INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 98: Summer 2019

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

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

Through *International Higher Education,* a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Links to all editions can be found at *http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe*. ***IHE*** articles appear regularly on ***UWN's*** website and monthly newsletter.

For weekly global higher education news and comment see our partner

University World News

THE WORLD VIEW

BOSTON BUENOS AIRES OXFORD CAIRO BEIJING

facebook.com/Center.for.International.Higher Education

twitter.com/BC_CIHE

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

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at the Lynch School of Education and Human Development, Boston College. The Center offers an M.A. and a Certificate of International Higher Education. For additional information see: https://www.bc.edu/IHEMA https://www.bc.edu/IHECert

Editor
Philip G. Altbach

Associate Editor
Hans de Wit and Rebecca Schendel

Publication Editors
Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Lisa Unangst

Editorial Assistant
Salina Kopellas

Editorial Office
Center for International Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467–USA
Tel: (617) 552-4236 **Fax:** (617) 552-8422
E-mail: highered@bc.edu
http://www.bc.edu/cihe

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policy maker, etc.), your country of residence, and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a digital subscription; a fee of $35/year applies to a subscription to the print version.

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)

Connectivity of National Systems of Higher Education: Evidence from the U21 Rankings

Ross Williams

Ross Williams is professor emeritus, Melbourne Institute: Applied Economic & Social Research, University of Melbourne, Australia. He leads the Universitas21 ranking project, details of which may be found at www.universitas21.com. E-mail: rossaw@unimelb.edu.au.

There exists a global trend for governments and business to want universities to be more engaged with the external world. The reasons are clear. Links with industry foster economic growth, through research that facilitates the introduction of new technology to raise productivity, and through education and training that provide a skilled workforce to meet industry needs. International linkages facilitate the transfer of new technology in both directions. Further, the individual student experience is widened through international study and any given receiving country strengthens its international links when students return home.

Connectivity is one of the four modules in the Universitas21 (U21) project, which annually evaluates national systems of higher education in 50 countries. The other modules are Resources, Policy Environment, and Outcomes. The use of national rather than institutional data recognizes that what matters is the total contribution of the higher education system; different institutions can contribute in different ways. This article summarizes empirical findings on relative national connectivity from the 2019 U21 ranking.

Measures of Connectivity

Five measures of connectivity are used in the evaluation: the percentage of international students, the share of publications that have an international author, the share of scientific publications that are jointly produced with industry, a survey measure of the extent to which business rates the degree of knowledge transfer, and the webometrics measure of the number of external views of web material.

Overall, the countries ranked most highly for connectivity are Switzerland, Austria, and the United Kingdom. Connectivity is lowest in India, Iran, and Turkey. But the overall ranks hide important differences in the five component ranks and in the relationship between the compo-

nents. Saudi Arabia, for example, is a clear first on publications with international authors, encouraged by national policy, but is below median levels on the other four measures. Even the individual measures can hide differences in composition. For example, within countries, the share of international students increases markedly by level of tertiary education. At the bachelor's level, international students comprise between 14 and 18 percent of students in Austria, New Zealand, Australia, and the United Kingdom. In the United States, international students comprise only 4 percent of total enrollments at the bachelor's degree level, but 40 percent at the doctoral level.

Research Linkages

Not unexpectedly, international authorship links tend to be inversely related to population size. Countries with large scholarly communities are in less need of collaborators from other countries. The share of publications that are joint with international authors are well below median values for China, India, Japan, and the United States. In these countries, domestic coauthorship ranks well above median values. At the other end, Switzerland, Belgium, and Singapore are in the top four ranked countries for international coauthorship.

In 2017, for the 50 countries studied, the median share of publications with an international coauthor was 44.5 percent, an increase from 40.1 percent in 2010. Increases of over ten percentage points were recorded by Saudi Arabia, Greece, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Australia, Singapore, and Finland. Countries with increases below three percentage points included Germany and Korea.

Turning to research links with industry, the data on joint scientific research publications is provided by CWTS at Leiden University. The top four ranked countries are Austria, the Netherlands, Hungary, and Sweden. Again, there is a domestic–international split: small countries tend to link with foreign-based firms, while large countries see links with domestic firms. The business survey of knowledge transfer is conducted by the Institute for Management Development (IMD), Switzerland. We interpret this measure as encompassing both formal and informal links that may not be reflected in publications. Such links are strongest in Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Some regional patterns emerge when the two measures of industry links are compared: in Eastern European countries, the rank on publications tends to be a good deal higher than the business rank, whereas for many East Asian countries (Malaysia, Singapore, China, Hong-Kong SAR, Taiwan), the reverse is true. Given the relative economic performance of the two regions, the data suggests that knowledge transfer in all its forms is more important for economic growth than activity geared to joint publications, which may be narrower in scope. Of course, some countries perform well on both measures: those ranked in the top 12 on both measures are Austria, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The data suggests that the more diverse the authorship of research publications, the greater the influence. There is a positive correlation between citations and the shares of publications that have joint authorship with either international scholars or industry. This effect is not found for joint domestic authorship. Research links are encouraged by governments as a means of promoting economic growth. The U21 data supports this policy: there is significant positive correlation between each connectivity measure and gross domestic product (GDP) per capita. But there is some reverse causality: international research links require funding.

The Web indicator is primarily a measure of the demand for access to research material. Even after deflating by population, the United States ranks first, followed by Switzerland and Canada.

Connectivity is one of the four modules in the Universitas21 (U21) project, which annually evaluates national systems of higher education in 50 countries.

Policy Implications

Connectivity of the higher education sector tends to be greatest in countries with relatively small populations. In these countries, the tripartite links between universities, government, and the private sector are easier to develop and maintain—the relevant e-mail and telephone lists are much smaller. Examples include the Nordic countries and Singapore. Modest geographic size also seems to be of relevance, as exhibited by the high connectivity rating for the United Kingdom. In countries that are large in both population and area, the links are sometimes more complex and formal, and decision-making slower. These potential disadvantages can be mitigated by universities developing research links at the local or state level. For all countries, government policy is important. Engagement with industry can be promoted through financial incentive schemes for universities and taxation arrangements for industry. Immigration laws can be framed to promote both student and faculty exchanges. ■

Higher Education Equity Policies Across the Globe

Jamil Salmi

Jamil Salmi is a global tertiary education expert, a research fellow at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US, and professor emeritus of higher education policy at Diego Portales University, Chile. E-mail: jsalmi@tertiaryeducation.org.

The full report on which the article is based can be found at https://worldaccesshe.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/All-around-the-world-Higher-education-equity-policies-across-the-globe-.pdf.

A recent study sponsored by the Lumina Foundation aims at assessing the nature and extent of policy commitments of national governments to address inequalities in access to and success in higher education. Besides reviewing the policies of 71 countries on all continents, the study also analyzes the equity promotion policies of relevant multilateral and regional agencies involved in providing policy advice, technical assistance, and financial support.

With the exception of a few fragile states recovering from a natural catastrophe or a major political crisis, equity is a priority theme in the higher education agenda of most governments. This official commitment reflects the fact that young people all over the world are keenly aware that opportunities for professional success and social mobility are directly linked to opportunities in higher education.

Equity, from Principle to Practice

However, beyond official statements about equity, which tend to reflect commonly shared principles of inclusion, the survey found a wide range of situations when it came to translating these principles into actual policies and interventions. A number of countries are still only paying lip service to the equity agenda, in the sense that they do not spell out clear equity promotion strategies, define concrete targets to enroll and support students in vulnerable conditions, mobilize sufficient resources targeted to underrepresented groups, and put in place actions to help students complete their degrees.

Many countries still adopt a narrow definition of equity target groups. As a result, the existence of equity target groups that suffer from neglect or discrimination does not translate into official recognition and actual compensatory policies. Minority ethnic groups are the frequent victims of these "blind spots," as governments may see the recognition of their rights as a threat to the power, prestige, or resources of the dominant group.

While most nations focus on the barriers faced by traditional equity target groups, including students from low-income households, women and girls, members of ethnic minorities, and students with disabilities, several countries have added nontraditional equity target groups, reflecting the social transformation of these countries:

- Victims of sexual and gender violence
- Members of the LGBT community
- Refugees of all kinds (internally and externally displaced; deported)
- Children of people affected by historical violence
- Students with care experience, orphans, youth without parental care.

Overall, 11 percent of the countries surveyed have formulated a comprehensive equity strategy. Another 11 percent have elaborated a specific policy document for one equity target group: women, people with disabilities, or members of indigenous groups.

Many countries' definition of equity policies is still traditional in focus, with a heavy emphasis on financial aid as principal instrument, and a tendency to look at access barriers instead of promoting interventions to boost the chances of success of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who are enrolled in higher education institutions.

With the exception of a few fragile states recovering from a natural catastrophe or a major political crisis, equity is a priority theme in the higher education agenda of most governments.

The survey highlighted much variety in the choice of instruments used to promote equity, beyond the traditional financial aid mechanisms—grants and student loans—that are widely available. Twelve countries use their budget allocation funding formula or earmarked grants to support equity promotion efforts at the institutional level.

Promising Trends

The survey identified two promising trends. First, a growing number of countries have realized the importance of combining both financial and nonmonetary interventions to remove, in a comprehensive way, all barriers faced by students from disadvantaged groups. The most frequently supported nonmonetary programs are affirmative action and reformed admission criteria, outreach and bridge programs, and retention programs.

Second, a few governments have begun to complement the direct support offered to students with incentives for the universities themselves, as a means of pressuring the

latter into taking a more proactive role in improving access and success opportunities. This is achieved by incorporating an equity indicator into the funding formula, setting up earmarked funds for equity interventions that universities can benefit from, and/or including equity-related criteria in the quality assurance process.

Comprehensiveness and Consistency of Equity Policies

The study attempted to compare national equity policies internationally from the viewpoint of comprehensiveness and consistency. The 71 countries surveyed were classified into four equity policy categories defined in the following way:

- Emerging: the country has formulated broad equity policy principles and goals but has accomplished little in terms of concrete policies, programs, and interventions (nine countries).
- Developing: the country has put in place the foundations of an equity promotion strategy, but has not defined many policies and programs, is not investing much in this area, and has implemented few policies and programs (33 countries).
- Established: the country has formulated an equity promotion strategy and has put in place aligned policies, programs, and interventions to implement the strategy (23 countries).
- Advanced: the country has formulated and implemented a comprehensive equity promotion strategy. Some countries in this category even have a dedicated equity promotion agency (six countries).

Most countries fall into the second or third category (developing or established). The distinction between the two is not due principally to the wealth of the countries concerned. The "established" category includes several developing countries that may not be able to devote the same amount of resources as OECD economies, but have fairly comprehensive policies to promote equity in higher education.

The countries that appear as "emerging" from an equity policy viewpoint are essentially fragile states that have had neither the resources nor the political stability necessary to elaborate and sustain robust equity policies for higher education over the long run.

The few nations labeled as "advanced" show a high degree of consistency over time in terms of comprehensive strategy, policies, goals and targets, and alignment between equity goals and the range of instruments—financial and nonmonetary—used to promote equity in higher education. Some of them even have a dedicated equity promotion agency. Most of these countries (Australia, England, Ireland, New Zealand, Scotland) are relatively rich Commonwealth countries with mature higher education systems, which have paid increasing attention to the obstacles to success faced by students from underrepresented groups. The other nation included in the list is Cuba, which for ideological reasons has consistently put a great emphasis on equity since the 1959 socialist revolution. ■

Two Cheers for US Higher Education: International Implications

Steven G. Brint

Steven G. Brint is distinguished professor of sociology and public policy and director, Colleges & Universities 2000 Project, University of California, Riverside, US. E-mail: steven.brint@ucr.edu.

In my recently published book, *Two Cheers for Higher Education: Why American Universities Are Stronger than Ever – And How to Meet the Challenges They Face* (Princeton University Press), I argue that the success of the US system is due to high levels of investment from multiple sources of revenue combined with the sometimes contentious, but ultimately compatible interplay of three propulsive "logics of development."

Compared to the state-dependent systems in most of the world, the US system is distinctive in the variety of revenue sources on which institutions can draw, including federal and state research funds, state subsidies, student tuition, and philanthropic support. By 2015, the federal government alone poured $65 billion into student financial aid and made hundreds of billions available in subsidized loans, and it disbursed more than $30 billion to universities for research and development. Donors provided billions of dollars more. It is hard to overestimate the importance of these multiple and comparatively abundant sources of revenue.

By "logics of development," I mean guiding ideas joined to institutional practices. The first of these logics is the traditional one: the commitment to knowledge discovery and transmission in the disciplines (and at their interstices). I refer to this commitment as academic professionalism. It remains fundamental and provides a necessary autonomy for universities from the priorities of the state and the economy. During the period following 1980, two movements hit colleges and universities with great force: one was the

movement to use university research to advance economic development through the inventions of new technologies with commercial potential. The other was to use colleges and universities as instruments of social inclusion, providing opportunities to members of previously marginalized groups. My argument is that these movements, in conjunction with the traditions of academic professionalism, created a special kind of dynamism because of the strength of partisan commitments to them, backed up by high levels of patronage.

