INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 92: WINTER 2018

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

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

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through ***International Higher Education,*** a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Links to all editions can be found at *http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe.*

Partnership with ***University World News*** (UWN):
IHE articles appear regularly on *UWN's* website and monthly newsletter. *UWN* is a widely recognized online resource for international higher education news.

Transatlantic Lessons on Higher Education Access and Completion Policy

Kevin J. Dougherty and Claire Callender

Kevin J. Dougherty is professor of higher education at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, US. E-mail: dougherty@tc.edu. Claire Callender is professor at Birkbeck College and at the Institute of Education, University College of London, UK. E-mail: claire.callender@ucl.ac.uk.

The article builds on the report: *English and American Higher Education Access and Completion Policy Regimes: Similarities, Differences, and Possible Lessons* (Centre for Global Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education, 2017), available from http://www.researchcghe.org/publications/english-and-american-higher-education-access-and-completion-policy-regimes-similarities-differences-and-possible-lessons.

England and the United States offer many similarities, but also instructive dissimilarities, with respect to their policies for higher education access and completion. This article describes these similarities and dissimilarities with an eye to what each country can learn from the other with regard to reducing social class and racial/ethnic differences in higher education access and completion. We focus on England since higher educational policy varies greatly across the United Kingdom and England is the most populous constituent nation in the United Kingdom.

The English and US higher education systems are quite different in any number of regards. Most obviously, the US system is far larger in number of institutions and enrollment, and the Unites States spends considerably more on tertiary education: 2.8 percent of the GDP versus 1.8 percent for the United Kingdom. Moreover, virtually all English institutions are "public," whereas three-fifths of US institutions are private.

Despite these differences, both England and the United States have set similar goals for higher education. Both countries have committed to a sharp rise in the higher educational levels of their populations and a widening of participation by working class and minority youth. Underlying this common commitment to expanding and widening participation in higher education is a shared belief that it is key to fostering economic growth and reducing socioeconomic inequality. This normative fusion of economic functionality and social equalization is characteristic of centrist neoliberal educational policymaking in both England and the United States.

Current Policies in Seven Areas

We focus on seven policy strands affecting higher education access and completion: student information provision; outreach from higher education institutions; student financial aid; affirmative action or contextualization in higher education admissions; higher education efforts to improve retention and completion; performance funding; and degree of reliance on subbaccalaureate institutions.

Information, advice, and guidance (IAG) provision:

- England: Poor government support for IAG in primary and early secondary schooling. Extensive government support for IAG in late secondary school, particularly when applying for university.
- United States: Poor government support for IAG in primary and early secondary school. More extensive but still inadequate government support for IAG in late secondary schooling, particularly regarding higher education options.

Outreach efforts by higher education institutions:

- England: "Access Agreements" between higher education institutions and government specifying what tuition will be charged, institutional financial aid provided, and outreach to secondary-school students made.
- United States: No access agreements. Outreach is at institutional discretion.

Student finance:

- England: Tuition is capped by government. Heavy reliance on government funded income-contingent loans. Much smaller reliance on grant aid (from government or institutions).
- United States: Public tuition (but not private tuition) is typically capped by state governments. Continued major role of grant aid (federal, state, and institutional). There are fewer income-contingent loans, and the repayment system is more onerous.

Affirmative action/contextualized admissions:

- England: Contextualized admissions with focus on social class and on benefits to society of greater social mobility for disadvantaged students. Uneven use across institutions.
- United States: Affirmative action with focus on

race/ethnicity (rather than social class) and on benefits both of social mobility for disadvantaged students and of reshaping the attitudes of advantaged students through interaction with diverse populations.

Higher education efforts to improve retention and completion:

- England: Rising governmental and institutional interest in the last 10–20 years.
- United States: Rising governmental interest in the last 10–20 years. However, longstanding interest among less selective institutions.

Performance funding:

- England: Shifting toward extensive use of financial rewards to institutions for student completion, employment, earnings of graduates, and teaching performance.
- United States: Extensive reward system, particularly at state level, offering benefits to institutions for student retention, progression, and completion.

Degree of reliance on subbaccalaureate institutions:

- England: Focus on universities and much less interest in further education colleges. Rising interest in for-profit colleges.
- United States: Focus on universities, but big increase in attention to community colleges. Declining interest (until recently) in for-profit colleges.

Lessons for the United States

Drawing on the English experience, the United States might wish to seriously consider adopting Access Agreements, making more use of income-contingent loans, and expanding the range of information provided to college prospects.

The requirement to have Access Agreements offers the promise of institutions becoming more transparent, thoughtful, and determined in their pursuit of wider access at a time of rising concern about the high degree of racial/ethnic and class inequality in access to higher education generally and to selective institutions particularly. Moreover, in committing to certain practices and outcomes, institutions could be more easily evaluated on their success and their use of practices that are rooted in sound evidence. In principle, the US government has the power to require Access Agreements due to the heavy dependence of virtually all US higher education institutions on federal, state, and local government funding of institutional operations, research and development, and (through student aid) student tuition.

US graduates owe US$1.3 trillion in student loans, and seven million borrowers are in default, with even more in arrears. England shows how government can address these problems, by providing more extensive income-contingent loans. By basing repayment on loan holders' income, a well-designed income-contingent loan program would provide a solution to the great concern in the United States about the many students who are saddled with loan debt. While the federal government does offer income-contingent loans, it can do much more and learn much from what England has done.

The United States could usefully emulate England in providing prospective students with nationally comparable information about the student experience, student satisfaction, and economic returns at the level of individual degree programs or majors. Program-specific information about income returns is particularly important because there is more variation in income returns by major than by institution. Besides income returns, the United States could also follow the lead of the United Kingdom in providing program-specific data on instructional conditions and student satisfaction.

Drawing on the English experience, the United States might wish to seriously consider adopting Access Agreements.

Lessons for England

England could benefit from emulating these aspects of US policy: greater focus on the role of further education colleges and very cautious consideration of greater use of for-profit higher education; greater use of grants in financial aid packages to students; more policy attention to informing student decisions in primary and early secondary school that affect preparation for higher education; greater use of contextualized admissions; and very careful consideration of the possible downsides of performance funding. For reasons of space, we only focus on some of these points.

Further education (FE) colleges do not play as big a role in England's higher education policymaking as community colleges do in US higher education. However, further education colleges account for one-twelfth of all higher education students. Hence, a strong argument can be made for more government policy attention to, and financial support of, further education colleges, as is the case with community colleges in the United States. The US experience also suggests careful attention to possible negative repercus-

sions from large-scale expansion of for-profit higher education. The United States has had to develop regulations to reconcile government provision of financial aid to students attending for-profit colleges and the dangers of poor quality provision by those institutions.

England should consider a more extensive program of government support for IAG in primary and early secondary school. Fateful student choices about higher education begin early as students, their parents, and their teachers make decisions about what fields they should prepare for in higher secondary school in order to be eligible for admission into selective universities. Also, students need to get high grades in the national examinations, usually taken at the age of 16 and again at 18, in order to qualify for entry into these most selective universities.

English universities do engage in contextualized admissions but they could do more. The limited success of the most selective UK universities in diversifying themselves by class and race/ethnicity is rooted in part in their emphasis on only accepting highly prepared students defined in terms of the dominant cultural categories. English universities therefore may benefit from a reconsideration of what constitutes merit in university admission. Are there other ways of measuring ability to benefit from higher education that would open up new opportunities for students coming from underrepresented backgrounds? These questions have been subject to extensive debate in the United States in the context of affirmative action, and selective universities have developed a variety of alternative measures of academic merit.

Finally, as England continues its use of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) to reward institutions for instructional quality, it will be important to carefully track the intended and unintended impacts of the TEF. This monitoring effort could benefit from research on the obstacles encountered and negative side effects produced by performance funding in the United States. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10210

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

Anarchy and Exploitation in Scientific Communication

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

(Note: This article also appears in Higher Education in Russia and Beyond.*)*

Technology, greed, a lack of clear rules and norms, hypercompetitiveness, and a certain amount of corruption have resulted in confusion and anarchy in the world of scientific communication. Not too long ago, scientific publication was largely in the hands of university publishers and nonprofit scientific societies, most of which were controlled by the academic community. Academic conferences were sponsored by universities or disciplinary organizations of academics and scientists. Most of this was done on a nonprofit basis and largely controlled by small groups of respected professors at the main research universities, largely in North America and Western Europe. It was all quite "gentlemanly" and controlled by a male-dominated scientific elite.

Then multiple tsunamis hit the groves of academe. Perhaps the most important was the massification of postsecondary education—the tremendous expansion of enrollments and numbers of universities worldwide. Now, with close to 200 million students in more than 22,000 universities globally, the higher education enterprise is huge. And while only a small proportion of these universities produce much research or aspire to the status of research universities, their numbers are growing as more institutions are lured by the rankings, which mainly measure research productivity, and by the natural desire to join the academic elite. Governments, accreditors, and quality assurance agencies are also stressing research and publications, in part because these are among the few metrics that can be accurately measured. At the same time, the global knowledge economy pushed top universities to link to academe internationally and to compete with institutions worldwide.

As a result of this increased competition and pressure on universities and individual academics to "publish or perish," tremendous pressure was placed on the existing scientific communication system, which was eventually unable to cope with increasing demands. At the same time, the Internet created additional challenges to the system, as journals had to adapt to new ways of publishing articles, evaluating submissions, and other aspects of their work. What had been a cottage industry managed by scholars with little

training in communication suddenly became a large industry. There are now more than 150,000 scientific journals, of which 64,000 claim to be peer reviewed.

Implications

First, major publishers and media companies, seeing that they could make a large profit from scientific journals, moved into the marketplace. Multinationals such as Springer and Elsevier are the giants, each now publishing more than a thousand journals in all fields. Journal subscription prices were increased to astronomical levels, with some journals costing $20,000 or more. For example, *Brain Research*, published by Elsevier, costs $24,000 for an annual subscription. These publishers mainly purchased existing journals from other publishers or scientific societies. They also started new journals in many interdisciplinary fields. The multinationals ended up with hundreds of journals, which they "packaged" for sale to libraries—which paid huge fees for access to all of the journals, as they were forced to purchase the entire list. In some scientific fields, submission fees for authors were imposed or raised. Journal publication became highly profitable. This system, of course, limited access to the latest scientific information to those who could pay for it.

Eventually, a reaction again journal prices by libraries and many academics led to the "open access" movement: some new journals were established with the goal of providing less expensive access to knowledge. The established multinational publishers responded by providing a kind of open access, mainly by charging authors for permission to provide their published articles less expensively to readers. By 2017, continuing conflicts between academic libraries and the multinational publishers concerning the high cost of access to journals have not resulted in any consensus on how to solve these complex problems.

Universities are themselves publishers of many scientific journals. A number of prestigious universities presses, such as Chicago, Johns Hopkins, Oxford, and others have traditionally published high quality academic journals—and continue to do so. They have in general maintained reasonable prices and have successfully adapted to new technologies. It is also the case that many individual universities worldwide publish local journals that have little circulation or prestige. For example, most Chinese research universities publish journals in several fields that have little impact and do not attract authors outside of the institution. There seems to be little justification for such publications—and they are likely to be damaged by the proliferation of low-quality "international" journals.

At the same time, the dramatic increase in the number of journals and the dramatic expansion in the number of papers being submitted to journals have placed unsustainable strain on the traditional peer review system. The increase in submissions is due to the expansion of the academic profession, increased emphasis on "publish or perish," and the rapid advance of scientific innovation and knowledge in general. But it is increasingly difficult to find qualified peer reviewers or talented journal editors. These jobs, while very important, are generally very time consuming, uncompensated, and even anonymous, a pure contribution to science and scholarship.

Another frightening and widespread development in the scientific communication industry is the emergence of "academic fakery." On December 29, 2016, *The New York Times* devoted a long article to "Fake Academe, Looking a Lot Like the Real Thing." The article discussed the proliferation of fake conferences and fake journals. International "academic" conferences organized by shady companies in India and elsewhere charge participants high fees to attend meetings held in hotels around the world, and accept all papers submitted, regardless of quality. Academics are sufficiently desperate to be able to put on their CV that they have had a paper accepted for an international conference, that they pay for these useless events.

Not too long ago, scientific publication was largely in the hands of university publishers and nonprofit scientific societies.

There is also a proliferation of fake journals. No one knows how many of these exist, but their number is in the hundreds or even thousands. Jeffrey Beall, an American university librarian, has been tracking these fakes for years, and now lists at least 923 publishers, many with multiple "journals," up from 18 in 2011. In late 2016, Beall announced that he was no longer compiling his valuable list and it was removed from the Internet. Although he gave no explanation, there is little doubt that he was threatened with lawsuits. The fake journals are often published from Pakistan or Nigeria by invisible publishers and editors. They often claim to be peer reviewed and list internationally prominent academics on their editorial boards—people who seldom actually agreed to serve there and find it difficult to have their names removed when they request it. But almost all papers submitted tend to be published quickly once a fee, often substantial, is paid to the publisher.

