Indian Institute of Technology-Bombay made an unorthodox but successful decision to require its curriculum to emphasize basic sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. The University of Ibadan set goals for increasing its proportion of postgraduate students and limited undergraduate enrollment. The University of Malaya also directed that graduate enrollment become more than half of its student numbers.

One striking pattern is the degree to which these universities address national needs for social and economic development.

BETTER DECISION MAKING

Reformers also argued that effective leadership could facilitate strategic and nimble decision making. The World Bank study documents many good decisions. The Monterrey Institute of Technology and Pohang University are private universities in out-of-the-way settings, but both creatively built on available options for strengthening research. Pohang University became distinctive for its industry-oriented research. Monterrey relied on several strategies, from building ties to the local business community to establishing a revenue-generating lottery. The Pontifical University of Chile, recognizing that dependence on public funding

could threaten its independence, became more efficient and more successful in winning competitive research funding. As with Monterrey, it enhanced its financial stability, by developing its hospital and TV station into revenue-generating operations. The Higher School of Economics in Moscow also illustrates nimble decision making, having developed rapidly amidst uncertainty in the 1990s. With no buildings or library, it overcame these constraints by deciding to specialize in a new field, transitional economies; and found international partners to help develop a distinctive curriculum.

OVERCOMING OBSTACLES

Clear vision and goals helped many institutions to address seemingly intractable problems. Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, as a new institution, was aware that its reputation depended on a strong initial enrollment. As a result, it designed effective outreach to applicants and their parents, including invitational events on its attractive campus. At Shanghai Jiao Tong University, its ability to expand was initially constrained by the urban, high-cost location of its main campus. Its decision to develop a new campus 20 kilometers away was highly successful. The new campus became its main campus, attractive for its advanced technology and facilities, and its location near research and development centers of foreign corporations enriched its research collaborations. Most institutions found it challenging to recruit talented new faculty, to help them raise their research activity. Yet, strategies helped them make progress. Hong Kong University of Science and Technology reached out to overseas Chinese. Others also developed policies to attract foreign scholars or research collaboration. Monterrey adopted a grow-your-own strategy, supporting PhD study among its academic staff.

SYSTEMATIC MONITORING

Most of these universities developed an evaluative culture, which policymakers had called for as a way to improve university operations. The University of Chile, in a recent strategic plan, placed high priority on developing an information-management system to monitor progress toward academic and administrative goals. Pohang University developed a set of performance indicators and publicized its progress annually. It also introduced a performance-based evaluation system for academic salaries. The Monterrey Institute of Technology created a strategic-planning office, developed indicators of research productivity, and voluntarily sought the scrutiny of accrediting agencies. The University of Malaya regularly invited external assessors and industry representatives to advise on its progress. It also established a performance evaluation for faculty—tied, in part,

to international publication rankings. Shanghai Jiao Tong University developed performance indicators, affecting all departments and schools, and benchmarked their progress to peer institutions.

CONCLUSION

As these university experiences document, new leadership can raise levels of institutional excellence. With clear priority setting, there has been progress toward ambitious goals, opportunities were pursued, and obstacles overcome. Roles, expectations, and the pace of change have been transformed. Evidence exists that new leaders offer open channels for sharing information and arriving at decisions. They often consider various alternatives for implementation, sometimes to phase in change or accommodate special situations. This flexibility does not jeopardize overall goals, while it mitigates some negative effects of change. All of this suggests that these institutions are stronger today, more able to pursue further achievement, and contribute to their nation's development. ■

Anarchy, Commercialism, and “Publish or Perish”

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND BRENDAN RAPPLE

Philip G. Altbach is Monan University Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: Altbach@bc.edu. Brendan Rapple is Collection Development Librarian, O'Neill Library, Boston College. E-mail: rappleb@bc.edu.

In recent years, scholars worldwide have found themselves under increasing pressure to publish more, especially in English-language “internationally circulated” journals that are included in globally respected indices such as the ISI Citations. As a result, journals in these networks have been inundated by submissions and many of them accept as few as 10 percent of papers, and in some cases fewer. Given that too few journals or other channels exist to accommodate all the articles written, there has been a proliferation of new publishers offering additional journals in every imaginable field. Complementing the growing demand for new outlets of scholarly work, clever people have understood that new technology has created confusion as well as opportunities and that money can be made in the knowledge communication business.

FAKE AND LOW QUALITY JOURNALS

Not surprisingly, a large number of “bottom feeders” are now starting “journals” with the sole goal of earning a quick profit and enriching their owners. One of these new journals charges prospective authors a “transaction fee” of US\$500, to be published. Others have alternative ways of exploiting unsophisticated authors. These so-called journals have impressive sounding names and lists of prominent advisory editors—some who have in fact never been asked to serve. Peer reviewing is touted, but one suspects that anyone who pays the fee can get published. Clearly, authors are not served by journals without academic standing and which will not be read nor cited by anyone. Many of these sham journals are in the sciences, with computer science being well represented. The primary problem, of course, is that it is increasingly difficult for potential users to discern respectable journals from the new fakes. A quite useful resource is Jeffrey Beall’s *List of Predatory, Open-Access Publishers* (<http://carbon.ucdenver.edu/~jbeall/Beall%27s%20List%20of%20Predatory,%20Open-Access%20Publishers%202012.pdf>). Other options include what may be called pseudo scholarly journals. A prime example is the *Australasian Journal of Bone and Joint Medicine* published by Elsevier, a major multinational publisher.

In recent years, scholars worldwide have found themselves under increasing pressure to publish more, especially in English-language “internationally circulated” journals.

According to the *Scientist* (<http://classic.the-scientist.com/blog/display/55750/>), from 2002–2005 Elsevier was paid by the pharmaceutical company Merck—to publish articles in that journal that were favorable to Merck’s drugs Vioxx and Fosamax. Merck’s financial involvement in the journal was not disclosed. Elsevier later admitted that it had employed a similar disregard of normal peer-review practice in eight other of its journals, in the early 2000s.

As well as exploitative journals with a primary goal to make money rather than to advance scholarship, a profusion exists of “legitimate” journals, mediocre at best—publishing articles that really should not be published. The major multinational publishers of these journals have assembled large “stables” of them packaged and sold at high

prices to libraries. Though many of these periodicals are supposedly peer-reviewed, the standard is frequently low, and much weak research is accepted for publication. Many faculty probably rationalize that being published somewhere is better than not being published at all. A 21st century paradox is that while it is ever more difficult to get published in a top-tier journal, it is now easier than ever to get published.

THE PUBLISH OR PERISH SYNDROME

Surely, the still vibrant “publish or perish” syndrome must bear some of the blame. Universities increasingly demand more publications for promotion, salary increases, or even job security. Further, the pressure has increased to publish in English-language journals, even for scholars in non-English medium academic environments. Far too many academic institutions—a large majority of ones that mainly focus on teaching—insist that their faculty publish. This, their administrators believe, will improve their rankings. Of course, publishers step in to create new journals, which publish these frequently mediocre research articles. Moreover, instead of publishing all their research results in one article, too many authors stretch them out to multiple articles or write repetitively just to increase their publications. Thus, pressure is created on scholars in many fields, who must consult an exponentially increasing number of articles—many of which are worthless. Administrators are happy that their faculty publish; the publishers are delighted to sell more subscriptions; and the game goes on.

Not surprisingly, a large number of “bottom feeders” are now starting “journals” with the sole goal of earning a quick profit and enriching their owners.

EXPLODING COSTS OF JOURNALS AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS

An excessive number of journals are exorbitantly priced. *Ulrichsweb Global Serials Directory* lists over 141,000 academic and scholarly journals, of which 64,000 are peer-reviewed. Clearly, libraries cannot afford to keep up with such numbers; for a long time, libraries have been canceling journals, due to the ever-escalating cost of serials. For years, the cost of journals has been increasing at a far higher rate than the Consumer Price Index, at a time when library budgets have generally been decreasing. The highest journal costs

are invariably in the sciences (the average price of chemistry journals in 2011 was \$4,044, that of physics ones was \$3,499). The cost of some journals are indeed astronomical, for example \$24,048 annually for *Brain Research*, \$20,269 for *Tetrahedron*, and \$17,258 for *Chemical Physics Letters*—all three journals published by Elsevier. John Wiley is another publisher whose journals are frequently extremely expensive. An institutional subscription to Wiley's *Journal of Comparative Neurology* will be \$30,860, in 2012. Though journals in non-hard-science disciplines tend to be

Another problem for libraries is the bundling in subscription packages of hundreds of journals that often range widely in quality.

substantially cheaper, they are also often subject to high-cost increases. *Library Journal's* 2011 Periodicals Price Survey reveals that journals in language and literature had a 29 percent cost increase from 2009 to 2011. Philosophy and religion were next with a 22 percent increase, followed by agriculture, anthropology, and arts and architecture being tied for third at 17 percent.

Another problem for libraries is the bundling in subscription packages of hundreds of journals that often range widely in quality. With the bundling model, the library cannot select specific journals and refuse others. Libraries are locked into a deal that often results in the acquisition of poor-quality journals with few readers. Bundling is a practice for publishers to sell journals that few libraries would subscribe to if they were to be selected individually. An additional difficulty is the nondisclosure agreements that some publishers require libraries to sign. These agreements forbid libraries from disclosing the cost and terms of journal package subscriptions.

POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

Is there any solution to this periodicals' crisis? Several strategies spring to mind. Scholars can refuse to serve on editorial boards, submit articles, or act as peer reviewer for journals that are manifestly of poor quality and/or are excessively priced. Those applying for promotion and funding can be limited to submitting, say, five or six seminal publications—the point being that the quality of one's research should count for more than quantity.

Open-access e-journals hold strong promise. Many scholarly organizations and universities have created new open-access journals that are reliably peer-reviewed and are backed by respected scholars. There are over 7,000 free, quality-controlled scholarly journals in the *Directory of Open Access Journals* (doaj.org). Some of these publications have achieved a high level of respectability and acceptance, while, admittedly, others are struggling, and there are no doubt some that are of poor quality and little relevance. It is early in the open-access movement. If successful, this movement can be an important vehicle for eradicating economic barriers to accessing scholarship. Moreover, if universities and scholarly societies, through expanding open access, can wrest more control of both the production and diffusion of scholarship away from commercial publishers, legitimate and illegitimate, as well as quality control and prices could be placed on a surer footing.

It is undeniable that presently technology and globalization have brought anarchy to the communication of knowledge in academe and have created serious problems for the academic profession, in a time of increased competition. A meaningful solution will take much dialogue and probably significant changes to how scholarship is diffused, as well as, rewarded. ■

New Ways to Rank Universities

ROBERT BIRNBAUM

Robert Birnbaum is professor emeritus of higher education, University of Maryland, College Park. E-mail: rbirnba@umd.edu.