The size and funding levels found in the United States are the product of more than 100 years of development and are not easily transportable to other nations. Nevertheless, the US experience holds both lessons and warnings for educational reformers in other countries.

The Lessons

The concentration of resources in a handful of selective institutions has been enormously valuable for scientific and scholarly contributions. Every country needs institutions where expectations are very high, resources are abundant, and the rigor of debate and discussion is uncompromised by extra-academic influences. The gradual expansion of the number of such institutions should be a policy goal throughout the world. The United States has 35–40 world-class institutions of this type.

Thus far, it appears that increased entrepreneurship is consistent with contributions to problem solving in the disciplines.

A climate of maximum freedom of speech and inquiry, together with traditions of very tough criticism, have been conducive to scientific and scholarly breakthroughs in the places that have historically excelled. By maximizing the sources of revenue—from students, state subsidy, donors, foundations, and research funding agencies, universities reduce problematic resource dependencies that can restrict essential freedoms.

Thus far, it appears that increased entrepreneurship is consistent with contributions to problem solving in the disciplines. The leading producers of scientific and scholarly knowledge are very often also the leaders in developing new technologies with commercial potential. Innovators, after all, need to receive feedback from experts about whether their discoveries will actually work. In the book, I provide the example of the competition between three teams of researchers working to develop the HIV protease inhibitor. The first team to publish had part of the solution wrong, a mistake the leader of the second team quickly spotted and corrected. The US case shows that greater porousness between universities and industries can be managed without endangering basic knowledge production in universities.

The variety of ways in which university researchers and firms interact to generate ties that are beneficial to each go well beyond patenting, licensing, and contract research. They include placement of graduate students in firms working on commercializing new discoveries, service by faculty members as scientific advisors, sabbaticals for corporate researchers in university labs, and in some cases open science collaborations with entire industry groups. Those universities located in regions with thriving high-tech businesses and medical centers can develop along the lines of the University of California–San Diego and the University of Texas–Austin by "plugging into" an already existing ecosystem of potential partner firms, while at the same time encouraging start-ups that complement the capabilities of existing firms. Those located in regions without such a favorable economic terrain need to "grow their own" high-tech economies by engaging faculty members and students in entrepreneurship activities. As I show in the book, the experiences of public universities in Colorado, Michigan, and Utah show that this strategy can work.

The Warnings

The extension of opportunity to members of low-income, first-generation, and underrepresented minority students has catalyzed upward mobility energy and has enriched the educational environment of American universities. At the same time, it has, on some campuses and in some departments, led to restrictions on politically acceptable speech. These restrictions are at odds with the traditions of freedom of speech and inquiry that are essential features of the university environment. The emphases on social inclusion have also fostered in some departments a confusion between the priority given to academic excellence as compared to social representation. Other countries can presumably do better in welcoming diverse student bodies within a value-rational framework in which traditional scientific and scholarly norms prevail in an undisputed way.

Tuition is essential in systems facing declining state subsidies, and student loans are therefore also essential. For the most part, students do not have unmanageable debt but that is cold comfort to the substantial minority of students who do accumulate high levels of debt and cannot find a suitable job. The main problem with the US student loan system is that students are asked to repay their debts before

they are well established in the labor market. The solution, already adopted by many countries, including England and Australia, is a well-designed universal income-contingent loan repayment system.

Human capital development among undergraduates is a serious problem. Apart from a motivated minority of 10–15 percent, US undergraduate students are not learning as much as they could. The onus for change is on faculty members and administrators. States could trade off additional funding for conscientious efforts to professionalize college teaching. Thanks to cognitive science and thousands of well-designed learning studies, the basics of effective college-level instruction are now well known. Instruments such as the Wieman–Gilbert Teaching Practices Inventory allow instructors to rate themselves on practices that the sciences of learning have shown to be valuable for student comprehension and mastery of subject matter. Accountability measures such as online reading quizzes prior to class meetings also make a difference.

The mass employment of poorly paid and often poorly prepared part-time instructors is a major drawback in the current US system. Research evidence indicates that these people tend to be less effective instructors, and that on many university campuses their work conditions and pay are deplorable. More institutions could follow the lead of the University of California by replacing these positions with permanent lecturers with security of employment, based on rigorous evaluation of candidates' teaching competence and knowledge of the literature on effective practices in college teaching. ■

Performance Funding as Neoliberal Policy

Rebecca S. Natow and Kevin J. Dougherty

Rebecca S. Natow is assistant professor of education policy at Hofstra University, New York, US. Kevin J. Dougherty is professor of higher education and education policy at Teachers College, Columbia University, US. E-mails: Rebecca.S.Natow@hofstra.edu and dougherty@tc.edu.

This article is based on the report Analyzing Neoliberalism in Theory and Practice: The Case of Performance-Based Funding for Higher Education *(Centre for Global Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education, 2019), available from: https://www.researchcghe.org/publications/working-paper/analysing-neoliberalism-in-theory-and-practice-the-case-of-performance-based-funding-for-higher-education.*

Neoliberal ideas—whether new public management (NPM), principal-agent theory (or agency theory), or performance management—have provided the rationale for sweeping policy reforms in the governance and operation of higher education. One such policy is performance-based funding for higher education, which has been widely adopted in the United States, Europe, and elsewhere. Around 35 US states now provide performance-based funding for higher education, in which some portion of government funding for public higher education is based not on enrollments and previous funding levels, but instead on institutional performance reflecting student outcomes measures such as persistence, degree completion, and job placement. Performance-based funding is also quite common outside the United States. Australia, Canada, and many European countries (19 as of 2010) fund their higher education systems based on output-related criteria such as degrees produced, credits earned, and research effort and quality.

Two kinds of performance-based funding programs can be distinguished. Performance funding 1.0 provides a bonus above regular government funding for higher education and is often no greater than 1 to 5 percent of total government funding. Performance funding 2.0 is not provided in the form of a bonus but instead is part of the government's base funding for public institutions of higher education. The proportion of government funding tied to performance in 2.0 programs is often much higher than in 1.0 programs, and may be up to 80–90 percent of government funding. With other institutional revenues such as tuition, fees, and research grants taken into account, performance funding 2.0 can amount to a quarter of a US public institution's total revenues.

Intended Impacts

The champions of performance-based funding aim to realize outcomes such as higher graduation rates and improved research productivity by changing the values and incentives of higher education institutions and, in turn, their organizational practices. Indeed, performance funding in the United States and Europe has influenced institutions to make changes to their policies and programs for the purpose of improving student outcomes. These include, for example, redesigning their academic programming and teaching practices and reforming their student advising and tutoring services.

However, the impacts of performance-based funding on student outcomes are often weak. For example, US performance funding has resulted in more students receiving

certificates from programs of a year or less in length, but it has had very little impact on baccalaureate and associate degree reception. Performance funding for higher education outside the United States has likewise not evidenced a significant impact on student completion.

With regard to the impact of performance-based funding on research productivity, the evidence is positive but not conclusive. There is evidence that performance funding in Europe is associated with higher rates of faculty research productivity. However, many of these findings come from studies that do not rely on research designs that adequately control for causes other than the advent of performance funding.

Obstacles

The limited impact of performance-based funding on student outcomes may be due in part to obstacles that institutions encounter when attempting to respond to performance demands. US government officials and higher education personnel have discussed a number of obstacles that hinder their ability to respond effectively to performance funding requirements: many incoming students arriving in higher education lacking college readiness; performance funding metrics that do not align with institutional missions and student-body composition, which can vary greatly across institutions; and insufficient institutional capacity and resources to respond effectively to performance funding. The obstacles related to capacity and resources are due at least in part to inadequate government effort to build higher education institutions' capacities to analyze their own performance, identify deficiencies in that performance, determine appropriate organizational responses, allocate resources for implementing those organizational responses, and evaluate how well those responses worked.

Two kinds of performance-based funding programs can be distinguished.

Unintended Impacts

As with any policy intervention, while policy makers pursue certain objectives when adopting performance funding, there are also likely to be unintended consequences. Indeed, government officials and institutional staff often report impacts of performance funding that were not intended by policy designers. The fact that institutions are funded at least in part on student outcomes raises the prospect that institutions may resort to illegitimate methods if they face both strong pressure to perform well on outcomes metrics and major obstacles to producing such performance. Those most frequently cited are institutions restricting their admission of less prepared students and lowering their grading standards and graduation demands in order to increase their program completion rates.

Policy Implications

As discussed in our working paper, governments should act to address the negative impacts of performance-based funding. Governments should protect academic standards and counteract the temptation to restrict admission of less prepared and less advantaged students. Academic standards may be monitored through learning-outcomes assessments, mandatory reporting of changes in grade distributions and degree requirements, and anonymous surveys of faculty as to whether they feel pressured to lower academic standards. Governments can also incentivize the enrollment and graduation of disadvantaged students by including metrics for their access and success and by taking account of institutional missions and student demographics when assessing a particular institution's student outcomes. Governments should also endeavor to overcome the barriers to effective institutional responses to performance-based funding, which may prompt institutions to resort to illegitimate means. To do this, governments can provide extra funding to higher education institutions with many disadvantaged students and help institutions to improve their capacity to devise and implement changes that respond effectively to performance accountability requirements. ■

Free Tuition in Chile: A Policy in Foster Care

Andrés Bernasconi

Andrés Bernasconi is professor of education at the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, and director of the Center for Advanced Studies on Educational Justice (CJE). E-mail: abernasconi@uc.cl.

Four years into its implementation, nobody in Chile seems to want to "own" the free tuition policy instituted in 2016. This is surprising, for the most universally acknowledged virtue of the idea of free tuition is its over-

whelming political appeal: an idea so popular with the voters should not find itself bereft of champions. Aside from the beneficiaries and their families, who are understandably happy about not having to pay for tuition or get a loan, why is it that hardly anyone in academia, political parties, or institutions of higher education in Chile seems to support the policy course set by decision-makers in 2015?

Unclear Definition of Goals

To begin with, the sponsoring government of President Michelle Bachelet (2014–2018) never articulated a clear rationale for abolishing tuition. Since the original idea was to make higher education free for all undergraduates, with no means testing, tipping the scale to benefit the underserved could not have been the goal. Was the goal then to limit exposure to debt? Possibly, at least from a political angle, given that debt was high on the list of grievances of the students who mobilized by the hundreds of thousands in 2011 to protest against the commodification of education.

President Bachelet often said that free tuition was a matter of principle: if higher education was a right of the people, then it had to be free. But open access unconstrained by academic performance was never considered as a parallel proposal to make higher education truly open to every high school graduate (Chile has an SAT-type test for admission). What was offered instead was free access, conditional on passing the academic filters for admission set by institutions. This cannot promote greater participation of the most vulnerable, for in Chile, as in the rest of the world, school performance and high test scores depend largely on social class background.

The Reality Check of the Budget and the Politics of Free Tuition

Fuzzy purposes were, hence, a clear weakness of the Bachelet free tuition policy. The national budget has proven a second weakness: a downturn of Chile's economy and more limited tax revenues than anticipated did away with the dream of universal free tuition, and the tinkering with numbers began. This is a story too long to recapitulate here. The upshot is that free tuition had to be reserved for certain students from families in the bottom six deciles of income who matriculated in certain institutions. In all, some 340,000 students (30 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment) pay no tuition.

For many associated with the political left, this is a far cry from the vision of a higher education system wrenched free from the claws of the market. Critics on this side of the aisle claim that free tuition is yet another form of voucher (a per capita funding system that Chile adopted early on for its school system), that it has done nothing to quell competition among institutions or foster cooperation, and that—contrary to the will of the left-of-center Bachelet government to strengthen public universities—it has resulted in an unintended windfall for large, nonselective private institutions with low academic entrance thresholds. Moreover, the funding structure retains tuition fees and loans to defray them for students who are not exempt from paying tuition.

While serving as the opposition party in congress, the political right, which has been in power since President Sebastián Piñera took office in 2018, was initially against the free tuition initiative, which it saw as economically wasteful and a capitulation to students' demands. Nonetheless, it ended up voting for the Bachelet administration's proposal, once it was assured that private institutions would not be excluded from the program. As a candidate, Piñera pragmatically vowed to maintain the free tuition program —dismantling it would have been political suicide.

Problems of Design

Aside from politics, there are elements in the design of the program that cause much distress to Chilean university rectors. For free tuition to work, there need to be caps: caps on what the government will pay for each enrolled student, on how many students can be enrolled, and on how long benefits will be provided. The current caps are rather low, the rectors contend, and are especially detrimental to the finances of more research-intensive institutions, where per-student costs are higher than at teaching colleges. First, the per-capita allocation provided by the government is based on the average per-program tuition charged by all institutions in each of four accreditation levels. The idea is for institutions with better accreditation (i.e., whose teaching is presumably more expensive) to have higher caps. But since institutions in each accreditation cluster are diverse in terms of quality and scope of functions, drawing an average unavoidably harms the better in each lot.

