

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 offers 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 Student Recruiting

- 2 The Pursuit of International Students in a Commercialized World
Philip G. Altbach and Liz Reisberg
- 4 In Search of Solutions for the Agent Debate
Rahul Choudaha
- 6 International Recruitment: Oversight and Standards
David Engberg
- 7 International Admissions: Ethical Challenges
Daniel Zaretsky
- 9 Barefaced Cheating in China's Bull Market for Fraud
Jon Marcus

International Issues

- 11 Professors: The Key to Internationalization
Gerard A. Postiglione and Philip G. Altbach

Africa Focus

- 13 Government and Governance Reforms in Africa
N. V. Varghese
- 14 New Reforms in Kenya
Ishmael I. Mumene

Quality Assurance Issues

- 16 Quality Regimes in Africa
Juma Shabani
- 18 The Problems with Cross-Border Quality Assurance
Kevin Kinser and Jason E. Lane

Private Higher Education

- 20 Challenges to Top-Ranked Private Universities in Poland
Joanna Musial-Sadilek

Countries and Regions

- 21 The Founding of University of the Chinese Academic of Sciences
Qiang Zha and Guangli Zhou
- 23 Venezuelan Higher Education's Legacy Under Chávez
Orlando Albornoz
- 24 Strengthening Higher Education in Laos
Jane Knight
- 26 New Missions and Ambitions for Russian Universities
Tatiana Kastouéve-Jean

Departments

- 28 New Publications
- 30 News of the Center

Introduction

Although this publication has tended toward more scholarly content, the editor believes that the policy debate about international student recruitment merits discussion here. As more institutions worldwide pursue international enrollment to meet different objectives, the process of recruiting students is undertaken in new ways that bring into question ethical standards of practice and raise concerns about how to protect the interests of various actors, particularly students. The articles presented here discuss aspects of this topic from several perspectives.

The Pursuit of International Students in a Commercialized World

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND LIZ REISBERG

Philip G. Altbach is Research Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Liz Reisberg is president of Reisberg & Associates. E-mail: reisberg@gmail.com.

Global student mobility creates big business. Approximately 3 million students are studying abroad, contributing more than US\$75 billion to the global economy. There are multiple reasons for choosing to study abroad, among them a desire to increase employability in the home labor market, the inability to find relevant study opportunities at home, and the desire for migration.

The motivations of countries and universities recruiting international students are equally complex and increasingly commercial. Many countries and institutions depend on international student enrollments to balance academic budgets. In some cases (Australia, for example), government policy has identified international higher education—including foreign study in Australia, branch campuses, and other initiatives as a significant income stream for higher education. The United Kingdom similarly views international education as a source of income, charging non-European Union foreign students higher fees. Increasingly, American universities also see international education as an income stream. At least two states, Washington and New York, are considering higher tuition for international students.

Recent research shows that international students constitute the large majority of students in some science, tech-

nology, engineering, and mathematics fields in a number of key developed countries, including the United States. Thus, a recent study noted that more than 95 percent of graduate students in electrical engineering and computer science are international students at some key American universities. Many American universities have become dependent on international students to serve as graduate teaching and research assistants.

GETTING INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE

Traditionally, when a student wanted to study abroad, he or she elected a destination country, researched academic institutions, locations, degree availability, and costs and applied directly to an academic institution. In the past, most people seeking foreign study were looking for graduate or professional qualifications and were typically from families with some international exposure. As long as the numbers were modest, this informal system of obtaining information through personal networks worked reasonably well. Additionally, prospective students could acquire additional information and support from a number of government and university-sponsored agencies—such as, EducationUSA, the British Council, Campus France, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), and others. These organizations maintain centers in major cities around the world and provide objective information about academic opportunities in the country that sponsors them. With the rise of the Internet and university Web sites, it became easier to search for universities directly from their respective Web sites.

As numbers of mobile students have grown and diversified during the past decade, this independent approach to researching opportunities ceased to meet the needs of less cosmopolitan students and families from the burgeoning middle classes, particularly in countries such as China and India, who seek study opportunities abroad.

There are private professional admissions consultants in many major cities who provide advising services to orient prospective students to appropriate opportunities abroad. These consultants may also guide their clients through the unfamiliar terrain of the admission process. The most professional consultants develop a broad knowledge of overseas institutions and admission practices and seek to match a student's needs, academic abilities, and objectives to an appropriate overseas destination. They receive a fee from the student for this service. Although they may develop relationships with admissions officers around the world, in order to remain up to date with current information, there are no contractual agreements with any foreign universities. Many of these consultants belong to professional organizations—such as, the Association of International Graduate Admissions Consultants—to collect data, share experience, and define ethical standards of practice.

AGENTS AND RECRUITING SHORTCUTS

Perhaps the largest and certainly the most controversial recent development is the emergence of agents and recruiters who work for specific universities and funnel students their institutional clients. Agents and recruiters hired on a commission basis have become big business in China and India, but they exist throughout the developing world. No one knows for sure how many agents are operating in the world—no statistics are available—and their activities are unregulated. Most agencies are staffed by entrepreneurs who may or may not have any knowledge about higher education in the countries to which they are sending students other than the information supplied by their university clients. There are a few large agencies with international branch offices and international events—such as the International Development Programme, an Australian-based company with operations worldwide—but most are smaller shops with limited staff.

In essence, agents work for a limited number of universities where they receive a commission for each successful placement. The commission paid varies but often falls in the range of 15 to 20 percent of the first-year fees—this can amount to US\$4,000–6,000 or more. Obviously this is an attractive incentive for agents to push specific institutions. Some US universities use large numbers of agents. For example, the University of Cincinnati lists more than 120 agents on its Web site, including 46 in India alone.

QUESTIONS RAISED

However, no one doubts that the task of researching study-abroad opportunities is daunting. The question is how to acquire the information and support needed and how to recognize the risks. Agents are appealing shortcuts for students as well as for universities that wish to enroll international students, but using agents present a number of dilemmas.

First, there is no way to guarantee whether the institutions recommended by agents are the best choices for the student client. Frankly, it is difficult to imagine that if agents earn their living from commissions from institutions A, B, and C that they will recommend institution S, when it offers a particularly appropriate program for a student. In fact, it is doubtful to imagine that the agent will know about programs other than those at A, B, and C.

Further, it is difficult, if not impossible, to know exactly what takes place between the agent and student, periodic inspections notwithstanding. Anecdotal reports suggest that many agents “help” clients by doctoring academic records, writing essays, preparing letters of recommendations, and providing other kinds of dubious “assistance.” It has been estimated that 80 percent of applicants helped by agents include faked credentials.

In some cases, agents are reported to charge both the student and the university, a practice of questionable ethics.

WHO DETERMINES WHAT IS ETHICAL?

The American International Recruitment Council (AIRC), a nonprofit organization, was launched in 2008 to represent the interests of the agent community and the universities that employ them, and later began to certify agents that meet that council’s ethical standards. The process is expensive, beginning with a US\$2,000 nonrefundable application fee, a US\$5,000 precertification fee, and followed by the travel costs of the evaluation team and a first-year member fee of US\$3,000. Membership must be renewed annually at an additional cost of US\$2–3,000. This puts the cost of certification beyond the budgets of many smaller agencies.

One of many concerns about AIRC is that this organization is entirely self-validating; its members are universities and agents who benefit from the ethical cover that certification provides. AIRC was created to validate the em-

The motivations of countries and universities recruiting international students are equally complex and increasingly commercial.

ployment of agents on the supposition that ethical practices could be assured. There is no independent corroboration of the effectiveness of the methodology or results.

In June 2013, after two years of study, the National Association of Collegiate Admissions Counsel (NACAC), the American organization of professionals in the field of college and university admissions established in 1937, issued a report on agents and recruiters. After considerable pressure from AIRC members, that document backed away from a previous statement that a NACAC member “could not” work with agents to a gentler “should not” work with agents. The NACAC national conference in fall 2013 will consider the report.

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers has also created a task force to consider professional standards for recruitments and other activities related to international activity.

Universities are being asked to disclose that they work with agents and with whom they work. This is, at a minimum, a basic ethical obligation. Yet, agents also need to disclose to students and families that they are contracted by universities, and that they are providing information to stu-

dents on behalf of only those specific universities and *not* pretend that they are professional admissions consultants, who are described above.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

From our perspective, agents and recruiters should not be condoned in the admissions process for domestic or international students. Thus, students should have a full range of information about the universities to which they are most suited and when agents have a vested interest in limiting options to the small number of universities that pay commissions. Further, the possibilities for corruption of the admissions process seem great and widely evident.

The choice about where to study overseas is an important commitment of family resources and student time. Students and their families need to take a proactive role regardless of how difficult the task and not leave their fate to agents or others who might not have their best interest in mind.

International student mobility reflects a mass phenomenon, and a multifaceted approach is needed. Many are already operating but need strengthening.

- Universities have the responsibility to provide informative, honest, user-friendly Web sites with clear information about academic programs, admissions procedures, graduation requirements, costs, and student services.

- Universities must assign staff to respond individually to prospective students, with information and assistance, during the admissions process. This will not be inexpensive, but if some of the budget now on agents can be redirected to this task, the funds will be well spent.

- University and other academic associations in the receiving countries or regions should provide Web sites with clear and complete information about academic systems and study opportunities open to international candidates.

- Governments must increase support to education information centers in the primary sending countries to provide on-site information with well-trained professional staff who can offer workshops and guidance to prospective students.

- Professional education consultants, who provide objective information about study opportunities and carefully assess the needs of potential applicants to match them to appropriate academic programs without the influence of commission, should be distinguished from agents.

- Universities should discourage students and their families from turning decisions over to agents, much as Cornell University has done.

CONCLUSION

Without question, global student mobility is of great importance—for countries, academic institutions, and perhaps

most crucially for individual students. Key to this enterprise is ensuring that the student is matched with the best possible study opportunity. ■

In Search of Solutions for the Agent Debate

RAHUL CHOUDAHA

Rahul Choudaha is the director of research and strategic development at World Education Services, in New York. E-mail: rahul@wes.org.

The use of commissioned agents for recruiting international students had been a divisive debate, with some strong viewpoints and weak action points. The recent report by National Association of College Admissions Counseling (NACAC), on the practice of commission-based international student recruiters, attempted to bring clarity to this debate through a comprehensive and inclusive process. Although it has something for everyone to justify their arguments for or against the use of commission-based agents, it left most of us searching for solutions. At the same time, the report aptly addressed two critical pieces, often overlooked in the debate and have implications for future directions—diversity and transparency.

DIVERSITY OF INSTITUTIONS, STUDENTS, AND AGENTS

The NACAC report rightfully acknowledges that just because commission-based agents are used in other countries, they are suitable in the US context. In the United States, international students are highly concentrated in research universities. Of nearly 4,500 postsecondary degree-granting institutions in the United States, just 108 universities classified as “Research Universities (very high research activity)” by Carnegie Classification, enrolled nearly two-fifth of all international students. Most of these universities are not engaged with the agent debate, as they have a strong brand visibility among prospective international students and also perceive the use of agents as a risk to delegate their brand presence with a third party. Granted, there are exceptions like the University of Cincinnati, which was an early adopter of the agent model.

The discourse on the use of agents in general and the NACAC report in particular, has implications primarily on institutions beyond these 108 research universities (very high research activity). Within this segment, public universities are increasingly interested in recruiting international undergraduate students. Diminishing state support ren-

ders undergraduate international student enrollment an important revenue stream, and agents are being positioned as a cost-effective measure for finding them. This is where some institutions have hastily started using agents without considering the fit with the type of students they want and how those students make choices.

A report by World Education Services—Not All International Students Are the Same—addressed this information gap to better understand students. The report identified four segments of international students—explorers, strivers, strugglers, and highflyers—based on financial resources and academic preparedness. These segments have diverse information needs; and this shapes not only whether or not they use agents but also why they use them. For example, only 24 percent of explorers (high financial resources and low academic preparedness) reported use of agents as compared to 9 percent of strivers (low financial resources and high-academic preparedness).

The quality of agents, in terms of their reliability and ethical behavior, is equally diverse. A segment of students and institutions may still want to work with agents, due to a variety of constraints related to market intelligence, resources, and capacity. Any kind of outright ban from NACAC would have been impractical and unfair, as it would have ignored these diverse institutional needs. At the same time, claiming that commission-based agents are a good fit for all segments of institutions is an overstatement.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Decisions of whether to use commission-based agents, or not, depend on the institutional context and needs. There is nothing *prima facie* unethical or illegal about such conclusions; however, based on autonomy professional responsibility must uphold the highest standards. This is where a commission-based agency model increases the risks and may result in actions by agents that are not in the best interest of students and even the institutions paying commission. At the end of the day, for agents, if there is no admission, there is no commission.

Consider the case of lack of transparency in an agent-student relationship. A forthcoming research report by World Education Services surveyed international students and asked them “Has your educational consultant shared with you whether he or she receives a commission from colleges/universities for each student recruited?” Only 14 percent of prospective international students who reported to use education consultants were informed that the agent would receive commission from institutions, 43 percent were unaware, and 45 percent reported “don’t know/can’t say.”