What Is to Be Done?

Without question, there is anarchy in the realm of knowledge communication in the twenty-first century. A combination of mass production of scientific papers, most of little scholarly value, tremendous pressure on academics to publish their work regardless of ethical considerations, the communications and publishing revolution made possible by the Internet, the greed of the established multinational publishers, and the huge new coterie of fake publishers have all combined to produce confusion. The issues involved are complex—how to manage technology, accommodate the expansion of scientific production, rationalize peer review, break the monopoly of the multinationals, and, of great importance, instill a sense of ethics and realistic expectations into the academic community itself. The implications of these changes for journals published in languages other than English and in countries other than the main publishing countries are also unclear. It is likely they will be weakened by these global trends. Questions abound, answers are few. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.9786

Globalizing the Academic Presidency: Competing for Talented Leadership

Richard A. Skinner

Richard A. Skinner is senior consultant, Harris Search Associates, and served as president of Royal Roads University in Canada and Clayton State University in the United States. E-mail: rick@harrisandassociates.com.

Higher education is not immune to globalization. Rare today is the research-intensive university that does not promote and support students and professors spending time abroad and, while still modest in number, foreign-born and/or -educated presidents are increasingly selected to lead universities in other countries.

Two Examples

American universities were among the first to benefit from attracting an influx of foreign-born scholars, thinkers, and researchers immigrating to the United States, beginning in the late 1930s but especially during and after the Second World War. When, in 1965, American immigration laws changed, there was steady growth thereafter in the numbers of students—particularly from India, South Korea, and Taiwan—seeking to attend American universities, earn advanced degrees, and remain in the United States on faculties and as department chairs, deans, provosts, and presidents.

Today, presidents of the 60 American member institutions of the Association of American Universities (AAU)—the most prestigious of all American research-intensive universities—number 12 foreign-born persons among them, with representatives from Australia, China, India, and Venezuela. To provide some perspective on that number, consider that a generation earlier, in 1992, six of the same American AAU institutions had presidents who hailed from Canada, China, Germany, Iran, Norway, and Sweden.

Among the AAU presidents are two who suggest just how internationally mobile experienced presidents are and how much they are valued at least in part, it seems, for their experience in countries other than their respective native one. Jean-Lou Chameau, a Frenchman and Stanford alumnus, resigned the presidency of Cal Tech in order to lead King Abdullah University of Science & Technology in Saudi Arabia. And when Subra Suresh, a native of India, resigned the presidency of Carnegie Mellon University to accept appointment as president of Nanyang Technological University in Singapore, he was replaced on an interim basis by Provost Farnam Jahanian, who immigrated from Iran.

A second example of the globalization of university leadership can be observed in the *Times Higher Education (THE)* World University Rankings for 2017 for non-American institutions (25) among the 50 highest-ranked institutions, and noting the international education and employment paths of their respective heads:

- Australian National University: born in the United States and earned degrees from the University of Arizona and Harvard University.
- École Polytechnique de Lausanne: Master's from Stanford University and on faculties of Columbia University and the University of California (UC), Berkeley.
- Hong Kong University of Science: Hong Kong-born, earned degrees from CalTech and Stanford University, and on faculty of CalTech, Yale University, and the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA).
- Imperial College London: American-born, left presidency of Lehigh University
- Karolinska Institute: Norwegian-born and educated.
- London School of Economics: Egyptian-born,

American undergraduate, Oxford University doctorate.
- Oxford University: Irish-born with graduate degrees from UCLA and Harvard University.
- University of British Columbia: on faculty at Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Emory University, University College London (UCL), and president, University of Cincinnati.
- University of Edinburgh: German-born and worked at the University of Texas and Xerox PARC
- University of Hong Kong: British-born and scheduled to become vice-chancellor of the University of Aberdeen in 2018.
- University of Illinois: Wales-born, educated at UCL and on faculty at the University of Colorado, Boulder and the University of Michigan.
- University of Melbourne: postgraduate work at UC Berkeley and Harvard University.

A second example of the globalization of university leadership can be observed in the *Times Higher Education (THE)* World University Rankings for 2017.

Of the 25 non-American universities' presidents, nearly half (12) have spent extended periods of time being educated in, or employed by, institutions in a country other than their native one. In comparison, of the top 25 American universities in the *THE* Rankings, eight presidents or chancellors are foreign-born (Britain, Canada [two], Cuba, India, Iran, Taiwan, and Venezuela) and four American-born leaders earned degrees from British universities.

Some Conjectures

Samples as small as the two presented here are not a base on which to build an explanation for what appears to be an emerging trend in higher education leadership, especially when the countries, cultures, and educational systems examined are as diverse as these. Nevertheless, some conjectures seem warranted.

A good place to start is with the actual selection of presidents and chancellors. Until recently, most countries' methods for selecting university leaders were either an election by professors (and in some cases, other employees of the institution) or selection by governments. That process began changing in recent years and, today, many presidents are selected by formal councils having varying degrees of connection with governments and consisting of a variety of university stakeholders. The other method builds off of a governing board of persons, usually a combination of representatives from within the university, and other, non-academic persons selected by government. The actual autonomy of such boards varies considerably.

By and large, when the method affords members of the university a preponderant voice, the record is for their choosing an academic, and evidence suggests a preference for a scholar from the country in which the university is located. Familiarity, it seems, does not foster contempt.

Where nonacademics outnumber academics is where it appears there is greater likelihood of a non-native candidate (but still more likely to be an academic) being chosen. This stems from members of the council or board with experience outside academia, especially business and finance, where globalization long ago became a practical reality. A candidate who offers qualifications that include active involvement internationally, including study or academic appointment and success in another country's university, is less of an anomaly to someone whose daily activities include interacting with people around the world and across time zones.

As the role of nonacademics appears to be increasing parallel to national governments granting more autonomy to universities, including their governance by "citizen" boards, we may presume that presidents from other countries are more likely to be strongly considered as candidates. Hence, the nascent trend observed here may well continue and grow.

A second factor promoting the selection of non-native university presidents is that it is part of the even larger growth of international higher education. Estimates of students studying abroad worldwide range from 3.7 to nearly 5 million annually. Year-over-year growth is 10–12 percent. Data on faculty foreign exchanges from 2014–2015 and 2015–2016 reveal an increase worldwide of more than 7 percent, a continuation of several years during which for all but one year the numbers of professors opting to spend a sustained period of time abroad have increased. More than 300 universities operate campuses abroad where a foreign education provider offers under its own name an entire degree program on-site.

A third conjecture leans on the anecdote of the sort of person who has the courage and initiative to leave one's homeland, family, and friends for another country, culture, and language in order to pursue an education. Such a person is likely to possess the ambition and drive to excel in new surroundings, including that of the university s/he attends; sometimes joins as professor, department chair, dean, provost; and, yes, is selected president. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10211

International Branch Campuses: Can They Be Research Universities?

Agustian Sutrisno

Agustian Sutrisno is a lecturer at Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia in Jakarta and a Fulbright Visiting Scholar at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: agustian.sutrisno@gmail.com.

Many international branch campuses (IBCs) are established by research-intensive universities in their home countries, such as Monash University Malaysia and NYU Abu Dhabi. There are also cases when a partnership needs to be formed between foreign and local universities; Xi'an Jiaotong–Liverpool University in Suzhou is an example of an IBC whose "parent" universities are both classified as research universities. However, these IBCs are not usually seen as research-intensive universities. IBCs are often considered teaching institutions without adequate capacity to undertake in-depth research.

Factors Inhibiting Research at IBCs

Many factors contribute to a lack of research focus among IBCs. The initial motivation to establish branch campuses is often profit generation. British and Australian universities, two top IBC exporting countries, faced continuous funding cuts from their governments and had to be entrepreneurial in looking for additional sources of funding, consequently establishing IBCs in emerging Asian and Middle Eastern countries. Intensive research, which demands substantial funding, is thus rarely the priority.

Support from local host governments can be difficult as they see IBCs as "foreign" entities. These host governments allow the establishment of IBCs mainly to absorb unmet demand for higher education at the undergraduate level. Postgraduate courses are on offer chiefly to increase professional skills—thus coursework programs, rather than research programs, are on offer in most IBCs.

With regard to the academics involved in the IBC operations, many involve fly-in, fly-out lecturers from the home countries who spend short periods at the IBCs delivering intensive courses, without real opportunities to conduct research. If they are engaged in any research during their stay, it most likely takes the form of short-term data collection. The bulk of the research work is completed back in the home country universities. Their publications are associated with the home country universities.

As the number of IBCs continues to increase, some are becoming more permanent features of the local higher education scene, notably in Malaysia. It is natural to think that these campuses will begin to have the capacity and aspirations to do research. The recruitment of academic staff will be for longer terms and fewer fly-in, fly-out lecturers from the home country universities will be involved. The new faculty will have better opportunities to do research locally. Some IBCs also have some access to local host government research grants. Recently, Chinese and Malaysian governments, main host countries for IBCs, have voiced their aspirations to make these campuses more research focused. While the possibility to be more research focused is starting to emerge, will these IBCs in the long run become research universities?

Etzkowitz's "Triple-Helix" model seeks to clarify how entrepreneurial research universities function. The model requires three key elements working in unison: government support, research-oriented human resources in universities, and partnering industries. When applying this model to analyze IBCs, the partnership with industries is perhaps a key problem in turning IBCs into research universities. This of course is not an exclusive problem of the IBCs. National flagship universities throughout emerging economies face the same issue. The establishment of IBCs in industrial parks or special economic zones does not guarantee close relationship with industry despite the geographical proximity. Many of these special zones house multinational companies whose research and development departments are located on the opposite side of the globe. They do not need basic scientific research to be carried out locally. Therefore, although local governments can contribute with substantial funding to bring research universities and IBCs to their shores, as exhibited by some of the wealthy Gulf countries, funding alone may not be sufficient to instigate university–industry partnerships—a key factor that supports the operation of research universities in many developed countries.

These host governments allow the establishment of IBCs mainly to absorb unmet demand for higher education at the undergraduate level.

Possible Scenarios

With such a predicament, is it then correct to assume that it is impossible to turn IBCs into research universities? It is perhaps too early to say whether IBCs will remain in their present state as teaching institutions. Three possible scenarios may change their outlook in the future. First, host government policies on IBCs have always changed according to national interests. Governments are becoming more aware of the fact that allowing IBCs to function as mere teaching institutions does not serve their interests if they aspire to be industrialized nations with knowledge-based economies. Host governments may mandate IBCs to undertake more research to support their economic and industrial needs. While giving mandates does not necessarily make IBCs function as research institutions, the persistent ones will try to adhere to these mandates to maintain their presence. Otherwise, they may have to abandon their investments in terms of building infrastructure in the country, and also suffer reputational damage.

Second, demands and opportunities from industries (both local and multinational) to conduct applied research may speed up the transformation of IBCs. For example, some local industries in China are emerging as global players with sufficient funding to set aside for research and development. The establishment of IBCs that are specifically aimed at conducting research and technology transfer—such as Guangdong Technion Israel Institute of Technology and Shenzhen Moscow State University–Beijing Institute of Technology (MSU–BIT) University—attests to the attractive university–industry partnership opportunities made available by local high-tech industries and entrepreneurship ecosystems. IBCs can draw on their "parent" universities' research strengths and on local or multinational industries' technology transfer needs to do more research in the host countries.

Third, when demand for research qualifications increases, IBCs will start offering research programs and become research focused. Countries such as Malaysia and China, which are now undergoing a massification of their higher education, may soon enter a period where the main demand for tertiary education systems lies in research qualifications. Due to massification, local national universities are becoming very adept at providing teaching programs, but may not be adequately prepared to offer research programs yet. Coupled with their governments' ambition to become knowledge-based economies, students will more likely access IBCs to obtain research qualifications. More empirical research is of course needed to ascertain how these scenarios are currently being played out in the real world.

Changes are possible for IBCs in developing countries, but transforming them into flagship research universities may not happen in the near future, if at all. However, there are niche areas of applied and technology transfer research that they will be able to fill in sufficiently to be perceived as research universities by their communities. This will occur in a way that is particular to the context of the IBCs, distinct from their "parent" universities. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10212

Internationalization of Universities: The German Way

Marijke Wahlers

Marijke Wahlers is head of the International Department, German Rectors' Conference, Germany. E-mail: wahlers@hrk.de.

The concept of internationalization at German universities, which has regained considerable strength since the late 1980s, has historically been based on the idea of cooperation and partnership, thanks to the post-1945 belief that only a Germany that was firmly anchored in Europe and the world could be internationally accepted and economically successful. There has been, therefore, a tradition of political support for the exchange of students and researchers embedded in international university partnerships based on an equal footing and on trust. In the 1990s, numerous binational initiatives, such as the Franco–German University and the Sino–German College for Graduate Studies, exemplified this idea of trust-based cooperation for the purpose of promoting cultural exchange and understanding between people. This cooperative approach to internationalization has since received further vital impetus from the education programs of the European Union, which require the full integration of student mobility into regular study programs.