What was offered instead was free access, conditional on passing the academic filters for admission set by institutions.

A second restriction affecting institutions' budgets is the extension of the benefit in time: free tuition lasts only for the official duration of an educational program. In practice, however, students enrolled in programs lasting four to

five years typically take between 10 and 30 percent longer time to complete their studies than expected, while students in associate's degree programs overextend their studies by 50 percent. As a result, every year tens of thousands of students lose their benefits in the final leg of their studies.

Lastly, lest the expansion of first-year student enrollment across institutions with free tuition threaten fiscal stability, no institution is allowed to increase enrollment beyond 2.7 percent per year. This has had a paradoxical effect on access. For two decades, the main driver of greater access to higher education for less privileged students was the expansion of the system, often at rates between 5 to 7 percent per year. These students would typically not wrest away the most coveted places in the most prestigious universities from upper middle-class students with better school grades and test scores, so their only option was to get a spot in the technical and vocational system, or in nonselective universities. They can still do this, but at a much slower rate than in the past.

Unknown Outcomes

All things considered, the ultimate judgment about the merits and drawbacks of free tuition will rest on the evaluation of its effects on the distribution of educational opportunity, on institutional finances and development, and on who wins and who loses. Administrative data generated every year on students' applications, admissions, progression, and graduation will soon shed light on the educational side of outcomes. An improved methodology for defining tuition caps will be implemented in 2020, through a panel of experts who will attempt to define costs of instruction per "family" of programs. This adjustment, together with a healthier pattern of growth of the Chilean economy and tax revenues, may assuage the various rectors' anxieties about finances. But for now, the seemingly popular free tuition policy stands alone, supported only by its powerful entrenchment and the difficulty of change. ■

International Higher Education would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) for its support of coverage of higher education in Africa and for its general support of our publication. CCNY has long recognized the importance of higher education in Africa and beyond, and this generosity significantly enables both our work as well as that of our partner at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).

"Successful" Internationalization: European Insights

Laura E. Rumbley, Ross Hudson, and Anna-Malin Sandström

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director, Knowledge Development & Research, Ross Hudson is senior knowledge officer, and Anna-Malin Sandström is policy officer at the European Association for International Education, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. E-mails: rumbley@eaie.org, hudson@eaie.org, and sandstrom@eaie.org.

This article is based on a report by the authors, The EAIE Barometer: Signposts of Success*, published by the European Association for International Education in April 2019 and available at www.eaie.org/barometer.*

Discussions around internationalization in higher education in Europe and elsewhere are increasingly focused on understanding the impact that internationalization has, as well as the processes that higher education institutions (HEIs) should follow in order to reach their internationalization (and related) goals.

The growing importance of the international dimension has led HEIs to take more strategic approaches to the development and delivery of internationalization. In order to equip the professionals charged with developing and implementing institutional internationalization strategies in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) with the most appropriate evidence to inform their decision-making, the European Association for International Education (EAIE) produced the *EAIE Barometer: Internationalisation in Europe (second edition)* report in 2018. The survey on which the report is based collected responses from 2317 professionals working directly on internationalization at 1292 individual HEIs in 45 EHEA countries.

More recently, data collected for the Barometer exercise provided the foundation for a follow-up consideration: how is internationalization designed, delivered, and sustained by those institutions where respondents reported high levels of progress with respect to their international activities, confidence in their institution's performance, and optimism about the future? Do the ways in which these institutions approach internationalization provide "signposts of success" for others? Although defining success objectively may be an elusive and highly contextual exercise, our consideration of the Barometer data found that those institutions that perceive that they are on firm footing with respect to internationalization exhibit some commonalities in

several areas, notably with respect to matters of motivation, organization, and execution.

Success as a Matter of Motivation

When it comes to perceptions of success among HEIs, the rationale for internationalization seems to make a difference. More specifically, our analysis of the Barometer data found that, where an institution's primary focus is understood to be on increasing the quality of research or improving the quality of education, respondents were more optimistic about the future of internationalization at their HEI than their colleagues at institutions reporting financial gains as the primary goal for internationalization. Those at institutions where the academic mission was the focal point for internationalization were also inclined, at higher rates, to think that their institution was above average in relation to others in their same country.

The lack of optimism and lower sense of superlative performance among respondents at institutions reporting a central focus on financial benefits could stem from a variety of sources. The need to prioritize monetary gain could reflect a precarious financial outlook for a given institution, which in turn could impact detrimentally on respondents' confidence in the future of internationalization in that context. The emphasis on the financial dimensions of internationalization by some institutions may also be seen as standing at odds with the traditional emphasis of higher education on educational endeavors. This, too, could lead respondents to conclude that their institution's performance with respect to internationalization is less robust than at institutions where the academic mission is more closely connected to the internationalization agenda.

The growing importance of the international dimension has led HEIs to take more strategic approaches to the development and delivery of internationalization.

Success as a Matter of Organization

The ways in which institutions choose to organize their strategic approaches to internationalization also seem to have an impact on the perception of success. For example, 47 percent of respondents at institutions with a standalone internationalization strategy and 43 percent of those at institutions with an internationalization strategy embedded in an overall institutional strategy considered that the level of internationalization at their institution was above average, compared to other institutions in their same country. In contrast, just 26 percent of respondents at institutions with strategies situated exclusively at the faculty level (i.e., the school or college level within a university) considered their institution to be above average in their national context.

Similarly, those whose institutions carry out their internationalization agendas using multiple offices working in coordination—as opposed to a single centralized office, multiple offices working independently, or individuals working in a noncoordinated fashion—were most likely to feel that their HEI was performing above average in internationalization. They were also more prone to report that progress was being made on their institution's priority activities for internationalization. However, the latter does not hold for all internationalization activities, which is perhaps understandable, as different activities benefit to varying degrees from different structures and resources.

The specifics of where an internationalization strategy "lives" within the institution and where responsibility for the international agenda resides both seem to have an impact on the way individuals at European HEIs perceive successful performance with respect to internationalization.

Success as a Matter of Execution

Beyond matters of why and how the most confident and optimistic European HEIs choose to internationalize, the question of what they do to support their internationalization efforts is also salient. Our consideration of the Barometer data points to several key areas in which a focus on specific action lines seems to influence a sense of success. Specifically, committing to a broad portfolio of priority activities; establishing targets, providing funding, and supporting training for staff in relation those priority activities; and undertaking both strategy evaluation and systematic quality assurance activities, are all salient to this discussion. To a greater or lesser extent, at institutions where respondents report commitments to these areas, there is a tendency for them to indicate that they see progress in relation to the identified priority activities. There are generally also higher levels of confidence in the future of internationalization among respondents at these institutions and a sense of outperforming peer institutions in the same country.

Overall, where European institutions think broadly and specifically about their internationalization agendas, nurture these aspirations with resources, and evaluate their

quality and progress, the sense of successful engagement in the internationalization process among their staff is more palpable.

Have We Found the Magic Formula? No, but...

It is a commonly accepted truism that there is no "one size fits all" model for internationalization of HEIs. Our analysis does not intend to contradict that notion, but it does point to some possible commonalities when it comes to approaches taken by European HEIs that consider themselves to be in relatively strong positions with respect to internationalization. Of course, "signposts of success" may point us in a general direction, but the specifics of why an institution thrives—or not—with respect to its internationalization performance remains a complex question. Still, operating from a starting point that aligns squarely with institutional mission, positioning strategy and its supporting actors purposefully within the institution, and implementing agendas that are both expansive and meaningfully resourced seems to add up to a recipe for (self-reported) success. ■

Is Strategic Internationalization a Reality?

Giorgio Marinoni and Hans de Wit

Giorgio Marinoni is manager, Higher Education and Internationalization policy and projects, International Association of Universities (IAU), Paris, France. E-mail: g.marinoni@iau-aiu.net. Hans de Wit is director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College, US, and member of the IAU Advisory Committee for the 5th IAU Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu.

The full report of the 5th IAU Global Survey will be published by DUZ Academic Publishers in the coming months.

The internationalization of higher education is a phenomenon that has implications far beyond the domain of higher education; it impacts society at large. According to the definition of Jane Knight, updated in 2015 by de Wit and others, internationalization is "an intentional process undertaken by higher education institutions in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society." Assuming that internationalization is an intentional process, the question arising is: how strategic is this process? In other words, is internationalization at HEIs supported by a defined strategy, with clear objectives, actions, and point persons, framed within a realistic timeline, and supported by the necessary (human and financial) resources? Is this strategy monitored and are outcomes evaluated? And in the current political climate of antiglobalization, anti-immigration, and increasing nationalism, to what extent is this strategy still relevant and up to date? The results of the 5th Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education, an online survey conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU) in 2018, help us address these questions.

The survey was based upon replies from 907 HEIs across 126 countries worldwide. For that survey, HEIs were asked to state whether internationalization was mentioned in their mission/strategic plan. A clear majority replied that it was. This is a sign of how internationalization has become widespread among HEIs around the globe, but it does not reveal how strategic their approach is.

Having a Strategy Does Not Mean Having a Strategic Approach

The presence of a strategy does not necessarily align with a strategic approach to internationalization if there are no activities to implement it and support structures in place, if the strategy is not monitored, and if progress is not evaluated. The IAU survey indicates that the internationalization policy/strategy is institution-wide in almost all HEIs that indicated having elaborated one. The presence of an office or a team in charge of overseeing the implementation of the policy/strategy is widespread, as is the inclusion of an international dimension in other institutional policies/strategies/plans. The presence of a monitoring framework and of explicit targets and benchmarks is slightly lower, but still present at almost three-quarters of the responding institutions, and a budgetary provision is present at two-thirds of them.

These results seem to indicate that a strategic approach to internationalization is indeed common at the majority of HEIs in the world. However, previous IAU Global Surveys included the very same questions, and an analysis of the evaluation of results over time unveils additional information. A clear growth of the presence of a policy/strategy at HEIs can be identified. The same is true for the percentage of HEIs having a dedicated office or team to implement the policy/strategy. In the present survey, this percentage reaches 89 percent, an increase of 25 percentage points in 15 years.

The percentage of HEIs having a dedicated budget has grown in the first three editions of the Global Survey, from 50 percent at the time of the 1st Global Survey (2003) to 73 percent at the time of the 3rd Global Survey (2009), then dropped to 61 percent at the time of the 4th Global Survey (2014) and slightly increased again to 64 percent in the 5th Global Survey (2018). The decrease of the presence of a dedicated budget between 2009 and 2014 can be interpreted as an effect of the global financial crisis and of related funding cuts at HEIs. The changing political climate of the past years does not seem to have had a negative impact. Still, overall, in the last 15 years as many as one-third of respondent HEIs have not had a dedicated budget for internationalization.

Regarding the percentage of HEIs indicating that they have a monitoring framework, the 5th Global Survey indicates a new record with 73 percent. However, the increase seems to have happened between 2005 and 2009, while in the last eight years the figure has stabilized. Almost one quarter of the responding institutions do not have monitoring framework in place.

The decrease of the presence of a dedicated budget between 2009 and 2014 can be interpreted as an effect of the global financial crisis and of related funding cuts at HEIs.

Increasing Inequality

The results of the 5th IAU Global Survey show that the presence of an institution-wide policy/strategy for internationalization, as well as the presence of a dedicated office or team to oversee its implementation, are becoming the norm at HEIs around the world. However, in terms of financial resources and monitoring and evaluation, the results, although encouraging, show that there is still room for improvement. While the allocation of dedicated financial resources may have been hindered by the consequences of the global financial crisis, the stagnation in the development of a monitoring framework in the last nine years suggests that there is a group of HEIs for which strategic internationalization is not yet a reality.

The majority of the respondents to the survey attach a high level of importance to internationalization, which is an increase over the last three years. However, this increase has happened mainly at HEIs where the level was already high. This might signal a growing inequality between HEIs, and is further reflected in the risks of internationalization identified by survey respondents. Indeed, the main institutional risk cited by respondents is "international opportunities accessible only to students with financial resources." This expresses a concern among HEI representatives that disadvantaged students may be left out as a result of globalization, and that institutions should be more inclusive.

The question is: does this matter, and if it does, how? According to the results of the EAIE Barometer of 2018, there is a positive correlation between the presence of a strategic approach to internationalization and its perceived success. The definition of "success" in internationalization is controversial, but the benefits of having a strategic approach and the reasons why it is a reality at some (but not all) HEIs is worth further thought and investigation. It will also be interesting to see in the coming years, as well as in future surveys, whether the current global political climate has an impact on inequality. ■

What Do We Know about Student Mobility in Mexico?

Magdalena L. Bustos-Aguirre

Magdalena L. Bustos-Aguirre is associate professor at Universidad de Guadalajara (UdeG), Mexico. E-mail: magda.bustos@gmail.com.