The finding highlights that the issue of information asymmetry—where one party in the transaction has more information than the other—provides an unfair advantage to the commission-based agents, often at the expense of the institutional brand. At the same time, it is nearly impossible to manage or enforce the “code of conduct” on agents and their network of subagents in other countries.

This is where institutions’ responsibility of setting standards of transparency at their end becomes even more important. The NACAC report recommends “Providing clear and conspicuous disclosure of arrangements by agents with institutions for students and families.” Higher education institutions using commission-based agents should come forward and explicitly state on their Web sites if they work with agents, what commissions they pay, and make this information available to prospective students. For example, the University of Nottingham transparently offers this information to students and also publishes how much commission it pays to agents.

The recent report by National Association of College Admissions Counseling (NACAC), on the practice of commission-based international student recruiters, attempted to bring clarity to this debate through a comprehensive and inclusive process.

The acid test for institutions that are using commission-based agents is in their proactive enforcement of transparency in engagements between themselves, agents, and prospective students. If they are confident about their practices, what do they need to disclose? This emphasis on transparency will bridge the information asymmetry and will set the standard from institutions that there is nothing secretive about the use of commission-based agents.

CONCLUSION

Many are in search of guidelines, however, in the context of seeking solutions to their increasing problems in recruiting international students proactively and quickly. This is where a global industry of agent networks has positioned itself as the panacea for all institutions. The fact remains that the quick-fix solution of using commission-based agents to ramp up international student numbers may increase the risk to the institutional brand, admissions standards, and even the quality of students admitted.

In this context, the NACAC report attempted to investigate and highlight several issues related to the use of agents—including, institutional accountability, transparency, and integrity. At the same time, it did not resolve the core issues related to incentive payments as “the Commission was unable to achieve unanimous consensus.”

This puts even more onus on universities using or considering the use of commission-based agents to assess the segments of students they wish to recruit, their decision-making processes, and institutional readiness to retain them. In addition, institutions need to take proactive steps in setting standards of transparency to break the ills of secretive practices and information asymmetry. ■

International Recruitment: Oversight and Standards

DAVID ENGBERG

David Engberg is executive director of the Global Opportunities Group, a US-based international education services organization. E-mail: dave@g-o-group.com.

The use of paid agents to recruit international students remains a contentious issue in US higher education. Proponents argue that paying agents is inconsistent with well-established domestic student recruitment practices, incentivizes agents to put their own financial interests ahead of students’ academic interests, and contributes to application fraud. Advocates claim that working with paid agents costs less and is a lower risk than managing international recruitment on their own and, by providing access to multiple markets, that it helps diversify international student enrollments.

In May 2013, the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC) released a much-anticipated commission report on international student recruitment. It detailed concerns related to commission-based agents, but recommended that NACAC eliminates its ban on member institutions using paid agents.

Since its publication, the report has been widely criticized by individuals on both sides of the debate. Those opposed to working with agents believe that NACAC compromises its integrity and credibility by allowing a practice that risks putting revenue ahead of students’ interests. The central complaint among supporters of lifting the ban is

that the report does not advance discussions related to international recruitment standards and quality in the United States.

This criticism is especially salient. Given (1) the international spike in demand for admission at US institutions, especially at the undergraduate level, (2) the ability of international students (or their governments) to pay the full cost of instruction, and (3) the fiscal challenges faced by many institutions, it can be anticipated that additional campuses will seek to enroll more and more international students and use third-party agencies to help them.

CURRENT STATUS

The United Kingdom and Australia are well-known for their use of agents to recruit international students to tertiary institutions. Each has well-developed regulatory systems, providing oversight of agent-university relationships—not so in the United States. Here, the federal government gives off mixed signals. State Department-funded EducationUSA offices around the world are prohibited from working commercial recruiters, for fear that doing so would create a perception of bias; the Departments of Commerce and Homeland Security are both involved in activities and events that bring universities and commercial recruitment agencies together and encourage them working together.

Ultimately, the best advice for US educational institutions interested in partnering with an international student recruitment agency, or agencies, is to develop their own set of standards and procedures.

With the exception of the American International Recruitment Council (AIRC), a Washington, DC-based nonprofit founded in 2008, there are no US organizations dedicated to the oversight of international student recruitment.

According to its organizational principals, AIRC’s mission is to develop standards of ethical practice related to international student recruitment, certify agencies determined to be in compliance with AIRC’s standards, and develop best practices and training to aid agencies and institutions to better serve students. To receive certification, an agency must complete a self-evaluation report, undergo a site visit, and pass a vote by AIRC’s Board of Directors. Cer

tification lasts five years, during which time approved agencies may use AIRC's logo to market their services. Once certified, agencies must submit annual reports to remain in good standing and pay an annual membership fee. After five years, they must repeat the entire self- and external-review process to be recertified.

Given the absence of other US organizations, actively involved in international recruitment standards development and oversight, AIRC's work is laudable. Their certification process is lacking, however, in several substantive ways. It is time consuming and expensive: AIRC's Web site instructs agencies to plan for an eight-to-nine month certification process, with a first-year cost of \$10,000. Each year, thereafter, small agencies (less than 500 student placements per annum) must pay a \$2,000 membership fee to retain their certification. For large agencies, the annual fee is \$4,000. Small "mom and pop" agencies still dominate the recruitment market in many countries, especially in Asia. Their cost of AIRC certification and membership—\$20,000 over five years—means that most will not seek certification.

The subjective nature of AIRC's standards is another concern, making them difficult to quantify and review. Is it possible, for example, to measure whether all of an agency's employees "are competent, well informed, reputable, and act at all times in the best interest of the applicant and institutions"? About determining whether the agency is managing its financial resources to best effect, representing itself honestly in advertising materials or ensuring that subagents or others employed offsite to manage, all or part of the recruitment process are in compliance with AIRC's standards?

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, AIRC's review/certification process is designed to certify agencies, rather than the individuals working at agencies. As a result, it does little to ensure that the counselors who are interacting with students actually understand the US higher education system, how admissions offices function, or the nuances of the US immigration system. AIRC, or another US organization, would do well to offer targeted training, like International Consultants for Education and Fairs (ICEF) and the British Council do in Europe, or certification, like Australian-based Professional International Education Resources (PIER) does for the actual counselors responsible for student placements in the US market.

THE PATH FORWARD

Ultimately, the best advice for US educational institutions interested in partnering with an international student recruitment agency, or agencies, is to develop their own set of standards and procedures. Some campuses—the Universi-

ty of Cincinnati and Wichita State University, for example—have done this successfully. Most have not, however, and are ill-prepared to effectively partner with agencies when they come calling. For instance, at many institutions, single individuals are responsible for both international recruitment and admissions, an arrangement that can lead to conflicts of interest. In addition, many campuses, even those seeking to enroll more international students, lack policies for vetting, contracting with, and evaluating the performance of commission-based agents. Thus, regardless of the external organizations engaged in recruitment agency standards and quality assurance, campuses that chose to outsource aspects of their international recruitment must establish plans and best practices appropriate to meeting their own enrollment objectives. ■

International Admissions: Ethical Challenges

DANIEL ZARETSKY

Daniel Zaretsky is chief ideas officer of Higher-Edge, a Toronto-based international higher education consulting firm, in Canada. E-mail: dani@higher-edge.com.

In its May 2013 Report of the Commission on International Student Recruitment (<http://www.nacacnet.org/media-center/Documents/ICR.pdf>), the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC) explores the contentious arena of commission-based international student recruitment contracts. The exclusive focus on commission payments is misplaced. The most disturbing abuses are more closely tied to money paid by students to education agents than commissions from institutions to agents. The lack of oversight by institutions of their international student recruitment practices, including their contracts with agents, is the issue. In addition to clarifying terms, the substantive steps that institutions ought to take to ensure they are operating a clean house are articulated below.

DO ALL AGENTS RECEIVE COMMISSIONS?

An education agent is a company or an individual recruiting students seeking to study in other countries. Education agents may be "stand-alone" or part of a travel agency, immigration consultancy, or other commercial operation.

The NACAC report neatly categorizes three types of education agents (p. 40) but additional clarification is needed. Those earning fees only from institutions, as commission

payments or other fees, should be characterized as “institution recruitment agents.” Those earning fees only from students should be characterized as “student agents.” Those accepting fees from both should be characterized as “mixed fee agents” (the report calls this “double-dipping,” p. 13).

WHAT ARE THE ABUSES?

The NACAC report rightly links commissioned recruiting—i.e., the payment of incentive commissions for each recruited student—with the possibility of an “array of misrepresentations” (p. 10). But the recruitment arena is littered with far worse transgressions, including the widespread faking or doctoring of academic and financial documents and systemic attempts to cheat on globally administered entrance examinations.

How widespread? According to one *Times Higher Education* (London) article of June 13, 2013, a NAFSA: Association of International Educators report concluded that “90 per cent of recommendation letters for Chinese applicants to Western universities had been falsified” (<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/fraud-fears-rocket-as-chinese-seek-a-place-at-any-price/2004704.article>). These abuses are sanctioned by students or their parents, who pay fees for these services.

There is a need to focus policy on “high-fraud high-volume” countries where the most troubling practices occur.

ARE COMMISSION FEES THE PROBLEM?

Commissions from institutions increase incentives to misrepresent information. Some agents steer students from an institution or program that pays no or little commission to a less suitable one that pays the agent US\$1,000, US\$2,000, or significantly more. Agents usually represent a suite of institutions that pay and pay comparably.

The more lucrative model for earning large sums of money is through student fees. Charges for routine service like filing an application offer high earnings. The same *Times* article notes that agencies in China are paid up to US\$10,000 by the student and at times double for admission to highly ranked institutions. Handsome fees can be charged for document fabrication or arranging for a rogue test-taker. Further, high-volume fees are earned from students’ quixotic pursuit of admission even when the agent knows the student will be refused.

Universities know most students they meet abroad will not show up on their shores. Experienced agents know that most prospects will decide to stay at home for their studies, use another agent, attend another institution not in the agent’s portfolio, or be refused a visa. Since only a small percentage of prospects will ultimately earn a commission for an agent, many are inclined to try to capture larger fees

from students for the application process than rely on the small commissions *that might be earned* from those candidates successfully placed abroad. In China and India, agents earn far more from fees charged to students than is paid to them from institution commissions.

WHAT IS THE ROOT CAUSE OF THE TRICKERY?

For the much wider array of unethical practices, such as doctoring an academic record or cheating on examinations (such as SAT), the root problem lies with the student and, too often, parents, pushing for an admissions (or scholarship) advantage. Agents serve as a go-between for guidance and execution.

When the SATs were cancelled nationwide in South Korea in May 2013, the *Wall Street Journal* on May 9, 2013 (<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323744604578472313648304172.html>) reported that the motivations to cheat were impelled by parents. Similarly, the gross, rampant grade inflation found in high schools established for students seeking to study abroad is not the fault

The NACAC report rightly links commissioned recruiting—i.e., the payment of incentive commissions for each recruited student—with the possibility of an “array of misrepresentations.”

of agents. The schools are simply sating parental appetites for top academic results for their children to enhance admission prospects at overseas institutions.

SOLUTIONS: SUPERVISION OF AGENTS

The NACAC report correctly emphasizes institutional accountability in its opening Commission Recommendation Relative to the Statement of Principles of Good Practice. Institutions should go well beyond the report’s recommendations for greater accountability (p. 45). Applications should require declarations of truthfulness from students and elaborate the consequences of dishonesty. Students should be explicitly instructed about what is unacceptable, such as altering or faking academic records. Students should be required to declare whether and what third-party assistance was provided. Those admitted should be notified in advance that English-language proficiency test results will be verified upon arrival and that they will be interviewed briefly and asked to write an essay.

In hiring agents, agreements should specify the terms and limitations of the relationship and that malfeasance will lead to immediate termination and possible referral to criminal law procedures. Periodic checking should be done at the discretion of the institution.

These represent low-cost, and even no-cost, measures for which no institution can claim a lack of resources. Beyond these measures, depending on the scale of operations, institutions can deploy delegations with expertise in the country in question to check whether agency agreements are being honored. Are students being appropriately advised? Are agency fees in compliance with the institution's agreement? Does student counseling evince accurate knowledge of the institution? Are documents genuine? Certainly, this is no easy task. Agents or parents may send faked documents and the student may be an unwitting accomplice. Institutions may not have contracts with agents and yet still receive their applications from them. But this challenge only accentuates the need for careful recruitment strategies without shortcuts.

SOLUTIONS INSTITUTIONAL PROPRIETY

The NACAC report states "(A) critical consideration for policy makers is the ability and/or willingness of colleges to establish and take seriously such procedures to ensure against misbehavior" (p. 42).

NACAC's use of "willingness" questions whether "ability" is actually the issue. Perhaps, it is not a lack of institutional gravitas but rather a canny recognition that more diligence in their relationships with agents could mean fewer students and lower revenues.

