Subscribe to *IHE*
http://ejournals.
bc.edu/ojs/index.php/
ihe/user/register

Learn more about CIHE's new MA in International Higher Education:
http://www.bc.edu/research/cihe/graduate-studies.html

What Is the "Special Sauce" for University Innovation?

Philip G. Altbach and Jamil Salmi

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Jamil Salmi was the coordinator of the World Bank's tertiary education programs. He is currently a global tertiary education expert. E-mail: jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org.

Cornell University is partnering with the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology on its new technology-oriented Cornell Tech campus in New York City. According to a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the reason is largely because Cornell wants to take advantage of Technion's innovative and entrepreneurial ethos, and not any particular organizational innovation at the Technion, which is similar to many top-ranked research and innovation-focused universities worldwide.

According to the Technion professor leading the New York venture, the institution's focus is less on creating "spin-out" companies and more on developing "spin-out people." While the Technion has been highly successful in producing innovative graduates in Israel—42 percent of its graduates set up their own company—it is not certain this will be duplicated in New York. Rarely does academic culture or particular kinds of innovations transfer easily from one institutional culture to another.

Lessons from MIT or Elsewhere?

The example of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) might be illustrative. Without question, MIT produces some of the brightest and most innovative graduates in the world. Further, the university seems to have a unique culture that spawns an entrepreneurial spirit and new ideas. MIT hires some of the smartest and most innovative professors from around the globe and works to ensure that they will fit the institute's ethos as well. It provides an environment that facilitates the process of translating ideas developed on campus into products and innovations with useful application in the "real world." Additionally, the institution offers support for faculty and students who want to operationalize their ideas.

For these and other reasons, MIT has been asked to help universities in other countries to develop "mini-MITs"—providing the "special sauce" that will turn a highly resourced institution into an innovative and entrepreneurial world-class one. MIT has engaged in a range of collaborative programs, in some cases helping to establishing new universities, and in others providing significant input to improve existing ones. Institutions MIT has helped create include the Skolkovo Institute of Technology in Moscow, the Masdar Institute in Abu Dhabi, and the Singapore University of Technology and Design. The MIT Portugal project helped build scientific and technological systems, and the Cambridge-MIT Institute has for several decades collaborated with Cambridge University in the United Kingdom on a variety of programs.

While full-scale analyses of these programs have not been published, it is probably fair to say that all of them have faced challenges and none has in significant ways achieved that "special sauce"—the top secret recipe—that makes MIT so outstanding. All of these initiatives have been lavishly funded by the partner institutions themselves or deep-pocketed benefactors, resulting in considerable income for MIT. All show the difficulty of transferring an academic culture from one institution to another, even more complicated in a different national context.

MIT and the Technion are not the only prototypes available to the planners at Cornell Tech. It is also possible to look at other highly successful university models directed at generating innovation. Stanford University, has been tremendously successful in spawning start-up companies and graduating individuals who have made impressive contributions to IT and related industries in Silicon Valley, where it is located. ETH Zurich is also well known for its excellence in technological education as well as its links and contributions to industry and technology. Both are quite different from MIT. While the numbers of universities that combine outstanding quality with contributions to industry are fairly small—there are many examples of different models that work.

The Key Ingredients are not Enough

Figuring out what are the main requirements for a top quality research-intensive university is not "rocket science." Our book, *The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities* (World Bank, 2011), provides case studies of successful new universities. All have built impressive research profiles in a short time, and most are contributing successfully to their countries as well as making rapid progress in the global rankings. But none can be called uniquely original or innovative in terms of organization or academic characteristics.

Among the key ingredients necessary for creating a new research-intensive university are the following—adequate financial resources to get started and sustain excellence over time; a governance model that includes significant participation from, but not total control, by the academics; strong leadership, not only a visionary president, but a professionally competent administrative staff

able to implement the university's mission; autonomy from the interference of governmental or private authorities, but that allows for a reasonable degree of accountability to external agencies; academic freedom for teaching, research, and publication; top academic staff who are committed to the university's mission (including teaching) and who are paid adequately and provided with appropriate career ladders; highly qualified and motivated students; and a firm commitment to meritocracy at all levels.

None of these elements provide the "disruptive innovation" that many regard as necessary for university excellence in the 21st century. All of them are tried and true characteristics of successful universities during the past century. No university is perfect, but all successful research universities have most if not all of these characteristics. These are the "universal principles" of excellence.

Rarely does academic culture or particular kinds of innovations transfer easily from one institutional culture to another.

Disruptive Innovation

The characteristics discussed here do not guarantee entrepreneurial vigor, or a dynamic start-up culture. The Technion may find it just as difficult to export its entrepreneurial culture as MIT has. Why? Transferring a highly complex academic culture from one university to another is quite challenging. Imitating, copying, or adapting the successful recipe of others is not easy. Innovative universities arise from a unique value proposition that reflects an original vision and the capacity to transform that vision into reality. This can happen through (1) niche programs in new multidisciplinary areas, (2) interactive, collaborative, and experiential teaching and learning approaches, and perhaps most importantly, (3) the unique combination of 21st century competencies (initiative, teamwork, communication) and the kinds of positive character traits (curiosity, grit, social responsibility) that drive outstanding professionals and successful change agents.

Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering, located in Massachusetts, may be one of the best examples to illustrate what it takes to set up a new institution that is truly innovative. Olin College opened its doors in 1999 with an audacious charter: offering an experimental laboratory for transforming engineering education in the United States. Olin College operates with several unusual features. The curriculum combines engineering, entrepreneurship, and humanities in a unique way. Olin benefited from significant start-up resources from the Olin Foundation, and initially offered a free education. Olin recruits both faculty and students who believe in the school's innovative mission, and are willing to invest their careers in an untested start-up institution. Olin's success lends credence to the benefits of developing "home grown" models over adapting existing models that have been successful elsewhere.

Conclusion

Perhaps there is no universal "special sauce" for producing innovations in higher education, and "disruptive innovations" may not always result in positive change—in fact, disruption for its own sake may be counterproductive. In the end, the verities of university development may after all be the best approach to building innovation. Whether the Technion's innovative DNA can be effectively replicated elsewhere with outside technical assistance remains to be seen.   ■

International Branch Campuses: Evolution of a Phenomenon

Kevin Kinser and Jason E. Lane

Kevin Kinser is associate professor and chair of the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies and co-director of CBERT at the State University of New York at Albany. E-mail: kkinser@albany. edu. Jason E. Lane is senior associate vice chancellor and vice provost for academic planning and strategic leadership at the State University of New York (SUNY) and co-director of CBERT at SUNY-Albany. E-mail: Jason.lane@suny.edu.

IHE regularly publishes contributions from CBERT, the Cross Border Education Research Team, headquartered at the State University of New York at Albany. See http://www.cbert.org.

International branch campuses (IBC) represent one element of a larger trend in transnational or cross-border higher education, whereby universities create physical presences in multiple countries. Since 2009, the Cross-Border Education Research Team (CBERT) at the State University of New York at Albany has been tracking the development of such institutions around the world. In fact, IBCs are becoming a more mature

part of the international higher education landscape; based on our research, we have identified three areas that emphasize the new roles that IBCs are playing around the world, and the changing conditions under which they operate.

Growth and Diversification

Despite some high profile misfires such as Michigan State University in Dubai and the University of New South Wales in Singapore, the overall condition of the global IBC market remains healthy and growing. According to CBERT data, there were 230 IBCs in operation as of the end of 2015. This is a 44 percent increase from the 160 IBCs in operation in 2009, as reported by the Observatory for Borderless Higher Education.

Such growth is significant but does not come without failures. At least 27 IBCs have shut their doors, according to CBERT data. This is more than 10 percent of the current population of operational IBCs. Given that many of these entities are entrepreneurial organizations operating much like start-up companies at their inception, such a failure rate should not be surprising. In fact, it is surprisingly low, given that start-ups in the high-tech field fail at a rate of about 90 percent in three years.

Some campuses, however, have become quite successful. While most IBCs remain small and concentrate on a few degree areas in niche markets, demand has been sufficient to sustain some relatively large operations. We now count at least 25 campuses that enroll over 2,000 students. The largest operations—Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University (China), Monash University (Malaysia), and Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (Vietnam)—enroll over 6,000 students each. Substantial enrollment occurs even in places not typically identified with the IBC trend, such as Westminster International University in Uzbekistan and Georgia Institute of Technology in France.

CBERT data also shows the diversification of importing and exporting countries. Now, 32 countries export to 75 countries, and the flow is not simply West-East and North-South. In fact, Russia is the third largest exporter, sponsoring 20 foreign campuses. Even the United States now hosts five IBCs, with at least two more in development.

Evolving Relationships with Host Governments

The oldest branch campuses, those sponsored by Florida State University, Johns Hopkins University, and Webster University, for example, tended to follow a model of being wholly-owned subsidiaries of the mother institution, and operated largely without much regulatory attention from the host country. More recently, however, the engagement of the host government has become more prevalent and has taken on different forms.

It is rare now for host governments not to be engaged in some fashion. But they have adopted everything from laissez-faire to highly planned approaches. For example, Dubai, which is one of the largest importers of IBCs, has adopted a free-market approach to IBC development. The government wanted to host a large number of IBCs to educate its large expatriate population, but provided very little academic planning, leaving IBCs to develop their own sustainable business models and face the fortunes of the marketplace.

Next door in Qatar, there is a much more centralized and strategic approach. The government selects which institutions it wants to partner with, defines which programs the institutions will offer, and provides significant subsidies to cover capital and operating expenses.

China adopts a different approach, where all branch campuses are organized as formal Sino-foreign partnerships, with the Chinese partner in the lead. Campuses recently established by Duke University and New York University, for example, are recognized as new Chinese universities that are considered independent entities within the Chinese education system.

> **We also have seen increasing sophistication from national quality assurance agencies about how to evaluate transnational education—some recognize that IBCs are unique educational entities and are modifying their policies and procedures as a result.**

Advancing Quality Assurance

Governments and institutions have been working to improve IBC quality assurance mechanisms. In many cases, IBCs are supposed to provide comparable academic programming to that on the home campus. Institutions like Florida State University and the State University of New York explicitly require that the academic programs at IBCs be the same as those on the home campus and follow similar approval processes. However, some exporting universities and host countries are beginning to see branches as having distinct identities that should not be a subservient child to the superior parent institution. The University of Nottingham branches in Malaysia and China have large academic programs that have the capacity to lead curricular development, rather than just follow what occurs at home.

New York University and Webster University have promoted a model where all locations are considered part of one global university, diminishing or even rejecting the notion of home and branch distinctions.

We also have seen increasing sophistication from national quality assurance agencies about how to evaluate transnational education—some recognize that IBCs are unique educational entities and are modifying their policies and procedures as a result. Dubai established a new quality assurance system, the University Quality Assurance International Board, to make sure branch campuses are comparable in quality to the home campuses. Other educational systems, like those in Taiwan for example, are recognizing quality assurance decisions by foreign agencies as the equivalent of their own. Likewise, there is more evidence that due diligence by the home university has overtaken the serendipity and personal connections that typified first generations of branch campuses. This results in fewer surprises for branch campus leaders, better business and financial models, and strategies designed for sustainable growth. Where we used to see every announcement touting a new campus for 10,000 students within five years, now slow roll-outs of a planned and measured expansion are the norm.

Conclusions

This review of new directions for branch campuses leads us to make a few conclusions. First, cross-border higher education is no longer unusual. It should be seen as a viable and important option for all countries to consider in their higher education systems. Second, university structures and regulatory systems are adapting to new education forms; new forms are also adapting to the systems. This adaptation is an iterative process; we should not expect a static picture to emerge. Third, national strategies surrounding IBCs need to be taken seriously as exhibitions of national sovereignty in the education sphere. This means that political risks should be considered alongside academic risks. Regulations can change quickly in response to local concerns, and foreign universities may suddenly find their patrons out of power. Fourth, the greater integration of IBCs into national regulatory systems calls into question the common western assurances of academic freedom in the host country. Often the definition of academic freedom itself is in dispute, as countries delimit political freedom as distinct from the ability of scholars to teach and research freely within the foreign-backed branch. It is important that foreign universities and host countries develop common perspectives of their different systems, and we should expect compromise and accommodation rather than strict adherence to one perspective over the other.

Finally, how countries respond to the importing of foreign institutions provides insight into their educational and governance philosophies and may provide lessons for how the country will respond to other forms of internationalization.   ■

The End of the Printed Scholarly Monograph: Collapsing Markets and New Models

Donald A. Barclay

Donald A. Barclay is deputy university librarian, University of California, Merced. Merced, California 95343, U.S., 95343. E-mail: dbarclay@ucmerced.edu.

The worldwide market for the print-format scholarly monograph—a bulwark of academia's "publish or perish" culture—is collapsing. Sales of scholarly monographs in print format have hit record lows while per-copy prices are at record highs.

Dismal Sales, Rising Prices

The book-centric academic field of history provides an example of how sales have dropped. In 1980 a scholarly publisher could expect to sell 2,000 copies of any given history monograph. By 1990 that number had plummeted to 500 copies. By 2005 sales of a little over 200 copies *worldwide* had become the norm. Similar declines in sales have occurred in other academic fields as well.

Publishers around the world have responded to declining sales of scholarly monographs by raising prices. Take, again, the field of history: in 1980 the average price for a hard cover history monograph was $22.78; by 2010 that price had almost quadrupled to $82.65. Similar price increases have been seen in every other academic field.

Academic Libraries in Crisis

Neither an anomaly nor a bump in the road, what the academic world is witnessing is a market collapse. A root cause for this collapse is the loss of buying power among academic libraries—including the relatively wealthy academic libraries of North America and Europe. Traditionally, the biggest customers for printed scholarly monographs,

academic libraries had no choice but to reduce spending on monographs in the wake of decades of increase in serial subscription prices. In the mid-1980s, the ratio of academic library spending on serials compared to monographs was roughly 50/50. By 2011 that ratio had shifted to 75/25 in favor of serials.

University Presses in Crisis

In a perfect ivory-tower world, the economics of the print-format scholarly monograph would not be a consideration. After all, university presses were created for the specific purpose of publishing scholarship that, while rich in intellectual value, had little or no economic value. But with the exception of China's approximately 110 thriving university presses, and a few very large university presses (such as Cambridge University Press and Oxford University Press) that effectively operate as commercial presses through their publication of highly profitable academic journals, most university presses are not in great financial health. In a global higher education environment in which the subsidies university presses once enjoyed have shrunk or entirely vanished, editorial boards have no choice but to consider sales potential before accepting a manuscript for publication. Good luck finding a publisher willing to overlook the dismal sales prospects of your treatise on land-ownership patterns in the 12th-century Árpád Dynasty.

In those academic fields for which the publication of scholarly monographs remains the standard by which emerging scholars are credentialed, the resultant ethical dilemma is obvious. Is the academy going to stand by and allow the market to determine who succeeds and who fails as an academic? Should a Ph.D. student in the humanities be forced to choose a dissertation topic based on how a publisher will view its sales potential as a book, rather than on its contribution to human knowledge?