Patlani—which means "to fly" in Nahuatl—is a survey of student mobility in Mexico published biennially since 2012 by the National Association of Universities and Higher Education Institutions (ANUIES). It presents information on international outgoing and incoming credit mobility, as well as on incoming degree-seeking mobility. It gathers data through an online questionnaire sent to Mexican higher education institutions (HEIs), with responses integrated in each report. It constitutes to this day the only publicly available source of statistics on student mobility in Mexico. It has survived changes in administration and funding during the last decade and its reputation and reliability have grown consistently over the years. Since the base survey is only sent to ANUIES members, its answers represent approximately 10 percent of Mexican HEIs; although it often includes data on outbound degree-seeking mobility from other sources, that data point cannot be seen as comprehen-

sive as it includes only selected institutions from among non-ANUIES members. More limited than Open Doors of the International Institute of Education (IIE) in the United States, this report is unique in the Latin American context.

Patlani's most recent edition reported 29,401 outbound credit-earning students for the 2015–2016 academic year, which represents less than 0.5 percent of the national HE enrollment and close to 1 percent of the enrollment at surveyed HEIs. Now up to 15,941, the number of outgoing students has almost doubled since academic year 2012–2013. Further, outgoing credit mobility in Mexico reflects mobility trends in other parts of the world: the majority of Mexican students abroad are women (55 percent), credit seeking (86 percent), undergraduates (79 percent), and studying social sciences, management, or law (40 percent). In terms of destination countries and regions, most Mexican students travel to study in Spain (26 percent), the United States (17 percent), France (6 percent), Canada (5 percent), or Germany (5 percent); three out of five outbound students (17,763) choose Europe as their destination abroad, and two out of five study either in North America (6,701) or in Latin America and the Caribbean (5,911). In the 2015–2016 academic year, Tecnológico de Monterrey ("Tec") was the leading institution with regard to outbound credit mobility with 7,331 students, followed far behind by Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) with 3,786 students, Universidad del Valle de México (UVM) with 1,826 students, Universidad de Guadalajara with 1,672 students, and Universidad de Monterrey (UdeM) with 1,156 students. Although public HEIs—like UNAM and Universidad de Guadalajara—enroll approximately 65 percent of Mexico's students, elite private HEIs, such as Tec, UVM, and UdeM have the highest mobility ratios.

On average, the group reported having studied foreign languages as an extracurricular activity for four years in total.

Features of Mobile Mexican Students

Aside from statistics provided by Patlani, little is known about Mexican students studying abroad for credit. In a search for answers, the author conducted a survey among Mexican students participating in international credit mobility and collected 533 responses from six HEIs, one private and five public.

Most students participating in the survey are women (60 percent), undergraduates studying social sciences, management, or law (54 percent), and single with no children (95 percent); they have on average 1.8 siblings, with students from the public HEIs belonging to larger families than their peers at the private HEI. The average daily family income was US$29, almost 6 times the minimum wage and well above the global poverty line. Income among students in the private HEI was four times higher. Half of all participating students reported that their parents had a university degree (51 percent of the mothers and 57 percent of the fathers), with a subset of at least 10 percent holding a graduate degree. Four out of five parents of students at the private HEI had a university degree vs. one in every three parents of students at the public HEIs. On average, the group reported having studied foreign languages as an extracurricular activity for four years in total; 25 percent had studied a foreign language during elementary school; and 45 percent reported being proficient in one foreign language, 18 percent in two foreign languages, and 3 percent in three or more. The ratio of students from the private HEI vs public HEIs who reported proficiency in at least one foreign language was 4 to 1.

Many of the students reported having experienced some form of "foreignness": 41 percent had changed their residency to enter higher education; 87 percent reported having friends who studied abroad; 29 percent had temporarily hosted someone from a different culture or country, who was not related to their family; 20 percent had lived close to a border; 4 percent had a dual nationality and 7 percent had parents, siblings, or children of their own with a nationality other than Mexican; 96 percent reported having already traveled internationally and 34 percent had lived in a foreign country for at least two months; 6 percent reported previous international academic experiences. These same mobile students had taken on average 2.5 trips abroad in the previous four years and showed a good degree of independence: 32 percent had traveled with companions other than their nuclear family and 15 percent had traveled alone. As seen throughout the survey, there were more features of mobility capital among students from the private HEI.

Concluding Remarks

Results indicate that outgoing student mobility in Mexico requires some measure of economic stability, higher levels of social and cultural capital, and some familiarity with "foreignness," all common characteristics among middle and upper social classes. This is confirmed by statistics in Patlani, which reveal that one in every three Mexican students abroad during 2015–2016 was enrolled in one of the top elite private HEIs. Credit mobility in Mexico seems there-

fore to be an option only for a very small group of privileged students. Nevertheless, statistics also reveal that public HEIs have been successful, to a certain degree, in compensating a lack of financial capital with well-resourced internationalization offices that make study abroad possible for their less affluent student body.

Finally, the study discussed here confirms research on credit mobility in other parts of the world, in particular in developing and emerging countries that do not have supportive programs like ERASMUS+ in Europe: credit mobility is still a luxury that only a small elite of students can afford. ■

The Challenges of Attracting and Retaining International Faculty

Wondwosen Tamrat

Wondwosen Tamrat is associate professor, founder–president of St. Mary's University, Ethiopia, and PROPHE affiliate. E-mail: wondwosentamrat@gmail.com or preswond@smuc.edu.et.

The value of international faculty in terms of infusing talent and diversity and improving the status of any given higher education system, is widely acknowledged. Despite the similarity of interest in attracting such faculty, the purposes for which international faculty are hired differ from one context to the other. Inevitably, this difference of purpose is reflected in the operational tasks of attracting, recruiting, hiring, and retaining international faculty.

Ethiopia is a country that has never been colonized, but the history of its modern education reflects a heavy and systemic dependence on foreign personnel. The indelible marks of foreign expatriates are noticeable in areas such as the establishment of schools, the design of policies and curricula, and their employment as advisers, officials, principals, and teachers in the various levels of the education system.

When Ethiopia's first Western modern institution, Menelik II School, was opened in 1908, it had to rely on Egyptian Copts. Both the principal and the teachers involved in the Teferi Mekonen School, which was set up later, in 1925, were similarly international faculty who came mainly from French Lebanon, while the position of administrator was left to Hakim Workneh Eshete, a foreign educated Ethiopian. Ethiopia's modest attempt to kickstart its modern education system before the beginning of the Italo–Ethiopian war in 1935 was staffed by a few hundred teachers, including foreign faculty. Before the war, French was the dominant foreign language used in schools.

After the Italian occupation (1935–1941), which was responsible for annihilating or forcing into migration a large number of local intelligentsia, Ethiopia had again to rely on foreign professionals to rebuild its modern education system from scratch. As a result of the Allied Forces' assistance in liberating Ethiopia in 1941, the period from 1942 until 1952 was dominated by the significant presence and influence of the British in the education sector and other government ministries. British experts and teachers were replaced by Americans in the second half of the 1950s, due to Ethiopia's strengthened links with the United States through what was then called Point Four Program of Technical Assistance (later renamed as Agency for International development–AID). In the next two decades, the United States had a huge influence in many sectors, including education, where it was involved in reorganizing the ministry of education, supplying needed manpower, materials, and textbooks, and setting up the first higher education institutions (HEIs) in the country.

When the University College of Addis Ababa (UCAA, the first institution of higher learning in the country) was established in 1950, the teachers and its president were Jesuit Canadians. As a matter of fact, UCAA had no Ethiopian faculty during the first four years of its existence. The same was true about a handful of colleges that were founded from 1950 to 1960. The number and nationalities of international faculty recruited in these HEIs were influenced by how they were established, the nationalities of their leaders, and the employment policies of each particular institution. Although there was some change toward the end of the Imperial government, as a result of the deliberate "Ethiopianization" policy it pursued, the Haile Selassie I University (HSIU, now Addis Ababa University) remained dominated by international faculty. In 1973, 54 percent of the HSIU staff were foreigners.

The balance between international and local staff in Ethiopian HEIs changed significantly after the 1974 revolution, which drove many foreign staff out of the country owing to the country's adoption of a socialist policy and its subsequent relation with countries of the Eastern bloc. The huge gap created by the departure of Western expats was filled by staff recruited from socialist countries, but the dependence on foreign faculty continued for as long as a decade after the socialist government assumed power. Out

of the total number of university staff, 934 in 1982–1983, 335 (36 percent) were foreigners. The dominance of international faculty in senior academic positions was much more pronounced.

Continued Need for Expats

The need for, and influence of, international faculty at the lower levels of education in Ethiopia is currently over, but their importance for capacity building in teaching/learning and research in the higher education sector continues to be acknowledged, particularly given the dramatic expansion of the sector over the last two decades.

British experts and teachers were replaced by Americans in the second half of the 1950s, due to Ethiopia's strengthened links with the United States.

Currently, around 8 percent of the 30,000 workforce in Ethiopian HEIs are international staff. Most of them work in fields of study where local staff is scarce. A significant number of international faculty are currently recruited from India, Nigeria, and the Philippines, in particular, from Europe, and from other countries. The recruitment of foreign faculty follows a variety of patterns, including the direct involvement of universities in recruitment and/or the intermediation of recruiting agencies, which have recently been sprouting to capitalize on this new business area. In its fifth Education Sector Development Plan (2015–2016 to 2019–2020), the government intends to further increase the proportion of foreign faculty to 10 percent. However, this plan can be challenged by new developments within the sector.

Impending Challenges

Issues of salary, taxes, and staff quality (among many others) appear to be factors that affect the process of attracting, recruiting, and retaining international faculty in Ethiopian HEIs. Although there might be differences based on nationality, the average expatriate serving in a public institution earns on average US$2,500–3,000 per month. This is a huge sum compared to the meager salary and benefits of local faculty. Yet, foreign faculty contend that this salary is much lower than what they would receive in other countries with a similar economy. Aside from the possible rivalry generated by the salary rate between local and international staff, pay scale continues to affect the capacity of institutions to attract and recruit the best talents. The issue of taxes has lately become another source of discontent among foreign faculty, influencing their motivation to remain in their positions. The introduction of a new tax on their base salary is forcing a significant number of international faculty (especially Indians, who are the majority) to leave their positions and return to their home countries. International faculty also face a heavy challenge in terms of being accepted by students and the local academic community, particularly when their performance fails to meet expectations.

Until Ethiopia's efforts to expand its postgraduate programs, especially at the PhD level, combined with the return of the numerous candidates currently abroad for training, can successfully meet the demand of the sector, the need for expat faculty will arguably remain unabated. In the face of the serious challenges mentioned above, this circumstance will require a steadfast national policy and sound management at the level of the institutions. ■

Five Little-Known Facts about International Student Mobility to the United Kingdom

Janet Ilieva

Janet Ilieva is director and founder, Education Insight, UK. E-mail: janet.ilieva@educationinsight.uk.

This article was produced for Universities UK International https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/International/Pages/five-little-known-facts-about-international-student-mobility-to-the-UK.aspx

The past decade posed a series of challenges to student mobility to the United Kingdom. First, the global financial crisis of 2007–2008 affected countries' spending on education. Globally mobile students were just as affected. Much stricter visa and poststudy rules were introduced in 2013. Finally, the Brexit vote of 2016 mainly affected applications from European Union (EU) students.

Declines in overall international student numbers (EU and non-EU) were first reported in 2012–2013, which was the first reduction in almost three decades. This was mainly attributed to the fall in numbers of undergraduate EU entrants, whose tuition fees trebled in 2012–2013. The second low point in the annual growth of numbers of overall

international entrants was in 2014–2015, which resulted from fewer non-EU students commencing their study in the United Kingdom. Their numbers continued to stagnate in the following years, in stark contrast to high growth in international demand elsewhere.

New International Entrants: Enrollment Trends

Fact 1: The United Kingdom enrolls the largest proportion of new entrants compared with its peer group. The United Kingdom's peer group are the countries with the most substantial numbers of international students in 2015 reported by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, and includes the United States, Australia, and Germany. More than half of the United Kingdom's international students are new entrants, i.e., they are in their first year of study. In comparison, about a third of the international students in the United States and Germany are new entrants (32 percent and 36 percent respectively). This is partly explained by the shorter duration of UK undergraduate programs, which are usually three years, compared with a typical four years in the United States. While masters programs in the United Kingdom last one year, they usually take two years in Germany and the United States.

The high proportion of new international entrants in the United Kingdom means that higher education institutions (HEIs) must continuously recruit new students. This requires a significant marketing effort and highlights the importance of streamlined student applications, admissions, and visa systems to facilitate this turnover. The high turnover of international students also indicates that the UK higher education system is more vulnerable to changes in global student demand and the external environment.

International Postgraduate Admissions

Fact 2: The United Kingdom receives the highest number of postgraduate entrants compared with its peer group. The United Kingdom hosts the second largest international population of masters and doctoral students in the OECD countries after the United States. The United States hosted 391,000 international postgraduate students in 2016–2017, twice as many as the United Kingdom. However, the longer duration of postgraduate degrees means that 32 percent of the total US international postgraduate population is in the first year of study, in contrast with the United Kingdom where 68 percent of international postgraduate students are new entrants. Although the UK postgraduate sector is half the size of its US counterpart, the number of *new* international postgraduate students starting their degrees in the United Kingdom each year is higher. This means that any changes in the operating environment such as shifts in demand, changes in the visa policies, and poststudy work rights would impact immediately over two-thirds of the postgraduate student population.