Without capacity or resources for rigorous enforcement, organizations that train, accredit, or license agents cloak institutions avoiding serious accountability. This avoidance has attracted increasing governmental oversight in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada, amongst others.

Institutions' financial dependence on international student fees significantly undermines an inclination toward strict oversight of recruitment practices. Admitting unqualified students, the unwarranted passing of students in courses, or participating in deals of dubious propriety with agents and even overseas institutions, are all examples of desperate acts that risk institutional reputation in the long run.

CONCLUSION

There are substantial financial incentives for agents to act improperly. Focusing on commission payments tends to distract from the bigger problem. There are large numbers of individuals paying large sums to agents for a variety of advantages in the admission processes. Particularly, in a short

list of high-fraud high-volume countries, agents command large financial rewards by exploiting genuine but poorly informed or easily manipulated prospects. Complicating the problem are educational institutions desperate for international student fees that may be willing to compromise their academic standards, and be willfully ignorant of improprieties committed by agents, students, and parents.

There is meaningful scope to clean up the field of international student recruitment, but this requires institutions to pay for their responsibilities and accept only honorable returns. ■

Barefaced Cheating in China's Bull Market for Academic Fraud

JOHN MARCUS

Jon Marcus is the North American correspondent for the Times Higher Education magazine, London. E-mail: jmarcus@hechingerreport.org. This article first appeared in Times Higher Education.

A 17-year-old student at the Jiangsu College for International Education in Nanjing China, Jiao Yizhou hopes to study environmental engineering at the Georgia Institute of Technology in the United States.

Like many applicants to university, however, he is anxious about the entrance tests and essays. He knows that other Chinese students cheat on the applications, persuade their teachers to falsify secondary-school grades and recommendations, and hire agents who purportedly write the admission essays for them.

"This kind of thing does not bother me, because I did it the right way, and the university officials are not stupid," Mr. Yizhou said. "They can know which applications are real and which are fake."

But increasing competition for spots in Western universities, and huge annual increases in the number of applicants from China, do have admissions officials worried about what experts say is a widespread and growing practice of cheating.

"I don't mean to caricature this as happening at every school," said Linda McKinnish Bridges, associate dean of admissions and director of program development in China for Wake Forest University. "But some schools I've visited have said to me, 'We will work with you in any way we can to get these students into the United States.'"

Ninety percent of recommendation letters for Chinese applicants to Western universities are falsified, according to research by NAFSA: Association of International Educators and the US-based educational consulting company Zinch China.

The two organizations, which conducted interviews with 250 students at the top-ranked secondary schools in China, also concluded that 70 percent of admissions essays are written by someone other than the applicant, half of secondary-school transcripts are doctored, and many awards and achievements are also fake.

“Fraudulent applications are pervasive in China, driven by hyper-competitive parents and aggressive agents” who can earn financial bonuses for getting students into top Western universities, said the researchers, who called this “a growing trend.”

They said the phenomenon was driven mostly by middle-class Chinese parents determined that their children study abroad, 80 percent of whom pay agents to help them.

But increasing competition for spots in Western universities, and huge annual increases in the number of applicants from China, do have admissions officials worried.

The going rate for this, per student, is up to US\$10,000—and as much as double if the agent can get the student into a university at the top of the influential *U.S. News & World Report* rankings.

“The cultural norm in China is to consider a 17-year-old not yet capable of managing a decision as important as his or her college education,” the Zinch and NAFSA report said. Or, as Dr. Bridges put it, Chinese parents “have got one child and for that one child you will do everything you can to help that child get ahead.”

Agents, the researchers said, will ghost-write admissions essays or hire recent returnees from Western universities, or expatriate English-speaking teachers in China, to do it. There are also separate essay-writing services available.

Chinese officials acknowledge the problem. It’s a “legitimate concern,” said Rob Cochrane, the Australian-born international programs manager at the Jiangsu Provincial Department of Education. But he said that the blame lies with the application process. “Just the nature of that process over distance provides a huge opportunity for the not-so-

ethically minded to perhaps fudge their credentials,” Mr. Cochrane said. “The whole idea of a written application from a second-language applicant, whether from China or anywhere else on the planet, is fraught with danger.”

Nor is China the only place where applicants to Western universities allegedly cheat. In May, the US Educational Testing Service canceled the scheduled administration of the SAT entrance exam in South Korea, where test-preparation services reportedly got copies of the questions in advance. “The issue is about the process rather than about the people who are applying,” Mr. Cochrane said.

Whatever the reason for it, all of this cheating is vastly complicating the work of admissions officers buried in applications from China, at universities accepting more and more of them to help bring in much-needed revenue.

UNESCO estimates that 440,000 Chinese are studying abroad, and the United States and the United Kingdom are the first- and second-most popular destinations.

China sends, by far, more students to the United States than any other country—nearly 200,000 a year, almost four times as many as it did at the start of the millennium, representing fully one in four of the international students coming to the country—and the number has grown by 20 percent or more in each of the last five years. In spite of visa changes, the number of Chinese students in the United Kingdom also is continuing to rise. It was up 8 percent last year.

At Wake Forest, which has gone from 79 applications from China to more than 600 annually in just the last five years, Dr. Bridges, who speaks fluent Mandarin, visits Chinese secondary schools, and he and other admissions counselors conduct interviews in English with students over Skype, while having them simultaneously complete sample writing assignments—all to weed out fraud. “If that student is very strong, but I have some reservations about their English ability—if the student does not understand and I have to revert to Mandarin—then that student is not coming to Wake Forest,” she said.

Another survey by Zinch China, which tested the language skills of 25,000 prospective Chinese students, found that two-thirds did not speak English well enough to use it in a classroom discussion. That is up from 38 percent whose English skills were judged deficient last year. The proportion of students whose language skills were judged as “strong” fell from 18 percent to 4 percent.

Mr. Cochrane said that Chinese students become so good at taking standardized tests, including the Test of English as a Foreign Language, that, “It wouldn’t be unfair to say that, with decent preparation and practice, they would probably be able to get a score marginally higher than their actual communicative skills” merit.

Talk of cheating may result in changes in China, Mr. Cochrane speculated. “There’s a lot of talk about it at our end. Cheating is not accepted here as being the norm, though lots of people ask me that question. The Chinese people are a proud people. They don’t want to be branded pariahs on the education system.”

One solution, he said, would be to require the accreditation of agents—another: accepting hard-to-counterfeit digital portfolios of Chinese students’ academic work.

In the West, the issue is likely to be addressed more forcefully when Chinese students continue to arrive unprepared for education in English. As valuable as full-tuition-paying Chinese students might be to universities that need the money, that would be offset by the price of having them drop out later. “The cost of not being able to keep that student, is tremendous,” Dr. Bridges said. “The incentive, the motivator that might change this, is retention and attrition.”

That loss of face could alter the behavior of Chinese secondary schools, whose students leave to study in the West but then return without degrees—or that are caught falsifying grades and transcripts. Dr. Bridges said she no longer accepts applications from the school whose headmaster told her he would do anything it took to get his students into Western universities.

“If these students that have been pushed into this by some eager principal, some eager agent, some eager parent, and then goes home having failed, at that point [the Chinese] will see this is a long-term problem,” she said.

Back in Nanjing, Mr. Yizhou’s classmate, Zhu Yi, is hoping to go to Boston University in the United States. He, too, knows that other Chinese cheat, he said. “Frankly, it’s true. But not everybody does that,” Mr. Yi said. “Most people do those things in the right way.” ■

Professors: The Key to Internationalization

GERARD A. POSTIGLIONE AND PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Gerard A. Postiglione is professor of education and director of the Wah Ching Center for Education in China at the University of Hong Kong. E-mail: gerry@hku.hk. Philip G. Altbach is research professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

Universities continue to position their professoriates for internationalization. As the heartbeat of the university, the professoriate clearly has a special role in helping drive

knowledge economies. This is particularly true in developing countries with aspirations for a closer integration into the global system. However, internationalization is a double-edged sword for many countries. A university can hardly become world class without it. Yet, it wildly skews the balance of brain power in the direction of those few countries with world-class universities. In order to get the best out of globalization, the professoriate in all countries would need to increase its profiles and attitudes geared toward internationalization. At present, the willingness of the academic profession everywhere to deepen their international engagement appears stalled.

The relevance of this research is that the academic profession globally seems to be less internationally minded than might be expected—with inevitable implications for internationalization.

It would seem obvious that those who teach at a university, the academic staff, are the key to any academic institution’s internationalization strategy. After all, the professors are the people who teach the classes at a branch campus, create the curricula for franchised programs, engage in collaborative research with overseas colleagues, welcome international students into their classrooms, publish in international journals, and the like. Indeed, without the full, active, and enthusiastic participation of the academics, internationalization efforts are doomed to fail.

Without the participation of the faculty, internationalization efforts often become highly controversial. Examples include Yale and Duke universities in the United States, where major international initiatives planned by the university president quickly became contentious on campus. Many of the New York University’s faculty members have questioned some of that institution’s global plans. There are many additional examples of faculty members refusing to take international assignments for the university, being unsympathetic to international students in their classes, and in general not “buying in” to the international missions expressed by many universities. Thus, the challenge is to ensure that the professoriate is “on board.”

However, data from the two major international surveys of the professoriate reveal a puzzling array of indicators with respect to internationalization.

WHAT THE DATA SHOW

The two important international studies of the attitudes and values of the professoriate, one undertaken in 1992 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and another known as the Survey of the Changing Academic Profession in 2007, have surveyed 14 and 19 academic systems, respectively.

These studies included a number of questions about the international commitments and interests of the faculty. In the United States, academic life is already known to be far more insular than in other parts of the globe. Most American academics earned all their degrees in the United States, including their highest degree. Less than one-third collaborate with foreign partners on research, even though a good number of them are foreign-born academics working at American universities; and they are the ones most likely to constitute the international collaborators. Only 28 percent of American academics have published in an academic journal outside of the United States, and barely 10 percent have published in a language other than English.

However, data from the two major international surveys of the professoriate reveal a puzzling array of indicators with respect to internationalization.

Yet, unlike universities in Japan or Korea, American universities are open to foreign born and foreign trained faculty. In fact, in most countries, nearly all academics are citizens of the country, and the percent of noncitizens are in the single digits—even in the United States with 9 percent. The percentages are somewhat higher in a few other English-speaking countries such as the United Kingdom (19% noncitizens), Canada (12% noncitizens), and Australia (12% noncitizens). The only other exceptions are small European countries like The Netherlands and Norway, where border crossing reflects the new reality of the European Union. The Hong Kong system is extraordinarily unique with 43 percent of academics being noncitizens, something that undoubtedly contributes to its having the highest concentration of globally ranked universities in one city.

Besides noncitizenship, doctoral study location also drives internationalization. In eight countries surveyed in 2007, more than 10 percent (and as many as 72%) of academics earned their doctorates in a different country than the one in which they are employed. Only a few countries were in that category in the 1992 survey. Exceptions include Japan and the United States, where most academics earn

doctorates domestically.

It should be no surprise that academics nearly everywhere say that they emphasize international aspects in their teaching and research. Large numbers include international content in their courses, but not nearly as many have engaged in study or teaching abroad. In a good many countries, less than 10 percent have taught abroad. Only in places like Hong Kong or Australia have large numbers of academics taught elsewhere. Thus, academic attitudes toward internationalization are not a hindrance to a country's efforts to internationalize its universities, but it is the actual engagement of faculty that matters more.

Academics in developed countries often resist their universities' efforts to establish international campuses, and the professoriate in research universities of some developing countries often faces obstacles to becoming internationally wired due to state control. Surprisingly, the percent of academics collaborating internationally in research has dropped in many countries since the 1992 survey. The reasons are surprising and worthy of concern. Junior academics are collaborating less than their older counterparts, and everywhere junior academics are unlikely to have taught abroad. The fact is that the most productive academics, in terms of referred publications, are those with the most international collaboration, including copublication of articles and publishing in a foreign country. Again, the United States is the exception with less of a gap in research productivity, between those who do and do not collaborate internationally.

The international survey reveals what is perhaps one of major hurdles for internationalizing the professoriate—the economic driver of the university system. Unlike state or professor driven systems, market economies have high proportions of academics who view their universities as bureaucratically onerous. Moreover, academics in market economies are more likely to view their universities as being managed by administrators who are less than competent. This naturally works against the professoriate having a high level of institutional affiliation. The result means they are less likely to support the vision of their university leadership's about how to internationalize—including overseas campuses.

On the more positive side, those who publish in a foreign country journal increased since 1992 in all countries surveyed, except Australia, Japan and the United States. Those who have published in a foreign language increased more in countries such as Mexico and Brazil (presumably in English). The relevance of this research is that the academic profession globally seems to be less internationally minded than might be expected—with inevitable implications for internationalization. ■

Government and Governance Reforms in Higher Education in Africa

N. V. VARGHESE

N. V. Varghese is Head, Governance and Management in Education, International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO, Paris. E-mail: nv.varghese@iiep.unesco.org.