More recently, growing competition within the German system, coupled with the effects of globalization, have resulted in the emergence of a more competitive approach. Interestingly, it was again the European dimension which provided crucial impetus here, especially the goal defined by European education ministers in 1998 of creating a competitive and internationally attractive European Higher Education Area aiming to gain a sizeable share in an expanding worldwide market of globally mobile students and researchers. It is worth noting that German universities approached the standard rhetoric of the "horse race for talent" with a degree of hesitation. The idea of self-promotion was rather foreign to them for several reasons. First, both rela-

tively open university access and the long-held assumption that the country's universities were homogenous in terms of quality meant that there was virtually no experience, nationally, of marketing to attract students. Second, it was simply assumed that the good quality of research and teaching at German institutions was already well known and that these brand credentials were enough on the international higher education market.

Different Rationales for Attracting International Students

Similarly, the cooperative and competitive approaches have coexisted for many years with regard to attracting international students, although these approaches have been distinct and unconnected. The more cooperative rationale is easily gleaned from Germany's tradition of offering tuition-free university education. Within this context, a growing number of international students have been studying at German universities, either taking courses as part of degrees awarded by their home institutions or for a full German degree. For students from developing and threshold countries, financial assistance has often been linked to a requirement to return to their home countries promptly after completing their studies in order to counter the brain drain effect. Providing an education to a large number of international students at the cost of German taxpayers is regarded as Germany's contribution to international exchange and global development. No less importantly, the international alumni of German institutions are valued as important ambassadors and worldwide partners for Germany.

We may observe the more competitive rationale with nationwide initiatives such as GATE–Germany, through which German universities have gradually come to terms with, and built competence in, international marketing. Universities have increasingly taken part in international education fairs and similar initiatives; some institutions have even established representative offices abroad for the purpose of attracting excellent students and early career researchers. This approach is supported not only by government, but also by industry, which views universities—sometimes, regrettably, with a rather one-dimensional perspective—as "magnets" for academically qualified individuals from abroad.

These parallel approaches have resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of international students in Germany over the past two decades—from 158,000 in 1997 to approximately 358,000 in 2017 (about 12 percent of all students). It should also be noted that the international student body is extremely heterogeneous. As in most host countries, China is by far the largest country of origin. Nevertheless, Chinese students only make up around 13 percent of the total international student body in Germany—contrasting with 30 percent in Australia, 32 percent in the United States, and 37 percent in the United Kingdom. Preparatory language and content courses and ongoing support and advice for this heterogeneous international student body pose significant challenges to German universities that are more than just financial. At the same time, international students offer considerable potential to Germany as a place of study and research. This valuable contribution, for example helping achieve a truly "international classroom," is being increasingly recognized and utilized by universities.

Where Do We Go from Here?

With few exceptions, the substantial increase in the number of international students has occurred without universities being able to demand financial contributions or cost-covering tuition fees from this group. Not surprisingly, this has caused some astonishment around the globe, with international partners wondering whether their German colleagues were simply naïve and good-natured or, in fact, remarkably astute.

The concept of internationalization at German universities, which has regained considerable strength since the late 1980s, has historically been based on the idea of cooperation and partnership.

The question arises as to whether, and how, the two sometimes contradictory rationales described here can, in the future, be harmonized. Like other European countries, Germany could follow the example of leading host nations and demand substantial fees from international students to cover the costs of their education. The argument that German taxpayers should not be expected to pay for international students is an understandable one. Yet, the example of the introduction of fees for international students from countries outside the European Union by the state of Baden–Württemberg (starting from this current winter semester) illustrates that an all too simple cost–benefit analysis is generally inadequate in a state-dominated system like in Germany. In this case, it is already clear that the universities will not benefit from the additional income: while they must handle the additional administrative workload, universities will be required to pass 80 percent of the revenue to the federal state.

So, there is much to be said in favor of an alternative op-

tion: in the global competitive market, Germany can further enhance its profile by consistently pursuing its partnership-based approach. This would mean that the country deliberately sets itself apart from the mainstream of recruiting international students to cover deficits in university budgets. There is plenty of evidence that not only universities, but also the economy and society, reap long-term benefits. German universities are therefore doing well to further internationalize their structures and offer attractive conditions to students, researchers, and experts from all over the world. Attractiveness not only depends on the legal framework for studying, research, and employment, but also on the establishment of a cosmopolitan culture within universities and beyond. The argument does not extend, however, to posit that students—including international students—should be exempt from making a financial contribution to the costs of their degree. For a long time, the German Rectors' Conference has expressed its support for the introduction of moderate, socially supported tuition fees for all students.

It remains to be seen how the situation will evolve further. The newly elected state government in North Rhine–Westphalia, Germany's most populous state, has announced its intention to introduce tuition fees for students from countries outside the European Union. It is not yet clear exactly how this will work, whether other federal states will follow suit, or what impact this will have on the higher education sector's internationalization efforts. But what is already clear is that universities will only be able to pursue a clear internationalization strategy if they are given greater scope for autonomous decision-making in international matters—from admissions and staff recruitment to resource allocation. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10213

Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses

Lucia Brajkovic and Robin Matross Helms

Lucia Brajkovic is senior research specialist, and Robin Matross Helms is director for internationalization and global engagement, American Council on Education. E-mails: lbrajkovic@acenet.edu and rmhelms@acenet.edu.

A signature research project of the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), the *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* study, assesses every five years the current state of internationalization at American colleges and universities, analyzes progress and trends over time, and identifies future priorities. The 2016 *Mapping* survey—like the three previous iterations—addressed the six key areas that comprise the CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization: articulated commitment; administrative structures and staffing; curriculum, cocurriculum, and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; and collaboration and partnerships. This article is based on a longer report, which is available at www.acenet.edu/mapping.

Key findings from the 2016 *Mapping* Survey

As in 2011 and previous iterations of the study, the final picture painted by the 2016 *Mapping* data is of a complex landscape—promising gains in many areas, slower (or negligible) progress in others, and some noteworthy shifts in broader trends and priorities. The past five years have generally seen greater institutional support for internationalization, in terms of both administrative structures and staffing, and financial resources. Articulated commitment to internationalization in mission statements and strategic plans is more prevalent, and is increasingly supported by specific policies and programming that operationalize broad ideals. Two-year institutions, in particular, have seen notable progress in a number of areas, whereas doctoral institutions seem to have plateaued in certain aspects of internationalization.

While the data in the individual pillars of the CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization are for the most part encouraging, a comparison of overall percentages across categories indicates that for many institutions, internationalization efforts are still focused first and foremost on the external; student mobility in both directions and international partnerships are identified as top priorities for internationalization. On-campus internationalization efforts, in contrast, are seen as relatively less important; internationalization of the curriculum/cocurriculum and faculty professional development rank number four and number five, respectively, in terms of overall priorities for internationalization. Though 2016 saw progress in terms of student learning outcomes and academic requirements, still only about half of institutions reported active efforts toward curriculum internationalization. When it comes to faculty policies and support, progress over time has been markedly slower than in many other areas, and recognition of faculty contributions to internationalization is a concern going forward.

This external orientation for internationalization efforts is ultimately problematic in that it neglects the core of the academic enterprise. At its heart, higher education is about student learning, and for the majority of US students

who are not internationally mobile—as well as international students coming to US institutions from around the world—that means the on-campus curriculum and cocurriculum. As the primary drivers of teaching and research, faculty are the lynchpins of student learning; in order for students to achieve global learning goals, faculty must be globally competent themselves, able to convey their international experience and expertise in the classroom, well prepared to engage effectively with international students, and actively committed to the internationalization endeavor.

It is not an accident that "curriculum, cocurriculum, and student learning outcomes," and "faculty policies and practices" are the two center pillars of the CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization. Their position is indicative of their importance; attention to these areas is critical in order for internationalization to fully take hold throughout colleges and universities, rather than remaining a peripheral activity. As core activities, they are arguably the hardest to change; going forward, however, they require increased effort and resources as institutions strive for deeper, more comprehensive campus internationalization.

The past five years have generally seen greater institutional support for internationalization, in terms of both administrative structures and staffing, and financial resources.

The Future of Internationalization in the United States

When looking toward the future of internationalization, it is impossible to ignore US political developments in early 2017. The *Mapping* survey closed in December 2016, following the election of President Donald Trump, but prior to his inauguration. As of the writing of this article, the Trump administration has issued a series of executive orders and policy statements related to immigration and foreign relations that will likely impact, perhaps dramatically, student mobility—the aspect of internationalization delineated clearly by the data as the top priority for US colleges and universities.

In a letter to the secretary of the Department of Homeland Security sent by ACE and 46 other US higher education associations in response to the January 2017 executive order titled "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States," ACE's president, Molly Corbett Broad, stated, "We fear the chilling effect this will have on the ability of international students and scholars to continue to see the United States as a welcoming place for study and research." This "chilling effect" was also a central component of the court arguments that ultimately stayed the initial executive order.

While anecdotal reports from US campuses, as well as sources abroad, indicate that the current political environment is indeed factoring into international students' decisions about where to study, the long-term effect on student mobility numbers—and broader internationalization efforts—is difficult to predict. Responses will undoubtedly vary by institution and sector.

At a recent meeting of the current cohort of ACE's Internationalization Laboratory, an 18-month program that guides institutions through a strategic planning process for internationalization, some participants described the overall climate for internationalization as "demoralizing"; others, however, characterized it as "energizing"—a time to refocus and push forward. In light of new policy hurdles and a charged political climate, some colleges and universities may indeed turn away from internationalization activities. For others, though, momentum will continue, perhaps with different activities and emphases coming to the fore.

Rather than relying on direct recruitment of international students, for example, some institutions might seek to strengthen relationships with international partners as a means to facilitate student mobility. Others may develop new academic programming for overseas student populations, or enhance their capacity for virtual teaching and research collaborations. And some institutions may turn their internationalization focus inward, with increased attention and resources devoted to on-campus curricular, cocurricular, and faculty development initiatives—exactly what is needed, as noted previously, to advance progress toward comprehensive internationalization in ways that an exclusively external orientation will not allow.

Whatever happens in terms of politics and policy, the overall lesson from the Mapping study will likely endure: there are always challenges to internationalization, but there are always opportunities as well. Only time—and the 2021 *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* survey—will tell what impact the current political discourse will have, and how the internationalization journey will play out on American college and university campuses in the coming years. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10214

Increasing International Students' Tuition Fees: The Two Sides of the Coin

Daniel Sanchez-Serra and Gabriele Marconi

Daniel Sanchez-Serra and Gabriele Marconi are analysts at the Directorate for Education and Skills, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The opinions expressed and arguments employed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the OECD or its member countries. E-mails: daniel.sanchezserra@oecd.org and gabriele.marconi@oecd.org.

The existence and level of tuition fees are among the most hotly debated issues in current higher education policy discussions. At least ten OECD countries have implemented reforms in this area since 2010. However, striking the right balance is not easy. On the one hand, higher tuition fees contribute to better funded tertiary education systems, especially in times of tight public budgets. On the other hand, higher fees can put a burden on families whose children enroll in tertiary education, especially those with limited financial means.

In many countries, however, international students are regarded as a group for which higher tuition fees are less politically controversial. Indeed, in about half of the OECD countries, public educational institutions charge different tuition fees for national and foreign students enrolled in the same programs. In Australia, Austria, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States, foreign students pay on average twice or more the tuition fees paid by national students, while in Denmark and Sweden, tuition fees are charged exclusively to foreign students who come from outside the European Economic Area (EEA). In absolute levels, the difference in tuition fees between national and foreign students can be very large: in all the aforementioned countries (except Austria), this difference exceeds US$8,000 per year.

For some countries, the difference in tuition fees depends on geopolitical factors that do not coincide exactly with the distinction between "national" and "foreign." For example, in the United States, national students usually pay the same tuition fees as foreign students if they study in public universities outside of their state of residence. For private universities, there is typically no difference in tuition rates. Alternately, students from the EEA can study in any other country within this area, paying the same tuition fees as national students.

Recent international experiences in tuition fee reforms can inspire other countries looking for evidence. For example, in the last 15 years, Denmark, New Zealand, Sweden and, very recently, Finland, have introduced or modified substantially the tuition fees charged by public institutions to some of their foreign students. Evidence from these reforms (discussed below) shows that foreign students are less willing to select a host country with high tuition fees. However, a substantial number of foreign students continue to enroll, presumably attracted by the perceived quality of education, labour market prospects, or life circumstances in the host countries. These foreign students, who enroll despite the higher tuition fees, can bring substantial economic gains to the host higher education systems.

In many countries, however, international students are regarded as a group for which higher tuition fees are less politically controversial.

The Financial Contribution of Foreign Students

The main considerations behind reforms in foreign students' tuition fees are financial. The contribution that foreign students make to the funding of national education systems can be approximated by multiplying their numbers at the bachelor's and master's (or equivalent) levels by the average tuition fees they pay. This figure is then divided by the total expenditure on public and private institutions at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral (or equivalent) levels, excluding research and development. In 2013, this ratio, which gives an idea of foreign students' role in funding a higher education system, ranged from more than 25 percent in Australia and New Zealand to 1 percent in Austria and Sweden.