Poststudy Work Options

Fact 3: There is a strong positive correlation between poststudy work options and growth in international student enrollments. While many factors are likely to influence trends in international student enrollments, research shows that international students value opportunities to gain work experience as part of their international education. Despite the fact that the United Kingdom offers similar opportunities to work during studies compared with its major competitors,

More than half of the United Kingdom's international students are new entrants, i.e., they are in their first year of study.

UK poststudy work options are less clearly presented and more limited. International comparisons show that global student mobility to the United Kingdom had the smallest growth between 2012 and 2015. International student enrollments grew by 0.7 percent in the United Kingdom, compared with countries with more generous poststudy work opportunities: growth in Australia was 18.0 percent; 26.9 percent in Canada; 16.3 percent in Germany; and 22.5 percent in the United States.

International Postgraduate Research Students

Fact 4: The future sustainability of international postgraduate research demand in the United Kingdom is uncertain. International postgraduate research students are particularly important to UK higher education. They represent 43 percent of the total number of research students in the United Kingdom. Our analysis of tuition fee sources for international research students shows that institutional fee waivers and awards were the only funding source that grew over the past two years. The most significant declines were among self-funded students and those receiving other overseas funding (usually dominated by government scholarship programs).

Transnational Education

Fact 5: Most international students in UK programs are studying overseas. In addition to shorter courses, UK universities have been innovators in diversifying modes of study and pathways into higher education, presenting international

students with greater flexibility over when and how they can commence their UK degree. Over 60 percent of all international students in UK higher education programs are studying outside the United Kingdom on transnational education courses (TNE). There is a clear link between TNE and onshore recruitment. Previous research has shown that a third of the non-EU first-degree entrants commence their course in England through the means of TNE programs that begin in another country. These proportions are higher for first-degree entrants from China, Malaysia, and Hong Kong, where more than half of the students started their UK degree in their home country or country of residence. Shorter duration of study in the United Kingdom, complemented with study at home, presents a cost-effective way of acquiring an international degree. This also means that TNE is widening access to UK education among students who may not have had the economic means to do so otherwise.

What to Expect in the Coming Years

There is a high degree of uncertainty around government policies that are likely to affect international students' study choices, such as the impact of Brexit on EU student demand; the impact of President Donald Trump's immigration policies; broader changes in the macroeconomic environment such as fluctuation in currency and commodity prices, particularly oil, which, among other things, influences some overseas government sources of investment in scholarships for international study. The latter has affected large scholarship schemes in Brazil, Iraq, Malaysia, and Saudi Arabia. Even if economic circumstances change, there is evidence that many countries that have been traditional sources of overseas scholarship-funded students are now placing greater emphasis on the development of their own institutions.

One example of a shift away from funding individual scholars toward institutional development programs with a focus on internationalization is Brazil's new Institutional Program for the Internationalization of Brazilian Higher Education and Research Institutions (Capes-PrInt). The program is funded by CAPES and seen as a successor to the Science Without Borders program. In addition, Thailand, Vietnam, and the Philippines are focusing on capacity building of domestic higher education institutions through policies aimed at attracting overseas providers to develop TNE in niche subject areas. This could be an opportunity for countries that engage in cross-border education. A strong argument in favor of greater support for the collaborative provision of education, such as double and joint degrees and supported distance/online learning, is the potential of such provision to widen access to tertiary education and support local capacity building and faculty development. While the contribution of collaborative TNE to equitable access to quality education globally is still to be fully utilized, it is an area that is likely to see rapid growth in the future. ■

Private Higher Education in the United Kingdom

Stephen A. Hunt and Vikki Boliver

Stephen A. Hunt is research associate at the Centre for Global Higher Education, Institute of Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: stephen.hunt@ucl.ac.uk. Vikki Boliver is professor of sociology in the Department of Sociology, Durham University, UK. E-mail: vikki.boliver@durham.ac.uk.

The vast majority of higher education (HE) in the United Kingdom has historically been delivered by universities and colleges operating as part of the public sector. The titles "university" and "university college" are legally protected, as are degree awarding powers, and these, until recently, have been exclusively located in the public sector. The University of Buckingham, the first, and for decades the only private university, was not awarded the title until 1983.

Yet there has long been a private HE sector in the United Kingdom, made up of colleges of professional training and niche providers offering vocational subjects outside the universities' traditional remit. These range from qualifications necessary to practice law or accountancy to psychotherapy and chiropody. Private providers within the creative arts have also had a notable presence: from independent art and design schools to a complete monopoly of training for actors for much of the twentieth century.

Recently, the UK government has sought to foster the growth of the private HE sector. As expressed in the government's strategic white paper, *Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice,* more private HE provision is expected to stimulate competition within the sector as a whole, leading to "a greater choice of more innovative and better quality products and services at lower cost" (p.8). Private providers are also seen by government to be more responsive to the changing skills needs of graduate employers, more flexible in the ways they deliver their provision to students, and well placed to meet continuing international student demand for a UK HE. To this end, the government has enacted legislation to make legally protected titles and degree-awarding powers easier

for private providers to access.

Despite these ambitions, much of the private sector remains an unknown quantity. In the absence of public funding, the private sector was not subject to any official regulation or even oversight, nor has there been any systematic data collected on private providers. There have been several attempts to document the private HE sector in the United Kingdom but, using questionnaire-based survey methods, they faced low response rates, which never exceeded 40 percent.

Our research replaced this underperforming approach with one designed to maximize coverage of all private providers in the United Kingdom: collecting data from the websites of every operational private provider, along with data from their entry in the UK business index Companies House and/or the Charities register. It allowed us to characterize the sector in terms of the kind of subjects taught, and the level of qualifications offered.

Size and Composition of the Sector

Our survey identified a total of 813 private HE providers active in the United Kingdom in 2017. Of these, only some 115 were entitled to enroll students with publicly backed tuition fee loans, on what are termed "designated courses."

Private providers were overwhelmingly located in England (88 percent), with what amounts to a token presence in the rest of the United Kingdom. Furthermore, there was evidence of the centripetal pull of the capital: 37 percent of all providers were located in the capital, London, and almost 50 percent of all providers were located in the southeast of England.

Five providers held the title of university, and a further four the title of university college. These were largely professional training colleges in subjects such as law, accountancy, estate management, banking, and all were of decades long standing. All nine of those providers had degree awarding powers, as did one other provider. Other than the University of Buckingham, the earliest any other providers were granted degree awarding powers was in 2006, and university status in 2010.

Sixty five percent of providers were registered as for-profit companies. These tended to be younger than not for-profit—the majority of for-profits were less than 20 years old, the majority of not for-profits over 20 years old. They also accounted for the greater proportion of failed providers: 23 percent of the 732 providers identified in 2014 had ceased to operate in 2017, 90 percent of which were for-profit.

Qualifications and Subjects Offered

UK HE qualifications range from level four to level eight (with a different but equivalent scale in Scotland), with traditional bachelor's degree at level six. The private sector as a whole tended to concentrate on subdegree-level qualifications at levels four (58 percent of all providers) and five (53 percent). Forty-three percent also offered postgraduate qualifications, principally diplomas at level seven. Only 20 percent of providers offered the staple of university education: the bachelor level degree.

In terms of provision, there is a high degree of specialization evident: most providers (64 percent) offered courses in only one major subject area. A further 24 percent offered courses in only two major subject areas, while just 12 percent had provision spanning three or more subject areas.

The composition of the student body at private providers is distinct from the public sector in several respects.

The most frequently offered courses were in business and administration, offered by well over half of providers (56 percent). Cheap to run and popular, there is no shortage of officially recognized business and management qualifications available (the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation lists 353 at level four or above). These courses are also a specialty for for-profit providers: almost three quarters of all for-profit providers offered courses in business and administration, whereas only a quarter of not for-profit providers did so.

Other areas commonly offered were "subjects allied to medicine" and creative arts and design. The latter was offered by twice as many not for-profit than for-profit providers, 20 as opposed to 10 percent.

Students at Private Providers

Information about student numbers is available for the smaller subset of private providers that offer designated courses: there were 58,735 students on designated HE courses at private providers in 2016–2017. This represents slightly over 2 percent of the total number of students in UK HE.

The composition of the student body at private providers is distinct from the public sector in several respects: they tend to be older, are more likely to be from an ethnic minority, and although women are the majority of students in both sectors, there are a greater proportion of male students in the private sector. Half of the 10 providers with the

highest drop-out rates for first degrees were private providers. It is often contended that private providers face greater drop-out rates because of the greater prevalence of nontraditional students.

Conclusion

The private HE sector in the United Kingdom has developed a distinct character that shows a degree of diversity. Many established niche and frequently not for-profit providers continue to offer education for professional qualifications: those recently elevated to university or university college status are largely drawn from this group. More recent for-profit providers often replicate each other's provision, frequently at subdegree level, and compete with one another for the same group of nontraditional students. These providers are undoubtedly meeting market demands, but do not yet appear to be providing an alternative to the public sector. Upscaling the sector has not been something internal or supported by UK based investment. A genuine alternative sector, as envisaged by the government, may only be realized by attracting international capital investment. ■

The Coming "China Crisis" in Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is founding director and research professor at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

A shortened version of this article has appeared in the South China Morning Post, *Hong Kong.*

Universities in major countries have come to depend on Chinese students for their increasingly important international student enrollments, and are to some extent dependent on these students to balance budgets and in some cases to fill empty seats. Significant numbers of postdocs, necessary to staff research laboratories and sometimes engage in teaching, also come from China. For a range of reasons, China's global higher education role is about to change significantly, with implications for the rest of the world.

One-third of the 1.1 million international students in the United States are from China. Similar proportions are found in such major receiving countries as Australia (38 percent) and the United Kingdom (41 percent of non-EU students). This has created an unsustainable situation of overdependence. There are also major challenges relating to China's Confucius Institutes, Chinese participation in research in several host countries, and others. In short, there are a number of key points of conflict and crisis that are likely to affect China's higher education relations with important partners.

Not only does China have the world's largest enrollments, it is also by far the biggest exporter of students, with more than 600,000 studying abroad in 2017. Around 35 percent are graduate and professional students. For the first time, China is itself active in international higher education. More than 440,000 international students, the large majority from other Asian countries, are studying in China. The multibillion-dollar "Belt and Road" initiative has a significant higher education component.

An Approaching Crisis

The generally sunny relationships between China and the major receiving countries is already beginning to undergo a dramatic and highly negative set of changes. To briefly summarize the key points that combine to ensure an impending crisis:

- Within China, several important transformations are taking place. Demographic trends combined with the considerable expansion of China's higher education system mean that there will be greater opportunities for study in the country. Of specific importance for geographically mobile students, there is more access to China's best universities as billions have been spent upgrading the top 100 or more Chinese universities. At the same time, there are significant new restrictions on academic freedom and a "shrinking" of intellectual space in China. Ideology has reclaimed a more central place in academic life, and access to information, never fully available, is better monitored and controlled with new technologies. These developments may push in opposite directions. Some students may find fewer reasons to study abroad to obtain access to high quality university, while tightened censorship may push some to leave. Also, within China, academic collaboration arrangements with foreign universities are slowing. Last summer, 234, or one-fifth, of its international university partnerships were closed, including more than 25 with American institutions—many of which were inactive anyway. Finally, the idea of "liberal education,"

for a while popular in elite universities, has been called into question. In short, for both internal political reasons and as a reaction to foreign criticism, especially from the United States, China is likely to become less open to international collaboration with top-tier universities.

- China has come under increasing criticism and pressure from abroad—criticism that is likely to lead to restrictions from some countries, and probable reactions from China itself.
- The United States, for example, has tightened rules for Chinese visa holders in some STEM fields. The FBI has warned of academic vulnerabilities to Chinese espionage, and the Trump administration has reestablished a committee to monitor the involvement of foreigners (mainly Chinese) in classified research. A report from the Australian Strategic Policy Institute has warned that collaboration between academic scientists in some Western institutions and People's Liberation Army scientists is providing research on artificial intelligence and other areas to "rival militaries." A British study has also warned of inappropriate research collaboration with China. And President Trump has called Chinese students and academics in the United States "spies"—which is hardly encouraging for scientific cooperation.

The United States, for example, has tightened rules for Chinese visa holders in some STEM fields.