Higher education was considered a “public good” worthy of public support in Africa, during the first decades of independence, and most countries adopted a state-funded and heavily subsidized model for university expansion. With the fiscal crisis of the 1980s, public funding declined and universities fell into a state of disrepair, leading to a deterioration of physical facilities—a decline in student enrollment and teaching standards and a depletion of research capacities. Reforms to revive the sector became necessary and unavoidable.

Most reforms redefined the role of the state in higher education development and in the governance and management of institutions. The institutional governance moved from a “state-control” to a “state-supervision” model, leading to increased institutional autonomy, on the one hand, and reliance on market tools of incentives and accountability mechanisms to steer institutions toward policy goals on the other. Some of these reforms helped expand the system, revitalize the sector, and improve institutional governance.

STATE AND GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

Higher education in Africa, like in the West, was centered on institutions funded and managed by the state. Hence, state control was the most-common pattern of university governance that evolved in Africa. Heads of state, serving as chancellors of universities, became common in some countries. Realizing the limitations of relying on state funding, countries in Africa introduced several reforms to develop financing alternatives to expand the system and reforms to govern and manage institutions more efficiently and effectively.

These reforms in higher education reduced state control on institutions, made them autonomous, and moved them closer to markets. The widespread privatization of public institutions and proliferation of private institutions over the past two decades are a reflection of this trend. Resultantly, a good share of additional enrollment in Africa has taken place in the nonstate-funded segment of public institutions (private students) or in private institutions.

Many countries created buffer bodies to support and implement policy, allocate resources, monitor performance,

and ensure accountability. National Councils of Higher Education or their equivalents were established in most anglophone African countries. The more-common practice among francophone countries has been to create separate ministries of higher education. This trend is changing and higher education councils are being established in some of the francophone countries. However, it seems that they mostly play an advisory role and, perhaps, a less-substantive role in policy formulation and its implementation than their counterparts in the anglophone countries.

INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY AND NEW GOVERNANCE

Institutional autonomy is seen as a mediating position between state control and market operations. Autonomy has helped universities to maintain the image of public institutions, while enforcing market principles in the operations. Autonomy expects institutions to set priorities, evolve strategies, develop study programs and courses, select institutional leaders, recruit staff, diversify funding sources, decide on internal resource allocation criteria, and allocate resources accordingly.

The granting of autonomy was accompanied by new structures of governance and accountability measures at the institutional level. Governing boards were constituted to oversee the overall functioning of an institution. They take policy decisions including those related to staff recruitment, appointment of heads of institutions, and finances.

National accreditation agencies have become common in many countries and internal, quality-assurance units are being established in several institutions.

The governing boards in francophone countries are very often composed mostly of internal members, while those of anglophone countries have larger numbers of external members, at times including international experts. In countries, such as Kenya, there are separate management boards at the institutional and school levels.

The new sets of accountability measures included strategic plans, result-based management, performance contracts, performance indicators, monitoring and evaluation reports, institutional audits, and external and internal, quality-assurance mechanisms. National accreditation agencies have become common in many countries and internal, quality-assurance units are being established in several institutions.

GOVERNANCE REFORMS AND THEIR EFFECTS

The reforms, no doubt, helped universities to design their own survival strategies, when they were in a state disrepair. Privatization measures—cost recovery and income-generating activities—helped many universities in Africa survive in the 1990s and prosper in the 2000s. For example, the reforms initially helped Makerere University to move “back from the brink” and later helped working and living conditions, increase enrollment, improve staff salaries, arrest staff depletion, improve the market relevance of courses, and reduce reliance on state funds.

Studies conducted by the International Institute for Educational Planning show that higher education governance reforms in Africa helped institutions to reduce their reliance on the government and to focus on serving market and local requirements. The reforms also helped to diversify the resource base and decentralize internal resource allocations. In countries such as Ethiopia, the line-item, budget-based resource transfer has been replaced by block grants; public universities in Ghana are expected to generate 30 percent of their budgetary requirements; and Nigeria has introduced competitive research funding. Performance monitoring increased research outputs in South Africa and improved operational efficiency in Ghana, while performance contracts improved accountability in Kenya.

The reforms made public institutions more market oriented in their approach and result driven in their operations. It seems the reforms contributed to a widening of inequalities in access to higher education and subsequently to the employment market. The market processes favor those who have the capacity to pay and seem less friendly to equity concerns. Since institutional pressures to expand stem more from financial rather than educational considerations, the market orientation seems to have promoted entrepreneurialism in universities and academic capitalism in higher education.

Many of the reforms are supported by the development partners. It seems that the same reforms that helped reduce reliance on national governments have increased reliance on external agencies. The implications of the changing relationships between the government, institutions, and external agencies need closer examination, especially in the context of globalization.

CONCLUSION

The reforms introduced in the 1990s helped higher education institutions in Africa survive, systems expand, and the region experienced the highest, global-growth rates in higher education in the 2000s. The market orientation of the reforms has, no doubt, destabilized the traditional ways of organizing university activities and governing institutions. After an initial inertia, institutions in Africa showed

resilience and became part of the change process.

The reforms centered on autonomy and market orientation have raised issues related to leadership. The leadership at the institutional level is challenged to find an appropriate balance between expansion and quality improvement, between academic priorities and financial considerations, between efficiency and equity concerns, and between local relevance, global standards and rankings, among others. The transfer of power and authority to institutions is not always necessarily accompanied by measures to reinforce leadership capacities—to make governance efficient and institutions more effective.

The fast expansion of the system, the proliferation of providers, and a diversification of study programs pose challenges to govern and manage the system. The entry of foreign providers and the flow of teachers, students, and study programs within and outside the region necessitate focused attention on harmonization, investment in quality, and the establishment of global standards. These challenges may not be effectively addressed by the market forces, since they require policies based more on long-term perspectives than on short-term financial considerations. Therefore, the need is not to move away from the state but to engage the state more actively to develop a futuristic perspective, a framework for operation, and for regulating the system than for funding, controlling, and managing the institutions. ■

New Higher Education Reforms in Kenya

ISHMAEL I. MUMENE

Ishmael I. Mumene is associate professor of education, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona. E-mail: Ishmael.Munene@nau.edu.

In the age of massification, ensuring education quality presents a formidable policy challenge. The recently enacted higher education law in Kenya—the Universities Act 2012—seeks to level the playing field in quality enforcement between public universities, which have operated as self-regulating entities, and private universities, which have been subject to strict regulatory control. The new law is an acknowledgment that, while private universities have come of age, public ones have begun to show signs of age and decay. Currently, the country boasts of around 23 full-fledged public universities with a total enrollment of over 197,000 students and 28 private universities, 15 chartered

and 13 with Letters of Interim Authority, with an enrollment of over 37,000 students.

Though the country embraced the neoliberal tenets of marketization and privatization as strategies for university development the 1990s, the previous higher education law failed to keep pace with emerging challenges of public and private university developments in the poststate dominance era. In a three-pronged strategy, the new law seeks to ensure parity in three quality-related areas: regulatory oversight, student admissions, and depoliticization of governance.

ACCREDITATION

To ensure regulatory oversight of all universities, the new law provides for the establishment of the Commission for University Education whose mandate covers both public and private universities. Hitherto, only private universities were required to obtain charters from the Commission for Higher Education after meeting stringent conditions in terms of physical facilities, staffing and learning resources. Consequently, as quality improved in the private universities, it deteriorated in the public ones. While the growth of private universities was regulated, public universities opened phony campuses all over the country in a concerted bid to shore up their shrinking bottom lines. One public university with a student capacity of 30,000 students has around 60,000 enrolled.

To ensure regulatory oversight of all universities, the new law provides for the establishment of the Commission for University Education whose mandate covers both public and private universities.

All public universities now are required to apply and obtain charters from the Commission for University Education by July 2013. As part of the stringent charter requirements, they need a student-instructor ratio, based on program; ensure a right mix of instructors with PhD and master's degree qualifications; provide first-rate laboratories for scientific and technical courses; upgrade their libraries; and rationalize the development of their satellite campuses. Failure to adhere to these quality indexes has had disastrous consequences for public universities. The School of Law at the University of Nairobi had its accreditation withdrawn by the Council for Legal Education, while that of Moi University's was put under a pending status. In contrast, all law schools in private universities have full accreditation. Simi-

larly, the Institution of Engineers of Kenya has declined to register engineering graduates from Kenyatta University and Masinde Muliro University of Science of Technology. Likewise, the Kenya Medical Laboratory Technologist Association has declined to accept medical technology graduates from Kenyatta University. In all instances these professional bodies could not vouch for the veracity of the curriculum and facilities at the institutions.

ADMISSIONS

Until now, public universities—through the Joint Admissions Board—have admitted all government-sponsored students. These are the top high school graduates who meet the Joint Admissions Board's criteria and pay a highly subsidized tuition fee of around \$400 per year in contrast to \$2,000 paid by privately sponsored students in public universities and \$4,000 by those in private institutions. Locked in public universities, many government-sponsored students who cannot be admitted in competitive programs—like medicine, engineering, and law—end up pursuing other courses. In contrast, those with lower admission scores and the wherewithal can pursue the popular courses, as privately sponsored candidates in public or private universities. The rich have choice but not the poor. A system designed to cushion the disadvantaged ended up punishing them.

The new law abolishes the Joint Admissions Board and creates the Kenya Universities and Colleges Central Placement Service to manage admissions in all universities, public and private. Government-sponsored students will be eligible for admissions in programs of their choice whether in public or private universities. That Central Placement Service will also work with the Higher Education Loans Board to determine students eligible for bursaries and loans, besides offering career and guidance services to all students. The net effect is to provide disadvantaged students additional institutional and program choices, while increasing student diversity across all universities and programs.

DEPOLITICIZATION OF GOVERNANCE

The relative advantage that state universities have enjoyed—in terms of minimal regulatory oversight, student funding, and admissions—are due to the political patronage they have enjoyed. Under the defunct law, each university operated under its own act of parliament that recognized the head of state or his nominee as the chancellor of the university. The chancellor appointed the university council members as well as the vice-chancellor (the chief executive officer). With such political associations, the government could steer universities in specific directions, regardless of impact on academic quality, while universities could extract major concessions from the state. Thus, the public university vice-

chancellors were automatic members of the Commission of Higher Education board, which only regulated private universities. The government has occasionally sought increased enrollment in state universities beyond capacity as the demand for university education surged.

The University Act of 2012 abolishes the individual university acts, discontinues the head of state chancellorship of public universities, and eliminates public universities vice-chancellors' membership in the new Commission for University Education board. University alumnae and the university senates will now appoint the chancellor, a community leader of high-moral integrity as provided for in the constitution. The vice-chancellors will be appointed by the university councils, following a competitive search in the marketplace. The objective is to depoliticize the university administrations, while strengthening internal shared governance as a means of improving quality assurance.

THE QUALITY CONUNDRUM

Increasing student choice and reconfiguring governance may be the easy parts of the reengineering, but whether the new law will radically improve quality in Kenya's higher education remains to be seen. As long as the demand for university education remains insatiable and the government continues to be a key actor in setting the university agenda, it is hard not to envision the effects of the market leaving no scars in the universities. For instance, the government increased the number of public universities from 8 to 23 within 6 months from October 2012 to March 2013. Further, the new 47 county governments, elected in March 2013, are each contemplating opening a university, notwithstanding the critical manpower shortfalls bedeviling

The University Act of 2012 abolishes the individual university acts.

the existing universities. It is also noteworthy that except Strathmore University and the United States International University, all private universities have mimicked public ones in establishing the much-derided, poorly resourced but revenue-enhancing satellite campuses across the country. Mount Kenya University, the largest private institution, has even surpassed public universities in the satellite campus race and even launched transnational campuses in South Sudan and Rwanda. ■

Quality Regimes in Africa: Reality and Aspirations

JUMA SHABANI

Juma Shabani is director at the UNESCO Office in Bamako, Mali. E-mail: j.shabani@unesco.org.

Since the middle of 2000, a number of initiatives have been launched in Africa to develop common frameworks for comparable and compatible qualifications, to promote academic mobility. Quality and quality assurance play a crucial role in these initiatives. This article identifies and analyzes the various higher education quality regimes and briefly discusses the challenges to implementing quality assurance, as well as the aspirations of African countries identified in recent commissioned research.

It is generally agreed that over the last two decades the quality of higher education has declined in several African countries, mainly due to rapid increase in student enrollments, poor standards of libraries and laboratories, inadequate pedagogic training of academic staff, and limited capacity of quality-assurance mechanisms. Several quality-assurance agencies have been established to enhance quality of higher education at national, subregional, and continental levels.

NATIONAL LEVEL

The first national quality-assurance agency was established in 1962, in Nigeria. By 2012, 21 African countries had already established such agencies, and a dozen other countries were at relatively advanced stages in this direction. Francophone Africa is lagging behind, with only five countries in sub-Saharan Africa with quality-assurance agencies.