It is university rating time again, and the newly released 2011 reports—whether coming from China, the United Kingdom, or other venues—are producing either smug satisfaction or the gnashing of teeth at institutions around the world. Although such ranking schemes have little educational relevance, they have great symbolic, economic, and political significance. They give certain institutions and countries “bragging rights,” and encourage “prestige wars.” Some institutions are led to game the system by making changes that have little positive educational impact but do respond to the criteria used by the rankers. Driven by the rationalistic mantra of accountability, the notion that international ranking provides some positive benefit, while frequently asserted, has never been demonstrated. The con-

cept itself appears to have many of the characteristics of an academic fad; it makes the ephemeral look scientific, increases activity, but leads to little substantive improvement.

To add an element of color to the otherwise drab rating exercise, several years ago I proposed five alternative ways to separate the educational sheep from the academic goats. The “sausage system” suggested combining all systems, regardless of whether they rated as the best party schools or with the most Nobel laureates, to create a single meta-ranking. The “Lake Wobegon system” proposed expanding the number of institutions that could be included in the “Top Fifty World-Class Universities,” so that more of them could be considered above average. The “Jeremy Bentham system” would rank institutions, according to the level of happiness they provided. The “Olympic system” suggested that rankings be based on head-to-head competition of institutional faculty engaging in feats of physical prowess, while simultaneously engaging in scholarly work. Finally, the “Jorge Luis Borges system” posited that a list of the one true ranking already exists, requiring us only to discover it amidst a collection of similar-appearing, but flawed, lists.

The “sausage system” suggested combining all systems, regardless of whether they rated as the best party schools or with the most Nobel laureates, to create a single metaranking.

SOME NEW SCHEMES

Significant progress has now been made on some of these proposals. Perhaps the greatest advance has been made in implementing the sausage system, which has recently gained purchase due to its use in analyzing public policy. As an example, the Ibrahim Index of African Governance is a widely recognized and influential means of assessing the performance of that continent’s governments. The index is based on a number of sophisticated variables (89 at present). Ratings of these variables, including measurements of the extent of corruption, or the use of mobile telephones, are then combined into a single number, by which governments are put in rank order. The genius of the final index is that it is constructed by adding all the variables without weighing them, so that infant mortality rate is no more or less influential than is freedom of the press. Just as the

Ibrahim Index is used by nongovernmental organizations and foundations as a guide for allocating resources, a single, unweighted summary of all institutional ratings might be used someday to identify the academic best of the best. The beginnings of such a possibility can already be seen in the new U-Multiranking rating system, sponsored by the European Commission, which creates metrics in five areas—from teaching to knowledge transfer. Using this system, any group or institution can apply its own weights to

The Lake Wobegon system may also now be coming into its own.

self-selected variables, thus allowing each to determine the criteria by which it should be judged. As the Dodo in *Alice in Wonderland* presciently opined after the chaotic caucus race in which the participants started, stopped, and moved whenever and wherever they liked—“everybody has won, and all must have prizes.” Well, why not?

The Lake Wobegon system may also now be coming into its own. While enlarging the number of high-ranking institutions is an obvious way to spread the wealth, the idea of doing so, by identifying 100 institutions as being among the top 50, may have seemed a bridge too far when it was first proposed. But this process now has been pioneered by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, which recently increased from 5 to 10 the number of potential nominees for annual Oscar for Best Picture. The implications of this change for university rankings are staggering; just as conceptually no limitation of the number of films that could be identified as “best” candidates, there is no limit to the number of universities that can be judged “world class.” When Hollywood sets the trend, can other social institutions be far behind? And indeed, China has apparently already adopted a variant of this system. In 2007, the Ministry of Education reportedly rated over 80 percent of its institutions as “excellent.” It cannot be long before *all* are considered above average.

DOES RANKING MAKE US BETTER?

These trends should not be unexpected. Life follows art, as we know, and it is not surprising that the quest for the one true university ranking should move us in strange directions originally dismissed as outrageous. Current discussions, over which of the metrics currently in use is best, may reflect a movement toward the Borges system. To be

sure, assessing a world-class ranking by using the Bentham or Olympic systems has so far not gained any noticeable traction; however, regardless of their usefulness the demand for comparative judgments appears insatiable.

The most recent support for developing world-class universities comes from the 2011 Riyadh Statement, which, while renouncing rankings and league tables, still concludes that national systems should support, among other things, universities with selective admissions and research missions. For many, if not most, national systems the emphasis on developing a world-class ranking should probably not be on research universities but on regional and local institutions, emphasizing teaching and curriculums based on social needs. The problem is that we get what we measure; encouraging many less-developed nations to direct their resources toward the establishment of world-class institutions ironically may inhibit the development of the basic educational infrastructure on which the existence and maintenance of great universities ultimately depend. World-class research institutions can come later, but only after the educational foundations on which such institutions depend have first been developed and nurtured. ■

The European Medieval Universities, from the Past and Today

MIRI RUBIN

Miri Rubin is professor of medieval and early modern history at Queen Mary, University of London. E-mail: m.e.rubin@qmul.ac.uk. (A different version of this article appears in Times Higher Education.)

As a historian of the Middle Ages, I am frequently asked about the links between universities then and now. Given the momentous changes affecting modern-day institutions of higher education and the lives of so many people—students, parents, teachers, and employers—such questions have become more frequent and more urgent. Given a great deal is different between the medieval universities and our own diverse global array of institutions, this makes comparisons difficult. None the less, an assessment of the role of medieval universities reveals some telling affinities that may hold lessons for today's turbulent times.

CHURCH AND STATE

When universities emerged between 1150 and 1200 in Italy, France, and England, they responded to the needs of the main institutions of governance—the Church and dynastic kingdoms. Both systems' institutions required bureaucrats, trained in the procedures of government and its language, Latin. Latin still depended on the conventions developed in the classical antiquity, and these were transmitted through the study of the liberal arts of rhetoric, logic, and grammar. Jobs for graduates—bachelors of arts—ranged from the drafting of letters, treaties, and keeping of financial records.

Church and states managed justice, this also required legal experts: men trained beyond the liberal arts to higher degrees in law, just as they progress in the United States today—from the bachelor of arts to further studies in medicine and law. To support this all-important training—popes, kings, and emperors were willing to allow groups of students and teachers to come together in Bologna, Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge. They exempted scholars from taxes and allowed students and scholars to be self-governing. The papacy licensed universities to award degrees that were recognized throughout Europe. The bachelor of arts became the gold standard for a certain type of literacy and administrative capacity throughout the Christian world.

MEDIEVAL REALITIES

Yet, potential employers who stood to benefit most from well-trained personnel did not provide comprehensive funding for students. They exempted universities from some dues—just as much of today's educational sector enjoys charitable status in many places—thus, each student needed to seek support. For some students this was easy. Clever monks were supported by their religious houses; bishops sponsored men on the condition that the scholars worked for them after graduation; lords of manors supported talented local boys who would return as household chaplains, secretaries, or parish priests. Most students had to create packages of funding, based on patronage, family support, and paid work. Accordingly, dropout rates in medieval universities were very high; the lists of matriculated students were always much longer than of those who graduated with the bachelor of arts. For students who relied on the whims of benefactors, any breakdown in the relationship could force them to drop out. Given the more precarious supports for university study, students are less likely to complete their courses. If students are required to beg and borrow support, they may well fall out of the system—wasting the time and the funds already invested in them.

Another interesting point arises from the high-dropout rate at medieval universities. Those who left before graduating were still able to use the skills acquired to secure employment. The skills were highly transferable and in such

short supply, that even people who had studied for only a year or two had an advantage. They could become one of thousands of teachers, tutors, scribes, and recorders that medieval society required—modest medieval equivalents to Steve Jobs and Mark Zuckerberg.

Finance of universities was closely linked to student enrollments during the Middle Ages. Outside certain areas of present-day Germany and Italy, most landed and titled people educated their sons at home. Their heirs did not need to follow a profession taught and accredited by the universities. Nor were universities the sole recruiters and trainers of bright, ambitious men. Whole areas of activity were not taught in universities. There were guild apprenticeships for surgeons, merchants, and notaries; the Inns of Court for aspiring lawyers; Chancery training for civil servants; workshops for artists; and military training at royal and aristocratic courts and within fighting units.

An assessment of the role of medieval universities reveals some telling affinities that may hold lessons for today's turbulent times.

Finally, regarding creativity, the futility of some aspects of medieval university learning, especially the system known as scholasticism, has long been the subject of satire—just as it was lampooned in the Middle Ages. Scholasticism was a method of training through dialectical probing, applied to questions ranging from medical to theological studies. Dialectical questioning for and against a proposition was familiar to all educated people and enabled some sharp and radical thinking. The philosopher Peter Abelard (1079–1142) used it in Paris (albeit before the university was founded) to question the existence of God; the theologian John Wycliffe (ca. 1330–1384) in Oxford, to question the nature of the sacraments and the relationships between church and state; and the biblical scholar and theologian Martin Luther (1483–1546) at Wittenberg University, to assail a 1,000-year-old system of Christian belief and practice, changing it forever. Far from being stale and predictable, medieval universities produced not only civil servants and ecclesiastical bureaucrats but also radical thinkers, whose work had real impact and who—despite their challenging critiques—died in their beds, not in prison cells.

CONTEMPORARY LESSONS

With millions aspiring to university education in Europe, the United States, India, and China—we face the challenge of making universities an effective training ground, while also a center for creativity and boldness. In the medieval universities young men were set apart for a period of intensive intellectual and social interaction, away from home, among peers, and in the presence of inspiring teachers. The skills imparted were highly transferable because they were generic: the ability to analyze texts, argue a case, examine problems from all points of view, and interrogate questions in order to reach solutions. Their liberal arts curriculum was already hundreds of years old, and it combined instruction in verbal dexterity with training in numbers and proportions. Like graduates today, some in the Middle Ages expected to serve and manage in their own countries, while others aspired to travel beyond on missions or for further study—armed with highly transferable skills. They studied all that was essential for the critical understanding of systems, for managing complex entities, for observing the world and for the forging of solutions to ever-emergent challenges.

We face the challenge of making universities an effective training ground, while also a center for creativity and boldness.

Such educated men expected to interact throughout their careers with people accomplished in other skills and trained otherwise: surgeons, notaries, architects, painters, merchants, soldiers, and map makers. Guilds, courts large and small, Inns of Court, and family workshops all trained people to crafts that could lead to financial reward and renown. A combination of bookish learning and guild training was necessary to produce such marvels as the 13th-century remaking of Westminster Abbey or the poetry of Geoffrey Chaucer, a century later.

LESSONS FOR TODAY

Thinking about medieval universities might provide some beneficial lessons. Perhaps we should not burden students with having to seek finance during this crucial period of training. Such burdens lead to suboptimal performance and the wasteful abandonment of precious university places. Since their skills are a common good, everything should

be devised and encouraged—comfortable student loans, scholarships, state support, and charitable endowment—to keep universities free at the point of access.

Another lesson is that the universities are not alone in fostering excellence. While the skills of high-level critical thinking and communication are essential to all forms of governance, other forms of reasoning and practice also deserve support and remuneration—design, craft, engineering, and more.