The Promise of Open Access

The good news is that the pending economic death of the printed scholarly monograph does not mean the end of long-form scholarship. A number of leading scholarly publishers are taking steps to move the economic model of the scholarly monograph from a foundation in print to a foundation in digital and, simultaneously, from a focus on sales to a focus on open access.

For example, Stockholm University Press is actively publishing rigorously peer-reviewed and open-access scholarly monographs. Upon accepting a manuscript, Stockholm University Press requires the author to pay a one-time Book Publication Charge of £3250 to cover the entire cost of production, distribution, and marketing. Similarly, the University of California Press recently announced the pub-

lication of the first five titles as part of its Luminos initiative. Luminos titles are fully peer-reviewed, professionally edited scholarly monographs initially published as open-access e-books, with a print-on-demand option for those who prefer physical books. Other notable examples of scholarly presses adopting open-access models for the publication of scholarly monographs include Amsterdam University Press, ANU (Australian National University) Press, De Gruyter Open, CLASCO (Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales), OAPEN (Open Access Publishing in European Networks), Berlin Academic, and others.

> **The good news is that the pending economic death of the printed scholarly monograph does not mean the end of long-form scholarship.**

By relying on an economic model in which the cost of publication is supported by upfront underwriting rather than by sales of copies, open-access digital monographs have the potential not only to rescue the scholarly monograph from oblivion, but also to offer advantages over the printed book: Open-access monographs can be used, wholly or in part, as course texts at no cost to students. Digital formatting loosens constraints on the number of pages and illustrations, while freeing scholars to integrate into their monographs such digital-age tools as timeline-enhanced maps, data visualization, and video. Open-access also means that scholarship focusing on impoverished regions of the world can finally be read by people who actually live in those regions—millions of whom cannot afford the First-World price tag of a printed monograph.

How Open Access Can Fail

In spite of its advantages, the open-access scholarly monograph can still fail if those senior faculty who make decisions about hiring, promotion, and tenure refuse to embrace it. Besides a lingering level of distrust of digital publication among some faculty in the traditionally book-centric academic fields, there are those who consider any underwriting of publication costs by the author and/or the author's institution as nothing more than vanity-press publication. For those of this mindset, new models of open-access publication rank with plagiarism and diploma-mill degrees in the pantheon of academic sins.

A strong argument against tarring open-access publication with the vanity-press brush is that there is no reason that monographs published under legitimate open-access models cannot undergo peer review and editing processes as rigorous as any undergone by traditionally published monographs. Quality peer review and editing are not, after all, functions of paper and ink.

Another counter to vanity-press accusations is that, with very few exceptions, the cost of publishing a scholarly monograph has always been underwritten in one way or another. In the past, the publication costs for any given printed scholarly monograph were very likely underwritten by a university press campus subsidy. Any argument that such traditional models for subsidizing the publication of scholarly monographs occupy some higher moral ground than do the emerging models of open-access scholarly publishing is entirely specious.

If, in the end, the forces of academic conservatism kill the open-access scholarly monograph by refusing to hire or reward emerging scholars who publish in this way, an unintended consequence will be the death of the scholarly monograph. Certainly, it is foolish to think that aborting the open-access scholarly monograph will save its print-format forerunner. The reality is that scholarly publishers, including non-profit university presses, cannot afford to perpetually lose money printing books that academic libraries cannot afford to buy. Open access offers an alternative to a market in collapse. Without such an alternative, production will inevitably come to a halt, and the scholarly monograph will become as much a relic of the past as the scroll and the illuminated manuscript. ∎

Giving Credit Where Credit Is Due

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. A different version of this article appeared in The Conversation.

It was striking that the headline on the first page of *China Daily*, on October 6, 2015, was "China wins first Nobel prize in medicine." Actually, Dr. Tu Youyou of the China Academy of Traditional Chinese Medicine won the prize, not the country. That same day, on page 4 of the *New York Times,* the headline read "3 share Nobel for work on treat-ment of devastating parasitic diseases"—the article noting, almost in passing, where the three winners came from—: the United States, China, and Japan. It is one thing to celebrate the number of Olympic medals won by athletes from a particular country—after all, the medals are awarded with flags flying and national anthems blaring—but scientific achievement is quite something else. Another aspect of the irrationality of contemporary science is the explosion in the number of coauthors of articles in many scientific journals. Nobel credits and irrational co-authorship are illustrative of two sides of the same coin: systems of scientific credit have run amok.

WHAT IS THE NOBEL COMMITTEE AWARDING, AFTER ALL?

Nobel prizes are awarded for specific and notable achievements and, by implication, a lifetime of scientific work. The credit accrues to the researcher or sometimes several colleagues or scientists working independently on a similar topic. The country where the research was done has little, if anything, to do with the achievement. Indeed, as is often the case, the researcher may be from one place, and is working in another. The American who was co-winner in medicine, Dr. William Campbell, for example, was born in Ireland, received his bachelor's degree in Ireland and his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin. He did his prize-winning work finding treatments for parasite infections while at Merck, an American pharmaceutical company. Indeed, many Nobelists, especially Americans, were born and received part or all of their education in other countries. And many are no longer working at the universities where they did their pioneering work.

Thus, Nobel prizes are the work of individuals or teams. Increasingly, science is carried out by groups of researchers, often affiliated to a particular laboratory. The Nobel committee has yet to recognize the implications of the fully collaborative and international realities of contemporary science—they do not award prizes to groups and, indeed, limit the number of scientists who can receive a specific prize to three.

CREDITS RUN AMOK

If the Nobel authorities set hard limits for allocating credit, academic science may have gone off the deep end in the other direction. An article was recently published in *Physical Review Letters*, a respected journal, with 5,154 authors. Another *Physical Review Letters* paper from 2012 has close to 3,000 authors—21 of whom were deceased by the time the article was published.

One of the authors of the latest paper, Dr. Aad, who is listed first, will receive a huge number of citations, no doubt boosting his reputation and increasing the citation rate for his university. The topic was the Higgs Boson, and

the article involved collaboration among scientists in many countries. This seems to be a world record for co-authors, although there are an increasing number of published articles with 1,000 or more coauthors.

While it is certainly true that science has become more collaborative, there seems to be little justification for listing such a large number of authors. Could they have all contributed substantively? Just as there was no rationale for listing as first author the senior scientist in a laboratory, even if he or she had done little or no work on the specific article, as was common and remains a practice in some laboratories and departments, it seems at least some of these many hundreds of coauthors are getting a courtesy listing. It is not appropriate to provide authorship credit to people who have had a remote relationship to the writing and preparation of the actual article.

This issue is important for a number of reasons, among them that citation counts are used for university rankings as well as for national policymaking in some countries and often for the evaluations of individual professors when promotions or salary increases hang in the balance.

> **While it is certainly true that science has become more collaborative, there seems to be little justification for listing such a large number of authors.**

WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

Globalization, academic competition, misplaced nationalism, the obsession with rankings, ever increasing demands for accountability by governments, and significant changes in how science is carried out all contribute to our contemporary "credit problem." Although the examples cited here may seem to border on trivial, they are actually important. Scientific productivity is increasingly an international phenomenon, with top researchers educated in one country, working in another, and frequently developing and sharing research with colleagues around the world.

Thus, science is global and it is increasingly irrelevant to credit Nobel research to a country or university. Yet, support for basic research is dwindling everywhere—and it is on the basis of basic research that Nobel-level discoveries are made. Countries that provide funding and autonomy for basic research will inevitably scoop up the best scholars and scientists.

At the same time, the scientific community itself must be reasonable about distributing authorship credit for aca-

demic articles. These articles, especially those published in the top refereed print and electronic journals, remain the gold standard of science and are a central means of knowledge and dissemination. The number of authors should be limited to those who have actually been involved in the writing of the article, even if a much wider community contributed insights or data to it. Others can be mentioned in relevant credits or references.

As in so many aspects of contemporary science and higher education, we are in the midst of an "academic revolution" in scientific recognition and research support and evaluation. A rational approach is needed to restore sanity to a system that is increasingly out of control, from the Nobels to articles "authored" by thousands. ∎

Higher Education Research Goes Global

HANS DE WIT

Hans de Wit is professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu.

Until recently the study of higher education and its international dimensions was the field of a small group of research centers and scholars, primarily in the developed world, and even there, funding and resources were scarce. There are two new initiatives, though, which indicate a more positive and global development of research in international higher education. These initiatives can be seen as a product of the "Shanghai Statement: The Future of Higher Education: The Need for Research and Training for the Higher Education Enterprise" in 2013. Reflecting the thinking of 33 research and policy professionals concerning the future development of the field of higher education research, policy, and training, the statement noted: "This developing field is so far limited to a fairly small group of countries." The statement made an appeal for more research and the development of research centers at universities around the world, for doctoral studies in international higher education, and adequate funding.

THE CENTRE FOR GLOBAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The official launch of the ESRC/HEFCE Centre for Global Higher Education, or CGHE, took place on 2–3 February 2016 in London. CGHE is the largest research center in the world specifically focused on higher education and its future development. It has more than £6 million (US$8.7

million) in funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) in the United Kingdom for work over 2016–2020, and is a partnership of three UK universities and several universities from around the world.

CGHE is a partnership led by the Institute of Education at University College London, with Lancaster University, the University of Sheffield and international universities—including Australian National University (Australia), Dublin Institute of Technology (Ireland), Hiroshima University (Japan), Leiden University (the Netherlands), Lingnan University (Hong Kong), Shanghai Jiao Tong University (China), and the University of Cape Town (South Africa).

A core focus of CGHE is maximizing the impact of its work on policy and practice. The center is headed by Professor Simon Marginson and includes several other key scholars in the field of higher education, such as professors Peter Scott and Ellen Hazelkorn.

Global Centers for International Higher Education Studies

In the same vein, on 14–15 January, the first meeting of the Group of "Global Centers for International Higher Education Studies" (GCIHES) took place in Santiago, Chile. This group was established as a result of an initiative of the Centro de Estudios de Políticas y Prácticas en Educación(CEPPE) at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile and the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), at Boston College, United States.

The group includes four other partners: The Centre for International Studies, Higher School of Economics, National Research University, Russia; the School of Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China; the Centre for Higher Education Development, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa; and the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy. The group is coordinated by CEPPE in Chile.

The launch meeting of the GCIHES group took place in the context of the XII Higher Education Summit, a conference organized by CEPPE every year. The group has decided to focus on joint research and professional development, as well as dissemination. Among the projects that the group will start are a comparative study of doctoral education in the world, with a specific focus on emerging and developing countries; research on Catholic universities, identity and internationalization; a summer institute in 2017, planned to take place in Shanghai; and a conference called "Higher Education Forum on Africa, Latin America and Asia" to be organized by Professor Damtew Teferra, director of the Centre for Higher Education Development, in Durban, on 19–20 August 2016.

The partners of GCIHES have already been collaborating bilaterally, for instance, on studies of the academic profession by CIHE in the United States and the Higher School of Economics in Russia. They will now go one step further to undertake joint research and professional development. The fact that the group is formed by six research centers from different continents and with a strong presence from the emerging and developing world breaks the dominance of European and Anglo-Saxon research in higher education.

The group does not have the same generous funding sources as CGHE, but builds on its own funding and smaller grants, for instance from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the Higher Education Forum on Africa, Latin America, and Asia conference, and the Luksic fund for the Catholic universities project.

The three Catholic universities in GCIHES held a first seminar in Santiago about the latter project, presenting three institutional case studies on how these Catholic universities deal with internationalization as part of their mission. They intend to develop this study with a larger number of case studies from different countries around the world.

Until recently the study of higher education and its international dimensions was the field of a small group of research centers and scholars, primarily in the developed world, and even there, funding and resources were scarce.

Expansion of International Higher Education

CIHE's publication, *International Higher Education*, is also expanding globally. In addition to the English version and its translations in Chinese, Russian, and Spanish by three of our partners in GCIHES, the publication is also translated in Portuguese and will soon be available in Vietnamese, translated by FPT University. You can have free access to the online version of the publication in all these different languages at http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index .php/ihe.

Two spin-off publications focusing on regional higher education issues have also been established. Now in its third year, the publication Higher Education in Russia and Beyond is published by our partner, the Higher School of Economics in Russia. In 2016, another publication will start, Higher Education in Singapore and Beyond, an initiative of the HEAD Foundation in Singapore, in cooperation with CIHE.

Another new initiative is relevant to mention in this context, as well. In the fall 2016 Boston College will launch

a 12-month Master of Arts in International Higher Education, an initiative of CIHE to provide a strong international program combining education, research, and field experience, using blended learning with on-site faculty and scholars from around the world, including our partners in GCI-HES.

The Shanghai Statement of 2013

The Shanghai statement of 2013 was a product of a roundtable initiated by CIHE. As a follow-up, the center made an inventory of research centers in higher education around the world, published under the title *Worldwide Higher Education Inventory,* and now available as an interactive map on the CIHE website.

The creation of the two global networks in higher education research, the new Master in International Higher Education and the expansion of "International Higher Education" illustrate the growing importance of higher education research and dissemination in a global context. Where higher education research was in the past limited and mainly focused on national and regional aspects, like the sector itself, the shift is now towards international higher education. This is an important development. ∎

National Policies for Internationalization—Do They Work?

Robin Matross Helms and Laura E. Rumbley

Robin Matross Helms is associate director for research, Center for International Higher Education and Engagement, American Council on Education. E-mail: rhelms@acenet.edu. Laura E. Rumbley is associate director at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu. This article is based on a report by the authors, "Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs," published by the American Council on Education in October 2015 and available at https://www.acenet.edu/newsroom/Pages/CIGE-Insights.aspx.

In response to the demands and opportunities of an ever-globalizing world, governments in a wide range of countries are introducing policies and programs to promote higher education internationalization. These initiatives are underpinned by a variety of academic, economic, political, social, and cultural motivations; sometimes higher education internationalization is an explicit goal, while in other cases, the focus is more specifically on a discrete activity, or on broader national policy goals.

A recent study by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) took a close look at the content of such policies—an overview, including a wide assortment of specific examples, is the basis for our recent report, *Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs.* Our analysis revealed five main categories of policies in place around the world, based on their primary focus:

Type 1: Student mobility. Policies designed to encourage and facilitate student mobility stand out as the most common focal point for policymaking related to internationalization of higher education. A broad array of nationally funded student mobility scholarship programs—from Saudi Arabia to Chile, Kazakhstan to Brazil, among many others—are the prime manifestations of this policy focus.

Type 2: Scholar mobility and research collaboration. Policy activity in this area is being undertaken by many countries around the world, as well as by key regions—notably Europe, where the European Union is investing heavily in this area under the Horizon 2020 initiative, and specifically through such mechanisms as the Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions. Common types of initiatives in this category include support for visiting scholars, programs, and grants to send faculty abroad, policies to repatriate faculty living in other countries, and project-based research grants.

