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The Imperial Tongue: English as the Dominating Academic Language

Philip G. Altbach

The English language dominates science, scholarship, and instruction as never before. While it is unlikely that English will achieve the status that Latin had as the sole language of teaching and scholarship at the 13th-century universities in Europe, the Latin analogy has some relevance today. Back then, Latin not only permitted the internationalization of universities but allowed the Roman Catholic Church to dominate intellectual and academic life. It was only the Protestant Reformation led by Martin Luther, combined with a growing sense of national identity, that challenged and then displaced Latin with national languages. As late as the 1930s, German was a widely used international scientific language. Until the mid-20th century, most countries used their national languages for university teaching and for science and scholarship. French, German, Russian, and Spanish were, and to some extent still are, used for academic and scientific publications and have some regional sway. Scholarly communities in Japanese, Chinese, Swedish, and many other languages continue to exist as well. English was the closest thing to an international language, with several major academic systems using it—the United States, Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and most of Canada. In addition, the emerging academic systems of the former British Empire—especially India, Pakistan, South Africa, and Nigeria—have traditionally used English as the main teaching and publishing language. But English did not dominate scholarly communication until the 1950s, and national academic communities seemed in general committed to national languages.

English now serves unchallenged as the main international academic language. Indeed, national academic systems enthusiastically welcome English as a contributor to internationalizing, competing, and becoming “world class.” But the domination by English moves world science toward hegemony led by the main English-speaking academic systems and creates difficulties for scholars and universities that do not use English.

Origins of English Hegemony

It is not hard to see why English is the dominant academic and scientific language. The nations using English, particularly the United States, have become the academic superpowers. Size and wealth matter a great deal in determining the academic pecking order. The United States alone spends almost half the world’s R&D funds and is home to a large proportion of the top universities on the world’s increasingly influential league tables. The English-speaking academic systems host more than half the world’s international students. Many of these graduates return to their home countries with a zeal for English and for the foreign universities at which they obtained their degrees. The main scientific and scholarly journals are published in English because their editors and most of their contributors are professors at universities in the English-speaking countries. Similarly, the large majority of the world’s academic Web sites and scientific networks function in English.

English is the world’s most widely studied second language. This gives English a significant advantage in many non-English-speaking countries simply because of the number of speakers and the fact that English is by far the most widely distributed language. There are, for example, more students studying English in China than are studying English in the United States and more speakers of English in India than in Britain. Further, English has an official governmentally recognized status in more than 70 countries. Colonialism provided stimulus for the spread of English (as well as other European languages) as early as the 18th century—to North America, South Asia, and the Caribbean—and later to Africa, other parts of Asia, Australasia, and the South Pacific. Today, no African university offers instruction in any indigenous African language, and academic and intellectual life takes place in English, French, Portuguese, Arabic, and Afrikaans.

Evidence of English Hegemony

The international role of English and its growing role in academic life worldwide have many implications. The power of English-language scientific and scholarly journals means that the research paradigms and scholarly interests of the journal editors, editorial board members, and indeed the majority of readers control journals and to a large extent research agendas and methodologies in most disciplines. Scholars in other parts of the world must conform to the interests of the prestigious journals if they wish their work to be published in them. While the Internet is more open, the interests of the major contributors and users tend to dominate, and the English language is most widely used. International scientific meetings increasingly use English as the only official language.

The curriculum is increasingly dominated by the major English-speaking countries, and in a globalized world this
means that curricular developments are expressed in English and increasingly come from the United States and a few other countries. The international proliferation of the master of business administration degree (MBA) is a good example of how academic programs spread. The MBA degree was developed in the United States to serve the needs of American business and became the standard qualification required by senior executives. In the past two decades, English has become recognized as a key qualification for management in other countries, compelled both by the growing influence of multinational corporations and by the power of American universities. US universities now offer MBA degrees in many parts of the world, and non-US universities have established their own MBA programs, often using English and a largely US curriculum. This development shows the power both of the English language and of American higher education practices and ideas.

The academic journals and books published in English are almost the only ones internationally circulated. They are the most prestigious journals, and academics worldwide compete to publish in them. They are listed in the Science Citation Index and its sister indexes. While SCI was not developed to rank journals or to measure the scholarly productivity of individual academics or institutions but rather to trace how scientific ideas become influential and are communicated, it has become a de facto ranking. Universities worldwide want their professors to publish in these listed journals and reward those who do. For example, Norwegian academics who publish in English and in recognized journals are paid fees for their accomplishments, while their colleagues who publish in Norwegian are paid less or not at all. In Korea, great pressures are placed on academics to publish in recognized international journals in English. Publication in English and in internationally recognized journals and by prestigious international publishers counts more than publishing elsewhere.