Transferability of skills should be central to higher education. As students are challenged by the rich heritage of human understanding—literature, languages, arts, social theories, sciences, and philosophy—they develop out of those specialized intricacies the ability to analyze and build, correct, and complement. What is worth studying should not be decreed by crude utilitarianism. For training the mind, we need both Latin and mathematics.

At a time of flux in modern higher education, policymakers, presidents, and academics should not overlook the past when mapping out the future. ■

What International Advice Do Universities Need?

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND JAMIL SALMI

Philip G. Altbach is Monan professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Jamil Salmi is coordinator of the World Bank's network of higher education professionals. E-mail: jsalmi@worldbank.org.

The latest accouterment of world-class universities, or those aspiring to world-class status, is an international advisory group. Heidelberg University, in Germany, has one headed by a former Oxford vice chancellor; the Higher School of Economics committee, in Moscow, is chaired by a Nobel Prize-winning American economist; and several prominent Saudi Arabian universities have committees composed of top-ranking academics and a few business executives. The launch of national Excellence Initiatives in various parts of the world—China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, Spain, and South Korea, to mention only a few—has often been associated with the creation of such advisory boards at the institutional level.

The laudable goals of such committees, which meet on an occasional basis to review and evaluate the institution's plans and performance, include bringing new ideas and analysis from the experience of academe beyond the bor-

ders and especially from the pinnacles of higher education globally, and hopefully assist the institution to understand itself and to improve. The committee members have a continuing relationship with the university and, presumably, a commitment to its welfare and improvement. They can be called on for occasional advice, generally on a pro bono basis.

These committees may also bring added prestige to the university. A distinguished group of internationally respected academics provides luster—having connections with a Nobel Prize winner helps, even if in an advisory group.

The laudable goals of such committees, which meet on an occasional basis to review and evaluate the institution's plans and performance, include bringing new ideas and analysis.

Such committees meet once or twice a year, usually at the university, and their sessions are typically attended by the top management of the university. Sessions last for a day or two and often include a consideration—not only of the broad performance and plans of the institution but often a specific analysis of one or more programs, departments, or initiatives thought to be worth detailed consideration.

WHO SERVES—AND WHY?

Although not based on a careful and systematic analysis of advisory-committee membership, it appears that most committees consist of prominent academics and institutional leaders, from a range of disciplines chosen from top universities worldwide—with a predominance of participation from the major universities in the English-speaking world. The natural sciences and the “hard” social sciences, such as economics, seem to be predominantly represented. Perhaps the largest numbers are senior administrators from top-tier universities—sitting or recently retired presidents, vice-chancellors, rectors, and the like. Few members seem to be from middle-ranking universities or emerging academic systems, and there are rarely members from universities within the country. An occasional business leader, often from the high-technology sector, is included. Seniority and maleness tend to predominate on the committees. From the university, members are often the senior management team—president, provost, vice presidents, and deans.

Advisory-committee members generally focus on service to overseas colleagues and assisting other universities.

Many enjoy a bit of academic tourism, and some wish to learn some useful lessons from the university or committee colleagues. Few, if any, are able to devote a significant amount of time to the enterprise.

DO THE BENEFITS OUTWEIGH THE COSTS?

International-advisory committees, while not a major part of any university's budget, entail considerable costs. While the members typically serve without significant remuneration—with some exceptions—expenses are not inconsequential. Direct costs usually include business-class air transportation and related travel, and hospitality while on campus. Indirect costs, often not considered carefully, are not negligible—including the time of members in the entire senior management team of the university during the meetings, considerable preparation time mainly by the president and senior staff, and logistical arrangements. A two-day international-advisory committee meeting might cost well over US\$100,000.

These committees may also bring added prestige to the university.

CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE COMMITTEE

Members must not only be committed to the university but also require being knowledgeable about the institution and its challenges. Thus, they must be provided in advance with appropriate documentation and be committed to preparing well before arriving to the actual meeting. An advantage of the committee is a continuing relationship with the university, and thus trust and insights are built up over time. Committee members need some hands-on experience at the host institution—through conversations with professors, students, and other key stakeholders plus interactions with top management.

The topics discussed at committee meetings must be relevant and within the purview of expertise of the members. These policies might involve long- and medium-term institutional strategy, proposed policies relating to governance, the academic profession, new curriculum plans, internationalization, and other macro issues. Detailed administrative actions, specific personnel policies—the promotion of academics for example—and other detailed management and academic decisions are not the purview of advisory committees—although policies concerning promotion and evaluation of academics might be.

The meetings themselves must be carefully prepared, with sufficient time allocated for themes so that the discussion can be effectively organized. Lengthy presentations by university administrators must be avoided. A good balance between providing information on the one hand and allowing for in-depth discussion on the other is of basic significance.

While the size of the university group that participates in the meeting must be small enough to permit productive discussions, the advisory board's contribution can be more useful, along with a wider representation from the academic community. Senior faculty members and also junior colleagues, as well, may constructively be included in meetings. It is relevant that the discussions remain confidential, so the careful choice of local membership is important.

The university must be willing to expose problems and even crises, as well as to present good news and accomplishments. The advisory committee should not be considered as a rubber-stamping group but must be seen as part of the academic community.

Advisory-committee members generally focus on service to overseas colleagues and assisting other universities.

Unlike a formal university board of trustees or governors, which exercises statutory supervisory responsibilities that sometimes place university leaders and board members in an antagonistic relationship, a major benefit of an international advisory board is that it can provide a non-threatening platform for candid feedback on the host university's performance and for sharing relevant experiences to inform the university's strategy and new projects.

CONCLUSION

Distinguished outsiders can bring an original perspective, help raise awareness about new challenges, provide relevant advice based on long experience from a range of institutions, and perhaps present innovative approaches derived from international good practices. Dialogue between the university community and knowledgeable and sympathetic outsiders can yield useful insights. Moreover, there is nothing wrong with the added prestige of an international advisory committee. ■

National Policies on Mobility in Europe

QUEENIE LAM

Queenie Lam is project officer, of the Academic Cooperation Association, Brussels, Belgium. E-mail: secretariat@aca-secretariat.be. This article is based on Irina Ferencz and Bernd Waechter, eds., European and National Policies for Academic Mobility: Linking Rhetoric, Practice and Mobility Trends (Bonn: Lemmens, 2012).

Europe—the continent that brought us the wildly successful student-mobility program, ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students), more than 20 years ago—may at first glance appear to be highly united in its enthusiasm for international student mobility. The situation on the ground, however, (in terms of both policy and practice) is much more complex than the “grand discourse” on European student mobility, of recent years, might seem to indicate.

This situation represents both a strength and a weakness. On the one hand, Europe (whether understood as a configuration of 27 European Union member states—or, the broader group of 47 Bologna process/European Higher Education Area signatory countries) presents a richly diverse higher education landscape. This variety clearly extends to the profiles presented by each country, when it comes to policies for international student mobility. Happily, this diversity allows different approaches to be tested—and accepted or rejected—according to unique national or institutional characteristics. The European Union works to help its member states moving toward the realization of a European Union-wide benchmark for mobility by 2020, following the endeavors of the European Higher Education Area to articulate its own set of mobility objectives for the rest of the decade. However, the lack of a systematic approach to mobility at the national level may prove to be a major stumbling block, on the road to achieving European-level policy goals.

MOBILITY POLICIES IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

Mobility, when understood in the context of European higher education, is closely associated with the European Union’s ERASMUS program—with good reason. Since its inception in the mid-1980s, ERASMUS has stood out as the largest and arguably the most “successful” funding program for short-term student exchange (hereinafter: credit mobility) in the world. With the introduction of other mobility initiatives, such as ERASMUS MUNDUS, mobility has acquired an array of new meanings, beyond intra-European credit mobility in the European Union’s policy discourse. Attention is now being given to opportunities

for non-European students to attain full degrees in Europe (hereinafter: incoming degree mobility) as well as academic/research staff mobility. However, recent research in this area, conducted by the Brussels-based Academic Cooperation Association, has found that these new mobility modes have not yet gained the same level of attention in national policy circles, as the longstanding credit mobility activities.

Despite the high importance attached to mobility by national governments, in general, few European countries have articulated a national policy to deal in a systematic manner with the different types of mobility now in evidence in their higher education systems, although many *believe* they have such policies in place. A handful of nations—among them, the Nordic countries (notably Finland and Denmark), the Netherlands, and two Baltics (Estonia and Lithuania)—may be said to acquire something close to a national-mobility policy. In most cases, though, where there is evidence of some national-level constructs concerning mobility, their elements are found scattered across a number of different policy documents and purviews, ranging from education and research to immigration and labor. The Academic Cooperation Association’s research in this area finds that the breadth and depth of mobility policies vary to a great extent. Often it is even doubtful whether the national governments

The lack of a systematic approach to mobility at the national level may prove to be a major stumbling block, on the road to achieving European-level policy goals.

have a clear understanding of the distinctions between different mobility types (degree versus credit, incoming versus outgoing, etc.) when setting national-mobility priorities and targets.

MOBILITY: INTERNATIONAL OR INTRA-EUROPEAN

Up to now, clearly credit mobility in Europe has a strong intra-European orientation, while degree mobility meets a strong external dimension, aimed at third countries (i.e., non-European). However, both types of mobility are generally referred to as international mobility.

Outgoing credit mobility is the top priority for national governments in Europe, in contrast with outgoing degree mobility. Most countries clearly do not want to see outgoing degree mobility, fearing brain drain. Not surprisingly, how-

ever, a growing number of European national governments appear to be actively interested in incoming degree mobility, although this is not without its risks. On the one hand, attracting fee-paying degree students makes a good economic option, and is a trend seen clearly in such countries as the United Kingdom, Ireland, Malta, and Cyprus. However, others have registered deep concern about the high influx of students from neighboring countries into their national systems, with perceived burdens placed on local taxpayers and local students seeking access and a high-quality (i.e., not overcrowded) educational environment. Austria's experience with large numbers of incoming German students is a prime example of this dynamic. Nevertheless, many European countries still attach high priority to incoming degree mobility (presumably, from outside Europe)—with specific interest in PhD and master's degree students, which is in line with the dominant discourse of attracting talent for “enhancing innovation” and “strengthening the knowledge economy.”

MOVING TARGETS?

The quantitative targets and geographical foci mentioned in European national discussions of mobility are defined in surprisingly vague terms. Agreement seems to be coalescing in many circles around the notion of aiming for 20 percent or more for outgoing mobility and around 10 percent for incoming mobility. The geographical locations of particular interest—for both sending and receiving students—include Europe itself (i.e., intra-European mobility), followed by Asia and the United States/Canada.

However, Europe's mobility aspirations are rarely defined in relation to any specific type of mobility. As a result, ambitious but vaguely defined mobility targets are seen as high as 50 percent, which left undefined could refer to mobility experiences as short as one week or mobility activities only tangentially related to study and/or research. Moreover, it is unclear whether countries aiming for 50 percent mobility aspire to have 50 percent of their annual cohort of students undertaking a study-abroad experience in a particular year or if 50 percent of their graduates within a certain time frame should have been mobile.