Type 3: Cross-border education. Whether involving branch campuses and other kinds of physical "outposts," or virtual (or hybrid) forms—such as MOOCs—national policy and program activity in this realm include initiatives to foster partnerships for capacity building, create educational "hubs," encourage domestic institutions to establish campuses and programs abroad, and more effectively regulate cross-border activity in practice.

Type 4: Internationalization at home (IaH). IaH is a nascent but rapidly emerging critical focal point for internationalization. Few policy documents currently address it overtly. The European Commission's 2013 strategy for internationalization, *European Higher Education in the World*, is a notable exception. But this is surely an important space to watch for future policy developments.

Type 5: "Comprehensive internationalization" policies. We see a small number of initiatives that present a rather sweeping set of rationales, action lines, focus areas, and/or geographic orientations, rather than being singularly focused on specific action lines. Again, the European Com-

mission's policy vision for internationalization stands out, but so does Canada's 2014 "International Education Strategy" and Malaysia's 2011 "Internationalization Policy for Higher Education Malaysia," among others.

Gauging Effectiveness

With national-level internationalization policies and programs proliferating in a variety of contexts and configurations, the question of effectiveness comes front and center. Do these policies positively impact the direction and progress of internationalization in their respective higher education systems? In the longer term, do they succeed in furthering the academic, economic, political, social, and/or cultural goals they set out to achieve?

As is often the case when it comes to education-related issues, determining the effectiveness of internationalization policies is challenging. Often, efforts to do so focus on easily measured, clearly quantified outputs. Did country A's policy achieve its goal of recruiting X number of new international students to the country's universities in the specified timeline? In addition to participant numbers, financial analyses—another easily quantified measure, and one that often appeals to policy-makers—may come into play as an evaluation tool.

Policies designed to encourage and facilitate student mobility stand out as the most common focal point for policy-making related to internationalization of higher education.

When it comes to the more nebulous, longer-term outcomes, and impact of such policies, studies by the British Council/DAAD and the HEFCE (the Higher Education Funding Council for England), the European Commission, and the International Association of Universities have made some inroads in delineating impacts of different policies, using various methodologies. Overall, though, specific data and clear answers about issues of impact are fairly scarce. In part, this is due to the newness of many of the internationalization policies now in place around the world—it is simply too soon to tell what their ultimate impact will be. In many other cases, evaluation of impact simply appears not be built into policy implementation structures.

Having examined a large number of such policies and the available data on effectiveness, however, it is clear that there are a number of key factors—both inherent to the

policies themselves, as well as external factors impacting implementation—that affect policy effectiveness (positively or negatively).

Funding is of primary importance. Not surprisingly, policy effectiveness may be directly affected by issues such as the level at which policies are funded, the ways in which funding is distributed, and the degree to which funding is sustained over time.

How policies are implemented, and by whom, is also crucial. It is common knowledge that "one size fits all" is not a useful way to think about internationalization policy or practice. So, national policies may be implemented in a wide variety of ways—for example, involving many actors or just a few. The ways that policies are implemented can have a major effect on issues such as efficiency, and raise important questions about the capacity of policy implementers to advance their agendas and manage their work well.

Looking beyond individual policies themselves gives rise to the issue of policy interplay and alignment. For most countries, the national policy environment is complex and interlocking. Initiatives undertaken in one area can have a direct influence on efforts being undertaken in other policy spheres. Classic examples in relation to internationalization include the intersection between national objectives to attract international students and scholars, and visa and immigration policies that control access to the country. If policies are developed and implemented in isolation from one another, or directly at cross-purposes, policy effectiveness will suffer.

Finally, the level of convergence between policy objectives and institutional priorities impacts effectiveness of national-level initiatives. Internationalization of higher education is a phenomenon most directly experienced by higher education institutions themselves. For this reason, national policies for internationalization must be grounded in an understanding of institutional realities. National policies that fail to take into account institutional priorities, and vice versa, present major challenges for achieving successful outcomes.

Internationalizing Internationalization

Will individual countries' internationalization policies ultimately achieve their short- and long-term goals? Only time will tell. But, perhaps the more interesting question is what the overall impact of such policies will be on higher education worldwide. The growing number of countries that are committing—in very concrete, formal, and resource-intensive ways—to internationalizing their higher education systems suggests that the time is right to collectively take our efforts to the next level, and turn our attention to the "internationalization of internationalization." The impact of country-level policies will be maximized when we find

the synergies among them—i.e., when our policies are mutually supportive and reinforcing.

This is not necessarily an easy task—it requires broad awareness of policies in place, and dialogue at the national policymaking and institutional levels. As we note at the end of the ACE-CIHE report, "ensuring that higher education around the world benefits from the best of what comprehensive, sustained, values-driven internationalization has to offer will take a great deal of creativity, substantial resources, and sheer hard work." ∎

Employment Opportunity as a Driver of Student Mobility

Christine Farrugia

Christine Farrugia is senior research officer with the IIE Center for Academic Mobility Research and Impact at the Institute of International Education in New York, where she oversees Open Doors®. E-mail: cfarrugia@iie.org.

The opportunity to gain practical work experience is growing in importance as a driver of student mobility around the globe. For several years Open Doors® has documented the increasing numbers of US students who are engaging in work, internships, and volunteering abroad. In 2013–2014, there were more than 41,000, including those who received academic credit for their work abroad and those who pursued non-credit work opportunities overseas. International students also value work experience to complement their studies, with more than 12 percent of the nearly 1 million international students in the United States in 2014-2015 engaging in Optional Practical Training (OPT), which is a period of work available for international students who have graduated from a US college or university. While recent extensions of the OPT eligibility period for graduates in STEM fields accounts for some of this proportion, students' willingness to stay on for work in growing numbers and for longer periods indicates how important this aspect of international education is for many students. Globally, we have seen that policies governing students' ability to work has impacted international student numbers in countries such as Canada, Germany, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

Work is More Attractive for Some International Students

Work opportunities are more influential drivers of mobility for students from certain countries than from others. While many students value the ability to gain practical work experience that will help them gain jobs back home or in their host country, others may be driven by economic conditions in their home countries that push them to take advantage of study-related work opportunities in the host country.

Many students from Asia pursue OPT in relatively high numbers, including those from India, Nepal, Taiwan, and China. Indian students are especially motivated by the opportunity to work in the host country following graduation. In the United States, Indian students are the leaders in OPT participation, with 22 percent of Indian students engaged in OPT in 2014–2015. At the same time, the number of Indian students in the United Kingdom has dipped over the past several years, following policy changes restricting the availability of post-study work visas following graduation. Following the implementation of the UK policy, Indian students fell by nearly 50 percent from 2011 to 2014, while their numbers increased by 70 percent in Australia, and 37 percent in the United States over the same time period.

While many students desire the opportunity to gain practical work experience along with their overseas studies, not all do so through work following graduation. The case of Brazilian students provides one example. While fewer than 5 percent of Brazilian students in the United States engaged in post-completion OPT in 2014/2015, over 12,000 were placed in internships alongside their studies in the United States in from 2011 through 2015. These training opportunities have been incorporated into the Brazil government's Scientific Mobility Program as a key component of the students' academic and professional preparation so that they may return to Brazil with both academic knowledge and practical skills. Among students from some countries, work opportunities play a lesser role in their mobility patterns. For example, OPT accounts for just 2 percent of the international students from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait who were in the United States in 2014–2015. However, these low OPT rates may not be a function of low student interest in work opportunities, but may result from conditions of their governments' scholarship programs that encourage them to return their home countries once they graduate.

It is not just where the students come from that factors into their likelihood to pursue work opportunities related to their studies; who the students are matters as well. A special study (forthcoming) on US students' non-credit education abroad conducted by IIE as part of Generation Study Abroad found that slightly higher proportions of men engage in non-credit activities, including work, internships, and volunteering, than they do in traditional curriculum-

based study abroad programs. Among students whose gender was reported by their institution, 40 percent were men, compared to 35 percent among study abroad students in traditional programs awarding academic credit, as documented in Open Doors. While men's participation in both forms of education abroad remain low, the slightly higher proportions engaging in non-credit education seem to align with anecdotal reports that male students are more apt to go abroad when they perceive a practical career benefit of their international experience.

> **International students also value work experience to complement their studies, with more than 12 percent of the nearly 1 million international students in the United States in 2014–2015 engaging in Optional Practical Training (OPT).**

The Value of International Co-curricular Work Experience

In the US domestic context, internships and work experience are widely recognized as important components of higher education programs and a vital way for students to gain work experience and practical skills that go beyond what they can learn in a classroom. Indeed, some academic programs require their students to complete internships as an integral part of their studies, as well as to prepare them for jobs following graduation. For international students, work experience in the United States provides similar educational benefits and provides them with critical skills in their field that will ultimately help them navigate a path to the working world in their host country, back home, or in a third country. When international students stay in the host country, they contribute their skills and knowledge to that country's development. In cases when international students ultimately work in another country, they help strengthen international cross-border ties in research and business.

Growing numbers of students are seeking out internships and work experience in countries outside of where they are pursuing their degree. Global internships are one way to make education abroad more meaningful for students by reflecting the reality of how students will use their international skills following graduation. While it is nice to study art in Florence, it might be better for a student's resume to work as part of a team building wells in Honduras, or to contribute to the development of a marketing strategy for a company in China. Such international experiences still provide the intercultural "soft" skills and transformative personal experiences that are familiar to many in the study abroad field, while also providing the opportunity for students to gain practical "hard" skills in a work context that can be easily translated to the job market down the line.

■

The International Education Market: Some Emerging Trends

Neil Kemp

Neil Kemp is deputy chair of the Council for Education in the Commonwealth and an international education consultant. He was formerly director of Education UK, British Council. E-mail: neil.kemp@nkeducation.com.

International student mobility has continued to surge, as reflected in recent data from most major destination countries. Changes are occurring, some large and some subtle, and a selection of these trends is briefly discussed below. The major exception to strong enrollment growth in recruitment has been the United Kingdom, where tough immigration regulations have impacted directly on international student numbers.

The China Question

How many Chinese students will be studying internationally 10 years from now? The answer is very important, as numerous universities around the world have high dependency on recruiting Chinese students. The total number of Chinese studying internationally in 2012 was estimated to be over 700,000, three times more than the number of students from the second country, India. While the increasing capacity of Chinese universities might reduce outward mobility, demographic change will likely be a major factor, given that the number of young Chinese of higher education age is projected to decline significantly. However, currently international enrollment of Chinese students has continued to grow, to most leading destination countries: Australia up 8 percent, Germany 8 percent, and the United States 11 percent. Chinese student numbers in the United Kingdom were up about 5 percent in 2013, with over half of the 17,300 new Chinese undergraduates came through some form of transfer arrangement—students commence in year 2 or 3 in the UK university after initial years in

China. Further, many of these transferring undergraduates progress to a master degree program.

Indian Mobility Continues

Indian student enrollments were recently up nearly 30 percent in the United States, Australia (up 20 percent), and Germany (up 21 percent). In contrast, the United Kingdom saw a fall of over 12 percent—estimates suggest that Indian enrollment declines probably resulted in a loss of some $700 million to the UK economy in 2013.

The destination choice of young Indian students aligns closely with immigration policies and access to post-study employment. That is not to say that young Indians seek long-term migration; merely, they want to consolidate their academic studies through work experience. For example, in the United States, some 32,000 Indian students, registered in a US university, are following temporary employment programs.

Demand for international study by young Indians is likely to remain buoyant, particularly at the postgraduate level. This is driven by the rapid increase of students exiting upper secondary schools—total higher education enrollment in India is projected to be 40 million by 2020, up from about 32 million in 2014.

***

Dependence on national scholarship programs can be a high risk, particularly for those universities that have many such students; governments can turn them off as fast as they start them up.

***

Some Other Mobility Trends

Saudi enrollment to US universities has continued to grow fast (up 45 percent over the last 3 years, to about 60,000), whereas for Australia and the United Kingdom there have been declines. In Brazil, where the "Science without Borders" program now faces cuts, many Saudi and other Middle East students are supported through scholarships from their governments, rather than from their own personal funds. Dependence on national scholarship programs can be a high risk, particularly for those universities that have many such students; governments can turn them off as fast as they start them up.

Considering a few other countries with large numbers of mobile students—current and potential, one observes the following:

•Outward mobility of South Korean students has been fluctuating (over 110,000 students studying internationally), with declines reported to the United States (currently about 64,000 students), Japan (16,000), and Australia (nearly 6,000), but there has been enrollment growth to the United Kingdom (nearly 4,500);

•The outward mobility of Nigerian students continues to increase, with the United Kingdom the main destination (over 19,000 enrollments); Ghana (12,000); the United States (nearly 10,000); and with others studying in Malaysia (2,700); Canada (2,500); and South Africa (2,300). There were reportedly also 3,600 Nigerian students studying in Ukraine in 2012;

•The number of Vietnamese (54,000), Iranian (50,000), and Malaysian (nearly 60,000) students studying internationally are all on the increase;

•There has been a growing number of Russian students studying internationally (over 50,000), with Germany hosting the most (14,500), followed by the United States (5,600);

•Indonesia appears to have good potential, given the size of the country; however, in spite of favorable economic growth and increasing university participation rates, international mobility has remained modest (approximately 40,000).

A noticeable recent trend in international enrollments to UK universities has been a shift away from large-scale recruitment from South Asia to one-year master programs (down 42 percent over last 3 years), to reinvigorated growth in undergraduate enrollments from China, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Malaysia (up 24 percent). There has also been recent decline in undergraduate enrollments from several EU countries to the United Kingdom (including Germany and France)—is this response to the United Kingdom's higher university fees, demographic change, or the UK government's somewhat negative messages about its EU membership?

Will Expanded Capacity in Lower Income/Medium Income Countries Result in Decreased Outward Mobility?

There is no evidence that this is happening, rather the opposite; the nature of demand continues to evolve, resulting in greater diversification of subject, level and modes of study. Such patterns have been apparent in the more wealthy countries for many years, where outward mobility has continued to increase—for example, US students are the second largest group of international students in the United Kingdom, and not just for study abroad. Similarly, the United Kingdom has experienced steady enrollment increases from Australian, Canadian, Swiss, and Norwegian students.

Other examples include the United States, where the number of European students has grown steadily. In Ma-

laysia, while policy changes have led to expanded local university provision, the number of Malaysians studying in the United Kingdom and the United States has continued to increase.

INCREASING COSTS, INCREASING COMPETITION

As competition to attract new international students increases, universities need to invest more to support recruitment, and this has driven up their costs. In Australia, the total per new enrollment could average over $4,000, and for the United Kingdom between $3,000 and $5,000. These costs include international staff support, investment in marketing, agent commission, and for a few universities, overseas representative offices.