The large streams of revenue from foreign students' fees that are observed in Australia and New Zealand are due both to the high numbers of fee-paying foreign students and to the comparatively high tuition fees they pay (which exceed US$14,000 in both countries). In contrast, the tuition fees paid by foreign students in Austria are relatively low (about US$11,700 per student per year, on average); in Sweden, the share of foreign students paying higher fees in 2013 was still relatively low (students enrolled before the reform of 2011–2012 do not pay tuition fees).

How Do Foreign Students Respond?

In the period from 2004 to 2014, three OECD countries

have implemented reforms aimed at changing tuition fees for international students. Evidence from national reforms implemented in Denmark, New Zealand, and Sweden shows that tuition fees and the number of new international entrants are strongly related.

In 2006, New Zealand introduced a policy that aimed to attract international students to join PhD programs by subsidizing their tuition fees, similarly to national students. Attraction and retention of international students were also promoted by granting them and their partners some rights to work in the country. This policy proved effective the same year of its implementation, as the number of new international entrants to PhD programs more than doubled in 2006 and continued growing steadily from 2007 onward.

On the other hand, Denmark (in 2006) and Sweden (in 2011) introduced tuition fees for foreign students in short-cycle tertiary programs (bachelor's, master's, or equivalent degree programs). While national students and students from the EEA did not have to pay tuition fees, new entrants from outside the EEA had to pay over US$11,000 in Denmark and over US$13,000 in Sweden. The year in which the reform became effective saw the number of national and EEA students increase in both countries, while the number of international students fell by 20 percent in Denmark and, even more dramatically, by 80 percent in Sweden.

Higher Tuition Fees for Foreign Students: All Good?

Available data shows that foreign students can be made to fund a substantial amount of a tertiary education system's expenditure. They have been called the "cash cows" of tertiary education, in this publication and in other authoritative sources. This has motivated many governments to charge foreign students higher fees than national students.

However, international students can afford to be selective: they are willing to move and have many options. Available evidence shows that the number of international students coming to a country can decline dramatically following an increase in tuition fees.

A reduction in the number of international students can potentially harm a tertiary education system, as international students do not only bring their financial contribution, but also a diversity of perspectives and cultures that improves the educational experience of all students. Discrimination by nationality can also harm the student experience by creating divides between students.

Perhaps because of these reasons, a few months ago, both national and international students in Belgium enrolled at the Free University of Brussels and the Catholic University of Leuven protested strongly to oppose plans to increase tuition fees for international students—and these protests were successful. Charging tuition fees to foreign students can be a tool to boost the funding of tertiary education, but governments must keep in mind that this tool is, essentially, a double-edged sword. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10215

"One Belt One Road" and Central Asia: A New Trend in Internationalization of Higher Education?

Aisi Li

Aisi Li is assistant professor at the Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan. E-mail: li.aisi@nu.edu.kz.

In his speech at Nazarbayev University, Astana, in 2013, the Chinese president Xi Jinping proposed the "Silk Road Economic Belt." The proposal, together with the "Maritime Silk Road" venture, has evolved to become the "One Belt One Road" (OBOR) strategy. The Belt covers a vast area along the ancient Silk Road, stretching from China to Europe through Central Asia. Critics see this strategy as the latest projection of China's economic ambitions in the world and another form of its soft power policy. The five Central Asian Republics, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, responded to OBOR differently. Kazakhstan's *Nurly Zhol* (Lighted Path) initiative directly tied into OBOR, reflecting the country's ambition to be more than a transit zone between China and Europe. Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan are cautious about Chinese labor force expansion, and have therefore restricted the number of Chinese employees that can be hired for projects in their countries. In higher education, OBOR has made a real impact on Central Asia. Four years on, several questions have arisen regarding the strategy's implications for higher education in China and Central Asia.

China's Investment in Scholarships

OBOR's emphasis on fostering relations has inevitably led to connecting the region through education. In his speech, Xi announced a 10-year plan to provide 30,000 scholarships to students from the member countries of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) to study at Chinese universities, and to invite 10,000 teachers and students from the region's Confucius Institutes to participate in training programs in China. Since four out of eight SCO members are Central Asian Republics, such a generous proposal has

led to speculation that China is leveraging higher education as a means to influence Central Asia.

In fact, China has been providing scholarships for students from Central Asia since the republics became independent in the early 1990s. The scholarships range from government scholarships at various levels to institutional scholarships, the funding of Confucius Institutes, as well as full or partial scholarships provided by private entities. These scholarships often reflect China's national policy orientation. For example, with OBOR being a current focus, the numbers of scholarships for Central Asian students are on the rise, as reflected in the increased number allocated to SCO member countries.

In 2013, more than 20,000 students from Central Asia studied in China, of whom approximately 2,200 were recipients of Chinese government scholarships. The latest figures released by China's ministry of education reveal that Kazakhstan is among the top ten countries receiving Chinese government scholarships, particularly under OBOR's policy support.

China's initiatives to attract Central Asian students come as no surprise. Higher education has been an approach of China's cultural diplomacy to win hearts and minds around the world. At the practical level, a productive and sustainable relationship between China and Central Asia needs to be supported by well-trained professionals. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Russia remains the first choice of Central Asian students when it comes to study abroad. Historically, Central Asian elites are educated in Russia and they keep strong cultural and political ties with Russia. Whether the increasing number of Central Asian students in China would shift this connection remains a question.

The Confucius Institute

The Confucius Institute is another important institution that facilitates higher education exchanges between Central Asia and China through language training as well as awarding "Confucius Institute Scholarships" to students, scholars, and Chinese language teachers of other countries to study in selected universities in China.

It has been long argued that, apart from raising awareness of Chinese language and Chinese culture, the Confucius Institute is also a vital component of China's soft power policy. Xi's speech on allocating scholarships to students and teachers from the Confucius Institute in the region precisely captures this role.

Currently, there are 12 Confucius Institutes in Central Asia, excluding Turkmenistan. They are considered as an important facilitator of OBOR. Compared with Confucius Institutes in Europe and North America, those in Central Asia have experienced a shortage of teachers, and a lack of textbooks in the national languages of Central Asian Republics.

Until today, Russian remains the common language in Central Asia, reflecting Russia's extensive and deep influence. The rise of the Chinese language, supported by the Chinese government, may be seen as a competitor to Russia's cultural influence in the region.

Internationalization at China's Frontier

A less visible consequence of these frequent exchanges is their impact on the internationalization of higher education in Xinjiang, China's northwestern frontier. Geographical proximity has been a reason why Central Asian students favor Xinjiang as a destination. In addition, well-developed infrastructure, low costs of living and tuition, and the increasing quality of programs are making Xinjiang an ideal destination. Policy support has also contributed to the increase of student enrollments from Central Asia. Since 2008, 100 Chinese government scholarships have been specifically allocated to Xinjiang annually to attract international students, focusing on students from Central Asia. This inclination is explicitly stated in the Mid- and Long-Term Educational Reform and Development Plan of Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region 2010–2020. By the end of 2013, there were almost 7,000 international students studying in Xinjiang, an increase of nearly three times compared with 2010. In 2014, almost 80 percent of international students in Xinjiang were from Central Asia.

OBOR's emphasis on fostering relations has inevitably led to connecting the region through education.

Xinjiang also plays an important role in the growth of the Confucius Institute in Central Asia. Among the 12 Confucius Institutes there, seven are partnered with Xinjiang universities. In Kyrgyzstan, all four Confucius Institutes have Xinjiang partners. The partnerships echo the priorities of developing western China through higher education cooperation with Central Asia, and Xinjiang has a unique role within this national policy.

Xinjiang may be in a disadvantageous position in recruiting students domestically. However, it presents a regional advantage in recruiting students from neighboring countries. At the national policy level, these advantages are expected to assist higher education development on China's frontier.

Where Is This Leading?

Three issues can be observed from OBOR's impact on higher education relations between Central Asia and China. First, education sector developments follow China's cultural diplomacy discourse, emphasizing building people-to-people relationships through education. However, it is still uncertain whether China's educational investment will contribute to the economic transformation of Central Asia, e.g., help the region move from dependency on extractive industry to a diversified economy. Second, China's frontier regions appear to be "quiet achievers" in internationalization of higher education under OBOR, and further development can be expected in Xinjiang. Third and most importantly, China's growing presence in Central Asia's education sphere may challenge Russia's dominant role in the region. There is much research regarding the competition between China and Russia for economic and political influence, but little is known about the competition in the educational sphere and its implications for the economic, political, and cultural transformation of Central Asia. ■

DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10216

Training Administrative Staff to Become Key Players in the Internationalization of Higher Education

Fiona Hunter

Fiona Hunter is associate director, Centre for Higher Education Internationalization, Università del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy. E-mail: fionajanehunter@gmail.com.

As definitions of internationalization have evolved over the last 25 years or so, they have typically excluded—or made only scant reference to—the administrative function. However, in the more recent definitions that advocate a comprehensive approach, there is increasingly evident reference made to support functions in the university context, and yet the role of administrative staff is rarely discussed. To a large extent, this trend is reflected also in the practice of internationalization, where, although administrative staff have always been involved, the focus has been placed principally on academic activities and hence on students and teachers.

While they have often been left in the background, at times invisible actors, administrative staff have nevertheless been expected to adapt to the changing institutional needs and provide the requisite levels of service, with or without the appropriate training. A current Erasmus+ project, Systematic University Change toward Internationalization (SUCTI), seeks to play a part in addressing this oversight by recognizing the fundamental role these staff play, and by enabling them to become active participants in the internationalization processes at their institutions through the provision of dedicated training.

In order to better understand their needs and the context in which they operate, the SUCTI team undertook a two-part survey, which included a questionnaire to international directors at universities in the European Higher Education Area and interviews with a range of administrative staff (from junior to senior levels) in the six universities that make up the project consortium. A number of key findings emerged that will inform the development of the training provision to be delivered within the project, but they also have broader implications for the management of internationalization.

Building Commitment

As is to be expected, universities surveyed declare internationalization to be increasingly important or even essential to their development, and the majority note that a strategic plan is in place. Naturally, these strategies come in a range of forms and degrees of effectiveness, and having a strategic plan does not always mean that it is reflected in institutional policies and everyday practices. The study revealed that where there is a comprehensive approach to internationalization, it is more likely that the institution is also seeking to build a shared understanding of, and sense of commitment to, internationalization. On the other hand, weaker processes tend to divide the administrative community into two groups—those who are committed and convinced versus those who feel distant and disengaged from internationalization, may have limited understanding, or resist involvement.

A commitment to internationalization requires a carefully thought-out strategic process that takes into consideration the development of the whole institution. This inevitably implies a long-term change process, and the study highlighted that the more open and future-focused the university is, the more likely it will be willing to engage in organizational change as an essential component of its internationalization strategy.

Shifting Roles

Furthermore, a more comprehensive approach leads inevitably to an increasing volume and scope of international activity and this requires the involvement of a more profes-

sionalized administrative community. Universities that recognize this need shift their traditional understanding of the administrative role to one where these staff play a decisive role in internationalization as equal partners. A shorter-term, more ad hoc approach to internationalization, often succumbing to external pressures rather than planning ahead, leads to frustration, tension, overload, and sense of inadequacy for those at the coalface of delivery.

Indeed, training in internationalization is typically understood as participation in English language courses.

The administrative staff interviewed highlighted that many of the challenges they faced in dealing with international activities lay in institutional structures and practices that were not supportive of the needs of internationalization. The most frequently mentioned were typical organizational challenges: coordination, communication, and excessive bureaucracy. A lack of alignment of goals between central management and the faculties/schools and the absence of an enabling policy framework for internationalization strategies led to tensions and miscommunications between the different administrative units, and also between the administrative and academic communities. Study participants also stressed their own lack of adequate preparation to deal with their new and often rapidly shifting roles.

Three Key Skills

Whatever the stage of development in internationalization or the traditions in strategic management, there was general consensus that the current level of administrative capacity is insufficient to deliver high quality services, and that there is room for improvement everywhere. The study highlighted a broad range of general training provision in the institutions but, typically, very little specific training on internationalization for administrative staff. Where training is provided, it may or may not be linked to the internationalization strategy, is rarely offered in a systematic manner, tailored to specific administrative needs, or formally recognized for career advancement.

Indeed, training in internationalization is typically understood as participation in English language courses, and while this is indeed one of three key skills that emerged from the study as important for administrative staff need to acquire, it is in itself not enough. The study also pointed to the need for staff to be able to communicate in a multicultural environment and to have an understanding of internationalization. Surprisingly (or not), many expressed a lack of knowledge about their own institution's internationalization strategy, highlighting the importance of effective internal communication if people are to feel part of an initiative. Indeed, many staff pointed out that training is not only about gaining appropriate knowledge and skills, but also building team spirit and shared commitment.