Similar loose ends are found with regard to geographic targets. While these objectives seem to be clearly identified, it is not always apparent which types of students might be the focus of these mobility actions. Without clear parameters, such targets remain largely symbolic signals of national aspiration, with little indicative value for guiding mobility development. The lack of clarity on these important specifics also makes comparing the mobility objectives across Europe exceedingly problematic.

LAYING THE GROUNDWORK FOR 2014–2020

The European Union is poised to introduce a new program in 2014—ERASMUS for All. Unlike the original ERASMUS, the new architecture foreseen by the European Union for cooperation in education and training through 2020 will likely encompass all levels of education—as well as, cooperation efforts with third countries, particularly those in the European Union's neighborhood region. This is likely to introduce further complexity into the concept of mobility in Europe, in light of the possible extension of the heretofore “Europe only” ERASMUS program to countries outside Europe and the inclusion of intra-European degree mobility at the master's level. As these developments unfold, careful reflection on the current state of affairs in European national policies on mobility is essential. More significantly, a systematic approach, based on clearly differentiated mobility types and well-defined targets among other key considerations, is most necessary for the formulation of robust national policies for advancing mobility. ■

Ideas of Student Mobility in Germany

ULRICH TEICHLER

Ulrich Teichler is professor at the International Centre for Higher Education Research, at the University of Kassel, Germany. E-mail: mann@incher.uni-kassel.de.

The European Union's decision in 1986, to establish the ERASMUS program for the promotion of temporary student mobility within Europe, was understood as nondurable in scope. Moreover, ERASMUS should be discontinued, not only if it did not have a major stimulation effect but also if it was successful. In the latter case, all European countries would take over the funding nationally.

In Germany, public funds for the mobility of students and young researchers traditionally have served two priority areas: support for inwards and outwards mobility of doctoral candidates and support for students from developing countries for degrees of any kind in Germany.

Initially, the ERASMUS program was not well received in Germany. Governments objected it as the European intrusion into national and regional policy domains. The credit system within ERASMUS, starting in 1989, was viewed as incompatible—with varied education and examinations across European countries. According to evaluation

studies, German university professors were least inclined to recognize study abroad as equivalent to study at home.

The situation changed in the mid-1990s. Germany became one of the key drivers for the establishment of a bachelor's and master's degree structure in Europe, to facilitate student mobility. Around 2005, a target was set to have about 20 percent of foreigners, among all students, enrolled in Germany, by 2020.

Available international statistics on foreign students seem to indicate that Germany has hosted, over decades, above-average numbers of students from other countries, in absolute and relative terms. Studying abroad among German students has also seemed above the average in economically advanced countries. As widely accepted, these shares should be above average in the future, and no controversies have emerged hitherto, regarding costs and funding of such objectives.

EXPERIENCES IN THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

The ministers in charge of higher education in many European countries suggested in 1999, in the Bologna Declaration, to introduce a bachelor's and master's degree structure. This policy was considered as instrumental for both increasing the attractiveness of study in Europe for outside students and facilitating intra-European mobility.

However, as shown in two studies—EURODATA and Mapping Mobility, published by the Academic Cooperation Association in 2006 and 2011—internationally available statistics are in such a deplorable state that the goal achievement can hardly be measured. Most countries measure citizenship, but not mobility for the purpose of study. Yet, available in-depth data suggest that one-quarter of foreign students in Europe have lived in the country beforehand and that one-tenth of the mobile students are not foreign but, rather, returners. Only about half of the temporarily mobile students are included in the available international statistics. The international, data-collecting agencies—UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) and Eurostat (the statistical office of the European Union)—even recommend excluding short-term mobility. International statistics of doctoral students are unreliable. Recently, many European countries have begun to gather data on genuine student mobility, although not yet a complete picture.

The above named, Mapping Mobility, study presents the following estimates to assess the impact of the Bologna process. The absolute number of students in Europe originating from outside doubled within eight years. Intra-European student mobility might have grown slightly, but it is doubtful whether the Bologna process had speeded up the growth process. Graduate surveys indicate that the pro-

portion of students having spent a study period in another country during their education varies dramatically by country—from about 2 percent to almost 30 percent. In Germany, student mobility has grown in all respects discussed above. The proportion of incoming mobile students from other European countries raised from 3.2 percent in 1999 to 4.5 percent in 2009 and, from outside Europe, from 2.8 percent to 4.4 percent, as well as study abroad, from 2.8 percent to 5.4 percent. More than 15 percent of recent graduates in Germany have spent a period of study in another country.

Concurrent structural and functional changes of intra-European student mobility occurred among various studies. In some countries the readiness to study temporarily in another country seems to have decreased slightly, because it was considered too difficult to spend a meaningful and recognizable period abroad—in these shorter overall periods, up to a degree. Additionally, more students study the whole master program abroad. Finally, the difference of international employment and work between formerly mobile and nonmobile students declines over time—possibly as a consequence of internationalization in general and an internationalization at home policy of higher education institutions. Thus, new curricular strategies might be needed to revitalize the value of mobility.

Available international statistics on foreign students seem to indicate that Germany has hosted, over decades, above-average numbers of students from other countries.

POLICY RESPONSES

In the second decade of the 21st century, European governments and respective stakeholders continue to advocate a growth of student mobility, without major changes of modalities. However, concern grew about the increasing costs for accommodating inward degree-mobile students—notably those from outside Europe. Some countries introduced or discuss the introduction of moderate tuition fees for students from outside Europe. Some countries suffering from the current international monetary crisis consider many means of reducing public expenditures and might change their attitudes toward foreign students, in this context.

The European Commission recently has published various proposals for the future of education and research. Expenditures for mobility of students and young research-

ers should grow. ERASMUS should continue to be the flagship of the European Union's educational policy—under the name “ERASMUS for all.” Intercontinental financial support in this domain should be increased. Promoting the mobility of doctoral candidates should be part of programs concerned with young researchers. Finally, European loans should be provided for students spending for the whole master's program in another European country.

In Germany, increasing public expenditures for education and science are widely accepted as “investment into the future.” There is no contested discussion about public good versus private good. Clearly, vocational training in Germany is traditionally largely paid by employers, advanced vocational training by the learners themselves, and study provisions in higher education by public sources—without fundamentalist discussions about costs and benefits.

Similarly, the tradition of development assistance in Germany is not challenged according to which support should be made available for persons, from low-income and middle-income countries, to study or to undertake doctoral research in Germany. There are no major fundamental debates whether this should be understood as charity, economic investment, international crisis prevention, or whatever else. There are no plans, as exist in some non-European countries, to differentiate between first-class national and possibly European students and second-class other students who have to pay high fees. In those domains, no policy changes in Germany are in sight. ■

Investing in Leadership Development: The UK Experience

ROBIN MIDDLEHURST

Robin Middlehurst is professor of higher education at Kingston University, London, and director of the Strategy, Research and International Leadership Foundation (www.lfhe.ac.uk). E-mail: r.middlehurst@kingston.ac.uk.

Across the world, in developed and developing countries, higher education is seen as central to economic growth and regeneration as well as to social well-being and cohesion. It is also tied into the spread of globalization, through expanding trade in transnational education and global networks of research and innovation. National com-

petitiveness agendas are mirrored by competition between institutions and higher education systems, in a global race for status and reputation.

Institutions operating in this environment have become large, complex, and increasingly focused businesses. Taking two UK examples in one city: the University of Manchester now has 40,000 students, including 7,400 international students from 180 countries on its campus. It has 9,755 staff, making it one of the biggest employers in the northwest region, and claims to have a financial impact on the region of £1.4 billion, annually. The newer Manchester Metropolitan University has 34,000 students, including 2,800 international students from 109 countries. It has 4,300 staff and claims to have an economic impact on the region of £690 million. To run these organizations—as successful not-for-profit businesses, *and* as engines of local and regional development, *and* as world-class academic

A significant boost to senior-level leadership development came in 2003, when vice chancellors voted to set up a Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

institutions—calls for a wide range of skills and experience. New management structures and working practices that build cooperation between academic leaders and professional managers are also needed. The European Commission recognizes this in its communiqués on the modernization of higher education (2006, 2011) arguing both for restructuring and more investment in professional management.

Such an agenda is not new to the United Kingdom, as successive governments have put pressure on universities to diversify income streams, become more efficient, and contribute broadly to public policy goals. In response, institutions have created executive management structures; developed top management teams; reduced committee-based decision making; increased budgetary and staff management responsibilities for heads of department and deans; and strengthened leadership at all levels (albeit with different balances of collegiality and managerialism across the 165 universities and colleges of the United Kingdom). Senior academic leaders from deans to vice chancellors (presidents) are now typically selected for their positions and appointed on fixed-term or permanent-management

contracts; and engagement in management preparation and development increasingly counts as part of selection criteria for leadership roles.

VICE CHANCELLORS VOTE FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

A significant boost to senior-level leadership development came in 2003, when vice chancellors voted to set up a Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, owned by the sector. A grant from government of £10 million now represents just 20 percent of its income; the remaining revenue comes from fees for programs and membership dues (almost 90% of UK universities and colleges are in voluntary membership). The foundation offers a range of United Kingdom-based and international programs for leaders at all levels; programs for new and experienced governors; professional networks for leaders and managers; topical leadership conferences and events; tailored in-house management programs; individual coaching; audits of effective governance; top-team development; and wider organizational change initiatives (such as the Change Academy for cross-functional teams working on institutional projects). The foundation also invests in the sector by commissioning research on leadership issues, creating management resources for institutions and providing competitive development grants for institutional and cross-institutional initiatives. Notably, this much expanded national-level activity has not diminished institutional effort. In 2000, 70 percent of higher education institutions reportedly provided little formal development for senior leaders. By 2010, 73 percent of institutions reported having systematic leadership and management development in place. Interestingly, 90 percent of academics surveyed believed it to be advantageous to their careers.

The developmental landscape today matches the variety of institutional needs and individual career trajectories. Particular features of UK higher education include a wide range of disciplinary and professional experience, among leaders and managers; increasingly blurred roles between academics and professional staff; and entry into the sector of numbers of senior managers from business, health care, and local and central government. Cross-cultural skills and understanding are increasingly important, as staff and students become more diverse. To prepare themselves, heads of department, deans, and professional service managers mix on master of business administration and master of science programs on higher education management, while potential chief operating officers and chief executive officers work together on the top management program. Preparing for strategic leadership attracts academics wishing to benchmark their skills and leadership potential against others. Vice chancellors (presidents/rectors) have tailored opportunities, such as individual coaching; paired pro-

grams with the chair of their board; or an intensive program on transitions: personal, institutional, and system level. In-house programs are equally important and include cohort programs for 100 senior leaders and managers in a university; a specific focus on team building for the top team; and targeted initiatives for developing new cadres of research team leaders.

International opportunities include twinning programs, policy-oriented study visits, and strategic leadership programs for cohorts of leaders and ministry officials from other countries. Programs are designed to achieve mutual benefits for individuals, institutions, and higher education sectors in the United Kingdom and overseas; they can also benefit local communities and leverage higher education business links across regions. As universities develop their internationalization strategies, there are opportunities to use leadership development creatively—to facilitate wider international partnerships in teaching, research, and enterprise.