Private education companies also provide services to support international recruitment through various forms of partnerships with universities, including delivering foundation and language programs; leading companies—include Kaplan Inc. (United States), Navitas Ltd. (Australia)—and INTO University Partnerships (United Kingdom).

TWINNING AND ARTICULATION ARRANGEMENTS

The growth of transnational education (TNE) has contributed to greater international mobility, with many TNE programs designed to encourage students to transfer at some stage to the awarding university's home campus (arrangements include articulation, twinning, and/or the recognition of prior learning). The motivation for both students and the universities involved being both educational and financial, the period of time studying internationally can vary from a few weeks to two or three years. In addition to the transfer provisions for recruiting Chinese students to the United Kingdom (mentioned above), many other arrangements are involved. For example, in India, several US and UK universities offer degree programs with transfer arrangements; typically, US universities offer master programs that might involve one year in India, with the second in the United States, while most of the UK programs are at the undergraduate level. Similar examples are apparent in Malaysia, where for instance Sunway University has transfer arrangements with Monash University, Australia.

New flexible delivery and support arrangements are also available for doctoral studies, with split site PhDs, transfer arrangements, residential programs and greater use of ICT for supervisory support. For example, over 4,600 students were following UK doctorate programs in their own country in 2013.

CONCLUSION

All indications are that international student mobility is likely to continue to grow over the next decade, and at rates of 5 percent per year or more. While demand will almost certainly be led from China and India, outward mobility from other countries is increasing significantly. Opportunities presented by strong growth have resulted in many more countries and institutions seeking to recruit internationally. While this has offered greater study choice for students, competition has also driven up the costs of recruitment. The growing dependence of many countries and their universities on international students, the speed and variability of market evolution, and the strong competition, all indicate the need for greater understanding—better market research and intelligence, and greater consideration of why international students might choose particular destinations, and what might influence this choice.   ■

The Value of Administrative Staff for Internationalization

UWE BRANDENBURG

Uwe Brandenburg is managing partner, CHE Consult, Berlin, Germany. E-mail: Uwe.brandenburg@che-consult.de.

Studies on internationalization usually focus on students and at best academics. But when you think about it: Who is the international student's first contact at the host university? It is usually not the professor and most likely not even the international office staff, but rather core administrative and service staff such as the porter or the housekeeper in the dormitory. For outbound students, it is not necessarily a professor with whom the students deal when organizing their studies abroad, but rather an administrator. Nevertheless, most strategies and analyses ignore administrative staff as a crucially relevant component (administrative staff is defined here as staff that is predominantly not engaged in academic-scientific work.) This trend is slowly changing. A good example is the Erasmus Impact Study, which explicitly investigated the role of administrative staff in mobility and internationalization. Administrative staff also gets more focus at the political level: the Bologna Follow Up Working Group stressed in its report that in future mobility programs, special efforts will be needed for administrative staff. If we concede this point, measuring the effectiveness of internationalization activities for this target group becomes pivotal.

In a large-scale study called InHoPe, which started in 2014 and was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, we tackle this question and aim

at analyzing the level of internationality of nonacademic staff and its effects on internationalization activities in German Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). The goal is to develop recommendations for the effective management of internationalization, with a focus on staff recruitment, structures, and development.

Tentative findings from the first two rounds of data collection and analysis indicate that this group forms an important information resource for an HEI, as well as its cultural basis, not the least because of its usually much longer affiliation at the institution than academics. More than 40 percent of the respondents were employed for more than 20 years, and three out of four were permanently employed. The results also show that the day-to-day work of administrative staff at HEIs has become increasingly international over the last decade: one third has monthly contact with international academics or students. However, it looks as if most staff are still inadequately equipped for such experiences: only one third spent at least three months at a time abroad. The work environment, therefore, seems to develop quicker than staff development and selection processes.

> **We tackle this question and aim at analyzing the level of internationality of nonacademic staff and its effects on internationalization activities in German Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).**

The Untapped Potential of Sensibilizing Administrative Staff to Internationalization

Not only does the majority of administrators at HEIs have no prior international experience, they also do not have much opportunities to improve this deficit during employment. 89 percent never participated in staff exchange, 87 percent never benefited from intercultural trainings, and 60 percent never even took a language course while working at the university. It is wrong to assume that administrators are not interested in such activities: two thirds would be interested in participating in an intercultural training or in staff mobility, and four out of five would be willing to take a language course. There are of course reasons for not engaging in these activities, in particular lack of time and an unclear perception of their direct benefit on the work to be performed. Administrators also very often lack information on how to participate in internationalization activities, especially staff mobility and intercultural trainings. The study also shows that such activities are not futile, but quite

on the contrary have substantial effects.

First Insights on the Effects of Internationalization on Administrative Staff

We conceptually assumed that experiences made in the context of internationalization activities influence the internationality of nonacademic staff on three levels: personality traits; attitudes and competences; and work environment. Firstly, we expect changes in personality traits that are relevant for coping with typical international and intercultural experiences in the workplace. Secondly, we assume that participation in internationalization activities influences individual attitudes, with an impact on the level of internationalization in the HEI. Thirdly, we aim to reveal under which conditions effects in the first two dimensions (traits and attitudes) alter work-related practices of nonacademic staff.

Our model of three levels (personality traits; attitudes and competences; work environment) seems to work. We find intercorrelations between all three levels, and the data seems to confirm that personality, in the end, strongly defines all results on the other two levels.

Internationalization of Administrative Staff through Recruitment and Staff Development

From the data, we can infer that, in general, recruiting staff with prior international experience has a stronger impact on internationality than developing the capacities of staff through internationalization activities (such as mobility or intercultural trainings). Recruiting is more relevant when seeking to increase the level of internationality of higher rank positions, and of staff at the international offices, while staff development is especially effective for lower rank positions, and for higher rank staff not focused primarily on internationalization. Staff recruitment is nevertheless pivotal for setting a framework for internationalization in any HEI. You need to use the right criteria to find the right people. Further, internationalization activities can have a strong impact on mindsets, but they do not have the same effect on everybody. They seem especially advisable for those without previous experience and on lower responsibility levels. In essence, both measures are necessary and quite complementary.

What Can Be Learned for Practical Implementation?

We need to improve targeting instruments and procedures for recruitment of internationally oriented nonacademic staff.

On the staff development side, firstly, far more people want to participate in internationalization activities but lack information on how to proceed: thus more information is crucial. Also, many respondents state that they lack time. Internationalization must not "come on top on everything

else." It must be integrated in the staff development strategy and regular work life, e.g. by inserting mobility windows into the annual feedback meetings between executives and employees, or by including regular time slots for preparation to trainings and courses, as well as mobility activities in staff contracts. Internationalization activities for the administrative staff (e.g. language and intercultural courses, participation in mobility programs, staff weeks) must be closely integrated into a differentiated and systematic framework of staff development. HEIs should base their programs on information on the predispositions, prior knowledge, and experiences of their administrative staff. Activities such as mobility programs should explicitly target nonacademic staff as a particular group. We need to allow for, and support, bottom-up initiatives of staff related to skill development activities.

This needs more coherent HR structures, such as a systematic follow-up of internationalization activities for administrative staff in order to stimulate organizational learning in the HEI, and integrating different internationalization activities into structured programs. The SprInt program at Technische Universität Dresden is a good example, where a certificate consists of a language course, an intercultural course, and an optional mobility stay.

When it comes to internationalization today, nonacademic staff can be described as a crucial group, whose performance can significantly improve with the right measures of targeted recruitment and well–planned HR development activities.

∎

The Rise and Fall of Brazil's Science Without Borders

Creso M. Sá

Creso M. Sá is professor of Higher Education and director of the Centre for the Study of Canadian and International Higher Education, Ontario Institute for Studies of Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: c.sa@utoronto.ca.

Brazil's Science Without Borders program attracted considerable attention when it was launched in 2011, with the promise to support study abroad opportunities for 101,000 students in STEM fields over four years. Spearheaded by none other than President Dilma Rousseff with an initial budget of US$1.2 billion, the program seemed to represent a bold investment. Brazil has a longstanding shortage of STEM graduates and a largely insular higher education system. With its explicit focus on placing students in highly ranked universities, some regarded the program as an important initiative to promote internationalization.

Less than five years on, the program's future hangs in the balance. Devaluation of the Brazilian real against the US dollar, along with constraints in the national budget, have led to the suspension of funding for the program in the fall of 2015. Some awards granted were cancelled, and the program only continued to support students who were already abroad. There is a good chance Science Without Borders will not continue in its current form. However, the current budgetary situation is not the only problem afflicting the program, and hard questions need to be asked about what it has accomplished.

> **The first problem this posed was of actual demand: it soon became evident that English proficiency among the undergraduate population was generally low.**

QUESTIONABLE POLICY DESIGN

Science Without Borders was created as a presidential initiative. There was no consultation process or public deliberation on the program priorities or design. Despite the longstanding role of federal agencies in managing scholarship programs for graduate study domestically and abroad, Science Without Borders came to life in a radically different size and format than preexisting initiatives. The most striking feature of the program is the focus on undergraduate students. Nearly 79 percent of all Science Without Borders awards were "sandwich" scholarships that support a year of study abroad for undergraduates. This brought an entirely new focus to the federal agencies in charge of graduate study and research.

The first problem this posed was of actual demand: it soon became evident that English proficiency among the undergraduate population was generally low. Federal agencies had to scramble to arrange language training for otherwise qualified students, which became rationalized as an initiative to "facilitate access" to study abroad opportunities (see http://isf.mec.gov.br). Evidently, no serious analysis of the candidate pool was undertaken prior to the implementation of the program, leading to the improvised effort to provide support for language learning.

Another demand issue came from the private sector. Industry was expected to fund 26,000 scholarships toward the total target, but that never materialized. Disagreements

over goals and objectives between potential corporate sponsors and federal agencies led many companies to withdraw support.

Fundamentally, the undergraduate sandwich scholarship lacks any real articulation with students' home institutions and academic programs. Several problems arise from this: students have been admitted to colleges in fields other than their own, have taken unrelated coursework, and have not had their courses at foreign universities recognized for academic credit at their home institutions.

The Student Experience

Science Without Borders presented a formidable administrative challenge to the administering agencies. The agencies were not prepared to meet the sheer volume of applications and grantees brought about by Science Without Borders, which left them incapable to provide individual assistance to students and to properly monitor and manage individual files. There have also been recurring issues with the timely payment of student stipends, relocation grants, and tuition fees, creating serious difficulties for some grantees.

Science Without Borders presented a formidable administrative challenge to the administering agencies.

A study by Julieta Grieco at the University of Toronto, the institution that has the largest number of Science Without Borders grantees, examined the experience of undergraduate students in detail. In general, students lacked proper predeparture orientation in Brazil to better prepare them to the new academic and culture contexts. They also lacked effective academic advising abroad, to help them access opportunities at the host institution and to navigate the academic system.

Differences in the structure of academic programs lead students to take classes at an inappropriate level, either for lack of knowledge of how the curriculum works or because they lacked course requirements for higher-level courses. A major stumbling block for some students is the inability to gain admission to schools and departments offering their program at the host university. This is often the case with students in professional undergraduate programs in Brazil that are only taught as graduate programs in North America (e.g. medicine). Such students are channeled to the general liberal arts curriculum, where they take classes that are unrelated to the coursework of their home programs.

Science Without Borders allows students to engage in industry or research internships. However, there is no general coordination of this aspect of the program and no clear guidance to students, who receive uneven assistance with how to access companies or academic laboratories that might provide placement opportunities. While some students have positive experiences with coursework and internships, it is evident that success is to a great extent left to chance.

Lack of Policy Learning

The lack of a national culture of policy evaluation is evident in the case of Science Without Borders. The risks of policy failure, wasteful spending, and adverse unintended consequences are clear with a program of this magnitude. Unfortunately, no mechanism is in place to monitor and assess this program, and generate useful policy lessons.

Science Without Borders provides a stark example of lacking policy capacity in the Brazilian government to design and implement effective public policy. Opaque decision-making about key program features, absence of consultation with key stakeholders, and top-down implementation have resulted in a poorly designed program. The major flaws in design discussed above were all avoidable. Nonetheless, no effort was made to assess existing needs and demands among students, administering agencies, universities, and potential industry partners.

Establishing Real Priorities

Science Without Borders consumed significant resources that could have been better employed elsewhere. Debate about the relative merit of allocating 6.4 Brazilian reals to this program never happened. This was a consequential decision for the academic research system. Funding for Science Without Borders was not "new money," but rather a reallocation of resources supporting university researchers and graduate students. This resulted in budget cuts and delays in spending that affected research programs around the country. These implications need to be considered as part of the opportunity costs of this program.

A revival of Science Without Borders in its original format is unlikely. The program's undergraduate focus is hard to justify academically, and finds political opponents among opposition parties. Given the president's association with the program, the government is not likely to simply terminate it, which would signal failure. A silent downsizing and shift in focus to graduate training through the budgetary process is more probable. ∎

High-stakes Entrance Examinations: A View from Brazil

Simon Schwartzman and Marcelo Knobel

Simon Schwartzman is a senior researcher at the Instituto de Estudos do Trabalho e Sociedade (IETS), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. E-mail: simon@iets.org.br. Marcelo Knobel is director of the Brazilian National Nanotechnology Laboratory (LNNano) and professor at the Gleb Wataghin Physics Institute, University of Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas, Brazil. E-mail: knobel@ifi.unicamp.br.

In Brazil, the growing dominance of the national exam for secondary education as a massive, unified entrance exam for higher education has several detrimental consequences. Besides effectively shaping the high school curriculum, with clear disadvantages for those who will not attend college, it restricts the diversity and regional characteristics of the higher education sector. Similar criticism applies to other countries that use national entrance exams. Some suggestions for possible changes are given.

Worldwide, millions of students and their families confront the stressful process of admission to higher education. Several countries employ national tests to determine who gets admitted, a system often presented as democratic and meritocratic, since all students take the same examinations. In Brazil, the national exam for secondary education (*Exame Nacional do Ensino Medio, ENEM*), is similar to the *Gaokao* (or College Entrance Examination) used in China, and similar high stakes entrance examinations in Turkey, Chile, Russia, and other countries. The current public debate about ENEM underscores its drawbacks, and parallels similar debates taking place elsewhere.

Brazilian higher education is characterized by a small, fairly well-financed network of selective federal (national) universities with free tuition, enrolling 1.1 million students, and a large private sector enrolling 5.4 million students. Additionally, 0.6 million students enroll at regional state universities, also tuition free. In contrast to many other Latin American countries, access to public universities in Brazil is limited; students have (historically) competed for admission on the basis of entrance examinations developed by each institution. Private institutions typically provide low-cost evening courses to people who have not been successful in gaining admission to public institutions. With the exception of a few elite private universities, admission to this sector is limited only by the student's ability to pay, and ENEM is not required.