Internationalization as a Lever for Change

The study has underlined the SUCTI project's conviction that a strategic approach to internationalization recognizes the value of administrative staff as equal partners and actively builds on their involvement. When training provision is aligned with strategy, it gives administrative staff not only the appropriate skills and competences to support the internationalization plan, but also builds their confidence and commitment to making an active contribution through the development and delivery of high quality services.

It has also underlined the belief that internationalization is also about institutional change and that there needs to be willingness to learn new practices at both individual and institutional levels. The study revealed that there is a greater sense of institutional happiness when internationalization is planned and implemented with care, when decisions are communicated effectively, when appropriate structures and processes are put in place, and when staff are adequately trained to carry out the tasks expected of them. Internationalization exposes and magnifies institutional weaknesses and any university serious about internationalization must also be willing to take an honest and critical look at its traditional modes of operation and undertake the necessary change. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10217

Disparities and Parallels in Internationalization: The Ethiopian Experience

Wondwosen Tamrat and Damtew Teferra

Wondwosen Tamrat is associate professor and founding president of St. Mary's University, Ethiopia. E-mails: preswond@smuc.edu.et.and wondwosentamrat@gmail.com. Damtew Teferra is professor of higher education, leader of Higher Education and Training Development, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, and founding director of the International Network for Higher Education in Africa. E-mails: teferra@ukzn.ac.za and teferra@bc.edu.

Interest and involvement in the internationalization of higher education are unavoidably on the rise across both

the developed and developing worlds. In both contexts, institutions are increasingly enticed to conform to this emerging trend. However, differences abound due to the influence of contextual factors such as prevailing needs, capacity, resources, institutional status, and ambitions. We examine the manners in which internationalization is realized in developed and developing countries by exploring such factors as motives, approaches, policies, strategies, and the nature of institutional relationships in the Ethiopian context. We believe that such an exercise is instrumental to plan and develop frameworks that are relevant to Ethiopian higher education, instead of opting for wholesale adoption from elsewhere.

Higher education in Ethiopia began in 1950 with the establishment of the University College of Addis Ababa. The sector remained elitist in its orientation until the end of the 1990s—with two universities, a student population of about 38,000, and a gross enrollment ratio (GER) of 0.8 percent, which was very low even by African standards. Over the last two decades, the sector has achieved phenomenal growth. The number of public institutions has reached 36—with 11 more projected in the coming few years. There are 110 private institutions—four of which hold university status. The sector accommodates over 700,000 students—85 percent in the public sector—and has a GER of 10 percent. This fast changing landscape has increasingly brought internationalization to the fore as a major mechanism to address the numerous challenges associated with fast "massifying" systems.

Disparities and Parallels

With regard to motives, the engagement of Ethiopian higher education institutions (HEIs) in internationalization has been driven mainly by emerging needs. The aggressive expansion in the sector has raised formidable challenges in terms of qualified staff availability and research output. Currently, PhD staff within the HE sector still stands at 15 percent despite government's plan to raise it to 30 percent by 2019–2020. Research output has also been rather low due to, among other factors, poor research traditions, excessive teaching loads, deficiency in skills—and of course funding constraints.

Ethiopian universities are aware of the importance of internationalization in terms of perceived benefits in improving teaching and learning, student and teacher development, and standards and quality. Their dominant forms of engagement relate primarily to teaching and research collaborations and international research projects. The government further envisages enhancing such collaborations and international exchanges in the interest of advancing the effectiveness of teaching and learning and the quality of academic programs and research.

When internationalizing, universities give the highest importance to PhD and masters programs, in that order. In terms of academic disciplines, engineering and health sciences take the lead. This appears logical, given the serious shortages of highly qualified personnel at these levels and in these disciplines. As a corollary, the dominant rationales identified for Ethiopian HEIs, as in most other African countries, relate more to academic than to economic, political, and/or cultural rationales. Issues of international student recruitment and using internationalization as a source of prestige, which appear to be dominant features of HEIs in the North and are increasingly emerging in developing economies, are not yet the focus of Ethiopian institutions.

Institutions recognize the importance of national policies in shaping institutional policies on internationalization, but, to date, no such policies exist. The lack of a comprehensive policy on internationalization is acknowledged by a recent government document: *The Education Sector Development Program V,* which envisages the preparation and approval of a national policy and institutional collaboration strategy on internationalization in the period 2016–2020. Establishing a national unit or body to promote, monitor, and evaluate the internationalization of Ethiopian higher education, as well as developing and implementing a strategy to attract foreign students, is also included in the plan. However, this has yet to materialize.

Higher education in Ethiopia began in 1950 with the establishment of the University College of Addis Ababa.

The lack of strategic engagement in promoting internationalization is widely discernible across universities. Most of the institutions that have initiated and managed partnerships with foreign institutions have not handled their engagements in an organized and systematic manner, due to lack of resources and clear directions. At the larger universities, initiatives are managed at different levels without being communicated to the higher echelons of the institute or the particular office in charge.

Equally serious is the paucity of data on many aspects of internationalization, further compounded by weak knowledge management systems that impinge on information flows at various levels. Institutions attribute these weaknesses to the excessive burden of mundane but critical issues, such as student accommodations, catering, and leisure, keeping their attention from more strategic tasks.

Most relationships established by Ethiopian universi-

ties are largely North–South rather than South–South, with Europe as the preferred continent for collaborations—distantly followed by North America. These lopsided partnerships are mainly attributed to the disparity in financial resources and capacity. In most cases, local institutions are mere "recipients" and the elements of reciprocity are not evident. There have also been instances of Northern partners seeking to achieve their own objectives without too much regard to the needs and aspirations of their local partners and, at times, their own funders.

The engagement of Ethiopian higher education institutions (HEIs) in internationalization has been driven mainly by emerging needs.

A peculiar and instructive feature of internationalization in Ethiopia is the presence of regulatory regimes and frameworks that are not always available elsewhere, even in developed countries. Academic recognition and equivalence arrangements for foreign qualifications was for a long time a task of the ministry of education (MoE). Any recognition of foreign credentials within the civil service required passing through the ministry's scrutiny. This role, and the additional responsibility of granting accreditation to cross-border higher education providers, have been transferred to the Higher Education Relevance and Quality Agency (HERQA), established in 2003. The agency uses its double mandate to keep dubious credentials and unscrupulous providers at bay.

The Way Forward

The above analysis demonstrates the need to understand global trends, national frameworks, and institutional contexts when navigating the internationalization terrain and setting one's own agenda. While the trend in Ethiopia, in terms of improved awareness and readiness toward internationalization, is upbeat, there is still an urgent need to address existing deficiencies—with regard to issues of policy, strategic direction, systems, and frameworks. Yet, given the multitude of challenges they are constantly confronting, HEIs in Ethiopia, and many others in similar nascent systems elsewhere, will probably continue to struggle with the complexities of internationalization—for many years to come. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10218

Imbalanced Student Mobility in India: A Serious Concern

Rashim Wadhwa

Rashim Wadhwa is an assistant professor at the School of Education, Central University of Kashmir, Srinagar, India. E-mail: nunha84@gmail.com.

During the last decade, education worldwide has experienced massive changes, ranging from domestic market expansion to internationalization. Over time, there has been a great urge for restructuring education systems to make them internationally comparable, ensuring an economic benefit across the globe, including in India. Internationalization is recognized as a priority, in particular in recent education policies. Indian policy makers are confronted with key questions such as how to increase the number of international students in the country and how to export educational services. Within this context, the imbalance between inbound and outbound student mobility has been highlighted, along with some emerging challenges. Currently, more than five million students worldwide are studying outside their country of citizenship, with India sharing a high proportion of outbound mobile students. The number of Indian students abroad has increased from 55,444 in 1999 to about 255,030 in 2016. It is forecasted that 400,000 Indian students will leave the country to enroll in foreign universities by 2024. These growing figures show that India, the second most important sending country after China, has become a leading player on the international student market. Although the major destination countries for Indian students have remained the same for several years, complex changes are underway, as other players are entering the field.

In contrast to the consistent increase in outbound student mobility, the number of international students in India since 1986 has been irregular, and their overall increase discouraging. In 1986, the number of international students in India was 10,877, rising to 13,707 in 1993. After that, numbers started declining and reached an all time low with 5,323 inbound students in 1998. Since then, numbers have increased again, reaching 30,423 in 2014. Inbound international students come from a limited number of countries: most come from developing countries, with only a minor fraction coming from developed countries. About 60 percent of the former category come from South Asian countries, with Nepal topping the list (6,009), followed by Afghanistan (3,855), and Bhutan (1,201). Amongst all the universities in India enrolling international students, Manipal University has the largest number (2,742), followed by the University of Pune.

Inbound vs Outbound Mobility

International students represent only 0.6 percent of the total number of students enrolled in higher education in India, while the corresponding figure is 1.0 percent for China, 3.7 percent for the United States, 19.0 percent for the United Kingdom, and 21.4 percent for Australia. Within this context, the ratio of inbound mobile to outbound mobility in India is 1:10 and represents a major challenge: it is not only human capital that is flowing out of India, but a substantial amount of revenue as well.

Loss of Human Capital and Revenue

Although higher education in India is no less developed than in many other countries, trade related to education services appears to be limited. The total import (payments) under trade in education services increased from US$61 million in 1999–2000 to US$2.6 billion in 2016–2017. It is likely to increase further, given the consistent rise in the number of Indian students going abroad for higher education. In contrast, the total export (payments) under trade in education services is US$504 million in 2016–2017, a clear indication of the imbalance of revenue between inbound and outbound flows.

The number of Indian students studying abroad has increased from 55,444 in 1999 to about 255,030 in 2016.

With respect to the flow of human capital, it is notable that graduates with degrees from prestigious institutions like the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) or the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) who pursued advanced degrees abroad have low rates of returning to India, particularly when compared to similar populations in foreign countries. In fact, Indian nationals are the largest national group obtaining specialized US work visas (H-1B), securing an impressive 59 percent of the global total. Unfortunately, there are few success stories involving young graduates returning to pursue their careers in India.

Serious Concerns, Some Solutions

If India wants to revive its position in the international higher education arena, policy makers should address the following concerns. There is a significant gap between the export and the import of educational services, as a result of the imbalance between outbound and inbound mobility. In order to access the international market for higher education, India has had to resort to exporting educational services through distance education programs, and building educational infrastructure mainly to target students from developing countries. As the cost of higher education in India is lower than that of developed countries, India has a strong comparative advantage in this respect.

In order to enhance inbound student mobility, special education zones should be established. India should focus on developing these zones in different regions with a current concentration of inbound students, or with the potential to attract a significant number of international students. It has been demonstrated that international students in India are drawn to particular cities and institutions: the cities of Pune with 29.30 percent of international students, Delhi, with 20.48 percent, and Manipal, with 12.78 percent, are leading the way. Perhaps it would be a good strategy to reinforce the infrastructure of cities showing potential to develop into centers of excellence in international education.

India should also reduce its outbound student mobility—which corresponds to an import of educational services. Although India has significantly strengthened its capacity in higher education in science and technology, there is a dearth of higher education institutions of good quality in other fields of studies. IITs and IIMs are highly competitive, yet unable to meet the local demand. Limited access to quality education leads to an imbalanced flow between outbound and inbound students. Further, there is a significant quality gap between the second and the third tiers of educational institutions. It is time to restore the quality of higher education institutions if India wants to attract higher numbers of international students. Quality can best be improved through a process of replicating the structure and strategies of leading Indian universities in the context of poorly performing institutions. This ought to begin a chain of improvement, with tier two institutions then supporting tier three institutions in a similar manner. Thus, a sustainable, dynamic, self-sustaining mechanism of quality ought to transform the higher education sector. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10219

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

Better Informing the Market? The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) in British Higher Education

Michael Shattock

Michael Shattock is visiting professor at the Centre for Global Higher Education, Institute of Education, University College London, UK. He leads a research team on the governance of higher education. E-mail: m.shattock@ucl.ac.uk.

A cornerstone of the Tory government's higher education policy has been the belief that the introduction of market forces and greater competition will raise quality. The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is often quoted as a good example of this, although its introduction in the mid-1980s was actually designed as an instrument to strengthen the concentration of British research in fewer universities for primarily academic reasons. A consequence of the continuation of the exercise over some 30 years, and the reputational and financial benefits that accompany success in it, is that REF has made an enormous impact on universities and led to criticism that they have prioritized research over teaching. The introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) has been, in part, a response to this, and an attempt to alter the balance toward a greater concern about teaching. But perhaps a larger influence has been the move to full-cost tuition fees in 2010 and the removal of the cap on student numbers, which has led to much increased competition in student recruitment. This has heightened a sense that the market needs to be better informed about the quality of teaching in individual institutions, especially when universities in England are charging the maximum fee permitted, £ 9,000. (Similar arguments were adduced in the 1990s to justify the creation of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and the bureaucratic overload produced by its review and reporting processes).