Such agencies were initially established to ensure the quality of programs delivered by private institutions through the face-to-face mode. This mandate has gradually been expanded to include public institutions and other modes of delivery.

SUBREGIONAL LEVEL

The African and Malagasy Council for Higher Education was established in 1968, with the main objective of harmonizing academic programs and policies related to staff recruitment and promotion in its member states. Since 2005, the council implements harmonization of programs through a reform that aims at aligning the degrees structure in Francophone countries to the three Anglophone bachelor's, master's and PhD degrees. However, this reform faces some challenges, mainly due to the lack of national quality-assurance mechanisms.

The Inter-University Council for East Africa has the responsibility of ensuring internationally comparable standards in the five member states of the East African community: Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda. This mandate is implemented through the establishment and use of a subregional quality-assurance framework. This council's handbook has been developed and used to instruct quality-assurance trainers and reviewers who are now instrumental in strengthening the capacity of quality-assurance units in member institutions.

CONTINENTAL LEVEL

The Association of African Universities implemented in 2010–2012 the Europe-Africa Quality Connect Pilot Project in collaboration with the European Universities Association. The project has helped to enhance institutional evaluation capacities in five African universities.

The Association of African Universities also hosts the African Quality Assurance Network, which implements its main mandate of promoting collaboration among quality-assurance agencies through capacity building and the African Quality Assurance Peer Review Mechanism. Currently, the network is facing financial challenges to implement its activities.

The African Union Commission implements three initiatives. The first initiative, the African Higher Education Harmonization Strategy, was adopted in 2007 to ensure comparability of qualifications and therefore to facilitate implementation of the “revised Arusha” convention—originally the UNESCO Regional Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Certificates, Diplomas, Degrees and other Academic Qualifications in Higher Education in the African States, adopted in 1981 in Arusha, Tanzania. A conference of African Ministers of Education will be held in March 2014 to adopt and sign the revised Arusha convention.

The revision of the Arusha convention began in 2002. Since 2007, this process, which is not yet completed, is jointly coordinated by UNESCO and the African Union Commission. The progress made on the harmonization strategy and the revision of the Arusha convention are limited. This may be partly explained by the poor involvement of higher education and quality-assurance stakeholders in these initiatives.

Some of the results expected from the harmonization strategy will not be achieved by 2015, as anticipated by the work plan approved by the Conference of Ministers of Education in 2007. These include the establishment of an African Regional Qualifications Framework and the development of an African Credit Transfer and Accumulation System, which are key instruments for the implementation of the Arusha convention.

The second initiative, the Tuning Africa Pilot Project, is anticipated to promote the implementation of the harmonization strategy. This project was launched in 2011 to contribute to the development of a qualifications framework in five subject areas in collaboration—with nearly 60 African universities, the Association of African Universities, and other higher education partners. The project focuses on intended learning outcomes, skills, and competences. Efforts are underway to expand the scope of this project.

The third initiative, the African Quality Rating Mechanism, encourages higher education institutions to assess their performance on a voluntary basis against a set of established criteria. This one is different from ranking systems. It helps to put African universities in clusters according to prescribed standards. In 2009/2010, 32 higher education institutions from 11 countries participated in this pilot project, undertaken on the basis of self-assessment. A project report produced by the African Union Commission noted some shortcomings and suggested to revisit the survey and implement another pilot phase prior to scaling up the mechanism to all higher education institutions.

It is generally agreed that over the last two decades the quality of higher education has declined in several African countries

CHALLENGES AND ASPIRATIONS

Today, quality assurance is at the heart of all efforts toward revitalizing higher education in Africa. These efforts have led to a rapid increase in the number of quality-assurance agencies. However, at least 60 percent of these agencies lack the human capacity needed to implement their mandates effectively.

Since 2006, UNESCO and its partners have organized five international conferences that have helped to train more than 700 experts in several key issues—such as: Accreditation at Program and Institutional levels; Quality Assurance of Teaching, Learning and Research; Institutional Audit and Visitation; and Use of ICT in Quality Assurance Practices. UNESCO has also developed a guide for training quality-assurance trainers. The annual conferences have played a positive role on human capacity building, fostering awareness of major actors, emergence of several agencies and the promotion of regional cooperation in quality assurance.

Throughout the continent, the major aspiration is to build an African Higher Education and Research Space. To inform the process of building it in 2010, the Association for the Development of Education in Africa Working Group on Higher Education commissioned several analytical studies, including a feasibility study on the establishment of the African Regional Quality Assurance Framework. The African Union has recently launched the process of establishing the African Accreditation Framework. These initiatives and the Tuning Africa project will provide a strong basis for the development of the African Regional Qualifications Framework and the credit transfer system.

CONCLUSION

In the last decade, quality-assurance efforts have experienced major developments and progress in Africa. Despite these achievements, major challenges and questions that require further attention and research still abound. First, the Bologna Process was partly built on the implementation of the European Convention on mutual recognition of qualifications. What role should the Arusha Convention play in the process of establishing African Higher Education and Research Space? Second, how should the African Higher Education and Research Space harmonization strategy involve higher education and quality-assurance stakeholders to enhance implementation of the Arusha Convention. Final, what lessons can be learned for the reform in Franco-phone countries from the experience of Anglophone countries to establish viable mechanisms of quality assurance at national and subregional levels? ■

The Problems with Cross-Border Quality Assurance

KEVIN KINSER AND JASON E. LANE

Kevin Kinser is an associate professor and chair of the department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies at the State University of New York, Albany. E-mail: kkinser@albany.edu. Jason E. Lane is the Associate Provost for Graduate Education and Research at the State University of New York. E-mail: jason.lane@suny.edu. They codirect the Cross-Border Education Research Team.

IHE dedicates an article in each issue to a contribution from the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT), headquartered at the State University of New York at Albany. More information about C-BERT can be found at www.globalhighered.org. Follow us on Twitter at @Cross-BorderHE.

With the rapid expansion of branch campuses and other forms of foreign educational outposts in both developed and developing nations, quality-assurance agencies are becoming more engaged in the challenging process of evaluating cross-border higher education. We argue the challenge is greater than simply helping individuals to make distinctions of academic quality in international contexts. In part, because there is no globally shared definition of quality, a problem of this work is only heightened as institutions and programs increasingly cross borders.

THE TALE OF TWO COUNTRIES

Despite ongoing discussions of creating multinational quality-assurance regimes, external quality assurance remains nationally organized. When an institution establishes a foreign outpost, it is obligated to abide by the laws of the host country (usually in addition to the laws of its homeland). In most cases that we are aware of (Dubai and Hong Kong are two notable exceptions), the host country either modifies its existing quality assurance to meet the unique characteristics of cross-border higher education or forces the campus

When an institution establishes a foreign outpost, it is obligated to abide by the laws of the host country (usually in addition to the laws of its homeland).

to modify its operations to meet the existing quality-assurance measures. The bottom line is that the host country and home country each have their own rules. The result is a series of idiosyncratic barriers and sometimes contradictory policies for institutions wishing to expand geographically, as well as logistical challenges for those charged with maintaining quality standards at home. Without a true transnational quality-assurance regime, nationally based policies will remain a source of conflict. Calls for stricter standards will not solve this inherent dilemma.

LEGITIMATE DIFFERENCES IN QUALITY

As noted above, quality is notoriously difficult to define. But even assuming a shared definition of quality, there would be legitimate differences among institutions. Not all institutions have the resources of the Ivy League, and an important place exists for programs providing training that diverges from the research-based standards of many world-class institutions. With new models of education emerging from the private sector, innovative attempts to provide

high-quality learning opportunities to students can look quite different from the traditional campus-based form. Few (if any) standards occur by which all institutions can be judged, and little agreement on how quality should be measured even for fundamental aspects common to all forms of higher education such as teaching. Given the variety of models and functions of cross-border higher education, establishing a threshold of quality for all foreign outposts is a difficult proposition.

MARKET FORCES

Cross-border higher education is often designed to meet market demand in the host country, whether that is from students seeking degrees or government officials looking for capacity development. This is for good reason as most such cross-border activities are expected to be self-supporting or help achieve the goals of the local government, providing a subsidy. However, as is clear from the prevalence of degree mills and other fraudulent purveyors of academic credentials, demand often is not based on quality. Privatization further encourages market forces to operate in the educational realm, by placing monetary value on student enrollments through the payment of tuition and fees. Regardless of market demands, however, quality-assurance agencies are intended to support the public good by ensuring legitimate, reliable, and sustainable institutions of higher education. In a conflict between the market and the public good, it takes a strong regulatory presence to win out. In most countries quality-assurance agencies are a relatively new and weak entity, and the pressures of the market often highlight their struggle to be effective.

INTERNAL PROCESSES AT THE HOME CAMPUS

Quality assurance is not just sustained through external oversight; internal processes are needed as well. Procedures that work well when applied across the campus quad, however, may not have the same success when their target is half a world away. Educational traditions vary along with student preparation for advanced study, and principles of academic freedom and faculty governance have contradictory interpretations. Yet, a hub-and-spoke model prevails, where quality assumptions established at home are expected to be applied abroad. The challenge of cross-border quality assurance, then, is to establish as rigorous procedures abroad as exist on the home campus, but with appropriately accounting for local differences. The infrastructure to do this, however, is mostly lacking in the typically small and narrowly focused overseas locations. Internal oversight, therefore, continues to operate at considerable distance.

TRUST

Former US president Ronald Reagan was famous for using

the expression “trust but verify” to indicate his stance on international treaties. The phrase has relevance for international quality assurance, as well. Most quality-assurance processes presume that the institution being evaluated can be trusted to honestly reveal details of its own performance and that peer reviewers will act with integrity in assessing the activities of an institution that could be a direct competitor of their own. But if the trust that undergirds the process is lacking, the veracity of the entire review process comes into question. In this respect, skepticism of assessments by other entities is embedded in most quality-assurance procedures and limits the traction that a transnational system needs to be successful. However, too much trust may also be a concern. If the home and host countries both assume the other has primary responsibility, or simply relies on internal institutional processes to maintain quality, then no one is watching the ship. Without trust in the integrity of the international higher education players and the reciprocity necessary to work across borders, international quality assurance will remain a buyer-beware world.

Cross-border higher education is often designed to meet market demand in the host country, whether that is from students seeking degrees or government officials looking for capacity development.

CONCLUSION

Poor-quality institutions exist within the cross-border higher education marketplace, as they do in public and private education sectors in all nations. However, by focusing the discourse about quality assurance in cross-border higher education on concerns about safeguarding students from being preyed upon by shady operators, larger issues that make quality assurance in the cross-border context problematic have become overshadowed. Quality assurance remains a largely nationally based phenomenon; however, cross-border institutions and programs must deal with at least two nations and, thus, two quality-assurance regimes. Such arrangements highlight the well-known problem of the lack of a global definition of quality, while also raising questions about how market forces, legitimate differences of quality, and conceptions of trust impact quality assurance of foreign education outposts. ■

Challenges to Top-Ranked Private Universities in Poland

JOANNA MUSIAL-SADILEK

Joanna Musial-Sadilek recently completed her dissertation on Polish private higher education at the University at Albany. E-mail: jmusial9@gmail.com.

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/>.

After years of dramatic increase in demand, Polish higher education enrollment will decline sharply between now and 2025. As Marek Kwiek shows, public-policy alternatives will influence the scope of the decline in the public and private sectors (fall 2012 *IHE* issue). Demographics present a threat to Polish enrollment in general and to the private sector in particular—one of the largest in Europe (518,200 students, a 29% share of Poland's total) in 2011. The private sector has already declined by 18 percent in absolute enrollment and 4 percent in enrollment share in just the last two years. However, the question arises: will *leading* private higher education institutions be able to face the demographic challenge in ways that spare them from the fate of the private sector generally? The first years of the demographic decline have not ravaged the leading private institutions. The 20 top-ranked private higher education institutions show a decline of only 8 percent in raw enrollment and an increase of 3 percent in their share of Poland's total enrollment.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC CHALLENGES TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The public sector is preferred over the private in Poland, as in almost all of Europe. It has high status and legitimacy and provides quality education without tuition for full-time students. In contrast, the majority of private higher education institutions have comparatively low status and legitimacy and provide low-quality education, while charging substantial tuition. Hit by reduced demand, public institutions may ease selection requirements and increasingly accept students who in the past would settle for private institutions.

However, the demographic challenge is not uniform throughout the private sector. Poland provides a good case within which to consider subsectoral differences. Its private sector subsumes large differentiation, prominently with a small minority of "semielite" private institutions. That mi-

nority of top-ranked ones, however, holds a not insignificant share of private enrollment: the top-ranked 20 of Poland's 330 private higher education institutions had 20 percent of the private enrollment in 2009 (the top 10 holding 10% of the enrollment).