The National Assessment of Secondary Education (ENEM)

ENEM was introduced in 1998 as a voluntary assessment of secondary education, in order to measure the quality of school leavers. In 2010, the Ministry of Education and the federal universities agreed that the exam would become their main selection strategy for admission. The current version is a content-based assessment of Portuguese language, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and writing, given annually over two days and administered simultaneously in different locations throughout the country. Students who pass the exam can apply to two federal institutions in any part of the country. The exam results are also used to select low-income students for fellowships and loans to study in private institutions; to determine eligibility for free secondary-level vocational courses; and to provide adults who meet specific minimum standards with secondary school completion certificates.

ENEM has been criticized for its high cost and vulnerability to corruption, well as for the quality and ideological biases of its questions, particularly in the social sciences. It costs about US$100 million for the government, and most students with low income or coming from public schools are exempt from the US$15 fee. In the past, the questions were leaked or stolen, and security measures need to be employed to limit the use of mobile devices to receive and/or share the correct answers to the questions. Additionally, there is growing concern about its potential to negatively impact secondary and higher education.

In 2015, 9.5 million current and past school graduates sat for the examination. Of these, 2.8 million competed for 205,000 places at federal institutions. The data show that students coming from highly educated families and good quality private or highly selective public institutions tend to get the most successful scores and thus skew the scores upward and make admission of local students more difficult.

The Negative Impact of ENEM

The curriculum of secondary education in Brazil includes more than 15 mandatory subjects, with no optional courses and no flexibility or room for vocational study (available only after completing the traditional curriculum). ENEM reinforces this rigid standardization, turning all secondary schools, effectively, into preparation for the exam, even though most of the students who take the exam will never pursue higher education, and the majority of those who do will study in the private sector, where a qualifying exam is rarely required.

Although higher institutions vary enormously in size and quality from research-intensive public universities to small, private evening schools focused on the professions, all provide the same type of degrees in addition to teaching licenses. National legislation allows for short-term, vocational degrees, and some lead to better job opportunities than university degrees from low-quality institutions. How-

ever, the system lacks a path to postsecondary vocational careers, which currently account for less than 14 percent of the postsecondary enrollment. The transformation of ENEM into a different type of assessment could contribute to the differentiation of higher education.

ENEM has also weakened links between federal universities and their local communities. The intent of establishing these institutions throughout the country was to provide opportunities to the local populations, and contribute to regional development through extension work and applied research. ENEM was expected to make access to higher education more democratic, since it would allow students from anywhere to apply for a place at a federal university anywhere in the country. Lack of financial support for students with limited means to relocate for study has made this unachievable. Furthermore, the universal acceptance of a national exam has actually made the system even more elitist. Higher education institutions located in more remote regions have filled some degree programs with privileged students from wealthier regions who can afford to relocate, skewing the local applicant pool by pushing "cut-off" scores higher.

> ENEM was introduced in 1998 as a voluntary assessment of secondary education, in order to measure the quality of school leavers.

Criticisms of National Exams in China, Turkey, and Chile

Other countries are also questioning their unified national exams. In China, changing the *Gaokao* system is a component of the future higher education reform, which proposes to turn several hundred universities from academic to vocational institutions more closely associated with the requirements of the job market. The Chinese government's 2010 "Blueprint for Medium and Long-Term National Education Reform and Development (2010–2020)" criticizes the system because: (1) "a single examination defines a student's life/destiny"; (2) admissions and selection criteria are overly reliant on the College Entrance Examination score, not on comprehensive selection criteria; (3) there is only one set of examination questions for all of the different types and levels of higher education institutions; (4) the content and style of these examinations are not aligned with the purpose of *Suzhi* (more flexible and creative) education; (5) inequalities in admission opportunities exist across provinces; and

(6) higher education institutions lack autonomy in admissions procedures."

Critics of the Turkish ÖSS (university entrance) exam express similar concerns and, additionally, condemn the reliance on cramming through private tutoring; the high social selectivity; and the effect of the exam on discouraging students from vocational paths.

In Chile, access to the country's main public and private universities is also determined by a national test, the PSU (University Selection Test). Much of the criticism of the exam is related to the social discrimination it reinforces. A 2009 OECD review on the tertiary education in Chile noted, "PSU contributes significantly to the unequal distribution of tertiary places between socioeconomic groups. Pupils from municipal schools and poorer households are much less likely than pupils from private schools and richer households to pass the PSU. If they pass, they are less likely to achieve the higher scores that unlock student support and give access to the best universities."

Proposals for Reform

In Brazil, the debate about ENEM is associated with the debates about the reform of secondary education. The proposal is to move from a unified to a diversified curriculum—a common core focused primarily on language and mathematics, followed by elective paths allowing either for more advanced academic studies, or for vocational choices for those who will enter the labor market directly upon graduation. Secondary schools must offer both general and professional education, and not a preparatory course oriented toward admission to a public university that only a few will attend. ENEM should test general verbal and mathematical competencies, and include separate evaluations for the different paths that different students will pursue, including certifications for technical careers. The outcomes of these assessments could be used by higher education institutions to select students, combined with other criteria appropriate to the institutions' academic and regional missions and objectives.

Finally, it is also clear that the current practice of administering paper tests nationally, once each year, is insane. The exam should be offered at different times and in different locations, using modern technologies and devices used elsewhere around the globe. National assessments are not the cause of inequitable access to higher education, but there is no reason to maintain a system that further exacerbates these inequalities. ∎

Islamist-Secular Cleavages at Tunisia´s Universities

AMANDA THO SEETH

Amanda tho Seeth is a Ph.D. student, Institute of Political Science, University of Marburg, Germany. E-mail: Amanda.tho.Seeth@gmx. de.

Five years after the overthrow of the authoritarian Ben Ali regime in January 2011, Tunisia is still caught up in an identity struggle between secular and Islamist forces. In the democratic era, the demands of Islamists for stronger piety have entered politics and the public discourse, and challenge the traditional secular image of the nation. The cleavage between Islamists and secularists runs also strongly through the universities, which after decades of religious suppression and depoliticization, have been transformed into places of political dissent and activism.

ISLAMISTS DOMINATE UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

High public investments in the higher education system since the 1970s and a strong degree of international linkages—through French as the teaching and working language, and through participation in the European Bologna Process since 2006—have contributed to the outstanding reputation of Tunisian universities within the Arab region. Furthermore, the fall of authoritarianism introduced an array of democratic reforms in the Tunisian institutions of higher learning. University police, which until then had been omnipresent, was removed instantly from the campuses, and major juridical changes of the higher education law were quickly initiated by the interim government. New features are the democratic academic senates that every three years elect deans and directors, as well as the democratic university councils that elect the university presidents. Tunisian universities are in the vanguard in many respects—however, since democratization they have become sites of conflicts between Islamist and secular forces, especially within the student milieu.

Tunisian students are broadly divided between the rather leftist student organization *Union Générale des Étudiants de Tunisie* (UGET) and its opponent *Union Générale Tunisienne des Étudiants* (UGTE), an Islamist student organization loosely affiliated with the Islamist Ennahda party. Both UGTE and Ennahda were banned before democratization, but currently they have become powerful political actors and are now in a position to shape future university life. For the first time ever, UGTE defeated UGET in the annual elections for the university councils in November 2015. The Islamists occupy 224 (42%) of the 528 seats, whereas UGET, which used to dominate the councils, fell back to 110

seats—114 seats remain vacant.

Each university council is composed of the university president, department heads and student representatives, and manages the university´s internal affairs such as study programs, human resource planning, or external cooperation. It remains to be seen how dominant the presence of Islamist student representatives will be on the campuses, leading to changes in the curricula, the introduction of stricter rules regarding gender separation and proper attire, or stronger cooperation with more conservative international providers of higher education like the Gulf States.

> **The fall of authoritarianism introduced an array of democratic reforms in the Tunisian institutions of higher learning.**

As the distribution of power in the university councils is believed to mirror the wider society´s political orientations, UGTE´s victory is discussed in the media as an indicator for renewed support for the Ennahda party in parliament. Ennahda led the national interim government from 2011 to 2014, but after the parliamentary election of 2014 it became the second strongest force after the secular Nidaa Tounes party. In the current cabinet formed in February 2015, Ennahda plays a rather weak role and only controls the Ministry of Employment and Vocational Training. However, since November 2015, Ennahda occupies again the majority of seats in parliament, when 31 members of Nidaa Tounes left the parliament after internal conflicts in the party. This concurrent coincidence of the weakness of the ruling secular party and the victory of the Islamists in the university councils could trigger a rise and stabilization of Islamist power in politics and academia in the years to come.

SALAFIST VIOLENCE ON CAMPUS

While UGTE´s and Ennahda´s plans for Islamizing the universities currently remain unclear, the cleavage between secularists and violent Islamists groups—especially the Salafist organization, Ansar al-Sharia—has a more radical and noticeable impact on the campuses. The most prominent case where Salafists provoked violent outbreaks is the so-called "Manouba Affair" at the traditionally leftist Manouba University. A ban of the face veil on campus caused violent Salafist protests throughout 2011–2012. During the outbreaks, Habib Kazdaghli, dean of the Faculty of Humanities, was attacked and temporarily taken hostage. Kaz-

daghli became the focus of Salafist dissatisfaction because of his academic interest and expertise in the long and rich history of Tunisian Jewry. To this day, Kazdaghli is under police protection.

Furthermore, Salafist activists exchanged the Tunisian flag at the University of Manouba with a black flag depicting the Islamic creed—a symbol of Salafist presence. When student Khaoula Rachidi climbed up the flagstaff and took off the black flag, she was beaten up. The Tunisian State honored the young woman´s courage with a reception at the office of the then president Moncef Marzouki. Still, during the whole course of the conflict at the University of Manouba, the Ministry of Higher Education and Science, then led by Ennahda, strikingly backed off. The then minister of Higher Education and Science, Moncef ben Salem, publicly played down the conflict and declared in September 2012 that wearing the face veil at universities was legal. Also, it is rumored that members of UGTE and Ennahda were involved at the beginning of the protests against the ban of the face veil.

Between Terrorism and Reform

The introduction of a democratic political system in Tunisia has turned the country into an ideological enemy and recurrent target of terrorist attacks by Islamic State (IS). Tunisian university life is affected by these attacks through the state of emergency and curfews that are imposed for security reasons by the government: Evening classes are temporary cancelled, and students cannot fulfill course requirements..

Even though Tunisian students are generally well educated, the national job market cannot absorb all university graduates. The ongoing economic crisis and high unemployment are seen as the causes for why IS, according to current data, is recruiting more members in Tunisia than from any other country. Protests and hunger strikes on campuses—especially by leftist students affiliated with UGET—against the poor prospects of university graduates, are prevalent phenomena since the introduction of democracy.

Still, the governments in power since democratization put high hopes in the role of higher education for the political, social, and economic development of the country, as laid down in the "Strategic Plan for the Reform of Higher Education and Science 2015–2025." This strategic plan aims at a better connection between universities and the job market, and regards autonomous universities as central players for the democratization of their local communities.

■

Frantz Fanon and the #MustFall Movements in South Africa

Thierry M. Luescher

Thierry M. Luescher is assistant director for Institutional Research at the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa. E-mail: thierryluescher@outlook.com.

By his detractors, Frantz Fanon is decried as an advocate of anticolonial violence—that cathartic *muti* (the Zulu term for medicine) to rid native society of the parasitic colonial body politic. Yet, to Mandela's born free generation, he is the prophet of the present, foretelling in *The Wretched of the Earth* South Africa's presumed neocolonial condition: an elite wallowing in conspicuous consumption, a liberation party sunk into lethargy and corruption, masses of people living in poverty, a country in political, economic, and cultural decay. South Africans are disillusioned, and the black youth is angry. A telling placard held by students at one of the many protests in 2015 read: "In 1994, my parents were sold a dream; I'm here for the refund."

#RhodesMustFall

The #MustFall movements took South Africa by surprise. It all started on March 9, 2015, at the University of Cape Town (UCT) in a most unsavory way. The news of a UCT student soiling Cecil John Rhodes' towering statue on campus with human waste reached around the world. Rhodes is one of Cape Town's grandest "sons": mining magnate, former prime minister of the Cape Colony, conqueror of the colonial "hinterland." UCT is built in large parts on Rhodes' estate. #RhodesMustFall became the first iteration of the 2015 student movement in South Africa. Black students learn to voice their experience of being "black on campus" and throw the white masks handed to them by institutional culture, along with Rhodes, onto the ash heap of history.

While #RhodesMustFall mobilized students demanding the removal of Rhodes' statue and disappeared from the public gaze when the statue was removed on April 9, 2015, the excision of this "symptomatic sore" was but a symbolic step in the Fanonian "decolonization" process of healing the post-apartheid university, and creating a new intellectual space. Xolela Mangcu, professor of Sociology at UCT, wrote in *University World News* in March 2015 that the quality of discussions in the occupied buildings on campus "was not anything [he] had seen at the University of Cape Town, Cornell, Harvard or any of the universities [he] had attended."

FROM #RHODESMUSTFALL TO #FEESMUSTFALL
#RhodesMustFall became briefly an inspiration to icono-clasts across the country. Even on university campuses as far as in the United States, the monuments of Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, Jefferson Davis, and others, started shaking. In South Africa, true to Fanon's famed call that "each generation must, out of relative obscurity, dis-cover its mission, fulfil it or betray it," students in other uni-versities asked themselves what needed to fall within their context—when at UCT it was the Rhodes statue that had to fall. At the University of Stellenbosch, the #OpenStel-lies movement reopened the *taal debat* (language debate) on a campus which is deeply divided between mostly white Afrikaans-tuition students and mostly black English-tuition students. And suddenly hashtag movements mushroomed: #BlackStudentsMovement, #Luister, #PatriarchyMustFall, #ReformPukke, #SteynMustFall, #TheTransCollective, #TuksUprising, and so forth.

The #MustFall movements took South Africa by surprise. It all started on March 9, 2015, at the University of Cape Town (UCT) in a most unsavory way.

However, whereas #RhodesMustFall and its derivatives represented a Black intellectual rage against the ideologi-cal superstructure of South African higher education and its whiteness, the #FeesMustFall movement captured the imagination of students nationwide, as it brought things to the grassroots' level of the material conditions of student life, with the powerfully resonant demand for free educa-tion. Free education—or at least a fair chance at higher education for the poor, with state allowances and scholar-ships—is an unfulfilled promise of the *Freedom Charter* that has spurred the anti-apartheid movement since 1955. In the wake of the Council of the University of the Witwa-tersrand (Wits) in Johannesburg, announcing in September 2015 that 2016 tuition fees would increase by double-digit figures, protests escalated at Wits. Within weeks (and more fee increase announcements), public universities in South Africa were shut by students nationwide.