International opportunities include twinning programs, policy-oriented study visits, and strategic leadership programs for cohorts of leaders and ministry officials from other countries.

LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE

While there is a constant need for innovation in response to a dynamic and volatile higher education landscape, some lessons from three decades of experience may have continuing utility. First, leadership development needs to be tailored to day-to-day management agendas, so that it is relevant and timely; second, it should challenge thinking and practice, as well as provide support and a safe space for discussion and experimentation; third, development needs to be conceived within a “whole-systems” philosophy of engagement at individuals, groups, and sector levels, if substantive change is the target; and fourth, if designed strategically, leadership development can offer much more than individual preparation and development, by providing a vehicle for developing academic business through relationships and partnerships, nationally and internationally. ■

Managing and Leading African Universities in a Globalized World

PIUS COXWELL ACHANGA

Pius Coxwell Achanga works in the Department of Quality Assurance, at the National Council for Higher Education, Uganda. E-mail: pius_achanga@yahoo.com.

The leaders of African universities face an urgent need to expose the critical aspects of operating universities in a globalized world. In the 21st century, managing and leading universities present enormous challenges—owing to their complexities, such as, multifaceted institutions with large budgets and the effects of cross-border education. This article explains the need for African university leaders to undertake some training in the nature of university governance, as a prerequisite. In 1960, only 20 universities were operating in Africa. Today, there are more than 500 universities (both public and private). This sudden explosion in the number of universities attributes to certain factors, including universal secondary education and the perception of higher education as a lucrative and viable commodity. However, with the rise in the number of universities, a high level of demand arises, for good leadership to manage these universities.

LEADERSHIP CHALLENGES

Within most African states, the selection of university management and leadership has been based on academic achievement and government endorsement. In most countries, top university leadership, such as the vice chancellors and rectors, gains access to such positions on the basis of being renowned scholars. While such a phenomenon may be considered a positive value, in reality it would be worthy to engage potential university leaders in training, to enable them to face the related challenges. In Uganda, few vice chancellors have participated in rigorous leadership and management training programs, and few programs have been set up to provide a localized African context. Yet, most African university vice chancellors are faced with numerous administrative and human-resource challenges.

EMERGENCE OF THE PRIVATE PROVIDER

In the African context, an emergence of new providers to university education has occurred—“the private providers.” The rise in the number of these private providers in the university arena raises a number of issues, because most of these universities fail to deliver quality education. Moreover, they experience enormous hardships—sometimes

forced to close operations as soon as they are licensed (see the Ugandan newspaper, the *Monitor*, May 21, 2010, on the closure of Lugazi University). Conversely, within the private sector, many times the vice chancellors are not chosen as good scholars but because they are part of the ownership (promoters or members of the board of trustees). Thus, the problem gets compounded since the person entrusted with the stewardship at a private university may lack the basic know-how of running an institution of such a magnitude—hence, creating a high rate of weaknesses, such as poor teaching.

THE WAY FORWARD

As the custodian of higher education institutions in Uganda, the National Council for Higher Education embarked on a three-year management and leadership training pilot program, to bolster Uganda’s emerging university leaders. The Management and Leadership Training Program, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, aims to identify, prepare, and equip 150 emerging university leaders with crucial higher education management skills.

This article explains the need for African university leaders to undertake some training in the nature of university governance, as a prerequisite.

Based on a needs assessment, it was resolved to develop nine modules. The first module, entitled “African Education in a Globalizing World,” introduces the concept of globalization and other related factors—such as, internationalization and cross-border education. The second module, “Leadership, Institutional Innovation and Development,” covers the subject of leadership in universities, which is viewed as a crucial lever in moving the institutions toward their desired destinations. The third module, entitled “Corporate Governance of Universities,” is designed to facilitate a deeper understanding of the corporate governance issues facing universities. The fourth module, the “Management of Resources of Universities,” aims at equipping universities managers with the knowledge of resource acquisition and management. The fifth module, the “Management of Academic Processes,” looks at the processes of academic provision in universities. The sixth module handles the issues of socioeconomic development and articulates the notion of universities as key actors, in reshaping the economic landscape of nations. The philosophy underpinning

the module selection is based on the premise that participants (trainees) are given opportunity to determine what to be rolled out as the eventual module. This aspect of module development is captured during respective training sessions and refined by carefully selected module writers, with good knowledge of curriculum development. The seventh, eighth, and ninth modules shall adopt a similar strategy but are forecast to embody the strategic issues (thinking and planning)—engulfing higher education as a whole.

Most African university vice chancellors are faced with numerous administrative and human-resource challenges.

To achieve its objective of attracting credible actors to the program, the Management and Leadership Training Team undertook an intense participant selection process, by conducting initial workshops at universities to identify potential leaders committed to the three-year training program and the higher education system. The outreach strategy, adopted by the Management and Leadership Training Team of engaging universities to directly in the selection process, realized excellent results. The plan provided a wonderful opportunity for both the Management and Leadership Training Team and the university community, to clarify issues and deal with anxieties and potential problems—early before the training time. The program identifies current and former vice chancellors as trainers, who would refrain from lecturing but adopt a facilitative approach. Such an approach constitutes developing a pool of training facilitators in university leadership and management, on the continent. However, as part of the training, participant cohorts are required to provide reform projects for their institutions. The program is currently working with 12 universities (public and private chartered), in Uganda, and is monitored by the Evaluation Research Agency, based at Stellenbosch in South Africa.

THE OUTCOME THUS FAR

Three cohorts of middle and top managers and leaders from the participating universities have been trained. In each case, the project has witnessed great enthusiasm and openness, to revising their worldview and to learning new things. The eagerness to implement the reform projects in the respective universities promises outstanding success for the project. Participants have been able to demonstrate the ability to distinguish the roles of and relationships with

the various stakeholders in higher education. Moreover, participants have shown a good degree of analytical assessment and are determined to chart strategies for aiding their progression.

CONCLUSION

The number of universities in Africa will continue to grow, as nations seek to acquire knowledge for economic development. Managing and leading the emerging universities pose theoretical and practical challenges. The onus is on university leaders to prepare themselves. Embracing innovative initiatives such as the Management and Leadership Training Program, by Carnegie, can propel potential leaders to embrace the reform process and set the leadership style for university graduates who become the nation's own leaders. ■

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>).

As part of that larger global reality, higher education in the region has also reignited interest globally.

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 Commission and African Union Commission 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 Support 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>).

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).

For more than two decades, DAAD has also been a significant player of university partnerships in Africa.

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 knowl-

edge, 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 were 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 perception 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 grows,

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. ■

Widening Participation in Higher Education in Ghana and Tanzania

LOUISE MORLEY

Louise Morley is a professor at the Centre for Higher Education and Equity Research, at the University of Sussex, UK. E-mail: L.Morley@sussex.ac.uk. For additional analysis, see www.sussex.ac.uk/education/cheer/wphegt.

An interrogation under way is whether policies for widening participation in sub-Saharan Africa are working. That was one of the key questions addressed by the research project *Widening Participation in Higher Education in Ghana and Tanzania: Developing an Equity Scorecard*. Research teams—at the Universities of Sussex, UK; Cape Coast, Ghana; and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania—found that the policies were working in the sense of increasing the overall number of students, especially women, participating in higher education. However, they found that poorer and mature students were still absent from many of the programs investigated in one public and one private university, in both Ghana and Tanzania. The universities included in the study did have quotas for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, but failed to fill them or monitor how many poorer students were participating and completing their studies. Students who did succeed, in entering university, shared helpful insights into their lived experiences.

STUDENT VOICES

An original aspect of the study contained two hundred student life-history interviews about their experiences of

primary, secondary, and higher education, with questions about their motivations, transitions, support, decision making and first impressions of higher education, its impact on them, and their future plans. Students from a diversity of backgrounds, including underrepresented groups—such as, women, mature, low socioeconomic status, and disabled students—discussed entering and experiencing higher education. Financial concerns ran through the entire study. Many students—especially those from low socioeconomic backgrounds—reported that their participation had been entirely dependent on loans and bursaries. Mature students

Many students—especially those from low socioeconomic backgrounds—reported that their participation had been entirely dependent on loans and bursaries.

reported the strains and stresses of earning, while learning, often with extended family responsibilities.

The evidence revealed many committed and caring individuals working in higher education, in both African countries, and students appreciated the support that they had received from lecturers, counselors, and advisers. However, a significant number complained of poor-quality tuition and a lack of learning resources and facilities, including libraries and information technology. Disabled students were particularly affected by low-standard and often inaccessible facilities. Many students reported problems with large classes and overcrowded classrooms and wanted fewer large-scale transmission lectures and more interactive and engaging pedagogies.

An area that attracted plenty of attention was assessment. Not only was it the focal point for considerable joy or sadness; many students felt that the process itself was often precarious and lacking in transparency. A common concern was that lecturers did not seem accountable to any wider-quality assurance procedures and often appeared to make unilateral, tardy, and inconsistent decisions about grades and curriculum content.

GENDER INEQUALITIES

The transformative and instrumental potential of higher education was noted by many women students—securing financial independence, professional identity, and status. However, while the numbers of women as undergraduate students were increasing, there were questions about the

gender inequalities and discrimination that many women, who once entered, experienced. Sexual harassment was discussed by staff and students in both countries, especially in relation to some male tutors pressurizing female students for sex, in return for grades. This led to extreme difficulties for female students' physical and mental well-being and deterred them from seeking tutorial support from male tutors or making themselves visible in class.

Women students also reported how they were pressured by male students, sexually and socially, with the men appropriating female students' domestic labor for cooking, laundry, etc. This disturbed and distracted women from their studies and left them with limited lifestyle choices. Having a boyfriend was the norm, and those women who did not succumb to this pressure were stigmatized and/or marginalized.

BECOMING A SOMEBODY

In spite of their often serious concerns about quality and dangers, students generally felt that higher education had transformed their social identities and potential. For many, it represented a means of "becoming a somebody." They reported that being a student had enhanced their sense of self-efficacy and self-esteem, and many wanted to use their newfound social and intellectual capital, for national economic and social development. Others simply wanted the "good life" and an escape route from rural and urban poverty. Any negative experiences seemed to be erased by their aspirations to succeed in societies, where they believed that being a graduate guaranteed comfortable lifestyles. Many wanted to continue into postgraduate study.

DOING MORE WITH LESS

The interviews with two hundred staff and policymakers often highlighted capacity challenges and how widening participation policies were introduced, without additional resources. They talked extensively about the impact of poverty on student participation and the crucial role of the loans systems in enabling poorer students to gain access and successfully complete their studies. They suggested that Education for All policies and Millennium Development Goals needed to be more integrated in higher education policy; currently, all the policy emphasis was based on including more socially disadvantaged young people in basic, rather than, higher education.