Even these top-ranked institutions share several characteristics of the general private sector that leave them vulnerable to the demographic changes. First, their limited research restricts their academic legitimacy and status, making them less attractive to candidates who can enter the public sector. Second, and more starkly, full-time students pay significant tuition at all private higher education institutions, whereas public sector counterparts do not pay tuition. As the number of prospective students decreases, it becomes easier to enter public institutions—most of which must fill seats with some students they would previously have rejected. A natural question arises: why should students pay for private higher education institutions if they can attend free public programs? Meanwhile, even the top-ranked private institutions simply do not have substantial nontuition income, which limits their financial ability to build attractive offerings.

TOP-RANKED PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AND THE CHALLENGE

Top-ranked private institutions are more vulnerable than public universities to the demographic challenge, for they are in many respects like other private institutions. However, they are simultaneously different from the majority of private institutions in ways to shield them in part from demographic challenge. The huge majority of Poland's private institutions arose after all as "demand absorbers," growing quickly and easily as the 1989 fall of Communism unleashed huge demand and broke the public monopoly. Logically, such institutions are in great trouble when demand itself plummets. In contrast, top-ranked private institutions strive to be institutions of choice and provide more to their customers than just a place in the higher education system.

Polish top-ranked private institutions tend to have the semielite characteristics of high student status and high quality of faculty members, compared to average ones. Many of their students come from families able to pay the subsector's high tuition. They are willing to pay because the institutions benefit is enough to make it worthwhile, even as the students have increasing options elsewhere.

An essential serious part is the faculty. These institutions employ well-known and respected professors. Concentrated in large cities—academic and economic centers—these institutions facilitated the attraction of these professors and the ability to pay competitive salaries. Similarly, these institutions can attract, as part-timers, experts in professional fields that the universities' teaching emphasizes.

There is a reasonable sense that many public university faculty devote themselves primarily to their research. In contrast, top-ranked privates concentrate on teaching much more than research, and administrators expect their faculty to devote themselves to serious teaching efforts. Nonetheless, the top-ranked privates do more research than average private institutions do, which brings knowledge and status to students. Thus, again the top-ranked privates attain a level of academic legitimacy not possible for the demand-absorbing private institutions. Differentiated from average private institutions, the top-ranked ones manage to compete with good public higher education institutions.

The top-ranked privates do not compete with publics across the board. Just as they do not excel in research, they cannot usually prevail in many expensive fields of study. Yet, private institutions instead concentrate (more than publics do or wish to) on “in demand fields.” With their combination of faculty quality and administrative acumen joined with business ties, they can indeed compete in fields such as business administration, law, and psychology.

After years of dramatic increase in demand, Polish higher education enrollment will decline sharply between now and 2025.

The agility of the top-ranked private institutions is their international orientation, which may help, in two ways, to expand the possible pool of prospective students. First, by building an international image—through international partnerships, exchange programs, and summer programs—institutions attract students from foreign countries, mostly to the east of Poland. Second, by this internationalism, top-ranked private higher education institutions try to attract domestic students who value internationalism and seek opportunities to experience diversity or expand their skills through language opportunities. Of course, internationalism has a good chance only if the quality and status of the institution are judged high enough by students.

CONCLUSION

Demographic change will unavoidably shape the higher education system in Poland. As noted in other countries, the private sector will be more affected than the preferred (public) sector; but not all private institutions need to be affected to nearly the same degree. A small number of top-ranked private institutions enjoy semielite characteristics that may shield them, not fully but partly, from the negative impact of the demographic decline. ■

The Founding of University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

QIANG ZHA AND GUANGLI ZHOU

Qiang Zha is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca. Guangli Zhou is a professor at the School of Education, Renmin University, Beijing, China. E-mail: guanglizhou@ruc.edu.cn.

Following the Soviet model, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) was founded in November 1949, as a landmark of China’s research and development (R & D) system. The CAS, together with Chinese Academy of Engineering and Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (both grown out of former divisions within the CAS), stand for China’s top research organizations, forming a separate research system from the university sector and equipped with the best research resources. The founding of University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (UCAS) in July 2012, on the basis of former Graduate School of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (GSCAS), should be viewed as a meaningful event occurring in China’s R & D system, and in the university sector. As such, the UCAS was born with “a silver spoon.” It shares a president with the CAS, and its program offering areas and school/college arrangements match well with the six academic divisions of the latter system.

Among its 10,599 faculty are 282 CAS members (out of a total of 694 across the country) and 5,335 doctoral student supervisors. These figures far exceed those of Tsinghua University (currently having 41 CAS members, 1,832 doctoral student supervisors, and 9,357 doctoral enrollment) and Peking University (now with 63 CAS members, around 1,700 doctoral supervisors, and approximately 7,000 doctoral students), the two most prestigious universities so far in China. Though the UCAS will not open its door to undergraduates until fall 2013, it has inherited nearly 40,000 graduate students from the GSCAS, among whom one half are doctoral students. In 2011 alone, the UCAS—while still under the name of the GSCAS—conferred 4,832 doctoral degrees. This figure itself would enable the UCAS to sit on the top category in the Carnegie Classification and to beat even those most fertile American campuses in terms of producing doctorates. With the founding of the UCAS, China seems to have had a world-class university overnight. At this point, a question is naturally raised: why does the CAS make this move, which seems to have turned itself into a university? Furthermore, is the founding of the UCAS an isolated story or a prelude to something more significant?

THE SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH IN CHINESE UNIVERSITIES

There have long been discussions and debates with respect to reforming China's R & D system, in particular surrounding the CAS. Ever since its founding, the CAS is mandated as to "defining scientific research orientations" and "outlining strategies for the nation's future scientific and technological development," while devoting itself to accomplishing research projects. As such, it plays a combined role of the nation's supreme R & D advisory body and the national flagship R & D center in sciences and technologies. However, ever since China started to boost research in universities in the mid-1990s, through launching a series of elite university schemes (i.e., Projects 211 and 985), there has been an increasing wish to optimize the country's R & D system and using universities as the backbone for basic research.

In a 2009 article, the former president of Peking University, Xu Zhihong (who is himself a CAS member) argues the state should recognize the predominant status of research-intensive universities, citing such advantage of universities over research institutes as concentration of researchers, integration of research and education, comprehensiveness of programs and subjects, and collegial ethos. He asserts those advantages are crucial not only for basic research but also for applied research, which now increasingly requires a multidisciplinary approach. He benchmarks the key research performance and outcomes of 10 Project 985 universities, against those of the CAS between 2004 and 2008, and affirms their combined research strength has outmatched the CAS. Notably, China now has 1,129 universities, including 112 research-intensive ones that are selected on Projects 985 and 211. In 2007, universities produced 84.6 percent of China's research papers that were published in international sources.

Some other universities adopt more critical tones toward the CAS's bureaucratic and less efficient style, suggesting to regenerate it following the model of the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique or the US National Academy of Sciences—to align it with a science and technology policy advisory role as well as a supreme honor society, while most of its subordinate research institutes should be delegated to universities. The CAS has been argued as a legacy of the planned economy and a role as both the nation's supreme science and technology advisory body and executing arm of the key research projects, putting itself in a controversial and awkward quandary. Furthermore, especially basic research can hardly attain breakthroughs under a planned regime. Notably, such contentions are often echoed in a socioeconomic context, where the higher education patterns have already shifted away from the Soviet model and toward the American one.

The National Outline for Medium- and Long-Term Sci-

ence and Technology Development (2006–2020) fully recognizes universities as "a principal player in basic research and original technology innovation," and sees the "establishment of high caliber universities, particularly world-class research universities" as "a prerequisite for enhancing the nation's S&T innovation and instituting a national innovation system." Following this initiative, the Chinese government launched Project 2011 in early 2012, which exclusively supports universities to expand their research and innovation capacity, through integrative collaborations with research institutes and industry. Most recently, the Opinions on Deepening Science and Technology Structural Reform and Accelerating the Making of National Innovation System (released in September 2012) promulgates a policy to turn industry into a major R & D spender and the backbone of technological innovation (like Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Microsoft, or Pfizer in the United States), while

There have long been discussions and debates with respect to reforming China's R & D system, in particular surrounding the CAS.

maintaining to push for world-class research universities in China's effort to optimize its R & D system. Indeed, in 2011, China's industry contributed 74 percent to the country's R & D spending. Against this backdrop, the founding of the UCAS appears to affirm an ongoing shift of China's R & D focus to the university sector.

WHAT IS COMING NEXT?

Following the UCAS, a brand new Shanghai Tech University was founded in January 2013, which is also patronized by the CAS (and the Shanghai municipal government). The academic areas of this university's program offerings correspond with those of the research institutes of the CAS Shanghai Branch. Also, it shares an executive head with the latter. The possibility could never be ruled out that more universities of this type (or spin-off versions) would come forth. Therefore, a preliminary conclusion could be drawn at this point that, if the role of the CAS as a research executing entity is coming to an end soon and its subordinate institutes are going to universities, Chinese universities will enjoy a great leap in terms of their research capacity and conditions. After all, the CAS had an annual research expenditure of \$3.6 billion, over 100 national key laboratories, and 45,400 researchers (all figures as of 2010). If the CAS stays as is (for a short while or a longer term), China would

probably see an expanding list of its star research universities, and many other Chinese universities would benefit from their growing and closer collaborations with the CAS research institutes, which is boosted by China's new policy initiatives and double-digit R & D funding increases. ■

Venezuelan Higher Education's Legacy Under Chávez

ORLANDO ALBORNOZ

Orlando Albornoz is professor at the Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas. E-mail: oalbornoz@reacciun.ve.

Hugo Chávez, who is now gone, was in power for a rather long period, 1999–2013, and tried to introduce many changes in higher education. While there has been an ongoing line of policy in operation of this system, he did not manage to oppose that plan. In 1830 the universities were nationalized. However, in 1953 the private sector was allowed to participate in this academic market. In 1958, a democratic revolution took power, and the university system was expanded and modernized. Of course, the Chávez Bolivarian revolution intended to change all that. He ran out of time, however, and the higher education system remains in 2013 much like the one he inherited in 1999. While the structure and organization of higher education have not changed, in 1999 the state (i.e., public) universities had 510,917 students and in 2011 1,132,306; the private sector had 299,664 students in 1999 and 555,198 in 2011. Yet, the growth of state institutions had slowed down in the last three years.

While the higher education system in Venezuela did not begin or will end with him, Hugo Chávez, however, left a legacy in the system. He opened two universities that are right now the largest in the country—opening access to thousands of students who otherwise would not have entered higher education. Partly, lacking the required qualifications and members of the poor population, those students also had fewer expectations to enter higher education. Thus, it would be a risk to earn professional degrees that would open the labor market to them, even if it was state employment. This expansion follows the Cuban model of the *munipalización* of the universities, and full control by the state, in this case eliminating the role of the autonomous universities. Chávez only had a vision of the universities, as goals of the revolution. Thus, he established these

universities on a Marxist-dochinarian approach, which will impede these universities from becoming a various knowledge section.

MODERNIZATION: 1958

In 1958, the Venezuelan higher education system established modern characteristics of autonomy, democratic governance, the professionalization of the academic staff, the establishment of many diverse institutions, larger members of the population, not only with the dominant role of the upper class, and the universities responding to social demands. The higher education system expanded strongly throughout the country. In 1990, the country opened a general plan to identify and finance scientific research, and graduate studies began to be opened in several state institutions. In those four decades, the system was a success and managed to create the political leaders and professionals in all positions—to point out that a new social class was created and legitimated the middle class. However, the system was inefficient: it could not open positions at universities for the growing demands. In spite of positive training, professionals were unable to advance to open up research universities, which were being established all through Latin America.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

Chávez inherited higher education based on a well-established and diversified system, with universities and other institutions covering the needs of society, with both the state and the private sector providing a good service to society. However, major mistakes were introduced as well. In 1975, the state opened a vast program that provided scholarship for university students to go abroad, trying to accelerate the training of human resources. Thousands of Venezuelan students were sent to Europe and the United States, not all of them returning with their professional degrees. This was done instead of doing what was mostly needed—strengthening the quality of the universities and bringing from abroad the necessary academic staff. Chávez committed a similar error when he sent thousands of students to Cuba.

However, Chávez left the higher education system unchanged, in spite of all the rhetoric about his political and ideological revolution. He applied policies to expand access, tried to follow in toto the Cuban model of the university—absolute state control. The universities under his government control became institutions dedicated to train staff based on the revolution rather than professionals for the market—both militarized and run under strict doctrinarian lines of thoughts. In his scheme to govern the universities, the universities were to be run not by the members of the

staff and the students but also with the participation of administrative employees and manual workers.

Instead of trying to issue policies that would be applied to all universities, Chávez created new institutions, to cover the needs of the revolution, not of society. He left the conventional system to operate but introduced his own group.

QUALITY AND THE FUTURE

The Venezuelan higher education system exhibits the inability to support advances in quality, which are the goals in many countries and institutions. Some data provided by both the Shanghai and the *Times Higher Education* university rankings show that the Venezuelan universities are lagging behind most countries of the region. Solely, the revolution tried to create its own socialist vision, isolated from the international flow of knowledge, which is obtained via globalization and internationalization.