- Confucius Institutes, which have been established at more than 100 American universities and number more than 500 worldwide, have recently come under heavy criticism. A report by US–China experts has recommended more transparency in the contracts between Hanban, the Chinese agency managing the Confucius Institutes, and American universities. A half-dozen institutes have recently been closed, and more are under review. While clearly part of China's soft power initiatives, what started out as an effort to popularize Chinese culture and teach Chinese language on foreign campuses is now seen by some as a potentially dangerous foreign agency on campuses.
- China's efforts to impose censorship on Western academic journals in China has received widespread publicity and condemnation in the West. Pressure on the prestigious *China Quarterly* and its publisher, Cambridge University Press, to censor 300 online articles resulted in their removal—only to be restored after widespread criticism among Western academics. Multinational publisher Springer Nature censors some of its content and prevents its distribution in China as a result of Chinese regulations. These policies and controversies have contributed to a negative image of China.

The Inevitable Implications

As with the current trade war between China and the United States, where China imposed retaliatory tariffs on US products—and cleverly targeted them toward the states that supported President Trump, China will inevitably react against the anti-China rhetoric and actions currently evident in many Western countries. The nature of such reactions is not clear but Chinese authorities may try to curtail outward student mobility to some extent—through specific policies, "guidance" from the government and media, and financial pressure, such as cutting back on China Scholarship Council and the other rather limited scholarship programs offered, tinkering the local job market for returning graduates, and others. While very difficult to predict, it is quite likely that the number of Chinese students going abroad to several of the key receiving countries will slow down or even decline. While the overall number of Chinese students enrolling in the United States has slightly increased, the number of newly enrolled doctoral students has declined, a likely forerunner of future trends.

Mobility trends largely unrelated to the political situation will also create serious problems. For example, less prestigious colleges and universities will see significant declines as a smaller number of Chinese students compete for places in top institutions—or choose to remain at home. In the United States, there is already a shift of Chinese students away from schools in the middle of country, places perceived as "pro Trump" and perhaps less friendly to outsiders.

It is quite possible that China will tighten regulations relating to foreign branch campuses operating in the country or even make it impossible for them to function, at the same time that the Trump Administration is threatening to tighten regulations from the US side. Similar restrictions are likely to be placed on foreign research centers operating in China.

While it is impossible to predict exactly the future of China's higher education relations with the rest of the world, it is clear that, at least for the countries that have had

the closest academic relations with China and have received the large majority of Chinese students, there will significant negative developments. For those countries and institutions that have come to rely on Chinese students to fill classroom seats and provide needed income, these developments will create serious problems. Global scientific relations with an emerging scientific power will be disrupted. On the other hand, countries working with China on its Belt and Road initiative are likely to see an increase in cooperation and involvement. ■

Australia's China Question

Anthony Welch

Anthony Welch is professor of education, School of Education & Social Work, University of Sydney, Australia. E-mail: anthony.welch@sydney.edu.au.

As in a number of other countries, Australian views on the Chinese influence in higher education and research have become a significant issue over the last year or more. In Australia, the debate is vigorous, touching on student enrollment trends, internet protocol and security issues, and Confucius Institutes, and has become rather polarized and politicized, with some critics charging that a few politicians are making political mileage out of the issue. There are, however, two key differences in Australia, compared to the United States and Canada. First is the extent of financial dependence upon Chinese students among universities across the country. Second is the decision not to close any Confucius Institutes.

Dependence on the Chinese "Market"

As in a number of other major destinations for international higher education students, individuals from mainland China comprise by far the largest cohort among international students in Australia. Of the almost 400,000 international students enrolled in Australian universities in 2018, Chinese students accounted for at least 30 percent. While this is not necessarily different from other major English language systems such as the United Kingdom or the United States, the degree of financial dependence on international student income among Australian universities is distinct. Recent data drawn from government auditors and individual university annual reports showed that among Australia's top-tier "Group of Eight" (Go8) universities, several earned 30 percent+ of their annual revenue from international students. The University of Melbourne and the University of Sydney each earned more than AU$750 million (US$532 million) from international students alone. Given that more than 30 percent of this amount derives from Chinese students, it is no surprise that vice-chancellors around the country are nervous about any downturn in Chinese enrollments, and are seeking to rapidly diversify the international student intake at their institutions. It is partly for that reason that enrollments from India rose by 32 percent in 2018, those from Nepal by 51 percent, and those from Brazil by 10 percent. The University of Sydney's Business School recently launched an AU$1 million fee-rebate scheme to attract 100 high-achieving students from other-than-China Asian countries such as Korea and India.

Security Concerns?

For much the same reasons, university leaders have tended to resist the concerns expressed by some within Australia's security organs, such as the Australian Signals Directorate (ASD). The head of the ASD, charged with the defense of the country from global cyber threats, recently underlined that the much-vaunted Shift to the East also included the rise of leading Chinese centers for technology and research and development, including Huawei's world-leading 5G communications technology, which Australia recently banned with strong backing from the United States. Faced with purported examples of Australia-based Chinese researchers who were also People's Liberation Army (PLA) officers engaged in high-tech research in areas such as quantum computing, robotics, new materials, or artificial intelligence, but who failed to disclose their military status and then returned to China with the results of their research, the response of one prominent vice-chancellor was to dismiss such concerns as "China-bashing." A report from the Australian Strategic Policy Institute in late 2018 listed the University of New South Wales (UNSW), one of Australia's leading research institutions, as among the top few institutions outside China with which PLA scientists copublished. In response, the vice-chancellor of UNSW, which benefits significantly both from collaboration with Chinese scholars and Chinese investment in joint scientific research, defended that institution's collaboration with China's National Defense University as a normal part of an internationally engaged university's work, and pointed out that the results were published in international, peer-reviewed journals. UNSW, it was claimed, conducted rigorous assessments to ensure that military expertise was not exported. Australia's membership in the "Five Eyes" intelligence sharing network (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States), which hosts many of the

2,500 scientists, researchers, and engineers reportedly sent overseas by the PLA to work with international researchers in recent years, has only sharpened debate on the issue.

Confucius Institutes

Unlike in Canada and the United States, no Australian Confucius Institute (CI) has been closed due to concerns about Chinese influence or political control. Among Australia's 40 universities, 13 host Confucius Institutes, including six of the eight leading Go8 tier. This does not imply an absence of debate as to their role and significance. Some critics in the media, and a few China hawks, have argued that CIs should be forced to register as foreign entities under Australia's sweeping new foreign interference laws (similar to the US Foreign Agents Registration Act), passed in mid-2018. Arguing that CIs receive funding from Beijing's Hanban agency, and that their activities seek to influence views about China and perhaps their host universities' international engagement strategy, some have criticized vice-chancellors for failing to register CIs as foreign entities, and characterized this failure as kowtowing to Beijing for fear of losing students or Chinese research funds. Other centers, such as the USAsia Centre at the University of Western Australia and the United States Studies Centre at the University of Sydney, have registered under the new legislation, and the federal government recently sent letters about the new policy to all CIs, signaling that they could be targeted. By contrast, some China scholars have juxtaposed the University of Sydney's well-endowed United States Studies Centre, for example—charged with advocating the importance of the US defense and strategic alliance and running a wide range of courses as a regular part of the university's curriculum—with the much smaller and much more modestly funded CIs, which offer a sprinkling of language and Tai Chi courses but play no role in undergraduate or graduate teaching. Openness and intellectual freedom, it is argued, demand that, if universities allow such centers as Sydney's United States Studies Centre to actively seek to shape debate on Australia's security and strategic alliance, it is illegitimate to target CIs as potential agents of foreign influence. If CIs were listed, might not France's Alliance Française and Germany's Goethe-Institut, for example, also fall under the sweeping new national legislation?

Individuals from mainland China comprise by far the largest cohort among international students in Australia.

Unlike in the United States, where politicians from both left and right agree that China is a strategic rival that should be contained, especially in key areas of high-tech research and development such as those highlighted in China's signature Made in China 2025 policy, the debate in Australia is more polarized. Part of the reason is that, given its geography and increasing integration within the region, Australia recognizes that its future lies in Asia, including its expanding collaborative research profile—notably with China. At the same time, its strategic and defense alliances remain tied to the United States, including via the Five Eyes intelligence network. Quite how the country manages these competing interests is yet to be seen. Its universities are increasingly engaged in international collaborative research, including with China, which has become a major knowledge partner over recent years. China's knowledge diaspora, an important and growing component of Australian university staff, is anxiously watching developments, including incidents of anti-Chinese rhetoric. Traditionally committed to making their research accessible, but now under pressure to audit international collaborative research on security grounds, Australia's universities are one site where some of these tensions and contradictions will play out. Their ongoing high-level dependence on international student fees, especially from China, will be a key factor in shaping their responses. ■

Taiwan: Universities in an Aging Society

Julian Marioulas

Julian Marioulas is a PhD candidate at the Department of East Asian Studies, University of Vienna, Austria, and teaches German at the School of Foreign Languages, East China University of Science and Technology, China. E-mail: julian@marioulas.de.

Colleges and universities in developed nations will face the impact of demographic change sooner rather than later. As numbers shrink in the younger age cohorts, enrollments will be negatively affected. In parallel, expanding higher education remains a stated policy goal in most countries. A far less attractive topic for decision-makers to bring up is how the inevitable opposite trend will affect institutions.

In Taiwan, universities are already confronted with

these shortfalls. In the past, the government implemented expansion policies in higher education. With its 23 million inhabitants, the island features one of the highest university enrollment rates, concurrent with one of the lowest birthrates in the world. This matter has already become an important policy issue and has resulted in—broadly speaking—the implementation of three different strategies that could be adapted elsewhere in the future: mergers, closures, and internationalization.

Mergers

Up until the early 2000s, college mergers in Taiwan usually went hand in hand with upgrading a newly formed institution to university status. In recent years, mergers of public universities have also served as a measure to deal with declining enrollments. The power dynamics and outcomes of such mergers have varied. In 2013, the University of Taipei came about as a combination of two existing, specialized universities, as did the National Pingtung University, in 2014. The National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology, established in 2018, is a public university combining three existing schools. In two other cases, smaller colleges were absorbed into more prestigious institutions, merging with the National Taiwan University and National Tsinghua University.

Another merger is on the horizon, as National Yang-Ming University has started talks with National Chiao Tung University. Both institutions are considered among the best in Taiwan. A union between them will take time, yet would see the emergence of a powerhouse in Taiwanese higher education. Along with other measures, including increased institutional autonomy and stronger integration with local industries, public universities have been given a tool set that should allow them to enroll sufficient student numbers even as age cohorts continue to shrink in size.

Among private universities, full mergers have not happened, though in 2015, the University of Kang Ning integrated an independent medical college into its structure. While a number of older, more reputable private colleges still attract enough applicants and do not have to worry just yet, the outlook for second-tier schools is bleaker.

Closures

Between 2014 and 2018, four vocational colleges have closed down completely. No university has as of now shut its gates, but enrollments have dropped sharply at a number of institutions, reaching a rate just shy of 30 percent at the Taiwan Culinary Institute, which fares the worst among those institutions remaining in operation. With enrollment at 32 percent of its previous total, Nan Jeon University of Science and Technology performs barely better. This, along with persistent doubt about the financial situation and teaching quality of the school, prompted the ministry of education to revoke the right of Nan Jeon University to recruit new students from 2019 onward. It is likely to become the first bachelor-level institution to go defunct in the near future.

Downscaling the level of enrollment and closing institutes is already under way among dozens of universities. In 2019 alone, 172 departments will stop matriculating new students. This adjustment process is mostly in the hands of the universities themselves, but will inevitably be met with opposition by the affected staff. In the case of Shixin University, the decision to suspend further enrollment at its Institute for Social Development sparked demonstrations from the faculty, who called on the ministry of education to halt the planned closure.

With its 23 million inhabitants, the island features one of the highest university enrollment rates, concurrent with one of the lowest birthrates in the world.

Early retirement options for older faculty and decreasing the student–teacher ratio are two measures listed by the ministry to cope with lower enrollment numbers. The shutdown of whole departments and institutes is a problem that requires innovative solutions. One proposal would be to offer incentives for career transfers in academic units that are likely to close in the coming years. This has already been implemented among public universities.

Internationalization

Not only do most high school graduates in Taiwan go on to attend university; they also tend to go abroad in sizable numbers. Every year, 35,000 to 40,000 Taiwanese choose that option, with the large majority heading toward English-speaking countries. For universities, higher outbound student mobility means an even smaller pool of local students. However, their internationalization efforts have also been successful, with a rise in the overall number of foreign students from 33,600 in 2008 to 118,000 in 2017. The proportional increase of the international student body, from 2.5 percent to 9.7 percent, was substantial. Close to half of all foreign students in Taiwan are enrolled in degree-conferring courses. Mainland Chinese make up the largest proportion, with 35,000 students. Yet, only 9,500 among them stay in Taiwan for a full degree course. In that category,

Malaysians take the top spot with 13,400 enrolled students, with Hong Kong and Macao also well represented.

Since Beijing is keen to isolate Taiwan under President Tsai Ing-wen, since 2017 it has capped the number of Mainland Chinese students allowed to attend degree courses on the island at 1,000 per year. This move has adversely affected private universities, which are dependent on revenue from the higher tuition fees paid by foreign students. The government of Taiwan is thus doubling down on its New Southbound Policy toward Southeast Asia and has offered scholarships and other incentives to students from that region.