The introduction of a TEF first appeared in the Tory Party Manifesto for the 2015 general election and was vigorously pursued by the new minister, Jo Johnson, when he took office. From the beginning, it was clear that this was to be a metrics-based exercise rather than the burdensome (and expensive) QAA approach. A panel of academics, students, and employers (the so-called stakeholders) was set up to put flesh on the bones, and the concept was firmly embedded in the new Higher Education and Research Bill that replaced the Funding Council with an Office for Students and also restructured the research councils. The TEF was only mandatory in England and it was left optional as to whether Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland wished to join. A new incentive was introduced, which only applied in England, in the provision that only institutions that performed well in the TEF would be permitted to raise their tuition fees. In the House of Lords debate on the Bill, there was considerable criticism of the metrics to be employed in the TEF ratings, but negative votes were overridden in the Commons in the eventual passage of the Bill.

A Metrics-Based Approach

Criticism of the metrics has, however, been widespread since the program's inception. The TEF assessments were to grade institutions Gold, Silver, and Bronze—where Bronze recognized provision as being of satisfactory quality only. These grades were based on three metrics and six data sets: the National Student Survey (NSS) (run for the government by Ipsos Mori), which records students' views separately on teaching, assessment, and feedback on their individual degree programs and on the overall academic support provided; the Higher Education Statistics Agency's data on institutional dropout rates; and data on employment after graduation. None of these are flawless. The NSS data is collected from returns by final year students and can be subject to events on campus unconnected with teaching, by the way universities encourage the completion of the forms, or by the recognition that favourable responses will ultimately be reflected in a university's league table position. The rate of return is variable though 50 percent is the qualifying minimum. Dropout statistics are inevitably correlated with social class and economic disadvantage, while the employment statistics, which distinguish between employment only and highly skilled employment, are based on returns by graduates six months after graduation and are notoriously variable in the return rates and the quality of information. Data for each institution is benchmarked against the demographic characteristics of its students, adding a further variable. Bundled together, this is a statistical "mish mash."

Each institution is invited to submit a 15-page report contextualizing the data and describing its teaching aims and objectives. Insofar as these submissions are critical to the assessment, as the chair of the TEF panel has claimed them to be, it can be argued that the TEF is metric led but not metric determined. This statement needs to be reconciled, however, with the published statement that marking was to assign plus or minus flags to each of the six core metric ratings; institutions receiving three or more plus flags and no minus flags qualified for consideration for a Gold assessment, and institutions receiving two or more minus flags qualified for a Bronze. Marks falling between these two qualified for a Silver.

The Results

The results of the first TEF assessment were published in June 2017. This first round was always recognized as a trial year, after which the panel would review the exercise and the criticisms. This has not stopped media headlines about some distinguished Russell Group universities only being awarded Bronze, and a number of post-1992 universities taking out double-page spreads in national newspapers to celebrate their Golds. (In fact, 33 percent of universities received Gold and 82 percent Gold or Silver). The minister has even taken the opportunity to couple the award of a Bronze mark to a Russell Group university with the (high) salary of its vice-chancellor and use it as a basis for criticizing vice-chancellors' salaries in general.

A cornerstone of the Tory government's higher education policy has been the belief that the introduction of market forces and greater competition will raise quality.

The significant questions that the review panel will need to address, apart from the flaky nature of some of the data, include that the TEF does not actually assess teaching but only the imperfectly recorded reactions to it. From the point of view of informing the market, it conveys only an institutional view and not an assessment of the actual degree program (or even the department) in which a candidate wishes to study. The selection of Gold, Silver, and Bronze awards can only be described as crude, populist, and pandering to media exploitation, especially when some of the most selective institutions and some of the most access-orientated may be disadvantaged by the benchmarking methodology. Some possible future refinements are even more questionable: the introduction of metrics based on contact hours or the incorporation of actual graduate salaries after five years to be acquired from the tax authorities.

However unsatisfactory, it seems that the TEF is here to stay—at least while a Tory government is in power—and that it will continue to remain controversial. We can also confidently assume that some of the best minds in institutions will be devoted to "gaming" the data to ensure that their institutions are positioned to protect their brand, and to thrive in the market that has been created, as well as to be able to raise their tuition fee levels when the government gives them leave. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10220

Reenvisioning Welsh Post-compulsory Education

Ellen Hazelkorn

Ellen Hazelkorn is professor emerita and director of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU), and education policy consultant, BH Associates, Ireland. E-mails: ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie and info@bhassociates.eu.

Like most countries and regions around the world, Wales is facing rapid social and economic change. As a nation within the United Kingdom, its future is being shaped as much by its own decisions as by the outcome of the current Brexit negotiations. The decision to leave the European Union, known as Brexit, passed by a slim majority in Wales (52.5 percent to 47.4 percent). Today, there is little indication that attitudes have changed since the referendum, despite ongoing uncertainty about what Brexit will mean in practice.

If the ongoing confusion surrounding the United Kingdom's future relationship with Europe was not enough, Wales faces its own share of demographic, labor market, and economic challenges. By 2039, the Welsh population is projected to increase by 6.1 percent to 3.38 million. Of particular significance, and concern, is the decline in Welsh-domiciled undergraduate entrants studying in Wales, and limited (funded) opportunities to pursue advanced/postgraduate qualifications, in contrast to the number of Welsh-domiciled young people entering further education and vocational training. These education trends compound deeper structural problems in the economy.

Wales is primarily a micro, small, and medium-sized enterprise economy, comprised of low-level manufacturing and large dependency on the public sector. There are few large employers. The city of Cardiff, which is integrated into the UK economy, is an exception. Despite some economic revival since the onset of the Great Recession in 2008, Wales continues to have the lowest economic growth (measured by gross value added or GVA) of any region within the United Kingdom.

The situation presents stark challenges. How best should the educational system be organized to maximize student learning opportunities and quality, as well as research excellence? How best can educational institutions help shape the future of Welsh society and economy? How effective are the current governance arrangements, and what needs to change?

Postcompulsory Education in Wales

Over the years, the Welsh government had identified ongoing challenges for its education system stemming from the

complexity of the postsecondary landscape and governance arrangements, continuous changes to public funding structures, and requirements to broaden its range of the services to meet the needs of citizens and society in the twenty-first century. Different parts of the system had responded in distinct ways to these challenges, resulting in "different arrangements for, different degrees of engagement with, and different levels of effectiveness in the delivery of the key functions." Responsibilities were shared across a mix of Welsh government and Welsh government-sponsored bodies.

A review was commissioned. It involved interviews with key stakeholders across the educational system, with employers, academic staff and students, and different government agencies. A study of international practice was also undertaken, with respect to: regulatory and governance arrangements with reference to the role of intermediary organisations; the postsecondary landscape and issues of mission and educational diversity and differentiation; and mechanisms of coordination, including performance agreements, compacts, and profiling.

Wales is primarily a micro, small, and medium-sized enterprise economy, comprised of low-level manufacturing and large dependency on the public sector.

The review found that to make Wales more attractive to postsecondary students, graduates and other professionals, as well as to businesses, more attention would need to be placed on developing a strong middle tier of Welsh-domiciled companies, based around closer linkages between economic needs and educational institutions. To underpin these objectives, forward planning and system coordination was necessary. This meant having a macroview of demographic and geographic patterns as well as social, economic, and labor market changes, within the context of a competitive national and global perspective, and with a centralized capacity and capability to nudge or steer institutions to actually meet those needs.

Recommendations

Towards 2030: A Framework for Building a World-Class Post-Compulsory Education System for Wales set out an ambitious pathway. It proposed a new governance model for postcompulsory education based on more effective coordination among public institutions and with Welsh societal goals in mind.

Six key principles underpinned the case for reform and recommendations. These included taking a system view, emphasizing the importance of creating a coherent educational ecosystem comprised of competitive and diverse institutions, which worked collaboratively and responsibly to build excellence and critical mass. As people live longer and healthier, democratic society depends upon active, engaged, responsible citizens who are able to access education throughout their lifetime. Thus, a strong message was the role and contribution that education makes to society and the economy through its graduates, new knowledge, and innovation. These are concepts often spoken about but too often overshadowed by institutional self-interest and reputation seeking. Thus, the report stressed the importance of putting the needs of learners of all ages, genders, and talents at the center of the educational system, enabling and facilitating changing opportunities and life circumstances over time. While emphasizing the importance of "system" and "society," institutional autonomy, strengthened by institutional governance, responsibility, and accountability, was also fundamental.

The main recommendation was the proposal to establish a single regulatory, oversight, and coordinating authority to be called the *Tertiary Education Authority*. This organization would replace the myriad organizations catering for different components of postcompulsory education. The aim is to encourage better long-term and joined-up thinking about educational needs and requirements, now and into the future.

Response and Subsequent Actions

After the review was submitted in March 2016, the Welsh government moved quickly to accept and implement the key recommendations. The report was discussed in the Welsh Assembly, the parliamentary chamber of Wales, and widely endorsed by all political parties. A wide-ranging consultation process was initiated.

In January 2017, a new single regulatory, oversight, and coordinating authority for postcompulsory education was announced. It would have responsibility for the provision of funding for all levels of postcompulsory education, for research, and for ensuring quality. To be known as the Tertiary Education and Research Commission, the new agency is tasked with bringing stronger coherence to the education system, with learners and society at its heart.

Towards 2030 makes a significant contribution to envisaging education and its role in and for society in the twenty-first century. It places strong emphasis on anchoring and underpinning regional, social, cultural, and economic development, and on institutional collaboration to boost institutional and national capacity, capability, and competi-

tiveness. Above all, it stresses the need for flexible learning pathways that enable all students, from all backgrounds and ages, to move through the educational system throughout their lifetimes. Accepting that educational providers, public and private, are part of a "coordinated system," rather than individualistic self-serving institutions, is in itself an important statement. Finally, by its swift endorsement of the report's principles and recommendations, the Welsh government conspicuously diverged from the market–demand driven approach adopted by the UK government for England. ■

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10221

English-medium Instruction and the Information Technology Parallel in Japanese Higher Education

ANNETTE BRADFORD AND HOWARD BROWN

Annette Bradford is associate professor, School of Business Administration, Meiji University, Tokyo, Japan. E-mail: bradford@meiji.ac.jp. Howard Brown is associate professor, Faculty of International Studies and Regional Development, University of Niigata Prefecture, Niigata, Japan. E-mail: brown@unii.ac.jp.

In Japan, as in much of the world, English-medium instruction (EMI) is part of an effort to internationalize the higher education sector, attract international students, and foster global competencies among students. It is receiving significant government investment and attention, and consequently assuming, perhaps not a central, but a meaningful role in higher education. However, the growth of EMI has not been without challenges and these are not unique to current internationalization efforts. It may be that we are seeing the most recent manifestation of longstanding structural issues in the Japanese higher education sector. When information technology (IT) was promoted in education in the 1990s, bureaucratic procedures, lack of technical support, and resistance to emerging pedagogies were found to be impediments to effective implementation. For anyone involved in current EMI implementation, these obstacles ring familiar. The parallels are striking and, by looking at the example of IT, we may catch a glimpse of where EMI is heading and learn where structural changes could be made.

Striking Parallels

The first parallel is related to the context of implementation. During the IT revolution, innovation was driven by a sense of crisis, a feeling that Japan had fallen behind in the race to adopt IT and urgently needed to catch up. There was a demand from potential employers for graduates with IT skills who possessed originality, individuality, creativity, initiative, and leadership abilities. Today Japan faces challenges from a globalizing society, a stagnant economy, and demographic changes; the rhetoric of crisis is again clear. The demand from business now is for more globally competent human resources: young people who have strong communication skills, understand different cultures and values, work creatively, take independent action, and can become global leaders.

Another aspect is seen in how implementation is approached at the national level. When IT was introduced, competitive grants funded initial large-scale implementation, with most resources going to elite universities. Less prestigious universities adopted IT later and on a smaller scale, without a clear mandate or coordinated strategy. The same is seen today with the national Global 30 and Top Global funding schemes supporting EMI initiatives at a small number of prestigious universities, while most EMI programs develop without government support or a central plan.

A third parallel emerges at the institutional level. Early IT initiatives were largely volunteer based and faculty led. Administrators assigned to IT projects were mainly generalists; there was a serious lack of skilled IT personnel. With this limited support, faculty leaders had to transform themselves into IT specialists. The same dynamics can be seen today. Internationalization activities and EMI programs are supported by nonspecialist administrators, many assigned to the EMI program for a limited term. Most of the leadership for EMI is coming from faculty members who, until they began working on EMI implementation, had no experience with, and limited knowledge of, EMI. Over the last 10 years, they have trained themselves to become specialists.

A fourth element concerns a focus on implementation rather than integration. In the case of IT, at the institutional level it was much more important to ensure the availability of a certain number of computers than to consider how those computers would be used to facilitate learning and teaching. Even now, a full two decades after the rush to implement IT, the infrastructure is in place, but Japan lags behind other countries in the actual educational adoption of IT. Equipment and software are widely available in universities, but little attention has been given to training or the development of pedagogy to support its usage. Similarly, much EMI implementation is characterized by decision-

making based on simplistic assumptions, a focus on numbers of EMI classes and student mobility rates, and ad hoc delivery. Coherent curriculum development, the linguistic, social, and academic needs of students, and the professional development of faculty members are not receiving the attention they deserve.