There was significant pride in the increase of women students, especially in science programs. Many of these interviewees felt that this could be attributed to the affirmative-action efforts, which had been introduced and funded by international donors. However, many noted the absence of effective data and management information systems that would allow them to monitor and evaluate access, reten-

tion, and achievement of different groups of students.

MAPPING INEQUALITIES

A distinctive feature of the study was to set the interviews alongside statistical data. One-hundred equity scorecards were compiled largely from raw data on admission/access, retention, completion, and achievement, for four programs of study in relation to three structures of inequality: gender, socioeconomic status, and age. They yielded a nuanced overview of the intersected effects of gender, age, and socioeconomic status and revealed a number of facts that often contradicted narrative accounts. Most programs enrolled few (or not any) low socioeconomic-status students. Low socioeconomic-status students who were present tended to be on programs with low-exchange rates in the labor market. However, once given the chance to enter higher education, fewer low socioeconomic-status students withdrew, and they performed as well as, and sometimes better than, other groups. The group most at risk of withdrawal were mature students. Women, especially low socioeconomic-status and mature women, were still underrepresented on

The transformative and instrumental potential of higher education was noted by many women students—securing financial independence, professional identity, and status.

science programs, but more women were entering private, than public, universities.

This research project illustrated how there is still a toxic correlation between poverty and access to higher education. Unequal geographies of knowledge and some archaic patterns of participation in higher education were found in the two countries. Globally, participation rates are rising but not from a range of social groups, in Ghana and Tanzania. For many, widening participation was seen in relation to quantitative change of one particular group, usually women, into science subjects. There was less policy engagement with qualitative experiences of students who once entered, with monitoring educational outcomes including retention and completion, or with intersectionality of social identities. The findings raised questions about the need to intersect quality and equality and how the value of higher education should be considered in terms of wealth distribution and poverty alleviation, as well as wealth creation. ■

What Organized Business Wants from Higher Education: A Look at India

DANIEL C. LEVY

Daniel C. Levy is State University of New York distinguished professor, at the University at Albany, State University of New York. E-mail: dlevy@albany.edu.

IHE publishes occasional articles from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/>.

In November 2011, the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI), which proclaims itself Industry's Voice for Policy Change, hosted a major conference on the future of Indian higher education. Participation amply involved, though not limited to, Indian business interests and private higher education. FICCI laid out organized business's basic views about the appropriate policy agenda for the future of Indian higher education.

The main FICCI tenets are strikingly close to those seen at a business-oriented higher education seminar, a year before in the Philippines. Likely, the FICCI view focuses the organized business sector in many developing countries. This view might be broadly characterized as liberal modernizing—overlapping aspects of what is often labeled neoliberal. It translates into an agenda of growth, priority attention to private higher education, academic modernization, and limited government regulation.

GROWTH

The business community appears as eager as public opinion for Indian higher education to expand, rapidly and greatly. Indeed expansion has been immense, with now 14.6 million students. Yet, this expansion still leaves a gross-enrollment rate of only 13.8 percent, up from 10 percent in 2000 but substantially below China's, for example. FICCI speaks approvingly of the government goal to reach 30 percent by 2020, which emphasizes the great excess of future demand over the present supply—without labeling that demand as excessive or the meeting of it as pandering to political pressures that are economically or academically injurious.

On the contrary, FICCI considers immense further growth as necessary to a knowledge economy, national development, and business interests. This growth must prominently include robust expansion of high-quality graduate education and research. FICCI laments the many

size deficits in the higher education system—such as, infrastructural needs and, above all, sufficient faculty trained to meet even the present student enrollment.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Though FICCI's pro-growth position encompasses both sectors of higher education, it gives most attention to private higher education. Amid different figures, it appears that 30 percent is a good estimate for the private sector's share of total enrollment. Of course, in countries like India and China, respectively, private higher education's ability to hold its own proportionally or moderately expanding share is remarkable given the unprecedented public growth.

The variability of figures on private higher education is a result of multiple factors, including the lack of a centralized plan for the sector, rapid expansion, enormous diversity of institutional type, as well as overlapping categories for labeling institutions. Deemed university, professional

The business community appears as eager as public opinion for Indian higher education to expand, rapidly and greatly.

institute, business groups (e.g., Manipal Education Group), unaided private institutions, distance education, and a diversity of international partnerships are all higher education forms that have a private higher education component. The most dramatic setting of the private sector's growth lies in professional applied fields, such as engineering and management. The majority of deemed universities are private. International partnership listings are more common in private higher education than in public higher education. The unaided private sector (without government subsidy) has enjoyed large proportional growth.

FICCI approves and promotes private higher education's explosion of various institutional types. It explicitly declares in favor of both growth within existing institutions and establishment of new institutions and varieties. FICCI particularly cheers the spread of "state private universities," established by India's state legislatures. The cheers are for their relatively high autonomy and flexibility. FICCI is enthusiastic about the growth rate: 94 percent of state private universities have been established in just the last five years.

ACADEMIC MODERNIZATION

What business wants from higher education is based mainly on both sectors. Higher academic quality, relevance to the job market, and internationalization are among the

prime examples. However, business speaks on behalf of changes within the public sector that can be seen as partial privatization. Some of that agenda stems from business's keen, direct stake in private higher education and therefore in intersectoral issues. For example, FICCI calls for leveling the playing field by moving toward "student-side funding," whereas government money for higher education has mostly been for institutions, basically public institutions.

FICCI manifests concern over the low academic quality of many of the private institutions, often termed "demand-absorbing." Concern characterizes the view of the mind-boggling explosion to 31,324 institutions of higher education, up from 11,146 in 2001. On the other hand, most of FICCI's attention is on the upper-end of private higher education, which we can term "semi-elite." Indian organized business certainly has the global bug for its country to go further and build "world-class" universities. These would be more ample than the world-class institutes that already exist, and they would be private as well as public.

REGULATION

FICCI is at pains to make clear that business is not antiregulation. The real problems of low quality and fraud are legitimate targets for government rules. Regulations promoting transparency and helping students are welcome. Keen to protect and promote private higher education, business does not want to allow bad apples to spoil the status and legitimacy of that sector in Indian higher education, overall.

But the thrust of FICCI's position on government regulations is that they must be limited. The lamentable reality is a "plethora of regulators and regulations." The regulations undermine the autonomy needed for institutions to strike their own paths and govern themselves coherently. Private higher education is thus overregulated but undergoverned. Based on the basic critiques that business usually has about government regulation of the private sector, FICCI claims that regulation of inputs is excessive; for example, requirements to have computer laboratories often conflict with the reality that students use their own laptops. Input regulations slow private growth, innovation, and diversification.

Perhaps for political purposes, FICCI sometimes frames its complaints in terms of government hyperregulation of higher education overall, in India. However, owners of many private institutions feel government is hostile to the private sector and targeting it. A good example lies in the Unfair Practices bill before parliament. FICCI also looks to government to lift its regulatory restrictions on foreign providers (a bill tabled in 2007 still has not been passed) and on for-profit providers. Business sees both restrictions as undermining growth, private investment, and competition. ■

Temples and World-class Universities

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is Monan professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. He has been an Erudite Scholar of the Government of Kerala.

It is not a routine event that a Hindu temple—or anywhere else—would discover US\$22 billion (approximately Rs. 98,000 crore) buried in the basement. Now that the Sree Padmanabhaswamy Temple in Thiruvananthapuram, the capital of the Indian state of Kerala, has this windfall, everyone is suggesting ways of using the funds. Here is one idea that would make a real contribution to India and to the state of Kerala and is much in keeping with the mission of developing culture, science, and civilization: build India's first truly world-class university.

Surprisingly, India, despite its rapidly growing economy and its long tradition of intellectual excellence, does not possess a world-class university—no existing university scores highly in the rankings and none of the institutions are considered top level globally. Only the Indian Institutes of Technology and the Indian Institutes of Management are well known, but they are not universities. Establishing a world-class university would not take all of the available funds, and of course all items of religious or historical value would need to be preserved—in a museum related to the university. Perhaps US\$200 million (approximately Rs. 900 crore) can be used to build a top-level campus in Thiruvananthapuram, seat of the former Travancore kingdom—and another US\$8 billion (approximately Rs. 35,000 crore) set aside for an endowment that would conservatively yield (at a 7 percent payout) about US\$560,000,000 (Rs. 2,500 crore) annually for operating the university. That would leave more than half the current estimate of the temple's worth to keep or spend for other purposes.

Sree Padmanabhaswamy University would serve several important purposes at once. A world-class institution would provide a model for higher education in India and the developing world. The university would contribute to Kerala's economy and indeed jump-start key fields, such as information technology and biotech.

Kerala is the ideal place for a world-class university. It calls itself "God's own Country" for good reasons. A pleasant and green environment is combined with decent infrastructure, and the society lacks many of the tensions found elsewhere in India. The state has good links with the rest of the world through the Gulf. Kerala has universal literacy, and 18 percent of young people access higher education—double the Indian average.

WHAT WOULD KERALA'S WORLD-CLASS UNIVERSITY LOOK LIKE?

Just as important as financing a top university are the ideas behind it. Sree Padmanabhaswamy University will be in virtually all respects un-Indian. It will be neither public nor private but rather independent and controlled by a public trust linked to the temple and to civil society in Kerala. Its controlling trustees would be chosen from among these groups and would include the most senior member of the Travancore royal family, with some additional distinguished international educators. Similar to the great private universities in the United States, Sree Padmanabhaswamy University would have an independent board of trustees. Its funding will be assured by its endowment, although tuition would be charged to students who could afford it, and income might be earned through research contracts. Additional philanthropy will be encouraged. The university would be free of the politics and bureaucracy that are so stifling to India's public universities. And it will be free of the for-profit motives or the capriciousness of business moguls who control some of the new private universities.

Surprisingly, India, despite its rapidly growing economy and its long tradition of intellectual excellence, does not possess a world-class university.

The university would be international in vision and scope. Professors and students would come from around the country and the world. The university's endowment would finance both salaries and scholarships that, while they might not match the richest universities in America or Europe, would be attractive.

The curriculum and focus would be consciously international. At the same time, the university would stress issues of importance to Kerala, south India, and the subcontinent. Sree Padmanabhaswamy University would not, like many recent efforts globally to establish world-class institutions, focus only on the sciences. It would be a comprehensive university, choosing carefully those fields in which it could excel. Some subjects of clear importance to the economy of the state and region—including information technology, some fields of agriculture, and perhaps some areas of biotech. Because of the university's link to the temple, it would aim to be the top university in the world in the study of Hinduism and Indian religions; and because it is in Kerala, which has large populations of Hindus, Muslims, and Christians, it could cultivate an interreligious dialogue.

The university would also focus on the history, art, and society of Kerala and south India. Foci will be chosen carefully, and faculty strength built deliberately to create strategic strength and distinction.

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT FOR THE WORLD-CLASS UNIVERSITY

Governance is central to any university. Sree Padmanabhaswamy University's academic staff should be central to making key academic decisions. At the same time, world-class universities must be effectively managed, and top university leaders should have significant control over strategic decisions. The university's vice chancellor, deans, and other key leaders will be chosen for their talent and leadership capacity—and not because of personal connections.