Yet, criticism abounds on the treatment of students from countries such as the Philippines and Indonesia. Several private universities have forced them to do factory work as part of their degree programs, allegedly threatened them with financial penalties and withdrawal of their scholarships, and subjected them to verbal and physical abuse. Since international student numbers are set to rise further, it is in the interest of Taiwan to ensure an adequate oversight of programs that target foreign students, especially at private institutions.

Conclusion

Taiwan provides an example of the challenges posed by an aging society to the management of educational institutions. While the prospect of a decline in enrollments may seem daunting at first, it can bring about positive effects. If done right, this process can help realign curricula to better suit current needs, concentrate resources to strengthen the quality of education, and foster a drive to reach across borders. As policy decisions will affect faculty, students, and the broader society, they should not be rushed, but rather take into account all parties and allow for adequate transitional periods. ■

Taiwan: Higher Education under Pressure

Chia-Ming Hsueh

Chia-Ming Hsueh is assistant research professor at National Cheng Kung University (NCKU), Taiwan. He was previously a Fulbright visiting scholar at the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), Boston College, US. E-mail: chiaming.hsueh@gmail.com.

After a period of expansion and reform, Taiwan's higher education system currently enjoys a high level of participation and a reputation for quality in Asia. The percentage of the population between ages 25 and 64 with a university or an advanced degree reached 46 percent in 2016, significantly higher than the 37 percent average in OECD countries. But the system has been facing increasing pressure from within and outside of the country, making its future seem less optimistic.

A Candle Burning at Both Ends

During the period from 1949 to 1987, Taiwan's higher education system underwent a phase of planned growth. Many junior colleges and private universities were established to train skilled human resources for emerging industries. During the 1990s, the deregulation of education was broadly advocated. In 1994, the "410 Demonstration for Education Reform" called for an increased number of senior high schools and universities in each city in order to reduce the pressure of massification. In response to public demand, the number of higher education institutions increased considerably, from 130 in 1994 to 164 in 2007. Some were new, but many were upgraded junior colleges or technical institutes. In 1991, the net enrollment rate (NER) was 20 percent, only slightly above the threshold of an "elite" system. It quickly increased to 50 percent in 2004, reaching the "mass" threshold, and to 70 percent in 2013, reaching "universal" coverage. The percentage of high school graduates entering university reached 95 percent in 2008 and has since remained constant. However, this extremely high enrollment rate also reflects the failure of the system to be selective and a decline of competitiveness within higher education.

Low Birthrate

A significant risk factor for Taiwan is its low birthrate. According to the data released by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) World Factbook in 2018, Taiwan has the third-lowest birthrate in the world. Young couples in Taiwan worry about low salaries, the cost of housing, the cost of education, and achieving a satisfactory standard of living; some embrace DINK ("double income no kids") as an attractive lifestyle. The Taiwanese government sensed that the situation was critical already in 2011, but is still grappling with how to solve the problem. According to the ministry of education, higher education enrollment is expected to decrease from 273,000 in 2015 to 158,000 by 2028. This decrease will have a huge impact on the higher education system, with 20 to 40 universities estimated to be in danger of disappearing within five years, especially small and private universities in the suburbs.

The China Factor

In 2016, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), which stands for the ideology of Taiwan's independence, won the presidential election. The government launched a national "New Southbound Policy," aiming to shift the focus from unilateral investment endeavors to building bilateral people-to-people relations with South and Southeast Asian countries. Since the DPP does not accept the Chinese government's "One China Policy," the relationship between China and Taiwan soon came to an impasse, directly impacting the willingness of Chinese tourists and students to come to Taiwan. The number of short-term Chinese students in Taiwan decreased abruptly by 37 percent from 2016 to 2018 as a result of a ban by the Chinese government, causing much stress among private universities in Taiwan. Chinese scholars who want to visit Taiwan are expected to face more rigorous vetting by the Taiwanese government. Taiwanese students are no longer encouraged to study in China; as a result of these politics, the flow of knowledge between China and Taiwan has been stifled, contributing to a decline in enrollments. With the trade war between China and the United States getting worse, the Taiwanese government, which chose to support the United States, is expected to face more pressure from China in the future.

For example, [China] announced "a package of 31 measures" in spring 2018, to attract young Taiwanese professionals to study, work, and live in China.

Although communication between the two governments is temporarily halted, the Chinese government still endeavors to push for unification through soft means. For example, it announced "a package of 31 measures" in spring 2018, to attract young Taiwanese professionals to study, work, and live in China. In April 2018, an additional "60 measures" plan was released by the city of Xiamen, announcing the provision of 5,000 job vacancies per year and many other benefits to Taiwanese people. In May 2018, 30 universities in the Jiangsu and Zhejiang provinces in China opened highly paid professorships, aiming to recruit 150 elite Taiwanese PhD professionals to teach in China. With the impending slowing down of the economy and of the industrial upgrading in Taiwan, these policies and initiatives from China have attracted the attention of Taiwanese people and are a huge pull factor, potentially triggering brain drain and a talent deficit crisis in Taiwan

Reflections

With the current hostile climate between the United States and China, the future for China and Taiwan is bound to be turbulent. The "New Southbound Policy," aiming to build new connections between Taiwan and South and Southeast Asian countries, appears to be opening other channels for higher education institutions in Taiwan. Obviously, the impact of declining student numbers from China and the threat of brain drain will last for some time, but, in the long run, the "New Southbound Policy" is expected to create opportunities for Taiwan's higher education institutions in the regional and global education market. For example, the percentage of students from Southeast Asian countries increased from 25.5 percent in 2016 to 38.3 percent in 2018.

Aside from these external factors, the quality of higher education has become a crucial issue. Taiwanese higher education has gone through the "elite" and "mass" stages, reaching universal enrollment within only a few decades. It has produced highly educated citizens for society and valuable human resources for the development of the country, but it has also created an oversupply of graduates, resulting in youth unemployment and "human capital flight" among young professionals. Some universities, most of them public, have been successfully consolidated, but there is no broadly accepted mechanism to transform or shut down universities, especially private ones, that fail to attract sufficient numbers of students. The Taiwanese government should facilitate a university "elimination" mechanism, while protecting the students' right to education and the teachers' right to work. It should also intervene against universities that demonstrate low quality or poor performance, and transform or close institutions when student numbers are too low and continue to decline. By focusing on high-performance universities, the investment of government in higher education can be maximized, with no wasted effort on ineffective institutions.

Facing increasing global competition and the strong influence of China, higher education in Taiwan is in urgent need of transformation. The government plays a critical role. The real crisis in higher education does not come from a lack of students, but from the inability of the system to pursue excellence. An increase in student numbers may solve the immediate problem; improving quality will take more time and effort, but will offer a more sustainable solution in the long run. ■

Taiwan: From "World-Class" to Socially Responsible

William Yat Wai Lo

William Yat Wai Lo is associate professor in the Department of International Education, Education University of Hong Kong. E-mail: willlo@eduhk.hk.

Building world-class universities has become an important project in many countries, as developing higher education is regarded as a means of enhancing global competitiveness. Following narrowly defined standards for universities to become "world-class," many governments have reformed, restructured, and internationalized their higher education systems. An implication of this "world-class" trend is the differentiation policy adopted by some higher education systems in East Asia, such as in Taiwan, in recognition that the number of top-tier universities is limited in most national contexts. This is particularly true in the case of Taiwan, where there are over 150 higher education institutions in a relatively small island-state with a population of around 23 million. Providing equal treatment for all universities in terms of budget and mission is impossible for the government. Against this background, and as in other East Asian countries, the Taiwanese government has been led to differentiate the higher education system by compelling stratified missions, with research-intensive universities typically considered top-tier institutions and aiming at world-class status.

World-Class Trends and Associated Problems

The Taiwanese government launched the Aim for the Top University Project (also known as the "five-year-fifty-billion" project) as a competition-based funding scheme to provide off-budget funds to universities. The project, which provided NT$50 billion (approximately US$1.63 billion) over five years (2006–2010), was designed to promote research excellence and internationalization in Taiwan's higher education sector. It was renewed to provide an additional NT$50 billion for another five years (2011–2015). Funded universities were those considered national flagship universities; these were expected to reach world-class status within five years.

The "five-year-fifty-billion" project reveals a policy of differentiation and funding concentration with limited public funds concentrated at a number of leading universities. This policy of building "skyscrapers" aims to sustain a critical mass of research excellence that drives quality and ensures the global competitiveness of Taiwan's higher education system, thereby enhancing the prestige as well as the overall quality of universities on the island. Indeed, according to the SCImago Journal & Country Rank, the number of scientific publications from Taiwan significantly increased in the 2000s, which may reflect an increase in research capacity.

However, this policy also caused a steep stratification and differentiation in the higher education system. A research- and output-oriented culture has been bred, which substantially intensified competition among universities. The consequence is a zero-sum game that causes unhealthy competition and inequality. The single standard that is used by the government, which merely stresses research outputs in indexed journals, reduces diversity in the sector. Meanwhile, as a result of the tendency to emphasize research, teaching has been neglected. These problems were aggregated and understood as a manifestation of the "SSCI (social sciences citation index) syndrome" in Taiwan's academia, and were widely reported in the press, raising public hostility against the relevant government initiatives.

The "five-year-fifty-billion" project reveals a policy of differentiation and funding concentration with limited public funds concentrated at a number of leading universities.

Promoting University Social Responsibility

In response to these problems, and after conducting several public hearings, the new administration that came into office after the general election in 2016 announced a change in the funding policy to develop world-class universities. In 2018, it allocated NT$86.85 billion (approximately US$2.82 billion) for a new five-year initiative called the Higher Education Sprout Project. The project includes both public and private universities and consists of two parts. The first part focuses on enhancing the overall quality of universities and encouraging their diversity. It highlights four elements (i.e., promoting teaching innovation; enhancing service to the public; developing the unique characteristics of universities; and achieving social responsibility), and funds a total of 158 higher education institutions, including 71 comprehensive universities and 87 technical institutions. This is the main part of the project. Its key missions include promoting equality in higher education, the development of local linkages, and nurturing talent.

The second part of the project aims to foster global competitiveness in the higher education sector. It is divided into two subprojects. The first subproject identifies four

universities as leading institutions in pursuing all-around excellence. The second subproject selects and funds 65 research centers at 24 institutions to develop as areas of excellence.

The government awarded NT$17.37 billion (approximately US$565 million) for the first year of the project, with 65 percent (NT$11.37 billion or US$370 million) allocated to enhance social responsibility, and 35 percent (NT$6 billion or US$195 million) to enhance global competitiveness. In this funding model, university social responsibility (strengthening university–industry collaboration; fostering cooperation among universities and schools; involving ministries and local governments in university-led projects; and nurturing talents required by local economies) has become a new key performance indicator used to monitor the performance of universities.

The adoption of this new indicator optimistically aims for a return of a local focus among faculty, who are expected to work closely with communities, industry, and government organizations as an alternative to seeking to compete globally by publishing in international journals. This initiative also marks a shift from an outward-looking strategy to a relatively inward-looking approach. Importantly, this reorientation exemplifies the tension between the global and local agendas in higher education policy.

Politics Matters in Higher Education Policy

This reorientation, following the Taiwanese election cycle, suggests the relevance of local politics for higher education policy making. In the new interplay between educational autonomy and performance culture, it is clear that political circumstances have substantially affected Taiwan's higher education policy. The island's democratic transition has played an important role in motivating various sectors (including industry and municipal authorities) to participate in higher education governance. It has resulted in a decentralized framework of governance, in which individual higher education institutions exercise increased autonomy, demonstrating the responsiveness and accountability of higher education policy to society.

Based on this evolution, we may consider the reorientation as an attempt to balance external/global trends and requirements (as revealed by the world-class trend) and internal/local pressures. To put it another way, there is a zero-sum relationship between the global and local perspectives on higher education policy. This not only justifies the shift toward an inward-looking approach, but also suggests that policy-making processes in higher education are inevitably local because of politically bound views and realities. In this regard, the controversies about world-class university and the call for university social responsibility should be framed in ways that incorporate political responsiveness and the potential for a blended approach to global and local needs.■

Higher Education Reform in Moldova: Achievements and Challenges

Johannes Wetzinger

Johannes Wetzinger is coordinator of EU projects and lecturer in political science at the University of Applied Sciences BFI Vienna, Austria. He coordinates the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education Project "Reforming Master Programmes in Finance in Armenia and Moldova." E-mail: johannes.wetzinger@fh-vie.ac.at.

Disclaimer: The REFINE project (project number 585784-EPP-1-2017-1-AT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP) has been funded with support from the European Commission. This article reflects solely the views of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information it includes. Project number 585784-EPP-1-2017-1-AT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP.

The higher education system in the Republic of Moldova has undergone a far-reaching transformation since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. This article analyses some of the main achievements and challenges of the higher education reform in that Eastern European country, which joined the Bologna process in 2005.