SURVIVOR: CAMPUS
In all cases, the university leadership responded with the tried and tested: a measure of engagement and showing goodwill, a measure of suppression and affirming its au-thority, a measure of divide and rule and clamping down on the activists—and always trying to get the process off the front-pages and into formal meetings. Many years ago, I jokingly described this strategy as "Survivor: Campus": outwit, outplay, outlast. Like the reality show, it is mostly a game of covert negotiation, the occasional show of strength, and a good dose of deceit. But just like #RhodesMustFall, #FeesMustFall proved extraordinarily successful at the game, achieving significant victory within a short period. In what was described as a "clearly panicked response," President Jacob Zuma announced on October 23, 2015, that there would be no fee increases in public universities in 2016. (Unlawfully so, for the South African *Higher Educa-tion Act* vests the authority of setting student fees in univer-sity councils.)

AN INTERNET-AGE NETWORKED STUDENT MOVEMENT
The truly innovative dimension of the 2015 #MustFall movements is the extent to which student activists and sympathizers took to social media and the Internet. If Man-uel Castells conceptualizes in *Networks of Outrage and Hope* a new form of Internet-age social movements (at the ex-ample of Occupy Wall Street and others around the globe), the #MustFall movements signal the advent of a new way of organizing student power in a networked student move-ment that occupies simultaneously the cyberspace and pub-lic spaces. Students used social media and Internet-based platforms prolifically as means to conscientize and mobi-lize others, coordinate activism, share pamphlets, readings, pictures, and video-clips, and document in an unending stream what is happening around the country. In the public space, national protests were held at the centers of power where visibility is greatest: the Houses of Parliament in Cape Town, the ANC Headquarters in Johannesburg, and the Union Buildings in Pretoria. Similarly, campus-based protests frequently barricaded university main gates to shut down operations in full view of the public, and students occupied buildings symbolic of university power on cam-pus, like UCT's administration building and Wits' Senate House.

THE ROAD AHEAD
After an initially quiet start to the 2016 academic year, student power reawakened in February with protests at a number of universities. Thus, observers like Pontsho Pi-lane of the *Mail & Guardian* predicted correctly that activ-ism will rekindle in 2016 as three core student demands remain unaddressed: tuition fees have not fallen, they have only been frozen for the moment; ending outsourcing of support service workers in universities has produced only vague commitments; and most importantly, "decoloniz-ing" South African academia remains a challenge, not the least at the conceptual level. Leigh-Ann Naidoo proposed

in the *New Agenda* that the critical task is: continuing "collective conscientization," ongoing disruption of dominant exclusionary norms, and recreating the university's teaching and learning space and decision-making platforms. The discovery of Fanon may give some hope; his prescription for the road ahead is radically democratic: accept that the masses are thinking people. In the context of the university: accept that the African university will not arise from an aged, white, male professoriate, but from young, astute, black staff and students. They are thinking people; they do not want their universities to fall. Networked student power can potentially be engaged for all manner of radically democratic participation in decision-making, redesigning curricula, and reorganizing university life. ■

Do or Die: The Dilemma of Higher Education in South Sudan

David Malual W. Kuany

David Malual W. Kuany is dean, College of Education at Dr. John Garang Memorial University of Science and Technology, Jonglei State, South Sudan. He recently concluded the Mandela Washington Fellowship at Cambridge College, Massachusetts, and Florida International University, US. E-mail: malualwuor@yahoo.com.

When South Sudan became independent from Sudan in 2011, there were hopes that higher education, and education in general, would top the national spending priority list. However, the education sector lost emphasis when two ministries of higher education and general education were amalgamated to form one ministry, the current Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. Budgets were reduced as part of national austerity measures, staffs were redeployed, and directorates renamed. To make matters worse (to say the very least), when the country entered into what I personally call a war of insanity on December 15, 2013, public universities were badly affected, with students, faculty and staff displaced, and assets destroyed. Now, at certain times, university administration is challenged with the question of whether to close universities or keep them open. This article analyzes the basic challenges facing higher education institutions in South Sudan, with the hope that the recent peace deal between government and rebels will be sustainable and provide tangible solutions.

Snapshot of Higher Education

South Sudan, the world newest nation, has a total of six universities. Five of these are public universities while one is a private institution. The top three university administrators are appointed by the president of the country. Each university has a vice-chancellor and two deputies for academic affairs and for administration and finance. Only one of the five university vice-chancellors is a woman. At the time of writing, the total number of students in all universities is estimated between 25,000 to 30,000.

Challenges

The most important challenge to higher education in South Sudan is the vicious circle of insecurity in both the periphery and the center of the country. Four of the five public universities are located in states prone to be attacked either by the rebels fighting the government, or by local communities in conflict with each other. As a result, many highly skilled foreign academics have left the universities and returned to their countries, or sought jobs with international nongovernmental organizations. Because of insecurity and interruptions in the learning and academic cycles, many students left the country to get enrolled in neighboring countries such as Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia, or Sudan. Some students and staff, traumatized by the murderous attacks, are too scared to return to the campuses and thus interrupt their studies or drop out of school altogether. However, the recent peace deal signed in Juba might help overcome this fear of insecurity.

Brain Drain and Public Financing

A number of outstanding, home-grown faculty have left South Sudan to seek refuge elsewhere, in search for greener pastures. Before July 2015, academics in South Sudan were receiving 35 percent less salary than their counterparts in East Africa. This led to brain drain. The incentive of state education is that beneficiaries should pay back to the state by way of serving the community in their respective specialties. This is compromised if these individuals prefer to work elsewhere. The implication is the insufficient number of faculty at public universities, hence the huge student-faculty ratio.

The national government pays the salaries of staff and faculty at public universities, but little else. There is no funding available for construction or maintenance of infrastructure, for research, holding examinations, and student accommodations. With these realities, universities are faced with the challenge of having to shut down. So far, no university has done so, but extended holidays are not uncommon and severely disrupt academic life. The delays provoke frustration and exacerbate the need to improve

working conditions.

TECHNOLOGY AND LABOR MARKET NEEDS

As in other developing countries, the demands of students enrolled nowadays in universities in South Sudan present a formidable challenge for university academics and administrators. Students need lecture theatres equipped with modern pedagogical equipment, air conditioning, stable electricity, and the means to commute to and from the university. Students are easily annoyed when lacking favorable conditions for learning. The faculty also face major challenges, lacking both standard equipment as well as knowledge on how to use digital resources.

The central purpose of education is to foster skills and values for individuals to successfully fit into society and engage in productive activity to earn a living. The current labor market requires a thorough understanding of modern technology, flexibility and creativity, and social intelligence. As observed above, insufficient technological tools might compromise the opportunity for university students to learn needed skills for the labor market, resulting in a mismatch of competencies and unemployment.

> **The most important challenge to higher education in South Sudan is the vicious circle of insecurity in both the periphery and the center of the country.**

FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES AND TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION

The increasing number of private institutions of postsecondary education in neighboring Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Sudan reflects an enormous competition for students in the region. The attraction of South Sudanese to foreign universities is probably caused by better learning environments, course duration, curriculum, level of technology, higher standard of living at low cost, integrated student support mechanisms, and the diversity of the student population, which provides unique opportunities for international exchanges. These conditions prompt students to cross borders in search of better educational conditions. Students tend to leave for foreign universities where they are certain of graduating within a specified period of time, and with better standards as compared to domestic universities.

CONCLUSION

Although higher education in South Sudan faces enormous challenges, it is moving in the right direction. Since 2013, more South Sudanese academics and staff have joined foreign universities for capacity building. If they return to the country, they will provide the much needed know–how to improve the quality of education. The recent peace deal, if it is sustained, will provide avenues for international inter-university exchanges, improvement in learning facilities, an increase in student enrollment, especially women, and resources might be invested in education. ∎

Challenges to Doctoral Education in Africa

FAREEDA KHODABOCUS

Fareeda Khodabocus is director of quality assurance at the University of Mauritius and a member of the Higher Education Advocacy Network for Africa (HERANA). E-mail: f.khodabocus@uom.ac.mu.

Research is one of the three major pillars of higher education. For a university to progress and to address the needs and challenges of the knowledge industry, academics must constantly be engaged in research. For the past two decades, research universities across the United States, Europe, and developed countries at large have been placing increasing emphasis on the importance of doctoral education as an engine for growth of the knowledge economy. Along the same lines, researchers in Africa have undertaken various studies to investigate the process of universities functioning as tools for development for the African continent. Worldwide, new curricula and new jobs are emerging, replacing traditional ones. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, jobs requiring a master's degree are projected to increase by 22 percent by the year 2020, while positions requiring a doctoral or professional degree will increase by 20 percent. New areas and fields of research will thus emerge, calling for universities to innovate and adjust to the needs of society.

Eradication of poverty, access to education for all, empowering the younger generation with education, minimizing the brain drain, gender equity, and encouraging African women to participate in the development of Africa, have been high on African government agendas. To contribute to the realization of the Millennium Development Goals on the African continent, African universities are encouraged

and supported to strengthen their research capacities to address the skills demands of their knowledge societies and to emerge as nodes of excellence to improve quality of life and the well-being of their citizens. Although the task is not easy given the socio-economic and cultural diversity and the political differences among countries, research policies and frameworks can be contextualized to approach solutions for the knowledge requirements of each country. This article draws on the research results of a five-year study, with yearly discussion forums, that has been carried out by the Center for Higher Education and Trust (CHET) for seven flagship universities in Africa.

This article draws on the research results of a five-year study, with yearly discussion forums, that has been carried out by the Center for Higher Education and Trust (CHET) for seven flagship universities in Africa.

Trends in Doctoral Education

The outcomes of the study reveal that the total doctoral enrollment at seven sub-Saharan African flagship universities (namely the University of Cape Town (UCT), Makerere University, the University of Ghana, the University of Botswana, the University of Mauritius, the University of Nairobi, and Eduardo Mondlane University) for the period 2000–2001 to 2013–2014 was 3,538 doctoral graduates, with a share of 57 percent for UCT and the remaining 43 percent for the other six flagship universities. A slow growth in doctoral enrollments was observed for the six flagship universities, which contrasted with the increase in master's degree enrollments for the same period. Results indicate that not many master's degree graduates move on to enroll for a PhD after completion of their studies. There is a lack of incentives at the levels of the higher education institutions and of private and government sectors, to motivate African students to pursue higher level studies. The study found two major factors affecting the production of doctorates at the six flagship African universities: Academics holding a PhD end up doing either consultancy and/or additional teaching, which are more rewarding than producing more doctorates. It was interesting to note that although Mauritius is ranked first in the sub-Saharan region in the Global Competitiveness Report 2015–2016 published by the World

Economic Forum, the University of Mauritius does not produce a large number of doctorates. It must be highlighted here that for any university to improve its knowledge production, a better understanding of the academic and non-academic job market for high level knowledge is important. The recent CHET publication, *Doctoral Education in South Africa,* emphasizes that in order to produce quality doctorates, adequate importance and emphasis must be given to the quality of supervision, and this must be supported by doctoral tracer studies analyses, to show whether there is a reasonable match between the demands of the labor market and the knowledge and skills presented by the doctoral graduates.

CHET research further reveals that apart from UCT, the knowledge production and research output of the six flagship universities are not strong enough to make a sustainable contribution to development, while it is widely agreed that African universities must produce more academics with doctorates to increase knowledge production. CHET criteria indicate that for a university to perform as a research tool for development, 50 percent of its core academics must have earned a PhD, enabling them to provide a high level of teaching and learning as well as generating more PhDs for the development of the knowledge economy. An additional concern was that, with the exception of the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) of South Africa, how policies are regulating the quality of postgraduate programs articulated in African countries is not clear. Few evaluation systems and quality control mechanisms are in place to ensure the quality of doctorates. Interestingly, CHET studies reveal that African labor markets and governments do not systematically evaluate the competencies of PhD holders, nor the relevance of what they can contribute to society.

As compared to what happens in Europe, predominantly in the United Kingdom for example, the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) provides a code of practice for postgraduate research, including doctoral education. Universities in the United Kingdom, as a result, have well-established guidelines that clearly delineate the rights and responsibilities of supervisors, universities, and doctoral candidates. Internal and external assessments form part of the research framework and add to transparency and accountability. Results of the internal assessments form the basis for external assessments from third party institutions, such as the QAA, the Higher Education Funding Council (HEFCE), or other professional research bodies. In many instances where external funders have funding streams for doctoral education, these may also externally evaluate doctoral education. Therefore, it is believed that for a university to perform as a tool for development, appropriate frameworks must be in place at the national level to regulate and

assess the effectiveness of doctoral outcomes.

CHALLENGES FOR RESEARCH

Africa is viewed as a continent with huge potential for growth, and is called upon to harness its resources to emerge. Universities in Africa have tremendous capacities and resources to deploy in favor of training, development, and innovation. As the knowledge economy grows, careers needing doctoral education will emerge in Africa, and new methods of teaching and research will need to supersede the traditional ones. Academics holding a PhD must be motivated and guided to produce more doctorates that will strengthen and empower the labor force. Digitization and computerization will play a key role in the transformation process of all businesses, and of the financial, educational, and other key development sectors in Africa. Likewise, universities will need to provide increased access to electronic research databases and improved information technology

---

CHET research further reveals that apart from UCT, the knowledge production and research output of the six flagship universities are not strong enough to make a sustainable contribution to development.

---

facilities for conducting research. Universities will need to review their model of doctoral education for new and better models of postgraduate management, supervision and coordination, providing more peer interaction and international collaboration. Regulatory mechanisms and policies at national or regional level should guide the implementation of research strategies and plans. Regular assessments must be in place to ensure that the outcomes of doctoral education match skills requirement for the academic, industrial, public and private job markets. Tracer studies will certainly help to understand the degree of employability of the doctoral graduates on the job market, and will determine the extent of the research contribution and impact on the knowledge economy. Last but not least, increase in support must be provided for research performing institutions, with a more stable model for funding. ∎

Kyrgyzstan: Quality Assurance—Do State Standards Matter?

MARTHA C. MERRILL

Martha C. Merrill is an associate professor of higher education administration at Kent State University, US. She wishes to thank IREX for a Short-Term Travel Grant that allowed her to do some of the research this article is based on. E-mail: mmerril@kent.edu.

The Kyrgyz Republic has been without a formal system for evaluating its higher education institutions since June 3, 2014, when the Division of Licensing and Attestation in the Ministry of Education was abolished. Interestingly, neither students nor parents nor the media nor politicians seem to care very much. Roger King, in *Governing Universities Globally* (2009), has argued that higher education institutions are increasingly subject to both formal and informal regulation from a number of supranational sources, but that many variations are possible in the pathways from conception to implementation. Does the situation in Kyrgyzstan tell educators more about the influence of global governance or more about specific circumstances in Kyrgyzstan?

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENTS

Although Kyrgyzstan is not a member of the Bologna Process, it has been adopting Bologna reforms for several years, including switching from Soviet-era degrees to bachelor's and master's degrees. Another reform would be exchanging state attestation for independent accreditation, as required in the *European Standards and Guidelines*. When the Division of Licensing and Attestation was abolished, educators expected that independent accrediting agencies would be established quickly, but the Jogorku Kenesh (Parliament) has not yet approved the regulations needed to create them.