A final, and perhaps overarching parallel between IT and EMI can be seen in how both have been going against a prevailing social structure. IT was seen as an addition. It was a layer added to existing administrative and curricular precedents, rather than an impetus for deep structural change within universities or the wider social environment. The attempt to develop a new generation of computer-literate specialist students went against the notion of what universities were supposed to do at the undergraduate level: produce generalists. This struggle is familiar to those working in current EMI initiatives. EMI is being implemented, in many cases, to create an internationally minded young generation. However, this goal runs counter to the prevailing notion of the importance of Japanese national identity. The ministry of education has repeatedly emphasized that moral education, and a deep understanding of Japanese traditions and culture, are prerequisites for global education. This leads to attempts to foster students as outward-looking people, but not *too* outward looking. The deep and possibly identity-threatening changes in institutional culture, administrative structures, and pedagogical approaches necessary to make EMI a central part of Japanese higher education are slow to be adopted.

Another aspect is seen in how implementation is approached at the national level.

The Way Forward

Looking back at the IT experience, the key roadblocks to implementation stemmed from decisions that universities made when they set out to establish new systems and policies. Implementing IT and effectively integrating it university-wide would have meant making deep systemic changes in the culture and politics of the given institution, a daunting prospect. The alternative, focusing on superficial technical issues and numerical targets on a department-by-department basis, thereby avoiding the more troubling issues, was an easier path. Universities chose the easier path. Implementation was characterized by short-term planning and reactive problem solving. Consequently, IT has never really lived up to its potential in higher education. Communications technology, information management, and online distance education all remain relatively underdeveloped in Japanese universities.

But what of current EMI initiatives? All signs indicate that we are heading down the same easy path of short-term, reactive decision-making. In 20 years, EMI could be where IT is now, with a stable position as a commonplace part of higher education, but not playing a central role and not deeply integrated into the university culture. If that is what we, as EMI stakeholders, want, then we may be on the right path. However, EMI in Japan is still in its infancy and there is time for universities to take a more challenging path. When properly integrated, EMI has the potential to effect the internationalization of Japanese higher education. We can learn from the experience of the IT programs before us and consider the structural changes that need to take place to ensure not just successful EMI implementation, but real EMI integration.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.9810

Admissions in Japanese National Universities: The Need for Change

Yukiko Ishikura and Tatsuo Kawashima

Yukiko Ishikura is lecturer and Tatsuo Kawashima is professor and director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education and Global Admissions (CHEGA), Osaka University, Japan. E-mails: ishikura@chega.osaka-u.ac.jp and tatsuo314@chega.osaka-u.ac.jp.

Japanese college admissions at national universities have traditionally practiced a devolved selection process. Faculty members in each department design their own admissions policies and criteria, and make selection decisions. There are admissions offices, but their responsibilities tend to be mostly administrative and managerial.

Up until this point, written examinations have been the most valued selection criteria at national universities. The majority of applicants to national universities are required to take two written examinations: a multiple-choice national examination called "National Center Test for University Admissions" (hereafter National Center Test), administered once annually in early January, and a second-stage examination administered by each university after the National

Center Test. That examination has more emphasis on thinking and writing skills. The two examinations mainly measure applicants' scholastic abilities (*gakuryoku* in Japanese) gained at high school.

This *gakuryoku*-oriented idea originated in the belief that a high score reflecting excellent *gakuryoku* was a strong indicator of the students' knowledge, skills, motivations, and even of their character. In order to assess applicants' *gakuryoku*, universities have relied on written examinations. The national university entrance examinations use this measure extensively.

Motivation for Change

While universities value *gakuryoku* for their college admissions, our knowledge-based society requires students to gain a multitude of skills useful in the twenty-first century, such as critical thinking, problem solving, and intercultural communication skills. Because of this trend, the definition of *gakuryoku* has been shifting recently. The ministry of education, culture, sports, science and technology, hereafter MEXT, recently redefined the components of *gakuryoku*. In addition to the previous definition of simply possessing knowledge and skills, the new *gakuryoku* concept values what students are able to *do and accomplish* by applying their knowledge and skills.

Up until this point, written examinations have been the most valued selection criteria at national universities.

Additionally, there is an increase in Japan in the numbers of nontraditional students, such as adult learners, disabled learners, repatriate students, international students, and students who have studied through alternative education systems. In order to admit these diverse students, universities have started to rethink the concept of "fair assessment" of applicants for university admissions. A single measurement for all applicants used to imply the idea of fairness, but this is no longer the case.

Implementation of Holistic Admissions

As of 2015, according to statistics released by MEXT, the percentage of students admitted through "holistic admissions" was 15.4 among national universities. Behind the current trends, there is strong pressure from the government for universities to shift their ways of implementing university admissions. In 2013, the Education Rebuilding Implementation Council released a statement on university admissions. It noted the significance of universities introducing multifaceted and comprehensive assessments of students' knowledge. This encourages universities to assess not only students' *gakuryoku* but also their twenty-first century learning skills, motivations, college readiness, and students' past activities, based on the university admission policies.

Following this statement, the powerful Central Council for Education and the Japan Association of National Universities echoed that reforming university admissions and developing a new national university entrance examination were necessary. Especially the Japan Association of National Universities set an ambitious goal of raising the percentage of holistic admissions to 30 by 2018. They also called for a screening that would assess critical thinking, ability to judge properly, and expression, as well as *gakuryoku*. To reflect this change, the university entrance examination will be revised in 2020.

Challenges and Prospectives

Taking the government announcements into account, more national universities, whose admissions have long relied on test scores, are currently introducing holistic admissions. However, they are experiencing several challenges when implementing these changes.

National universities, especially leading national universities, have not moved completely away from old *gakuryoku* concepts, nor have they well understood the implication of introducing holistic admissions. The concept of fairness—using the same measurement for all applicants without any regard to their backgrounds—is strongly ingrained and prevents universities from doing away with objective test-score based admissions.

Despite the introduction of a holistic review approach, test scores remain an important factor in the application review process and are considered an indicator for how well students may perform in college. To assess the students' personalities, universities require students to submit personal statements and recommendations from high schools, attend interviews, or submit documents indicating their engagement and achievements in and outside of school, in addition to demonstrating a high level of *gakuryoku*. Holistic admissions at national universities are rather demanding. Universities are unfortunately not able to attract enough applicants for the holistic admissions process, as students prefer to go through simpler test score-based admissions.

Moreover, national universities have insufficient infrastructure to implement holistic admissions more broadly. Practicing effective holistic admissions requires a lot more time and human resources, and it is necessary to establish a system far removed from test-score based admissions.

Holistic admissions is an art and a science. It allows universities to make decisions based on students' academic and personal backgrounds, experience, and potential. Reviewers need special expertise and experience to ensure a fair and transparent admissions process.

Such professionalism in college admissions has yet to take root. Faculty members are still key drivers for both policies and practices in holistic admissions. Currently, holistic admissions are quite limited. Faculty members are able to remain involved with the whole selection process. This raises the question of whether or not they will have the capacity to remain as involved when the percentage of holistic admissions reaches 30—as recommended by the Japan Association of National Universities.

The introduction of holistic admissions is going to bring tremendous changes to universities: measuring the implications of introducing holistic admissions, reviewing ideas on *gakuryoku* and fairness, professionalizing college admissions, adapting organizational structure, and reexamining the admissions system as a whole. However, these challenges may turn into great opportunities. High schools and universities are shifting from teacher-centered to learner-centered teaching and learning in order to prepare high school students for holistic admissions and allow a more diverse student body to be admitted to college. This will have a positive impact not only on college admissions, but also on education in high schools and universities as a whole.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10043

Creating National Champions in France: A Little Less *Égalité*, a Little More *Sélectivité*?

Ludovic Highman

Ludovic Highman is senior research associate at the Centre for Global Higher Education, Institute of Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: l.highman@ucl.ac.uk.

Few universities can claim such an animated history as the now defunct University of Paris, split in 1970 into 13 autonomous universities following the May 1968 events. Two of its "successor" universities, namely Paris–Sorbonne University (Paris IV) and Pierre and Marie Curie University (Paris VI), have vowed to spur a return from the ashes by merging and becoming a single, multidisciplinary institution. The merger should be understood within the French context, as well as within the broader European trend of mergers aiming to consolidate higher education systems, provide economic gain, and enhance the position of higher education institutions (HEIs) in global rankings.

The French context is characterized by an unclassifiable higher education system that nonetheless presents elements of a hierarchical binary higher education system, ever since Napoleon established the prestigious *grandes écoles,* predominantly selective, hyperspecialized, small, vocationally oriented institutes of higher technical or business education. On the other side of the binary divide, many universities present the unusual characteristic of being specialized institutions, having undergone structural reorganizations after 1968 and dismemberment along disciplinary lines. The reunification of historic universities has been a government priority in recent years, following a trend of mergers observed in Europe since 2005.

One of these mergers is the rebirth of the "old" Sorbonne University, expected to take place on January 1, 2018. The *Times Higher Education (THE)* World University Rankings (2018) placed Paris IV at rank 197 overall, while Paris VI was ranked 123rd. These specialized universities score higher in their disciplines: in the 2017 QS World University Rankings by Subject, Paris IV reached the 26th position for its arts & humanities course offerings, while Paris VI claimed the 55th spot for natural sciences and the 94th place for life sciences & medicine. What can we expect from the merger of these two leading specialized universities, and the establishment of a large multidisciplinary institution, claiming the history and academic pedigree of one of the oldest universities in the world?

Recent European Trends

Mergers are often framed by governments as a way to rationalize and consolidate higher education sectors, while reducing duplication in course offerings and, as a result, costs. Furthermore, they increase scale, notably of research outputs, and can enable HEIs to perform better in global rankings. Research by the European University Association suggests mergers became more prevalent beginning in 2005, with Denmark and Estonia setting the trend. In Denmark, the number of institutions decreased from 12 to eight. In Estonia, the University of Tallinn absorbed eight surrounding institutions, and the number of HEIs in the country decreased from 41 to 29 between 2000 and 2012.

Mergers and the Creation of National Champions

France followed suit in 2008, through the € 5 billion *Opération Campus* that sought to promote up to 12 centers for research and education, then known as *pôles de recherche*

et d'enseignement supérieur (research and higher education hubs) or PRES. These centers were discontinued in 2013 and replaced by *communautés d'universités et établissements* (communities of universities and HEIs) or COMUE. The flurry of difficult-to-translate French acronyms did not help make these associations or their potential implications better understood abroad. In 2011, the founders of the Academic Ranking of World Universities in Shanghai informed the French government that they would not officially rank the PRES as the government had been hoping for. Only HEIs that had legally merged into single institutions were considered eligible for the ratings scale.

Initiatives for Excellence

Roughly, from that period onward, France has encouraged consolidation, promoting mergers between multidisciplinary universities, specialized universities, and *grandes écoles*, notably through its ambitious Initiatives for Excellence (IDEX) program, launched in 2010. This program is part of a nationwide *Programme d'investissement d'avenir* (PIA), or Investment Program for the Future, which aims to increase French competitiveness and growth. The decision to allocate € 7.7 billion to the first eight university clusters selected by the program was equivalent to a Category 5 hurricane within the traditionally egalitarian French higher education system—the French government has traditionally avoided any policy of explicit differentiation between universities.

The two universities are founding members of the "Sorbonne Universities" COMUE, which was awarded the IDEX label in 2012.

A second wave of IDEX was launched in 2015. Two more recipients were nominated in 2016, and a final university cluster joined the club in 2017. Selected IDEX institutions are placed under intense scrutiny, and progress toward full mergers is reviewed regularly by an international panel that has the power to revoke the prestigious label. This happened to several university clusters, including the Federal University of Toulouse, in 2016, creating a political cataclysm in the region and forcing Prime Minister Manuel Valls to intervene and offer alternative, albeit reduced, funding to support the university.

Expectations for the "New" Sorbonne University

The Parisian merger takes place within the framework of the IDEX program. The two universities are founding members of the "Sorbonne Universities" COMUE, which was awarded the IDEX label in 2012. The diversity of models among merged institutions—including the reunification of domestic universities and mergers that occurred abroad, such as in Manchester (2004) or Helsinki (2010)—will be beneficial.

The "new" Sorbonne University will initially comprise three core schools, namely humanities & social sciences, sciences, and medicine. Furthermore, it is expected that the University of Technology of Compiègne, north of Paris, will join, further expanding the disciplinary reach of the university to include a top ranked school of engineering. It is also hoped that Panthéon–Assas University (Paris II), initially a founding member of the consortium, will again join the new university as its Law School.