The university must be a fully meritocratic institution. Both faculty and students would be chosen for their academic quality. Academic staff, once hired, will be carefully evaluated for their teaching and research over a period of years, prior to being given permanent appointments. Students will be chosen on merit and without the strict constraints of the reservation system—although able students from disadvantaged groups could be given some special consideration—and provided with scholarship and bursary assistance and academic support.

India has a unique opportunity to establish a world-class university with some of the unparalleled resources of Kerala's Sree Padmanabhaswamy Temple—using the best international practices and focusing on the needs of Kerala and south India in an international context. The chance to build a world-class university free of the constraints of a bureaucratized system is unique. Higher education is very much in Kerala's traditions, and the state is a logical place for a well-funded university, far from the distractions and politics of New Delhi. ■

A New Approach for Classifying Chilean Universities

CLAUDIA REYES AND PEDRO ROSSO

Claudia Reyes is executive director of Red Universitaria Cruz del Sur, in Santiago, Chile; Pedro Rosso is rector emeritus and professor of pediatrics at Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, in Santiago, Chile. E-mail: Claudia Reyes and Pedro Rosso: barriga@uc.cl.

Over the last few decades, particularly during the 1980s and 1990s, most university systems in the developing world underwent an impressive transformation—with several fold increases in the number of students enrolled

and the opening of many new, mostly private, universities. One of the consequences of this expansive change has been a marked increase in the heterogeneity of the institutions comprised in the various systems. Beyond its academic dimensions, heterogeneity poses serious problems to systems attempting to classify the universities for research, ranking or public policies purposes. Chile is a good example. The first attempt to classify national universities—based on selectivity, size, prestige, and nature (public or private)—resulted in eight categories. Despite some of its merits, this classification was criticized on conceptual and practical grounds, including the fact that the categories were not exclusive ones.

Other observers have tried to classify Chilean universities, using selectivity and annual publications as *primary* criteria, and the number of students and the years of accreditation granted to the institution as *secondary* criteria. They described seven categories of institutions—some improvements over the previous ones. However, this classification was also flawed on several accounts, including the use of selectivity as a main criterion. For example, one category listed selective research universities, while another group was described as nonselective, teaching, large-size, and low accreditation institutions.

A NEW APPROACH TO CLASSIFYING UNIVERSITIES

A recent approach faced the challenge of classifying Chilean universities—using as main criteria the existence and number of accredited doctoral programs and the annual number of internationally indexed publications. Applying the first criterion, the universities were divided into two groups: (a) without accredited doctoral programs; and (b) with doctoral programs. Then, those without doctoral programs were subsequently divided, according to the number of publications, in two categories: (a) with less than 20 annual publications; and (b) with 20 or more annual publications. The first category was named “teaching university” and comprised 23 institutions. The second one, called “teaching university with limited research,” included 11 universities. In turn, the universities with accredited PhD programs were divided in two categories: (a) those with up to five programs, and (b) those with more than five doctoral programs. The first category was called “university with research and doctoral programs in selected areas,” and 11 institutions met this criterion. The second one was named “research and doctoral programs university” and comprised 6 universities.

MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES

As expected, the four categories had marked differences in the mean values of the variables used as “primary classification criteria.” Thus, the teaching university group aver-

aged 4 publications per year, the teaching university with research projection group averaged 41 publications per year; the “university with research and doctoral programs in selected areas” group averaged 94 annual publications; and the “research and doctoral programs university” group averaged 636 publications per year. In turn, while the average number of doctoral programs was 2.2 in the group of “university with research and doctoral programs in selected areas,” it averaged 18.5 in the group of “research and doctoral programs university.” “Consequently, the primary classification criteria had successfully grouped Chilean universi-

One of the consequences of this expansive change has been a marked increase in the heterogeneity of the institutions comprised in the various systems.

ties in markedly different categories. Particularly striking was the tenfold difference in the number of publications observed, between the two “teaching universities” categories—indicating that on this aspect the category “teaching university” is indeed quite different than its “teaching university with research projection” partner. On the other hand, this difference implies that in approximately 30 percent of the Chilean universities practically no research is conducted.

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH THE FOUR CATEGORIES

The four categories were also compared on the values of institutional size and academic performance (accreditation)—unrelated to the publications and doctoral programs indicators used to define the four categories. The statistical significance of variations in mean values between categories was tested using a one-way analysis of variance. This test provides a method to establish whether or not the means of several groups are statistically different. The analysis of variance test was complemented with post hoc tests, which do establish more specifically means that were significantly different, from each other. Results indicated a major diversity in mean values in most of the indicators explored, including: number of students, number of faculties, percentage of faculties with advanced degrees, number of faculties per study program, percentage of accredited study programs, and years of institutional accreditation. The main differentiations were found between the “teaching university” and the “research and doctoral programs university” categories, with mean values of the other two categories falling in between.

NEW CLASSIFICATION FOR COMPARATIVE STUDIES

The categories defined by the new classification are associated with basic institutional characteristics and academic performances. Thus, for comparison purposes, the institutions included within a given category could be considered to be “academic peers.” The latter seems a relevant point, since most of the available comparative studies—including national and international university rankings—generally overlook this aspect. From this perspective, it is unfortunate that the research universities, especially those considered to be “world class” have become the paradigm of academic quality. While recognizing the need for any country to have a “critical mass” of those institutions, from the stand point of diversity and their intrinsic value, the only paradigm that a university should have is the best institution within its own category.

CLASSIFYING UNIVERSITIES IN DEVELOPING SYSTEMS

The new classification used for Chilean universities can be applied in other countries, with some adaptation to local realities. For example, other cut-off points for annual publications or number of doctoral programs accredited by a national agency could be used. The new classification also might provide an overall diagnosis of a system, in terms of the percentage of teaching and research institutions present. In university systems diversity represents a value in itself, since it implies both for the students and the faculty more options to decide where to study or work.

When classifying and comparing universities, particu-

From this perspective, it is unfortunate that the research universities, especially those considered to be “world class” have become the paradigm of academic quality.

larly in developing systems, all classifications do *freeze* in time essentially dynamic situations. In the future, many institutions will reform their category as research activities expand and new postgraduate programs are created. On the other hand, faithful to their missions, many other universities will remain in the same category, while improving their academic performance. Ultimately, in the academic world what really counts is coherence between mission, human, and financial resources and the will to achieve the highest possible quality standards. Thus, it is crucial to properly classify universities. ■

Economic Growth and Higher Education Policies in Brazil: A Link?

SIMON SCHWARTZMAN

Simon Schwartzman is president of the Instituto de Estudos do Trabalho e Sociedade in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. E-mail: simon@iets.org.br.

Brazil is one of the new “emerging economies.” It is flexing its muscles to become a leading international player, and thus, it needs good university institutions capable to produce the scientists and engineers needed to keep the momentum. Therefore, clear policies are required, to improve the standards of universities and the quality of higher education institutions, based on a clear identification of priorities. However, contrary to the assumptions and expectations of external observers, Brazil does not have such a strategy.

Brazil experienced cycles of rapid economic growth in the 1930s, after World War II, in the 1970s, and again after 2002. Each of these cycles can be explained by favorable external conditions—the revenues created by the agricultural and mining sectors, the influx of international investments, and the use of such resources to finance a growing public sector; the steady transfer of the population from the countryside to the urban centers, and generating a growing internal consumption market. These developments were also preceded by internal reorganizations of the economy, controlling inflation and increasing the governments’ ability to raise taxes, as it happened in the late 1960s and more recently in the 1990s. In none of these cycles is a causal link found between investments in education, science, and technology and economic growth. On the contrary, the causality seems to be the opposite. With more resources, governments became more generous and willing to respond to the demands of an emerging middle class for more benefits, including free access to education. Thus, the existing network of federal universities was created during the period of economic expansion after the Second World War; and the current network of graduate education, research, and technology was set up in the late 1970s, when the “economic miracle” of the previous years was about to implode.

The economic boom of the last 10 years was mostly fueled by the macroeconomic stability achieved in the late 1990s, the favorable winds of international trade blowing from China, and the ability of a small sector of the economy—mostly the agrobusiness and mining companies. With economic stabilization, high interest rates, and an overvalued currency—the country became attractive to foreign investments, generating more jobs and employment

for the middle classes.

THE EXPANSION OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURE AND EDUCATION

With the economy growing at the steady rate of 4 to 5 percent a year, public expenditures increased to almost 40 percent of the gross domestic product, most of it spent on social security, the payment of civil servants, and the service of the public debt. The federal government benefited from the growing tax base, to distribute some benefits to the poor, with the conditional cash transfer programs and increases in the value of the minimum wage; to the civil servants, increasing their numbers, raising salaries and social benefits; to the rich, providing cheap subsidies and generous contracts for public works and services; and to political allies, through widespread patronage and tolerance to corruption. For the middle class, one benefit was to provide growing access to free higher education in public and private institutions and affirmative action, to respond to the demands of organized social movements.

None of these options required a national policy for good-quality higher education and effective and economically relevant science and technology. Brazil spends today about 5 percent of gross domestic product on education, mostly through states and municipalities for basic and secondary schools. In spite of recent investments in public universities, the provisions cover about 25 percent of the enrollment. While some institutions and professional schools are of good quality, most of them are not; and there is no mechanism to stimulate quality. The assessments carried on by the government only affect poorly rated private institutes in medicine and law, largely in response to the pressures from the professional corporations. Graduate education and research continue to expand, mostly in the State of São Paulo, in selected federal universities and in a network of federal research institutes. It is by far the largest research and development and graduate education establishment in Latin America. But research is mostly academic, with little factors in terms of patents and applied technology, and is poorly connected with the country’s economic and social needs.

There are some counterexamples: Embraer, Brazil’s successful airplane company, grew out of the Aeronautical Institute of Technology (ITA)—a technological institute and engineering school established by the Air Force; and at least part of the achievements in agriculture is explained by new varieties developed by Embrapa, Brazil’s agricultural research agency. The National Service for Industrial Training (SENAI), a vocation-training agency run by the Federation of Industries, has a history of success in the qualification of specialized workers for the industrial sector. All, tellingly, are outside the realm of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science and Technology.

In short, as the Brazilian society modernized and its

economy grew, higher education institutions also expanded in size and some of them even in quality; they were and are still part of the same wave. Clearly, higher education could not have grown without economic development, but the reverse (so far at least) is not true, although it may become so in the future.

THE FUTURE

This situation may be transforming. As the economy becomes more complex and sophisticated, it requires a more skilled population and more relevant research. There are

signs that this is already happening, with new companies complaining for the lack of qualified engineers and mid-level technicians; and multinational corporations importing qualified manpower from abroad. To respond to this situation, higher education in Brazil will have to change its priorities from uncontrolled growth and access to quality and relevance—not an easy transition.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

“Access and Equity in Financing Higher Education in Arab Countries.” *Prospects* no. 157, 1–176, March, 2011.