The fact that the Division of Licensing and Attestation was abolished does not mean that no ways of evaluating quality exist. Some higher education institutions, such as the Kyrgyz-Russian Slavonic University and the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, were founded by intergovernmental agreements, and their diplomas are recognized in both countries. The American University in Central Asia has a dual-degree arrangement with Bard College, and students majoring in programs also offered by Bard can receive Bard diplomas.

Other universities are pursuing international accreditation for specific programs; the "German Informatik" program at the Kyrgyz State University of Construction,

Transportation and Architecture, which has a partnership with the German Westsächsische Hochschule Zwickau, has been accredited by the German agency ASIIN, and business programs in at least two universities in the capital, Bishkek, are preparing for ACBSP (Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs) accreditation. The NGO Ed-Net, through a TEMPUS grant, has formed an accreditation agency, and, with European colleagues present for the site visits, has performed three pilot accreditations.

Despite the fact that thousands of students could be denied diplomas in 2017, little public concern is evident.

Implications

In the system carried over from the Soviet era, a program had to be licensed before it could begin operating, and it went through attestation when it had its first group of graduates and every five years thereafter. If a program has not passed attestation, its graduates cannot receive state diplomas. Programs that were last attested in the 2009–2010 academic year should have undergone attestation in 2014–2015. In addition, since every comprehensive university in the country started new four-year bachelor's programs in 2012, and the first graduates will complete those programs in 2017, hundreds of new programs need either attestation or accreditation next spring.

Despite the fact that thousands of students could be denied diplomas in 2017, little public concern is evident. One reason may be that Kyrgyzstan had parliamentary elections on October 4, 2015 and many decisions seem to be on hold until the results are known and a new government is formed. Another is that accreditation and attestation do not affect how current or incoming students pay for their educations. Those who score well on the National Scholarship Test, which is administered by the independent agency, the Center for Educational Assessment and Teaching Methods (CEATM), have their tuition paid by the state. Those who do not score well enough pay their own way. Additionally, state institutions are presumed to have the state behind them, and all institutions that award Kyrgyz diplomas have to follow the same curricula, so students (and parents) are not used to choosing universities based on curricular differences. Also, substantial consensus exists about the quality of the various newer and private universities, regardless of offi-

cial program attestation. Moreover, as Alan DeYoung points out in his book, *Lost in Transition* (Information Age, 2011), many stakeholders are interested in higher education's latent functions, rather than its manifest ones: the government wants to keep the burgeoning youth population out of the stagnant job market; parents see "dat' detyam obrazovaniye"—give children education—as the socially correct thing to do; students see the chance to move to the capital or another city as attractive. The actual quality of the education does not matter much for any of these latent functions. Furthermore, in a relationship-based society, people often are "invited" to positions, and family connections may be more important than program quality for finding employment. Also, given the importance of family connections, many students from the regions will stay there for their education, or will go to cities where they can live with relatives. Location, more than formal quality assessment, can determine institutional choice. Finally, corruption is widespread: degrees can be bought and the attestation system itself was perceived to be corrupt. Thus, then and now, families rely on word of mouth and nongovernmental evaluations to validate university quality.

Conclusion

Kyrgyzstan thus has specific circumstances that make the lack of formal assessment mechanisms at the national level less critical than might be the case elsewhere. Nevertheless, since among the reasons a national system seems unimportant, are that some of the stronger institutions have degrees recognized elsewhere and others are pursuing international accreditation, educators elsewhere might want to keep an eye on Kyrgyzstan. National systems of quality assessment may not be as relevant as they used to be. ■

University Governance Reforms in Kazakhstan

Darkhan Bilyalov

Darkhan Bilyalov is a researcher at Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Astana, Kazakhstan, and PhD candidate, Pennsylvania State University, US. E-mail: dyb5296@psu.edu.

National governments worldwide are introducing western corporate governance in universities as a means to increase institutional autonomy and efficiency. Former Soviet Union countries are no exception to this global trend.

Among them, Kazakhstan is dramatically changing its educational landscape: from rigid ministerial control and of a command economy, to modern, market oriented corporate governance practices. It is doing so by decentralizing governance functions from the national ministry to individual institutions, by means of creating and empowering institutional governing boards. Policymakers argue that this will increase the autonomy of institutions in their academic, financial, and organizational decision-making. Numerous challenges of this governance reform are discussed below, with the goal to share its lessons with other post-Soviet countries attempting similar reforms.

TRADITIONAL GOVERNANCE

The prime actor in the education landscape in Kazakhstan is the Ministry of Education and Science. It has historically played a crucial role in institutional governance by defining policies, detailed procedures, curriculum, state-funded enrollments, personnel policies, and other key aspects of university life. The higher education system is highly centralized: public university rectors report directly to the Ministry that retains authority over their appointment, evaluation, and dismissal.

University rectors are the chief executive officers, legally responsible for the well-being of the institutions. This ultimate responsibility has in many cases resulted in their domination over major institutional decisions, with low levels of transparency and collegiality. Faculty participate in governance through the structure of *Uchenyi Sovet* (academic senate), chaired by the university rector. While nominally the supreme governance structure of higher education institutions, it often acts either as a formal "rubber stamp" or as an advisory body to the rector.

EMERGING GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

The State Program for Education Development for 2011–2020, the main strategic document for national education, stipulated that by 2020, 90 percent of all public universities would use "corporate governance mechanisms" and establish boards of trustees. Such boards would include representatives of the wider society: civic leaders, employers, authorities, business, NGOs, and mass media representatives.

Within several years after the State Program set the goal of establishing the Boards of Trustees, they were created at virtually all public institutions. However, such remarkable responsiveness in board creation was not accompanied by a clear definition of their powers and responsibilities. Board by-laws allow them merely to suggest, discuss, and advise, thus withholding any real formal authority. The Boards of Trustees now are mainly involved in institutional affairs serving as the voice of employers and regional community through curricular alignment, graduate employment, provision of internship opportunities and research collaboration.

There were legal controversies that did not allow the Boards of Trustees more institutional power. To avoid these controversies, new Boards of Overseers were recently created in nine universities. The legitimacy of these boards (unlike the initially created ones) is guaranteed under the Law on State Assets that regulates public universities. After piloting the Boards of Overseers in nine universities, the plan is to transform the existing Boards of Trustees into these new structures. These transformed boards will have powers comparable to governing boards of western institutions. In particular, they would be entitled to select the rector of the university; approve budgets; define strategy, admissions criteria, and faculty hiring policies; and even set the senior leadership team's salaries.

So far, the new Boards of Overseers have achieved varying degrees of success. Some have approved strategic plans, changed personnel evaluation policies or even initiated new financial models for their respective institutions. Others are still struggling to fill in vacant board seats.

> **The Kazakhstan government has significantly modernized and internationalized universities through centralized policymaking and governance since the country's independence.**

RESPONSE TO THE REFORM

The national government has used a set of policy instruments from mandates to stimulate change and contribute to capacity building. It has placed special responsibilities on Nazarbayev University, the new highly internationalized research institution: to organize training for hundreds of board members and university administrators. Unlike state universities that cannot approve budgets, set tuition fees, appoint and dismiss rectors, determine hiring policies for faculty and administration, determine admissions requirements, or open new programs, Nazarbayev University is under a separate law that determines its full autonomy in these aspects. It has functioning shared governance structures and has been charged with the mission to share its experience with other institutions through training and communication.

While Nazarbayev University enjoys considerable autonomy, there is little clarity as to the extent of university autonomy that is to be granted to the rest of the system. While policymakers talk freely about academic freedom, management, and curricular autonomy, issues of financial

autonomy and of leadership appointment are rarely discussed. When such discussions appear, some raise concern that boards may not realize their full potential if the Ministry retains the power to appoint and dismiss university rectors. Others note that society does not have a strong cultural foundation for lay governance. The legislative barrier poses another challenge that requires amendments in a set of laws, rules, and regulations.

The academic community seems in principle to embrace the idea of autonomy and corporate governance, but is cautious about the realities and timeline of implementation. In particular, some anticipate a power struggle between traditional and new governance structures; others, a pushback from rectors unwilling to give up their powers.

Conclusion

The Kazakhstan government has significantly modernized and internationalized universities through centralized policymaking and governance since the country's independence. However, there is an agreement, both nationally and worldwide, that to succeed in the twenty-first century, universities need to be given more autonomy. Lessons learned from Kazakhstan's decentralization efforts might be useful for other countries sharing the legacy of the soviet governance system.

Private Higher Education: Even France, Even For-Profit

Aurélien Casta and Daniel C. Levy

Aurélien Casta is assistant professor at Université de Lille in France and a PROPHE Affiliate. E-mail: aureliencasta@wanadoo.fr. Daniel C. Levy is SUNY Distinguished Professor, State University of New York at Albany, and PROPHE director. E-mail: Dlevy@uamail.albany.edu.

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

Many consider France as the "home" of a strong and centralized state, dominating society and imposing regulations on institutions, including the higher education sector. Seen from abroad, no country has been more associated with the historic "Continental Model" dominant in Europe, and partly transplanted in Latin America and elsewhere. Yet 200 years after the end of the Napoleonic era (1815), French higher education includes a significant *non*-state sector. Indeed, private higher education (PHE) enrolls 19 percent of all students. Furthermore, an increasing share of that PHE is legally for-profit, with a large international investor presence. At first sight, this contemporary reality may seem an abandonment of a glorious French state tradition. But in fact both the existence of PHE and even the recent for-profit surge within it have been consistent with accommodating state policy.

Stunning Numbers and Character

The 19 percent private share—representing some 436,000 of France's 2.3 million enrollments (2013)—is striking by its sheer size and also in comparative terms. Western Europe's PHE share is 12 percent (15 percent for Europe overall). In fact, the French private lead is larger than these figures alone suggest, for the great bulk of French PHE is "independent private"—an official European term indicating among other things that most funding is private, whereas PHE in several neighbor countries depends mostly on public funds. Moreover, French PHE is fast-growing, its present 19 percent significantly exceeding its 12 percent share in 2000; during the same time period, the PHE share has remained relatively stagnant in Western Europe overall.

There has been remarkable media attention on France's PHE growth generally, and in particular on the for-profit surge within it. True, in France as elsewhere outside the United States, anything private (and not religious) is often seen as for-profit, even if it is not officially for-profit. Yet, currently the dramatic emergence on the French higher education scene of private equity and multinational companies, and their quite visible acquisitions, make for "hot" news stories. Financial and educational media outlets stimulate public fascination. Of the five largest higher education "groups," only one is national (also family-owned); the four international groups include Laureate (easily the world's largest for-profit chain in higher education) and three French and British transnational private equity companies (Apax, Bregal, and Duke Street).

As is common in other countries, for-profits institutions are somewhat wary of the interest and coverage, lest they bring increased scrutiny and regulation. Nonetheless, for now at least, the French for-profit institutions have reason to welcome the attention, which helps "put them on the

map" for potential clients and employers.

How large is the for-profit component of French PHE? No close estimate can be responsibly made. Government has chosen not to gather comprehensive data sorted by for-profit/nonprofit. We will nonetheless hazard a very broad estimate: the for-profit share of PHE is probably substantially larger than 20 percent, and substantially smaller than 50 percent. Few of the roughly 235,000 PHE enrollments in 2000 were for-profit. The nonprofit share has grown

> **The 19 percent private share—representing some 436,000 of France's 2.3 million enrollments (2013)—is striking by its sheer size and also in comparative terms.**

over the past 15 years, so it is probably still today significantly larger than the for-profit share. On the other hand, the five largest groups mentioned above claim having some 80,000 students, thus accounting for roughly 18 percent of PHE. Whatever the exact current share of for-profit PHE, it is notably growing.

An Accommodating State Policy

Any outsider's guess that such private, and especially for-profit, growth would happen despite restrictive state policy would be grossly mistaken. So would an assumption that the state has only recently become accommodating, with a more limited role and a broader acceptance of the market. On the contrary, state policy has been generally accommodating ever since the end of the Napoleonic era.

Specific state provisions have many times changed or been added, but no such provision has upset the general atmosphere of tolerance. To be sure, regulations have placed some restrictions, but they have also conveyed state recognition, thus buttressing PHE legitimacy, and now even for-profit legitimacy. In fact, several of the provisions introduced over time have *liberalized policy*. In the past half century, for example, PHE has gained rights to offer state diplomas, getting more latitude from various ministries for their vocational training, and even forming partnerships with public entities, including universities.

In the past two centuries, the French State has never banned or nationalized PHE—interventions seen in some European and other countries. On the contrary, it has generally allowed private institutions to go about their business. In the immediate post-Napoleonic era, tolerance of PHE mostly meant tolerance of Catholic institutions; today

it is mostly business that has latitude to go about its business in PHE.

Remarkably, all of the above holds for for-profit PHE as for nonprofit PHE. For-profit non-university higher education awards official degrees and diplomas. When allowing PHE, many countries in Europe and beyond proscribe for-profit education or regulate it more stringently than nonprofit PHE. French public policy is virtually neutral in this respect.

None of this means that the French State places no restrictions on PHE. Perhaps the most striking is that no PHE institution can be a university. Nor, for the most part, can any PHE institution offer university degrees or diplomas. But equally striking is how restricted the restrictions are. There are no extra restrictions on the for-profit PHE institutions and, since 1968, private institutions can in partnership with universities award university degrees and diplomas. Additionally, since 1999, if granted permission from a national commission and the ministry, business schools can by themselves award one of the three university degrees, the master. Though PHE graduates do not have the same access to the civil service as their counterparts from public education, the great majority of PHE graduates seek employment in the private sector and international business anyway.

Unions and public universities sometimes lobby for the state to be less accommodating of PHE, and their case may resonate with many citizens' longstanding unease about private ownership and management in higher education. But actual French policy remains largely accommodating of PHE, now even of for-profit PHE. ∎

Performance-Based Funding of Universities in Europe

Thomas Estermann and Anna-Lena Claeys-Kulik

Thomas Estermann is director for Governance, Funding and Public Policy Development at the European University Association in Brussels, Belgium. E-mail: thomas.estermann@eua.be. Anna-Lena Claeys-Kulik is policy analyst & project manager at the European University Association, in Brussels, Belgium. E-mail: anna.lena.kulik@eua.be Note: the full report on performance-based funding of universities in Europe is available on the EUA Web site at: http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications-homepage-list/define-thematic-report_-pbf_final-version.pdf?sfvrsn=26.

In a context of tight public budgets, performance-based funding of universities is often perceived as a useful tool

by policy makers, both in order to connect funding to measureable indicators and thus increase the transparency of spending, as well as to incentivize and reward the achievement of specific policy goals.

Definition

Performance-based funding is understood here as funding allocated based on indicators measuring the output (at different stages) of the process of learning and teaching, research or interaction with external stakeholders. Indicators used are for instance the number of graduates, the number of credits awarded, the number of publications or citations, the amount of external funding obtained and other factors. Performance-based funding is associated to funding formulae with output criteria, as well as performance-contracts between public authorities and universities including goals and targets to be achieved.