Chavez's achievements on higher education were modest in performance and greatly exaggerated by the government propaganda.

As for the future, the higher education system depends on the political as well as the economic situation. If Chávez's successors were able to remain in power, regulation would be accelerated and the state would take full control of higher education. The fact is, however, that the years of the financial largesse of the government during the years of Chávez have finished. Venezuela is about to enter a period of reduction, which would cause conflicts at the universities. Of course, this society seems to work well when funds are available without restriction—including the academic system. There is plenty of room for a reform that could put the universities back on track.

CLOSING THE VENEZUELAN MIND

Chavez's achievements on higher education were modest in performance and greatly exaggerated by the government propaganda. The damages to the autonomous universities and to the academic development of Venezuela, however, are serious. As the lack of public support and the misunderstanding about the role of higher education in society, steps were taken by the now deceased leader during his 15 years in power—expanding student access and closing the Venezuelan mind.

Strengthening Higher Education in Laos

JANE KNIGHT

Jane Knight is adjunct professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: jane.knight@utoronto.ca.

Internationalization plays a critical role in building university capacity, especially in developing countries. In the current world of higher education—with competitiveness, branding, and commercialization front and center—international development cooperation is often relegated to a low priority. Status building networks with elite partners are receiving more attention and support than capacity-building initiatives with developing country institutions.

It is time to reemphasize the importance of higher education internationalization as a process of working collaboratively with recently established higher education institutions in developing nations. These kinds of initiatives bring different but mutual benefits, to all partner institutions and reflect the social responsibility and solidarity of more established and experienced universities.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN LAOS

Lao People's Democratic Republic presents an excellent case study where higher education reform is critical to national development, and in turn, international academic cooperation is fundamental to building and strengthening its higher education system. In Laos, total population of 6.6 million in 2012, the public higher education sector is less than 20 years old and consists of five universities. The National University of Laos, located in the capital Vientiane, is the leading university, and was established in 1996. Three regional universities were founded in the last decade—Champasak (2002), Souphanouvong (2001), and Savannakhet (2009). They are smaller institutions, meeting the needs of their regional population and economies. The University of Health Sciences, founded in 2007, is dedicated to educating health professionals and is located in Vientiane.

The Asian Development Bank has supported the Strengthening Higher Education Project in Laos since 2009. One of the key components is professional development for university staff with teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. This is especially true for the regional universities. As an example, Souphanouvong University, located in the north, enrolls 3,700 students—primarily undergraduates. There are 6 faculties, 19 departments, and 320 faculty members—of whom 3 have PhDs, about 60 have master's degrees, and the rest have under-

graduate degrees. Not surprisingly, professional development, especially degree upgrading is a top priority and complements other areas of development—such as text books, information technology, infrastructure, graduate programs, research capacity, quality assurance, and others.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR DEGREE UPGRADING OF UNIVERSITY STAFF

In Laos, degree upgrading for the majority of Lao university teachers and researchers relies on a collaboration with foreign universities, primarily through scholarships. Laos cannot produce enough PhDs because it does not have graduate programs in all discipline areas or enough spaces.

Lao People's Democratic Republic presents an excellent case study where higher education reform is critical to national development.

The Department of Higher Education has established an ambitious target for faculty development—requiring that 10 percent of university academic staff have a PhD, 60 percent a master's level credential, and 30 percent an undergraduate degree. The enormity of this task, for example, involves a regional university such as Souphanouvong, in which about 83 percent of the current academic staff have an undergraduate degree, 16 percent a master's degree, and .01 percent have a PhD.

Achieving this target is contingent on international cooperation with universities who can provide the graduate training and, secondly, foreign governments and multilateral agencies who can provide the financial support. Scholarships for enrollment at foreign partner universities are the preferred modality. Offering graduate programs in Laos by foreign universities is one option, but a critical mass of students is necessary. While this is possible for some subjects—such as business management or teacher training—it is not feasible for more specialized graduate programs in the natural sciences, engineering, and humanities.

Thus, faculty members normally need to leave the country for graduate studies. The implications include many—for example, language requirements for studying abroad and the impact on the teaching load at the home university. In Laos, all foreign scholarships require additional language skills, except perhaps in neighboring Thailand; but even there many of the new international master's degree and PhD programs are commonly offered in English. Thus, a fundamental requirement for further educa-

tion is knowledge of another language. To date, Japanese, Vietnamese, Korean, Chinese, French, and English are common language requirements, given the source country of scholarships. But, accessing high-level skills in these languages for regional university staff is a challenge. Provision for language instruction is often needed as part of the scholarship.

SHORT-TERM PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

It is not surprising that scholarships are seen as the most serious way for university staff to upgrade their teaching and research knowledge and skills and to ultimately improve higher education in Laos. But scholarships are not the only type of needed and beneficial professional development. Short-term and more-focused training courses on site—in regional centers or nearby universities—are equally useful. In Laos, university staff assume teaching, research, and administrative roles. It is common for all senior administrators—such as, rectors, vice-rectors, and heads of finance, personnel, and planning—to have teaching responsibilities. This is also true at the departmental level, as many of the teachers assume administrative tasks. The ultimate aim is to professionalize the administrative staff of the universities and colleges, so that academics can spend more time on teaching and research activities; but this is a long-term proposition. In the meantime, short-term professional development opportunities oriented to teaching and learning methods; curriculum development, research design and analysis, quality assurance, financial management, human resources development, and information technology are needed.

Achieving this target is contingent on international cooperation with universities who can provide the graduate training and, secondly, foreign governments and multilateral agencies who can provide the financial support.

Laos is only one country—nearby Myanmar is another—which needs to collaborate with foreign universities for capacity building, especially staff training, and development. International partnerships need to bring mutual and multiple benefits, and the international cooperation departments of universities in Laos are committed to developing strategies to ensure benefits for all partners.

International engagement has never been more important as a strategic priority in universities. Yet, can we afford to let the current preoccupation with commercialization, competitiveness, and rankings jeopardize international cooperation for capacity building in countries that are developing and strengthening new higher education institutions and systems? The answer is no. But, this will require a shift in the values that are driving internationalization. ■

New Missions and Ambitions for Russian Universities

TATIANA KASTOUÉVA-JEAN

Tatiana Kastouéva-Jean is a research fellow at the French Institute of International Relations, Paris. E-mail: jean@ifri.org.

Russian universities are facing many new challenges. On the domestic level, Russian authorities ask them not only to train highly qualified personnel for the national economy but to also become important actors in research and development and innovation. This role was traditionally played by the Russian Academy Sciences, but it has had trouble reforming itself and thus has lost legitimacy. On an international level, President Vladimir Putin wants five Russian universities in the global top 100 by 2020. In addition to economic dividends from attracting foreign students, having such leaders should improve the image of Russia as an international educational and scientific power. In spite of efforts (for example, Russia joined the Bologna process in 2003), internationalization of Russian higher education remains weak: in 2010, Russia hosted 3.9 percent of international students worldwide, the overwhelming majority coming from Commonwealth of Independent States countries (former Soviet Union). Only two Russian universities appear in Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities: Moscow State University in 80th level and Saint-Petersburg State University in the last 100th. Russia's road to international leadership seems to be a long one.

DIFFICULT STARTING CONDITIONS

In the 1990s and in the beginning of 2000s, Russian universities went through a difficult period of transition and insufficient state funding. During these lean times, they had to develop strategies for survival: universities, including public establishments, offered more payment of edu-

cational services (as a result, 60% of students are enrolled today for a fee) and opened regional branches and departments teaching non-core disciplines that were in demand (especially law, economics, and management). Aging and badly paid faculty members combined positions in multiple establishments with private lessons, in order to make a living. The simultaneous growth in the social prestige of diplomas, with the democratization of higher education, encouraged the spread of corrupt practices, plagiarism, and the outright purchase of diplomas. With only a few exceptions, the quality of training deteriorated.

In addition to this challenging legacy, student demography is a worrying factor for future. Because of low birthrates in the 1990s, the number of young people between 14 and 19 years old dropped from 11 million in 2007 to 7.6 million in 2012. In a short and medium term, this demographic situation is a challenge for universities. Closures, reorganizations, and mergers will obviously be necessary to manage surplus capacity in higher education. These processes are already underway: between 2008 and 2012, 88 establishments disappeared and the number of student population shrank by 1,460,000. Clearly, competition between universities for candidates will be hard in the coming years.

On an international level, President Vladimir Putin wants five Russian universities in the global top 100 by 2020.

THINGS CHANGE...

Since 2005, the government has sought to reverse the negative trends in the sector and to modernize the education system. State funding for higher education increased from 119 billion rubles in 2005 (\$4 billion) to 402.4 billion in 2011 (\$13 billion). In October 2012, Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev promised that spending on education will be equal to the defense budget by 2020. It is the first time in Russian history that education and defense have been given the same level of priority. However, the average spend per student remains extremely low even in leading universities (\$8,000 versus \$14,000 on average in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries or \$30,000 on average in the United States).

Three Excellence Initiatives were launched in order to select the most promising universities. The new quality-labels "National research universities" and "Federal universities" (created by mergers in regions) were created, representing 5 percent of all Russian universities. These received significant additional funding and some now have modern

equipment and laboratories that would make even Western universities green with envy. Various measures were undertaken in order to integrate teaching and research, to bring universities closer to companies, and to encourage them to create startups and business incubators. The Russian government is clearly inspired by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Stanford University model.

...BUT NOT ENOUGH?

Some factors have been overlooked. Thus, the success of reforms has been put at risk. First, the human capital of teaching and research professions needs to be reconsidered. This will require an appropriate salary—at present that remains a promise for the majority of universities—and an increase of social prestige in order to attract the mostly highly talented professors. This should replace recruitment by cooptation; in some universities, 90 percent of teachers are recruited from among former students. Courses prepared in a “copy and paste” manner, compartmentalization between disciplines, and old methods of teaching should be changed. The scientific reputation of each researcher should be as important as an appropriate salary. Recently, a long series of recent scandals over plagiarized dissertations demonstrated not only the degree of corruption in the higher education system but, as well, the overall weak level of research in Russia. The barriers between research and teaching should be abolished: for instance, teachers have a different status and salary to researchers and the number of teaching hours is three or four times more than in Western countries.

This traditional separation between teaching and research is a second core handicap to the achievement of the new national and international missions for universities. In 2010, universities accounted for only 15 percent of all national research organisms, employed 6.4 percent of

personnel in research and development nationally, while their share of domestic expenditure on research and development represented 8.4 percent. The average figure of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries is at the same moment being 26.6 percent. It is clear that universities have progress to make.

Third, the state seeks to establish the ideal model in a short line. Such a mechanistic approach does not take into account numerous obstacles: the duration of natural processes, relations with a number of socioeconomic factors, the interests of the parties, the inertia of the system, and institutional resistance. This could encourage a mechanical and superficial implementation of quantitative indicators of development programs in order to satisfy the ministry and thus preserve the volume of state funding. For example, the number of startups created can be impressive, but their turnover is often weak, their products are not competitive, and their viability in real economic conditions is questionable.

Fourth, despite the newly created status of autonomous establishments, even leading Russian universities remain impeded with the dominant role and overwhelming control exercised by the ministry, which decides everything from the number of “budget” (free) places for students by region and by specialization to wages and utilization of funding. At a time when ambitious development programs are not accompanied by appropriate implementation mechanisms, there is a risk that in the short to medium term the reform of Russian education will get stuck. Considering tough international competition, Russian universities risk being ousted to the periphery of the global educational space permanently. ■

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 notic-

es 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.

NEW SPANISH-LANGUAGE BOOK SERIES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Universidad de Palermo, Cátedra UNESCO-UNU. Colección de Educación Superior (Higher Education Series). Web site: <http://www.palermo.edu/cienciassociales/investigacion-publicaciones/coleccion-educacion-superior/index.html>.

The School of Social Sciences at the Universidad de Palermo (Argentina) and its UNESCO-UNU Cátedra (chair) have issued a series of books on higher education. Currently, the series consists of 20 titles, including translations into Spanish of several “classics” of the United States’ literature on higher education, such as Rosovsky’s *University: An Owner’s Manual*, Thelin’s *A History of American Higher Education*, or Clark’s *Sustaining Change in Universities*. Other titles provide a view from other educational systems, such as Russell’s *Academic Freedom* (UK), Tuiller’s *History of the Universities of Paris and the Sorbonne*, Altbach’s *Comparative Higher Education*, or Milaret and Vidal’s *World History of Education*.

Most of the books focusing on Argentina are collections of chapters written by several authors; the book titles include *La Actividad Científica* [Scientific Activity]; *Financiamiento de la Universidad* [University Financing]; *Entre la Tradición y el Cambio* [Between Tradition and Change]; and *Desarrollo Económico, Educación y Corporaciones Transnacionales: los Casos de México, Corea del Sur y Argentina* [Eco-

nomic Development, Education, and Transnational Corporations: the Cases of Mexico, South Korea and Argentina]. *De la Educación Popular* [On Popular Education] is a reprint of the book by former Argentinian President (1868–1874) Domingo Faustino Sarmiento.