This special issue of UNESCO’s *Prospects* focuses on access and financing in the Arab countries. Following a comparative analysis of trends in the region, this publication includes a series of case studies. These include Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Morocco, and Tunisia. The issue concludes with a discussion of international trends in public and private financing of higher education.

Bhandari, Rajika, and Peggy Blumenthal, eds. *International Students and Global Mobility in Higher Education: National Trends and New Directions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 243 pp. \$85 (hb). ISBN 978-0-230-61878-7. Web site: www.palgrave.com.

Focusing on key countries engaged in international student mobility, the chapters provide an overview of trends over time for regions and countries and include useful statistics—concerning flows of students, as well as analysis of policy and practice. Among the countries and regions included are the United States, India, China, Africa, Latin America, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Canada. Useful overviews are also included.

Bolman, Lee G., and Joan V. Gallos. *Reframing Academic Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011. 254 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-7879-8806-7. Web site: www.josseybass.com.

The authors recognize that universities are a special type of organization, and thus

the challenges of leadership in academic institutions are unusual. This book is a practical guide to leadership in American universities. It stresses how leaders can be effective on academic context and stresses creating a humane environment, as part of the responsibility of leadership.

Cimic, Charles, Neil Gross, and Michèle Lamont, eds. *Social Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2011. 471 pp. \$30 (pb). ISBN 978-0-226-09209-6. Web site: www.press.uchicago.edu.

A highly original sociological study of aspects of academic culture includes the use of archives, the role of theory in sociology, the role of peer-review panels in several academic contexts, the role of objectivity in regulatory science, and others. The cases are all from the United States, and the perspective of the research is sociological.

Cloete, Nico, Tracy Bailey, Pundy Pillay, Ian Bunting, and Peter Maassen. *Universities and Economic Development in Africa*. Wynberg, South Africa: Centre for Higher Education Transformation, 2011. 188 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-920355-73-9. Web site: www.chet.org.za.

The focus of this volume is how universities in Africa can contribute to economic development. Case studies from Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda discuss this theme. Authors conclude that universities need to focus more specifically on this goal; and the academic core of the university, and particularly the faculty, needs to be emphasized.

DeMillo, Richard A. *Abelard to Apple: The Fate of American Colleges and Universities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011. 320 pp. \$27.95 (hb). ISBN 978-0-262-01580-6. Web site: www.mitpress.mit.edu.

This wide-ranging discussion of the past and future of universities, focusing mainly on the United States, links history with high-tech development to analyze how universities can best serve modern society. A main theme is how technology is changing higher education and what its role should be in the future.

King, Roger, Simon Marginson, and Rajani Naidoo, eds. *Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011. 539 pp. \$260 (hb). ISBN 978-1-84844-5857. Web site: www.e-elgar.com.

A comprehensive discussion of the various aspects of the key themes of globalization and higher education, this book features 29 research-based chapters. Among the topics discussed are the university as a global institution, higher education and the new imperialism, globalization and inequality, regional responses to globalization, themes in steering higher education globally, competition in the global labor market, and a series of country-based chapters.

Lane, Jason E., and Kevin Kinser, eds. *Multinational Colleges and Universities: Leading, Governing, and Managing International Branch Campuses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011. 116 pp. (pb). Web site: www.josseybass.com.

A multifaceted discussion of aspects of international branch campuses, this volume

is written mainly from an American perspective. Among the themes discussed are multinational quality assurance, managing academic staff in multiple countries, replicating the student experience, operational considerations in operating a campus abroad, and others. A select bibliography of key items is included. This book is part of the “New Directions in Higher Education” series.

Lindow, Megan. *Weaving Success: Voices of Change in African Higher Education*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2011. 218 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-342-6.

Focusing on how the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa contributed to development, this book mainly examines how the various programs affected Africans. Nine African countries are profiled, as are a series of other initiatives concerning libraries, the development of data, and other programs.

Luescher-Mamashela, Thierry. *The University in Africa and Democratic Citizenship: Hot-house or Training Ground?* Wynberg, South Africa: Centre for Higher Education Transformation, 2011. 118 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-920355678. Web site: www.chet.org.za.

Student involvement in politics has a long tradition in Africa. This volume reports on what is perhaps the first multicountry survey of student opinions about politics and governance of higher education. Countries included are Kenya, South Africa, and Tanzania. The book reports on student attitudes toward democracy, student involvement in governance, and related issues.

Magolda, Peter M., and Marcia B. Baxter Magolda, eds. *Contests Issues in Student Affairs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2011. 504 pp. \$34.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-57922-584. Web site: www.styluspub.com.

Focusing on the United States, this volume provides a discussion of key controversial issues in the field of student affairs. Organized around 24 “contentious questions,” the contributors deal with the philosophical foundations of student affairs, the challenges of promoting learning and development, achieving equitable learning environments,

and organizing student affairs practice.

Marginson, Simon, and Erlenawati Sawir. *Ideas for Intercultural Education*. New York: Palgrave, 2011. 221 pp. \$80 (hb). ISBN 978-0-230-11793-6. Web site: www.palgrave.com.

Based on interviews with international students studying in Australia, Marginson and Sawir discuss patterns of life, study, and intergroup relations and develop generalizations about their experiences. The focus of the book is on how the academic and other experiences of international students can be improved.

Marginson, Simon, Sarjit Kaur, and Erlenawati Sawir, eds. *Higher Education in the Asia-Pacific: Strategic Responses to Globalization*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2011. 465 pp. \$189 (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-1499-1. Web site: www.springer.com.

This comprehensive book focuses on how nations in the Asia-Pacific region—and a few other countries such as Saudi Arabia and India—have dealt with globalization in the context of their universities. Several chapters focus on broader issues, such the Confucian model of higher education in Asia and transnational higher education. Most discuss countries or specific universities in the region. Not surprisingly, China receives a good deal of attention, but chapters on Vietnam, Cambodia, Papua-New Guinea and several others discuss areas not often analyzed.

Parra-Sandoval, Maria Cristina, Ana Julia Bozo de Carmona, and Alicia Inciarte Gonzalez. *University: The Last Call?* Maracaibo, Venezuela: Universidad de Zulia, 2010. 235 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-980-12-4428-8. Web site: www.luz.edu.ve.

This book presents an argument for a new concept of the university, focusing on Latin America and using Venezuela as a case study. The concerns of this study are the realities of higher education and the needs of developing countries. The authors argue that a new model of higher education is emerging in Venezuela.

Pasztai, Gabriella, ed. *Religion and Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*. Debrecen, Hungary: Center for Higher Education Research, Univ. of Debrecen, 2010. 310 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-963-473-372-0. Web site: www.revacern.eu.

This volume provides case studies of religiously affiliated higher education institutions in Poland, Romania, and the Czech and Slovak republics. Additional analyses of religious faculties in Slovenia, Austria, Bulgaria, Ukraine, and several others are included as well. Several analyses of the religious views of students in Hungary and Poland are provided.

Post, Robert C. *Democracy, Expertise, and Academic Freedom: A First Amendment Jurisprudence for the Modern State*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012. 177 pp. \$30 (hb). ISBN 978-0-300-14863-3. Web site: www.yalebooks.com.

This short book discusses the American legal concept of academic freedom and the current challenges it faces in the context of free-speech challenges in the legal system. There is some focus on higher education in the analysis.

Regini, Marino, ed. *European Universities and the Challenge of the Market*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011. 233 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-1-84980-403-5. Web site: www.elgar.com.

This analysis, by Italian researchers, focuses on how European universities have reacted to the pressures on higher education of the past half century. An overarching theme is the impact of “market ideas” on higher education. Case studies from six countries—the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy, and Spain—are included.

PLEASE KEEP YOUR *IHE* SUBSCRIPTION UP TO DATE

International Higher Education was first published more than 15 years ago. Although hard to remember, the Internet was in its infancy and electronic subscriptions to journals like ours were unusual. In the early days, *IHE* was distributed only as a paper edition. Technical progress now makes it possible for us to deliver *IHE* more quickly and at a lower cost in an electronic version.

We have many subscribers who have been with us since 1995 for whom we have no e-mail address. In fact we have not heard from many of our subscribers since our first mailing! It is urgent for all subscribers to have complete profiles registered in our database in order to continue to receive *International Higher Education*.

We would like to be able to include all subscribers in our occasional electronic bulletins with news of the Center and our projects as well as the electronic distribution of *IHE*. If you do not receive the electronic version of *IHE*, we do not have your e-mail address. We are happy to continue to send paper versions as well as electronic versions, but we need to confirm who truly wants them! Therefore, we would greatly appreciate it if you would take the time to update your subscriber profile online at:

<http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/research/cihe/ihe/subscribe.html>

Thank you!

NEWS OF THE CENTER

Philip G. Altbach and Liz Reisberg, both members of the planning committee for the 3rd Riyadh conference on higher education, will travel to Saudi Arabia in April to participate in the conference. Altbach will give one of the conference plenary presentations. A member of the international advisory committee at the Higher School of Economics, he will travel to Moscow for the annual meeting of the committee in late May.

The Center has a collaborative arrangement with the Institute of Advanced Study at the University of Campinas, in Brazil. Liz Reisberg is assisting to organize a leadership-training seminar at Campinas in July. Among the speakers are Philip G. Altbach and Karen Arnold of the higher education program at Boston College.

The Center's partnership with the American Council on Education (ACE) has resulted in the first of our *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders*, focusing on emerging opportunities and challenges for higher education cooperation with China. ACE and the Center will produce two publications, annually. Each report will be followed by a webinar organized by ACE. This new series will be available by subscription only, available through ACE.

David A. Stanfield has joined the Center as a research assistant and doctoral student in higher education administration. Liu Jin from the Huazhong University of Science and Technology in Wuhan, China, Kazuhito Obara of Tamagawa University in Tokyo, Japan, and Dr. Dan Lincoln are visiting scholars for the current semester.

CRITICAL INTERNATIONAL NEWS AT A GLANCE ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER

Do you have time to read more than 20 electronic bulletins weekly in order to stay up to date with international initiatives and trends? We thought not! So, as a service, the CIHE research team posts items from a broad range of international media to our Facebook and Twitter page.

You will find news items from the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Education*, *University World News*, *Times Higher Education*, the *Guardian Higher Education network UK*, the *Times of India*, the *Korea Times*, just to name a few. We also include pertinent items from blogs and other online resources. We will also announce international and comparative reports and relevant new publications.

Unlike most Facebook and Twitter sites, our pages are not about us, but rather "newsfeeds" updated daily with no-

tices most relevant to international educators and practitioners, policymakers, and decision makers. Think "news marquis" in Times Square in New York City. Here, at a glance, you can take in the information and perspective you need in a few minutes every morning.

To follow the news, press "Like" on our Facebook page at: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-International-Higher-Education-CIHE/197777476903716>. "Follow" us on Twitter at: https://twitter.com/#!/BC_CIHE.

We hope you'll also consider clicking "Like" on Facebook items you find most useful to help boost our presence in this arena. Please post your comments to encourage online discussion.

We will keep you informed and save you time!



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

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

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your 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