The new university has a coherent and comprehensive strategy, building on a history only rivalled by Oxbridge in Europe. Nonetheless, issues remain. Managing this mega-university of nearly 60,000 students, of whom 18 percent are foreign, 7,700 professor–researchers, 45 industry-sponsored research chairs, and 200 laboratories will be no mean feat. The predominantly law-oriented Paris II initially left the consortium because of tensions regarding autonomy and leadership—it preferred a standalone status, or the option of merging with another law university (Paris I), to avoid being subsumed into a larger organization dominated by Paris VI and the sciences. But rivalry between the disciplines has no place in today's higher education landscape. As stated by the former French minister for higher education, Valérie Pécresse, "now we know that good research and good teaching means you need a multidisciplinary university" (2011).

Conclusion

Today's global challenges cannot be solved by one country, one university, or one discipline. Interdisciplinarity, inter- and intrainstitutional collaboration, and international cross-border cooperation are essential to tackle global societal challenges and achieve the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals.

France is now breaking with its egalitarian legacy. The gap between IDEX institutions and universities that were not selected for the prestigious program is widening. In the 2018 *THE* World University Rankings, the IDEX generally outperform other French institutions, with Paris Sciences et Lettres, ranked 72nd, taking the national top spot, while the IDEX-labelled university clusters of Aix-Marseille

(251–300), Bordeaux (301–350), Grenoble Alpes (301–350), Côte d'Azur (351–400), and Strasbourg (351–400) follow suit. Their ranking will no doubt still disappoint French civil servants and institutional leaders. Nonetheless, there is evidence that the IDEX are, slowly but surely, on the move.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10222

Conflict of Interest in Eastern Europe: "Academic Capture"

Mihaylo Milovanovitch*, Elena Denisova-Schmidt, and Arevik Anapiosyan*

Mihaylo Milovanovitch is founding member of the Center for Applied Policy in Sofia, Bulgaria, and staff member at the European Training Foundation in Turin, Italy. E-mail: mihaylo@policycenters.org. Elena Denisova-Schmidt is a lecturer at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, and research fellow at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: elena.denisova-schmidt@unisg.ch. Arevik Anapiosyan is a lecturer at Yerevan State University and the American University of Armenia, and project leader at the Center for Applied Policy in Sofia, Bulgaria. E-mail: arevik@policycenters.org.

**The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of their respective organizations.*

Lobbying public officials is a common and legitimate practice. However, it may also become an integrity concern, for instance when officials have a financial interest in the sector that lobbies them and for which they are responsible. In such cases, lobbying may amount to undue influence, promote conflicts of interest, and "capture" the decision-making process in ways that create undue advantage for specific individuals, institutions, or the sector at large.

In Eastern Europe, higher education providers, especially in the public sector, depend on the state in pivotal aspects of their operations such as funding, accreditation, closures and mergers, enrollment quotas, etc. The stakes are high and universities have good reasons for trying to influence the decisions of authorities through lobbying. They are also in a good position to do so, as they mostly work in proximity to national governments: universities have a mission to serve the public interest and supply the public sector with the graduate workforce that it needs, and many have government representatives on their boards.

The research presented here reveals that in most countries of Eastern Europe, the close relationship between academia and the state is permeated by conflicts of interest, which manifest themselves in high-ranking public officials responsible for (higher) education being widely affiliated with universities on a for-profit basis. We call such affiliations "academic capture." Both academia and the public sector are exposed to a risk of corruption every time academic institutions lobby for their legitimate interests and corresponding policy decisions are being taken.

Conflict of Interest through "Academic Capture"

Our data sets are based on publicly available evidence from the Western Balkans (Bosnia-Hercegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia) and the former Soviet Union (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Russia, and Ukraine). We looked at the affiliation of public officials responsible for higher education with universities, which seemed to be profit-seeking in nature; this included ministers and deputy ministers of (higher) education or the equivalent; heads and members of cabinets or the equivalent; heads of departments for higher education; heads of external agencies operating on behalf of the ministries of (higher) education; and chairs and/or regular members of parliamentary committees on education.

The most common form of for-profit affiliation with universities by target group members is practiced by salaried staff in public universities.

An ongoing analysis of evidence from these countries is gradually revealing a situation in which a remarkably high share of these public officers have a profit-seeking affiliation with at least one university in their respective countries, or are expected to engage in one. Among officials caught up in a conflict of interest during data collection (the second and third quarters of 2016) were the ministers of education of Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Russia, and Ukraine. This is also true for some (Ukraine) or all the deputy ministers of education (in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Moldova, and Serbia), as well as for some members of the minister's cabinets in Armenia and Ka-

zakhstan. Some deputy ministers in Russia and Ukraine, and the minister of education in Kazakhstan, did not have an active for-profit affiliation at the time of data collection, but based on employment history and national expert assessments, are expected to go through the "revolving door" into a salaried or shareholder position at a university immediately after completing their mandate in the public sector. To the extent evidence is available, for-profit affiliations with universities are also common at a lower level of decision-making: among the heads of departments for higher education in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Russia, and Serbia, and among legislators in charge of education in Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Moldova, Serbia, and Ukraine.

The most common form of for-profit affiliation with universities by target group members is practiced by salaried staff in public universities. In the region of the Western Balkans, the benefit of being on the payroll of a higher education institution is usually combined with the provision of fee-based expertise. In some countries (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Serbia, and Ukraine), holders of public office are also owners of (private) higher education institutions, or are expected to resume ownership upon completion of their tenure. In addition, in Azerbaijan, the for-profit affiliation of some deputy ministers includes the provision of procurement services to universities, and, in Croatia, the benefit of affiliation of a high-level civil servant in the ministry is expected to be an academic credential (a Ph.D degree) from a public university.

Why It Matters

The threat of "academic capture" has manifold and detrimental implications. Thanks to "captured" individuals with regulatory responsibilities, the higher education sector may secure channels of influence on policy decisions and achieve favorable policy outcomes—where many of these outcomes would have been detrimental to the sector, and/or come at the expense of other education and public policy priorities. Consider, for example, the hypothetical case of a smaller, regional higher education institution that expects a fair approach to the accreditation of its new study programs, only to discover that the accreditation authority has rejected them, while applying a double standard in favor of the alma mater of the minister of education. Or imagine a discussion about public budget allocations, which year after year concludes with a decision to increase investments in an already oversized university network instead of addressing a persistent and acute shortage of kindergarten places. Finally, consider all the ways in which a tertiary educational institution that has influence over its regulators can harm itself by exercising its influence to prevent the very changes it might need in order to improve. As a sector-specific risk of regulatory "capture,"" academic capture" deserves to be treated with the same urgency and attention as any other form of conflict of interest in the public sector. The alternative—leaving distortions in higher education policy-making unexplored and their harmful, long-term side effects unaddressed—means accepting that certain groups among educational actors are wrongfully and systematically put at a disadvantage, that trust in public education policy is undermined, and resistance to change encouraged.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10223

NEW PUBLICATIONS FROM CIHE

Georgiana Mihut, Philip Altbach, and Hans de Wit, eds. *Understanding Higher Education Internationalization: Insights from Key Global Publications*, published in 2017. This book uniquely organizes selected articles published in *University World News (UWN)* and *International Higher Education (IHE)* to reflect themes relevant for higher education internationalization, thus offering an accessible and analytic perspective on pressing contemporary concerns regarding internationalization. https://www.sensepublishers.com/catalogs/bookseries/global-perspectives-on-higher-education/understanding-higher-education-internationalization/

Jamil Salmi. *The Tertiary Education Imperative Knowledge, Skills and Values for Development*, published in 2017. This book explores the crucial role played by tertiary education toward achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. https://www.sensepublishers.com/catalogs/bookseries/global-perspectives-on-higher-education/the-tertiary-education-imperative/

Damtew Teferra, ed. *Flagship Universities in Africa. Basingstoke*, published in 2017. This book offers an in-depth, comprehensive analysis of flagship universities in Africa—the largest, most selective, and most prestigious universities on the continent. http://www.springer.com/la/book/9783319494029

Adriana Pérez-Encinas, Laura Howard, Laura Rumbley, and Hans de Wit, eds. *The Internationalisation of Higher Education in Spain, Reflections and Perspectives*, published in 2017. In this publication, 12 experts offer their vision of the internationalization of the Spanish university system. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/SEPIE_Online_ENG.pdf
Also in Spanish: *Internacionalización de la Educación Superior en España, Reflexiones y Perspectivas*. http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/SEPIE_Online_ESP.pdf

NEW PUBLICATIONS

(Editor's note: *IHE* no longer publishes short book summaries, but rather provides a more comprehensive listing of new books that will be of interest to a higher education audience. 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 Edward Choi, graduate assistant at the Center.)

Austin, Ian and Glen A. Jones. *Governance of Higher Education: Global Perspectives, Theories, and Practices.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2016. 218 pp. $47.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Arthur, James. *Policy Entrepreneurship in Education: Engagement, Influence and Impact.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 176 pp. $140 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com

Bain, Alan and Lucia Zundans-Fraser. *The Self-organizing University – Designing the Higher Education Organization for Quality Learning and Teaching.* Singapore, Springer, 2017. 192 pp. € 93,59 (hb). Website: www.springer.com

Bradford, Annette and Howard Brown, eds. *English-Medium Instruction in Japanese Higher Education – Policy, Challenges and Outcomes.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2017. 320 pp. $159.95 (hb). www.multilingual-matters.com

Davis, Niki. *Digital Technologies and Change in Education: The Arena Framework.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 174 pp. $39.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Deem, Rosemary and Heather Eggins, eds. *The University as a Critical Institution?* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense, 2017. 248 pp. $43.20 (pb). Website: www.sensepublishers.com

Dent, Samuel, Laura Lane, and Tony Strike, eds. *Collaboration, Communities and Competition – International Perspectives from the Academy.* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2017. 246 pp. $99 (hb). Website: www.sensepublishers.com

Eggins, Heather, ed. *The Changing Role of Women in Higher Education.* Singapore: Springer, 2017. 310 pp. $69.99 (ebook). Website: www.springer.com

Killick, David. *Developing Intercultural Practice – Academic Development in a Multicultural and Globalizing World.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 232 pp. $49.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Kiyama, Judy Marquez and Cecilia Rios-Aguilar, eds. *Funds of Knowledge in Higher Education – Honoring Students' Cultural Experiences and Resources as Strengths.* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, 2018. 208 pp. $46.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Li, Guofang and Wen Ma, eds. *Educating Chinese-Heritage Students in the Global–Local Nexus Identities, Challenges, and Opportunities.* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, 2018. 272 pp. $49.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Lupton, Deborah, Inger Mewburn, and Pat Thomson, eds. *The Digital Academic – Critical Perspectives on Digital Technologies in Higher Education.* New York, NY: Routledge 2017. 172 pp. $39.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Manning, Kathleen. *Organizational Theory in Higher Education.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 222 pp. $49.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Marah, John K. *Pan-African Education – A Must for the African Union.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 284 pp. $149.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Merrill, Michelle Y. et al., eds. *Education and Sustainability Paradigms, Policies and Practices in Asia.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 302 pp. $160 (hb). Website: www.routledge.com

Salmi, Jamil. *The Tertiary Education Imperative Knowledge, Skills and Values for Development.* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2017. 218 pp. $54 (pb). Website: www.sensepublishers.com

Samuels, Robert. *Educating Inequality: Beyond the Political Myths of Higher Education and the Job Market.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2018. 182 pp. $47.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Schrag, Zachary M. *Ethical Imperialism: Institutional Review Boards in the Social Sciences, 1965–2009.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017. 245 pp. $24.95 (pb). Website: www.press.jhu.edu

Scott, W. Richard and Michael W. Kirst, eds. *Higher Education in Silicon Valley: Connected but Conflicted.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017. 282 pp. $54.95 (pb). Website: www.press.jhu.edu

Stefani, Lorraine and Patrick Blessinger, eds. *Inclusive Leadership in Higher Education International Perspectives and Approaches.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 216 pp. $46.95 (pb). Website: www.routledge.com

Tsuneyoshi Ryoko, ed. *Globalization and Japanese "Exceptionalism" in Education – Insider's Views into a Changing System.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2017. 240 pp. $160 (hb). Website: HYPERLINK "http://www.routledge.com" www.routledge.com

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

The Center For International Higher Education (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the *International Higher Education* quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE Web Site

The different sections of the CIHE Web site provide detailed information about the work of the Center, along with links to news and relevant resources in the field of interest to scholars, professionals, and students of higher education. All issues of *International Higher Education* are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the Web site provides easy access to details about current and past CIHE projects, initiatives, and resources; information about our key partners; and links to our many publications. Prospective graduate students and visiting scholars can also find extensive information about how to seek connections with us in support of their studies and research.

The Program in Higher Education at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science–based approach to the study of higher education. Specializations are offered in international higher education, administration, and student affairs. For additional information, see: http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/departments/eahe/graduate.html/.

Special Section on Internationalization

The section on internationalization is made possible through a cooperative arrangement between CIHE and the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. Fiona Hunter, Associate Director of CHEI, is editorial advisor for this section.

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

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

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

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

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)