This series fills a gap in Spanish-language literature on higher education by making world-renowned authors and texts more accessible to the Spanish-speaking world, and by addressing key issues such as financing, admissions, development, internationalization, and academic freedom—all of which are topics of immense concern across Latin America.

A launch ceremony has been held for each book and has included a presentation in which local experts discussed some of the most important topics under consideration. These presentations are available online through the collection’s Web site: <http://www.palermo.edu/cienciassociales/investigacion-y-publicaciones/coleccion-educacion-superior/index.html>. By making these titles accessible to a Spanish-speaking audience, the Universidad de Palermo is contributing to the vibrant debate of higher education in Latin America.

IVÁN F. PACHECO

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Bowen, William G. *Higher Education in the Digital Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013. 172 pp. \$26.95 (hb). ISBN: 978-0-691-15930-0. Web site: www.press.princeton.edu.

Bowen, former president of Princeton and one of the top analysts of American higher education, focuses on issues of the cost of higher education and the possible role of distance education and MOOCs (massive open online courses) in possible solutions. Originally, given as several lectures, thoughtful commentary follows the analysis.

Carnoy, Martin, et al. *University Expansion in a Changing Global Economy: Triumph of the BRICS?* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013. 383 pp. \$60 (hb). ISBN 978-0-8047-8601-0. Web site: www.sup.org.

This volume examines the BRICS countries in the context of global higher education

expansion, the knowledge economy, and economic return issues. Among the themes analyzed are financing of higher education in the BRICS, quality, BRICS strategies, universities in the process of change, and others.

de Wit, Hans, ed. *An Introduction to Higher Education Internationalization*. Milan, Italy: Vita e Pensiero, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 2013. 193 pp. 18. (pb). ISBN 978-88-343-2445-5.

This collection of essays focuses on aspects of internationalization, including the role of joint and double degrees, international recruitment in the United States, internationalization of the curriculum, changing paradigms of internationalization, and others. This volume is related to the new Center for Higher Education Internationalization at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan.

Grimaldo Durán, Humberto, and Francisco López Segrera, eds. *La Internacionalización de la Educación Superior a Nivel Mundial y Regional: Principales Tendencias y Desafíos*. [Higher Education Internationalization at Global and Regional Levels: Major Trends and Challenges]. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad Católica de Colombia. 275 pp (hb). ISBN 13: 978-958-42-3238-0.

This book consists of an introduction and 12 chapters. The 3 chapters with a global perspective are written in English (by P. G. Altbach & J. Knight; C. Brock; and L. Douglas). The other 9 chapters—providing regional, country, or case-based overviews—are in Spanish and include the works of S. Didou, J. J. Brunner, J. Gacél-Ávila, N. Fernández, J. Cortadellas, M. L. Neves, X. Zarur, and R. Hernández. (Iván F. Pacheco)

Gross, Neil. *Why Are Professors Liberal and Why Do Conservatives Care?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013. 387 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-674-05909-2. Web site: www.hup.harvard.edu.

Sociologist Gross focuses in this book on the common assumption that, in the United States, most academics are on the political "left." He argues that there is a self-selection among people who choose the academic profession, as well as socialization once in the profession. Fewer conservatives choose academe as well. While the analysis concerns the United States, there is international relevance to the broad theme of the political opinions and values of the academic profession everywhere.

Hao, Ping. *Peking University and the Origins of Higher Education in China*. Los Angeles: Bridges21 Publications, 2013. 421 pp. \$80 (hb). ISBN 978-1-936940-37-0. Web site: www.Bridges21.us.

A detailed history of the development of Peking University from its establishment in 1898 until the end of the monarchy in 1912, this volume provides a discussion of the social and political context for the university's development. The author, a senior Chinese academic leader, provides detailed documentation.

Hendrickson, Robert H., Jason Lane, James T. Harris, and Richard Dorman. *Academic Leadership and Governance in Higher Education: A Guide for Trustees, Leaders, and Aspiring Leaders of Two- and Four-Year Institutions*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2013. 418 pp. \$45 (hb). ISBN 978-1-57922-481-3. Web site: www.Styluspub.com.

Intended to provide a guide to academic administration in the context of American higher education, this book considers most of the key elements shaping academic institutions. Among the specific topics discussed are the global engagement of universities and colleges, student experience, the academic profession, the roles of the states and the federal government, the role of academic departments, the presidency, the legal system, and others.

Kleypas, Kathryn L., and James I. McDougall, eds. *The American-Style University at Large: Transplants, Outposts, and the Globalization of Higher Education*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012. 305 pp. (hb). ISBN: 978-0-7391-5020-7. Web site: www.Rowman.com.

Written mostly from the perspective of English and humanities scholars, this volume examines unusual facets of the growing pattern of "American style" universities around the world. Several chapters focus on English departments worldwide, including in Taiwan. Others discuss aspects of neocolonialism in the American-style university, transplanted universities in the Arab Gulf States, internationalizing the field of composition studies, and others.

Montgomery, Scott L. *Does Science Need a Global Language?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013. 225 pp. \$22.50 (hb). ISBN 978-226-53503-6. Web site: www.Press.uchicago.edu.

Geologist Montgomery has provided a fascinating and very relevant discussion of the role of English as the global scientific language. He discusses the historical development of the role of English and how other languages earlier played this role. Native speakers are now outnumbered by nonnative speakers of English, and this is changing the nature of scientific communication.

Olivas, Michael A. *Suing Alma Mater: Higher Education and the Courts*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. 221 pp. \$32.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-0923-8. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

An analysis of current trends relating to the legal system in the United States and universities, this book provides a wide discussion of contemporary legal trends. One-hundred-twenty legal cases are examined and six carefully analyzed to discern legal trends in the past half century, particularly in the context of the expansion of interest groups focusing on the legal aspects of higher education.

Palmer, John D., et al., eds. *The Internationalization of East Asian Higher Education: Globalization's Impact*. New York: Palgrave,

2011. 230 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-230-10932-2. Web site: www.palgrave.com.

While not all of the chapters are concerning internationalization, this volume provides insights into the impact of globalization on several East Asia countries. Topics include English courses in Taiwan, and others.

Paulsen, Michael B., ed. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. 28*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2013. 728 pp. \$239 (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-5835-3. Web site: www.springer.com.

The 2013 annual edition of the handbook provides 13 in-depth essays, some 50 pages in length, on a range of higher education themes from an American perspective. Volume 28 includes such subjects as the meaning of markets in higher education, research integrity and misconduct, social networks, the history of teacher preparation in the United States, student engagement, public policy and student attainment, and several others.

Shils, Edward. *The Order of Learning: Essays on the Contemporary University*. (Edited and with an introduction by Philip G. Altbach). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2013. 375 pp. \$34.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4128-5154-1. Web site: www.transaction.pub.com.

Sociologist Edward Shils, a prominent scholar of higher education, wrote about the development of the European university, academic freedom, the academic profession, the problems of contemporary higher education, and related issues. This volume includes a comprehensive bibliography of Shils' writings.

Smart, John C., and Michael B. Paulsen, eds. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. 27*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2012. 564 pp. \$239 (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-2949-0. Web site: www.springer.com.

This annual publication, now in its 27th year, provides in-depth essays on research themes in higher education. The focus of the volume is on American research and themes, but there is international salience to most of the chapters. Authors are among key researchers in their fields. For volume 27, the

themes include the sociology of academic careers, the role of international organizations in higher education, state merit aid programs for undergraduates, privatization of higher education, and others.

Smith, Larry, and Abdulrahman Abouammoh, eds. *Higher Education in Saudi Arabia: Achievements, Challenges, and Op-*

portunities. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2013. 194 pp. \$129 (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-632-3. Web site: www.springer.com.

This book adds to general knowledge about Saudi Arabian higher education and includes essays on key facets of academic realities. Among the topics discussed in the chapters, which are all coauthored by a Saudi scholar and an international scholar, are pri-

vate higher education, medical education, academic staff, accreditation and quality assurance, teaching and learning, and others.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

Philip G. Altbach continues to serve as director of the Center, although he is no longer teaching at Boston College. Associate director Laura E. Rumbley is assuming more of the day-to-day responsibilities for Center leadership. The Center—in collaboration with the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University and with IHERD (Program on Innovation, Higher Education, Research, and Development) and SANTRUST—is coordinating the first international conference of heads of higher education research centers. This conference, taking place in Shanghai in November 2013, will result not only in discussions about the increasingly important role of higher education centers in research and policy development but will also result in a special theme issue of *Studies in Higher Education*, a major journal.

The Center's fruitful collaboration with the Laboratory for Institutional Analysis of the Higher School of Economics (HSE) in Moscow continues with a new research project on the topic of "inbreeding" of the academic profession in seven different countries. The research group will meet in Boston in December 2013. Our current project with HSE, concerning the challenges facing young faculty members, is nearing completion. The results will be compiled in a book to be published by the State University of New York Press. The project is coordinated in Moscow by Vice Provost Maria Yudkevich at HSE.

Work on a 3rd edition of our global inventory of higher education research centers and academic programs focused on the study of higher education is also continuing. The Center continues to publish frequent postings on its blog, "The World View" (<http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view>), in collaboration with InsideHigherEd.com

Associate director Laura E. Rumbley will be joining the editorial team of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*. She is currently serving as chair of the Publications Committee of the European Association for International Education (EAIE) and will represent the Center at EAIE's annual conference in Istanbul in September. She will also deliver a talk on trends in the internationalization of American higher education at Hiroshima's University's Research Institute for Higher Education in early December.

Center director Philip G. Altbach was the keynote speaker at the German Academic Exchange Service's GATE conference in Bonn in July. He will keynote a conference at the University of KwaZulu-Natal

in South Africa and will speak at an education policy meeting in Abu Dhabi, both in September. His work with the Russian Ministry of Education's Committee on the Competitiveness of Russian Universities continues.

Although the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA) retains a presence on the CIHE Web site, responsibility for INHEA has now shifted to the University of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, under the leadership of INHEA's founding director, Dr. Damtew Teferra, who obtained his PhD at Boston College. The Center looks forward to continuing to support this exciting and important work on African higher education.

In June, the Center hosted a delegation of administrators from (fellow Jesuit institution) Sogang University in Korea for a week of meetings and professional development activities. We also received a delegation of doctoral students from the University of Basel in Switzerland, who are participating in the Global Perspectives Program, a collaboration between Basel and Virginia Tech in the United States, designed to cultivate international insights and understanding among young academics.

We are pleased to note that the Spanish translated edition of *International Higher Education* is now published at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile in Santiago. We would like to thank the Andres Bello University for their collaboration for the past several years.

The Center welcomes Ariane de Gayardon as a graduate assistant. David Stanfield continues in his graduate assistant role; and Yukiko Shimmi, a doctoral candidate, continues to provide some additional staff support. We also welcome Dr. Hanife Akar, a Fulbright scholar from Middle East Technical University in Turkey, and Dr. Xiong Geng, of Nankai University in China. Professor Ivar Bleiklie of the University of Bergen in Norway returns to the Center as a visiting scholar. In July, we were pleased to have hosted Dr. Alberto Roa of the Universidad del Norte in Colombia.

PROTECT YOUR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION SUBSCRIPTION!

In order not to miss any future issues of *IHE*, please be sure that you are a registered subscriber! If you do not receive an electronic copy of the newsletter, you probably are not registered in our database. To avoid being dropped from the distribution in the future, please update your registration online.

Go to:

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

Click on:

“Subscribe to IHE” in the navigation panel on the left side of the screen.

Click on the link:

[Click here for our subscription form.](#)

Choose your subscriber status:

New Subscriber/Existing Subscriber/Not a Subscriber
[If you are not sure, choose “New”]

Skip “Expert Status”

Complete the remainder of the form and click “Submit”

If you have any questions, contact us at highered@bc.edu

CENTER SPONSORS SUCCESSFUL CONFERENCE

On April 5, a conference titled “At the Forefront of International Higher Education” was held at Boston College to celebrate the career and scholarly contributions of the Center’s founding director, Philip G. Altbach. The event attracted more than 100 researchers, scholars, policymakers, university administrators, and students from several countries and featured discussions of key issues in international higher education. Among the speakers were J. Donald Monan, S.J., Hans de Wit, Jamil Salmi, D. Bruce Johnstone, Nian Cai Liu, Henry Rosovsky, Judith Eaton, Patti McGill Peterson, and others. The symposium was made possible through the generous support of the American Council on Education, the Association of International Education Administrators, the

European Association for International Education, the Ford Foundation, the National Research University-Higher School of Economics, Johns Hopkins University Press, the Lumina Foundation, the Talloires Network, SAGE India, Ms. Mariam Assefa, Dr. Hans de Wit, and Dr. Tom Parker. A related book, *At the Forefront of International Higher Education*, coedited by Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett, will be published by Springer later in 2013. A video of the conference can be found at <http://www.youtube.com/bostoncolleg-ecihe>.



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