Various Purposes

Performance-based funding may be used for diverse purposes. This ranges from being simply a distribution mechanism, to the idea of a steering tool to increase the performance of universities in certain areas that are linked to specific policy goals, such as increasing higher education attainment, fostering knowledge transfer, increasing university-industry collaboration, and others.

The Share of Performance-based Funding

It is important to note that a funding mechanism is rarely ever completely performance-based. This means that a formula can for instance be composed of a few output indicators (such as the number of doctoral degrees awarded, number of citations) and a few input indicators (number of students enrolled at bachelor and/or master level). The share of funding that is allocated based on performance (meaning via output indicators) is often smaller than the share based on more traditional input-indicators.

A majority of the 28 systems in Europe covered in the study consider their basic funding allocation mechanism to be at least partially performance-based for teaching (via criteria that are linked to the number of graduates at bachelor or master level or the total number of credits awarded), and partially or mainly performance-based for research, where indicators related to publications and external research funding are normally taken into account.

Nevertheless, the most common method of allocation remains a primarily input-based formula used by 13 of the systems considered. It is often combined with other mechanisms such as performance contracts or budget negotiations and historical allocation.

Indicators and Associated Effects

Performance-based funding can have various effects on teaching, research and institutional management and governance. Study completion criteria such as the number of credits or degrees awarded are used with a view to fostering quicker graduation, increasing the completion rate and higher education attainment in general. In systems where universities are free to decide on student numbers, such completion criteria provide a clear incentive to increase enrollment, which usually needs to be proportionally higher than the desired number of graduates due to students dropping out. In contrast to input indicators such as student numbers, completion criteria have the advantage that they force institutions to focus on the end product of the teaching and learning process and discourage institutions from keeping students enrolled as long as possible. This can be a driver for the development of student support services and measures to reduce the number of dropouts (e.g. tutoring, guidance, and counselling, etc.).

> **Bibliometric criteria might represent a relatively easy way to measure research outputs, but their use is very controversial.**

However, increasing enrollment can be challenging for institutions given limited space and facilities. In addition, completion criteria bear the risk of decreasing educational quality and standards to be able to produce more graduates in less time. As a consequence, big lectures might be privileged over smaller seminars, leading to less close contacts between professors and students.

Output indicators in research funding try to measure the productivity of an institution and its researchers, for example, through bibliometric criteria, the amount of external funding obtained, the number of contracts with business and industry, etc. These indicators may incentivize the dissemination of research results in academia and cooperation with external partners. The latter has not only the potential to foster knowledge transfer, but helps to ensure that research results are used outside of academia and are relevant to other stakeholders, which can enhance the impact of research on society.

Bibliometric criteria might represent a relatively easy way to measure research outputs, but their use is very controversial as they put high pressure on academics to publish early and frequently, with the risk to foster quantity rather

than quality and make academic staff privilege research over teaching.

OPPORTUNITIES AND LIMITATIONS

The analysis reveals that the expectations of performance-based funding are often too high and that incentives should therefore be used with caution. It can help increase the transparency of funding allocation and the accountability of public spending. It might also support profiling and strategic positioning of universities, notably through performance contracts between public authorities and universities. A pre-requisite for this is that procedures and goals are clear and not too complex, and that universities are an equal partner of the ministry, so that a real dialogue can take place.

However, the effects of performance-based funding are difficult to control and are highly dependent on other factors, such as the regulatory framework, the overall funding system and share of funding allocated based on performance, as well as the institutional profile, income structure, internal management and governance. It bears the risk of a decrease in quality of teaching and research if no other measures are taken to prevent this.

Furthermore, the fact that institutions receive their funding not upfront (when a student enrolls), but at a later stage (when a student has made progress, e.g. completed a year or graduated), makes funding very volatile and does not leave much room for adaptation, with buffer budgets becoming very small. The cost structure of universities is very rigid with a high amount of staff costs, accounting on average for around two thirds of the overall expenditure, which makes quick adjustments difficult. This constellation limits the possibilities to invest in innovations such as new modes of teaching, new programs, or high-risk research.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Policymakers, funders, and universities should take a holistic view on performance-based funding and develop strategies for reaping its benefits while mitigating its risks. They should pay attention to the characteristics of the overall university funding system and ensure transparency for all actors. Keeping the share of performance-based funding limited and providing it in form of additional funds are ways to ensure the financial sustainability of the institutions. Furthermore, the costs of universities' activities should be taken into account when determining funding levels. At institutional level, university leaders need to develop a strategic approach toward internal funding allocation, based on the institutional profile and strengths as well as their vision for the future.

Institutional autonomy is a prerequisite to enable university leaders and managers to develop and implement strategies to work with performance-based funding mechanisms, and put in place measures to mitigate its risks such as appropriate quality assurance mechanisms.

Funding, be it performance-based or not, is just one tool that must be combined with other measures to ensure the sustainability of the system and the high quality of education and research. ∎

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Austin, Ian, and Glen A. Jones. *Governance of Higher Education: Global Perspectives, Theories, and Practices.* New York: Routledge, 2016. 203 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-73975-7. Web site: www.routledge.com/education.

This volume provides a multifaceted discussion of both the theoretical and practical aspects of higher education governance in a global perspective. It is aimed at advanced graduate students as well as those concerned with understanding aspects of governance. Among the topics discussed are relations between state and university, academic self-governance, governance and management, theories of governance, and others.

Bellin, William. *The Islamic Republic of Iran: Its Educational System and Methods of Evaluation.* Milwaukee, WI: Educational Credential Evaluators, 2015. 207 pp. $125 (pb) ISBN 978-1-883971-29-8. Web site: http://publications.ece.org.

Aimed at credential evaluators, this book provides an informative overview of Iran's educational system, including current statistics. It also includes a comprehensive listing of Iranian higher education institutions in English and Farsi, and sample documents relating to academic degrees and certificates, with English translations. Given the paucity of information about Iranian higher education, this is a useful compendium.

Cloete, Nico, Peter Maassen, and Tracy Bailey, eds. *Knowledge Production and Contradictory Functions in African Higher Education.* Cape Town, South Africa: African Minds, 2015. 295 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-920-677855. Web site: www.africanminds.org.za.

A series of research-based essays on aspects of African higher education with a special focus on the role of research universities, this book includes such topics as the performance of African flagship universities, incentives for knowledge production, the roles of national councils for higher education, student engagement, and others.

Cloete, Nico, Johann Mouton, and Charles Sheppard. *Doctoral Education in South Africa.* Cape Town, South Africa: African Minds, 2015. 282 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-928-331001. Website: www.africanminds.org.za.

The focus of this volume is on how to increase the number of doctorates offered in South Africa to 5,000 annually by 2030—this goal will require significant changes in current policy and practice. Among the topics considered are how to improve efficiency in doctoral educa-

tion, different paths to success, improving quality, and others. While focusing on South Africa, this book is relevant to Africa generally, and emerging economies as well.

Green, Wendy, and Craig Whitsed, eds. *Critical Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum in Disciplines: Reflective Narrative Accounts from Business, Education, and Health*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2015. 304 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-946-3000833. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

Internationalization is, of course, the focus of many universities worldwide. This book focuses on an aspect of internationalization that has received little attention yet is of central importance—the curriculum. From the perspective of three disciplines—education, business, and health—contributors discuss many aspects of curriculum development and integrating international perspectives. Institutional case studies provide perspectives on such themes as internationalizing nursing degrees, linking curricula from several universities, and others. The examples come from a range of countries.

Helms, Robin Matross. *Internationalizing the Tenure Code: Policies to Promote a Globally Focused Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2015. 44 pp. (pb).

Part of the ACE's "Insights" series, this publication discusses how rules for tenure and promotion in the United States can be focused on strengthening international work among faculty members. Existing policies are mapped, and suggestions are made for improvement. While

U.S.-focused, this publication may be of international relevance.

Helms, Robin Matross. *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Current Policies, Future Directions*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2015. 42 pp. (pb).

Part of the ACE's "Insights" series, this publication discusses U.S. government policies and initiatives relating to all aspects of internationalization, including student mobility, internationalization at home, and others. The publication notes that there is no consolidated national policy concerning internationalization.

Helms, Robin Matross, Laura E. Rumbley, Lucia Brajkovic, and Georgiana Mihut. *Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2015. 80 pp. (pb).

Part of the ACE's "Insights" series, this publication discusses national policies concerning internationalization in a global context. Among the topics considered are student mobility, scholar mobility and research collaboration, internationalization at home, and comprehensive internationalization strategies.

Hutchison, Charles B., ed. *Experiences of Immigrant Professors: Cross-Cultural Differences, Challenges, and Lessons for Success*. New York: Routledge, 2016. 269 pp. $160 (hb). ISBN 978-1-138-806-962. Web site: www.routledge.com.

A combination of essays by professors who are not natives of the countries in which they are teaching, and with several chapters based on research concern-

ing immigrant professors, this volume focuses on the experiences of non-native academics in their professional and personal lives.

Jones, Elspeth, Robert Coelen, Jos Beelen, and Hans de Wit, eds. *Global and Local Internationalization*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2016, 183 pp. (pb). $54 (pb). ISBN 978-6300-299-8. Web site: www.sensepublishers.com.

The local implications of higher education internationalization are increasingly recognized as a key part of the process. This book looks at a range of local aspects of internationalization. Among these are internationalization and local employability, student outcomes at the local level, local and global drivers of internationalization, implications for the curriculum, and several case studies of local programs and impacts.

Kirst, Michael W., and Mitchell L. Stevens, eds. *Remaking College: The Changing Ecology of Higher Education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015. 323 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-8047-9329-2. Web site: www.sup.org.

The focus of this book is on what the editors define as the ecology of American higher education. Their argument is that both the social context as well as academe itself need careful analysis since both are related. Like many others, they argue that the ecology is rapidly changing. Among the topics discussed in the book are changes in early adulthood and its impact on access to higher education, the changing roles of for-profit higher education, measuring college performance, and particularly the roles of "broad access"

institutions that serve students who might not have had access earlier.

Lane, Jason E., ed. *Higher Education Reconsidered: Executing Change to Drive Collective Impact*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2015. 228 pp. (pb). SIBN 978-1-4384-5952-3. Web site: www.sunypress.edu.

Collective impact, a concept taken from the literature and practice of management, is applied to American higher education in this book. The aim is to stress major change in higher education. Among the themes discussed in the chapters are collective leadership in higher education, moving from perpetuation to innovation, using design thinking, and related topics.

Major, Claire Howell. *Teaching Online: A Guide to Theory, Research, and Practice*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 234 pp. $29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1633-5. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

A guide aimed at faculty members engaged in online teaching. The examples and context are all U.S.-based, but the themes have international relevance. Among the topics considered are course structure, instructional time, intellectual property, student engagement, faculty knowledge, and others.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

The Center's new Master's Program in International Higher Education has been officially approved by Boston College, and we are currently receiving applications for the first iteration of the program, to begin in September 2016. Full information on the program and application instructions can be accessed here: http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/departments/eahe/graduate/maihe

The Carnegie Corporation of New York has recently approved a two-year extension of its grant support for coverage of African higher education in *IHE*, as well as for the work of the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), which is based at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, under the direction of Damtew Teferra. We are exceedingly grateful for the ongoing generosity of the Carnegie Corporation in this area.

IHE is now published in Vietnamese, thanks to a new collaboration with FPT University in Vietnam. The version in Portuguese is produced by SEMESP in Brazil.

In February, CIHE director, Hans de Wit, and associate director, Laura E. Rumbley, were active presenters at the AIEA 2016 annual conference in Montreal, Canada. CIHE also actively supported the March 4, 2016 conference in Baranquilla, Colombia on "Dialogues on Latin American Higher Education," organized by Reisberg & Associates and Universidad del Norte. Hans de Wit and CIHE Research Fellow Liz Reisberg played key roles in the organization and delivery of this event.

CIHE is currently involved in a World Bank-sponsored project comparing seven national higher education systems across four main dimensions. This work may serve as a framework for future analyses of higher education systems by the Bank. Hans de Wit has also been involved in recent World Bank discussions on key developments in Latin American higher education, which took place in Bogotá, Colombia in March.

Since the start of the new year, CIHE has hosted four new visiting scholars: Ignacio Irarrázaval, of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile; Aisling Tiernan, of Kings College London; Corinne Bossé, of Maastricht University; and Douglas Proctor, of the University of Melbourne.

Philip G. Altbach, CIHE founding director, has just released a new book, *Global Perspectives on Higher Education* (John Hopkins University Press). Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit will speak at a conference at the University of Guadalajara, and then at CINVESTAV in Mexico City, in May CIHE associate director, Laura E. Rumbley (co-authoring with Fiona Hunter), has just had a chapter published in *International Higher Education's Scholar-Practitioners* (Symposium Books), edited by Bernhard Streitwieser and Anthony Ogden, for which Hans de Wit has written the foreword.

This spring, CIHE plans to launch a new report series, *CIHE Perspectives*. The first number in this series will be titled "Sage Advice: International Advisory Councils at Tertiary Education Institutions," and is based on a World Bank-sponsored project undertaken by CIHE.

NEW CENTER BOOKS PUBLISHED

The first part of 2016 sees the publication of several books written or edited by Center faculty members. These books reflect the research foci of our staff and of the Center for International Higher Education. They are an indication of the scope of our work.

•Philip G. Altbach. *Global Perspectives on Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016), 330 pp. $34.95 (pb). Featuring 18 essays on all aspects of international higher education, including mass higher education, internationalization, the role of the BRICs, rankings and globalization, research universities, the western impact on Asia, and others.

•Michael N. Bastedo, Philip G. Altbach, and Patricia J. Gumport, eds. *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges*. Fourth edition, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016), 546 pp. $32.95 (pb). The standard textbook in most graduate courses on American higher education, the fourth and extensively revised edition features a comprehensive analysis of the complex role of American higher education in contemporary society.

•Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley, eds. *The Global Rankings Game: Changing Institutional Policy, Practice, and Academic Life*. New York: Routledge, 2016. 298 pp. $52.95 (pb). A detailed examination and critique of global academic rankings, with a special focus on how the rankings influence specific countries and academic institutions. Among the countries analyzed are Russia, Netherlands, United States, Australia, China Malaysia, and several others. This combination of international, national, and institutional analysis provides a unique perspective on the controversial theme of university rankings.

•Elspeth Jones, Robert Coelen, Jos Beelen, and Hans de Wit, eds. *Global and Local Internationalization*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2016. 183 pp. $54 (pb). Higher education internationalization is an increasingly complex phenomenon in the contemporary world. This volume provides a multifaceted perspective on internationalization. Of special concern is the impact of internationalization on universities. Among the themes discussed are employability and internationalization, curricular issues, changing patterns and developments, and others.

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. Specializations are offered in international higher education, administration, and student affairs. For additional information, see: http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/departments/eahe/graduate.html/.

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