The "Dilemma of Simultaneity"

Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the newly independent Republic of Moldova went through severe crises and had to adjust to a swiftly changing political and socioeconomic environment. The small landlocked state between Romania and Ukraine faced what political scientist Claus Offe once described as a "dilemma of simultaneity," as the country was confronted with multiple transformational challenges at the same time. As an independent state, Moldova had first to establish a new political system and a framework of political institutions. The former Soviet republic then embarked on a transition from a command economy to a market economy and faced economic crises. Last but not least, Moldova had to cope with a secessionist conflict in the region Transnistria, which culminated in a brief war in 1992 and remains unresolved to date.

All these developments had important repercussions on the higher education system in Moldova, which had been designed and shaped by Soviet higher education policies. The impact of the new political and socioeconomic environment on higher education was twofold. On the one hand, political decision-makers and higher education institutions (HEIs) had to deal with new requirements from the economy and from society. For example, demands for new subject areas (e.g., in the social sciences) and a changing labor market created a need for education reform. On the other hand, the political and economic environment created obstacles for the actual implementation of reforms. For instance, state budget shortages caused pressure on higher education funding streams and frequent government changes resulted in policy uncertainty.

Moldova and the Bologna Process

In this complex environment, European higher education models emerged as important reference points, in particular when Moldova was included in the Bologna process in 2005. According to scholar Lucia Padure, the Bologna process at that time was seen by some stakeholders as "an opportunity to fully break with the Soviet system of HE and modernize HE in terms of methods of instruction, content of curricula, quality improvement, and greater mobility of students within a larger European context." On a formal and structural level, Moldova made considerable progress in implementing Bologna reforms: a three-cycle system (bachelor, master, PhD) was implemented in most areas of study and the "European Credit Transfer System" (ECTS) as well as the "Diploma Supplement" were introduced. Moreover, steps to develop a new framework for quality assurance were undertaken.

Higher education reforms—including the implementation of the Bologna Process—were also supported by the European Union through funding schemes like Tempus and Erasmus+. These programs bring together international consortia of HEIs and related stakeholders to promote the reform of HEIs and higher education systems. For Moldova, 83 Tempus projects (1994–2013) and 11 Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education projects (2015–2017) were selected for funding. Moreover, Moldovan HEIs participate in several Erasmus+ mobility projects for students and staff (2015–2017: 1303 mobilities). All of these projects have contributed to the internationalization of higher education in Moldova and promoted the integration of HEIs in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). However, the actual degree of internationalization of Moldovan HEIs remains uneven.

Challenges Ahead

An analysis of the current state of the Moldovan higher education system also reveals substantial challenges. Studies show that the labor market relevance of higher education is often lacking. For example, a recent World Bank report published in 2018 found "strong indications that higher education lacks responsiveness to current labor demand, let alone to the skill demand of the future." According to the World Bank, "nearly half of Moldovan firms face systematic problems in finding staff with the right skills." Likewise, a survey conducted by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building Project "Reforming Master Programmes in Finance in Armenia and Moldova" (REFINE) indicated a need for more relevance to practice in study programs and an update of didactical approaches.

Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the newly independent Republic of Moldova went through severe crises and had to adjust to a swiftly changing political and socioeconomic environment.

The higher education system of Moldova also faces a fundamental demographic obstacle: according to the National Bureau of Statistics, student numbers decreased from 127,997 in the academic year 2006–2007 to 74,726 in 2016–2017. This downward trend is caused by a declining birth rate and substantial emigration from Moldova. Forecasts indicate a further decline of the student population in the coming years, which raises fundamental questions about the future and sustainability of a relatively large tertiary sector.

The higher education system has increased considerably in size during the post-Soviet period and comprised 29 HEIs in the academic year 2017–2018 as compared to nine HEIs in 1988. This development is the result of an increasing liberalization and differentiation of higher education after independence: a number of new state HEIs were founded and private providers were allowed to enter the tertiary sector. A peak was reached in the year 2000 with a total of 47 HEIs, but not all of these institutions were able to consolidate their position in the higher education system. Several private HEIs disappeared again from the higher education landscape and the overall number of institutions has gradually stabilized in the past decade.

Pressure for Future Reforms

In conclusion, despite a challenging political and socioeconomic environment, some important steps for higher education reform have been taken. The Bologna process has become an important reference point, as Moldova aims to integrate further into the EHEA. The structural reforms that have been implemented have enhanced the international comparability as well as compatibility of the Moldovan higher education system and provided a foundation to enhance internationalization. However, while formal and structural changes have been made, challenges remain.

One of the most pressing issues for the Moldovan higher education system is undoubtedly the nation's demographic development: the declining student population makes it clear that a reorganization of the large higher education system is required in order to ensure its sustainability. Under these circumstances, increasing competition between HEIs appears likely. Investments into enhanced quality and relevance of higher education can strengthen the position of HEIs and thus their ability to survive the coming changes. However, it cannot be excluded that some HEIs will disappear from the higher education landscape in this process. ■

Evaluating Institutional Grants at African Universities

Harris Andoh

Harris Andoh is research policy evaluation expert at the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning & Technology, Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria, South Africa, and at the Science and Technology Policy Research Institute (STEPRI) of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Accra, Ghana. E-mail: andoharris@gmail.com.

Since Africa's earliest modern public universities were established on the continent in the 1940s, these institutions have struggled to generate adequate and sustainable funding. They depend mainly on subventions from national governments, grants, donations from the international donor community, and cooperation with industry to fund their learning, teaching, and research activities.

The new missions of African universities—coping with massification, becoming research intensive, and attaining world-class status—require tremendous amounts of funding. Most African governments have chosen to give their public universities autonomy to secure foreign grants from national governments, universities in developed countries, the international donor community (in particular, the World Bank), and philanthropic organizations (e.g., the Gates and Templeton Foundations). To give a few examples, in 2015–2016, the Office of Research and Development at the University of Ghana received US$32 million from nine international donor agencies. In 2010, the website of the University of Ibadan in Nigeria revealed that the university had 106 grants (101 from international donors), for an amount of over US$17 million. At the University of Nairobi in Kenya, only one of the 16 donors mentioned on the university's website is local. In 2016–2017, the government of South Africa earmarked US$46 million as Teaching Development Grants (TDG) for universities to improve their teaching, and US$14.8 million as Research Development Grants (RDG) to improve their research. Most recently, the University Capacity Development Grant (2018–2020) seeks to address the issue of inequality and promote the recruitment of black academics into the South African higher education system.

The new missions of African universities—coping with massification, becoming research intensive, and attaining world-class status—require tremendous amounts of funding.

Limited Capacity for Evaluation

While international donors have systems to evaluate the use and impact of their grants, the internal self-assessment mechanisms of African universities generally do not monitor the use of external grants. In the past 15 years, many of the continent's universities have established grant offices whose role is to develop strategies and attract external funding. However, in most cases, these offices do not have clear grant policies to guide their operations or the use of funding received by the institution. This lack of policies prevents universities from properly evaluating the impact of externally funded programs, which in turn limits their ability to determine whether these programs are actually of benefit

to the institution.

A strong program evaluation mechanism would review activities outlined by the terms of each grant; deliverables; performance indicators; and outcomes achieved. Currently, most universities simply measure the success of programs in terms of proper financial auditing and the achievement of expected outputs and outcomes according to indicators set by the donors. For instance, in the first cycle of South Africa's TDG and RDG, the department of higher education and teaching (DHET) did not request any narrative report from institutions that had received funding from the programs. Nor did recipient universities conduct any post-program evaluations. This absence of data makes it extremely difficult to assess the impact of these two grant programs on the operations of the recipient universities.

Benefits and Challenges of a Framework to Evaluate Institutional Grants

A basic program evaluation framework is a detailed tool used to organize and link together evaluation questions, outcomes or outputs, indicators, data sources, and data collection methods for any given project or program. Such a framework at the institutional level should focus on improving policy and practice in the utilization of all grants awarded to the university. The design of the framework should include a detailed definition of activities, inputs, performance indicators, deliverables, means of verification, and outcomes/outputs/results expected from the use of the grants. Most importantly, the framework should be aligned with the broader vision and core mission of the respective universities in terms of teaching, research, and community engagement; their mid- to long-term strategic plans; and the expectations of the universities' regional councils.

Establishing such a formal grants evaluation framework at the institutional level would benefit African universities in several ways. It would ensure that donor grants are properly used. It would improve accountability within universities and restore trust among university staff and donors. It would also provide impact pathways for organizational learning and prepare the ground for future impact studies and grants assessments. Some efforts are already being made to address this issue. For instance, through DHET, the Centre for Research Evaluation on Science and Technology (CREST) at Stellenbosch University in South Africa is assisting the country's universities to monitor activities related to government grants by helping them set up logical frameworks to guide their program implementation.

However, universities may face several challenges in their efforts to establish such a framework. These include the lack of a critical mass of higher education experts in monitoring and evaluation or with a background in managing institutional operations. The lack of an appropriately standardized methodology for institutional evaluation will also be an obstacle at most universities. However, an institutional commitment from universities to properly evaluate the results, outcomes, and wider impact of the use of their grants will be a first step toward ensuring that externally funded grants truly benefit African universities. ■

NEW PUBLICATIONS

(Editor's note: We welcome suggestions from readers for books on higher education published especially outside of the United States and United Kingdom. This list was compiled by Jean Baptiste Diatta, graduate assistant at CIHE.)

Brennan, Jason, and Phillip Magness. *Cracks in the Ivory Tower: The Moral Mess of Higher Education.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2019. pp. 336. Website: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/cracks-in-the-ivory-tower9780190846282?cc=us&lang=eng

Cannizzo, Fabian, and Nick Osbaldiston, eds. *The Social Structures of Global Academia.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2019. pp. 240. Website: https://www.routledge.com/The-Social-Structures-of-Global-Academia/Cannizzo-Osbaldiston/p/book/9781138610125

Finkelstein, Martin J., and Glen A. Jones, eds. *Professorial Pathways: Academic Careers in a Global Perspective.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 2019. pp. 301. Website: https://jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu/title/professorial-pathways

Higgs, Joy, Geoffrey Crisp, and Will Letts, eds. *Education for Employability: The Employability Agenda.* Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Sense, 2019. pp. 231. Website: https://brill.com/view/title/55064?rskey=jrzoym&result=14

Kövér, Ágnes, and Lorand Eötvös, eds. *University and Society: Interdependencies and Exchange.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2019. pp. 320. Website: https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/university-and-society

Leonard, Jacqueline, Andrea C. Burrows, and Richard Kitchen, eds. *Recruiting, Preparing, and Retaining STEM Teachers for a Global Generation.* Boston, MA: Brill Sense, 2019. pp. 390. Website: https://brill.com/abstract/title/54979?rskey=mmPJ4K&result=6

Neubauer, Deane E., Ka Ho Mok, and Jin Jiang, eds. *The Sustainability of Higher Education in an Era of Post-Massification.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2019. pp. 148. Website: https://www.routledge.com/The-Sustainability-of-Higher-Education-in-an-Era-of-Post-Massification/Neubauer-Mok-Jiang/p/book/9780367272784

Paksuniemi, Merja, and Pigga Keskitalo, eds. *Introduction to the Finnish Educational System.* Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Sense, 2019. pp. 157. Website: https://brill.com/abstract/title/54458?rskey=DeqY3L&result=27

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

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

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

International Higher Education has an advisory board of distinguished higher education experts to provide insights, suggest topics, and increase the visibility of the publication. The Editorial Advisory Board is comprised of the following members:

Andrés Bernasconi, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Chile
Eva Egron-Pollack, Former Secretary General, International Association of Universities, France
Ellen Hazelkorn, BH Consulting Associates, Ireland
Jane Knight, University of Toronto, Canada
Marcelo Knobel, University of Campinas, Brazil
Betty Leask, La Trobe University, Australia
Nian Cai Liu, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China
Laura E. Rumbley, European Association for International Education, the Netherlands
Jamil Salmi, Global Tertiary Expert, Colombia
Damtew Teferra, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
Akiyoshi Yonezawa, Tohoku University, Japan
Maria Yudkevich, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE)

At the forefront of international higher education.

Subscribe
International Higher Education
https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe

Explore
Master of Arts in International Higher Education
https://www.bc.edu/IHEMA

Evolve
Graduate Certificate in International Higher Education
https://www.bc.edu/IHECert

Participate

Consider writing for one of our publications:

International Higher Education
https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe

The World View
https://insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view

Educación Superior en América Latina
http://rcientificas.uninorte.edu.co/index.php/esal/

New Publication from CIHE

CIHE in cooperation with the American Council on Education (ACE) has published International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders no. 8 on Attainment and Inclusion in Higher Education. This annual brief was edited by Robin Matross Helms and Lucia Brajkovic from ACE and Laura E. Rumbley from CIHE and contains 13 international perspectives and 4 case studies from different countries around the globe. It examines sustained efforts undertaken to ensure equitable opportunities for degree attainment for all students, including underserved or traditionally marginalized populations.