Academic programs offered in English have become widespread in many non-English-speaking countries. Universities in Europe, Asia, and Latin America are offering degree programs in English alongside instruction in national languages. A small number of new private universities operating solely in English have also been established, sometimes calling themselves the American University of . . . to take advantage of the prestige and popularity of English. In some cases, these universities seek accreditation in the United States, and for a few such institutions accreditation has been granted.

The worldwide branch campus movement for the most part uses English as the medium of instruction. The United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom have been most active in establishing branch campuses, and it is not surprising that English is the medium of instruction. Non-English-speaking countries often use English as well. Dutch and German branch overseas campuses often offer their programs in English. There are at least 100 branch campuses, mainly sponsored by universities in the North and operating in the South. The branch campus movement exports both language and curriculum, introducing new ideas into host countries and perhaps displacing national models.

Most observers see the impact of English in higher education worldwide as a positive trend—contributing to globalization and enhancing an international academic culture. A global academic environment needs a common medium of communication, and English is the only possible language. While English brings new ideas to sometimes moribund academic institutions worldwide, there are significant downsides to the new hegemony of English.

**Downsides**

The impact of English increases the influence of the major English-speaking academic systems, particularly of the United States and the United Kingdom. These countries have many of the world’s leading universities, produce a high proportion of scientific discoveries and scholarship, and form the centers of scientific communication. The norms, values, methodologies, and orientations of the academic communities of these centers tend to dominate the rest of the world—the peripheries.

What happens to national scientific communities in an English-dominated global environment? There has always been a tension between the local and the global in science and scholarship—since knowledge is by its nature international. The use of national languages and the existence of national journals and publishers are called into question by policymakers and academic administrators worldwide. Knowledge is ranked according to whether it is recognized by the international academic community or not. If not, even though a domestic publication may be highly relevant to national needs, it is considered even within a country as being less prestigious, and this may have implications for a scholar’s academic career or salary. Ambitious academics will naturally seek to publish in international publications to advance their impact and careers. Topics such as local history or research on local health problems may be ignored to gain recognition internationally.

Some time ago, the Dutch minister of education proposed that universities in the Netherlands shift the language of...
instruction from Dutch to English so that Holland could boost its attraction for international students and integrate more fully into the global scholarly community. The Dutch Parliament debated the issue and decided not to shift the language—arguing that the Netherlands would lose its distinctive culture if the Dutch language was no longer used for intellectual and academic life. This argument is relevant elsewhere. If the knowledge that is most valued is aimed at the international academic world and is communicated in English, there will be negative implications for national scientific and intellectual systems.

In many countries, academic rewards of all kinds accrue to those using English and participating in global scientific networks. These scholars are typically invited to international conferences, awarded research funds by both international and national funders, and are generally seen as leaders of their scientific communities. Universities and governments often use the SCI and related systems to judge the impact and value of their academics and universities. SCI becomes a kind of proxy for quality and productivity. Similarly, the international ranking systems use such measures. However, again, this offers privileges those who produce their work in English and intend to reach an international audience.

These factors will tend to orient researchers and scholars to themes that they feel will appeal to an international audience, often at the expense of essential but more parochial themes that might be of interest only to local or national audiences. Further, the methodologies chosen for research will follow those popular internationally, whether these methods are relevant to the specific topic being researched.

The current debate concerning the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) as part of the World Trade Organization (WTO) has direct implications for this discussion. GATS will force academic systems worldwide to be more open to foreign influences. Should GATS be widely implemented, this will inevitably mean the English-language institutions and programs will further entrench themselves worldwide.

These factors lead to homogenizing knowledge worldwide. Not only is English the dominant language, but its relationship with the controlling trends in international science and scholarship is a powerful combination of forces contributing to decreasing diversity of themes and methodologies.

**What Can Be Done?**

If globalization determines the direction of the world economy, science, and other factors, then the growth of English as the global language of science and scholarship is inevitable for the foreseeable future. Science indeed is increasingly international, and the global mobility of students and professors is a long-term reality. There is an international knowledge network that involves not only science and scholarship but increasingly people. This network operates mainly in English and is dominated by the main English-speaking academic systems.

The argument here is that the international network is both inevitable and largely positive but that national and local scientific communities and higher education systems must be protected. These communities deserve both respect and support because they bring a valuable perspective and diversity to science and scholarship. Internationalization may be positive but with homogenization we lose a concern for local and regional issues as well as ideas that may not be in the international mainstream. An entirely open market will weaken these communities, just as the major world languages today are snuffing out small and weak languages. Science and scholarship in national languages deserve support. The evaluation of academic merit should not depend solely on the rankings of the SCI or other exogenous agencies—and thus left to the judgment of foreigners. While local evaluation may not be easy, it is necessary. An appropriate mix between local and international publication will help nurture an active research community.

The essential necessity is an understanding of the importance of national scientific and intellectual communities. Creating a balance between the local and the global may not be easy but intellectual independence depends on it.

---

**The Global Higher Education Race**

**John Aubrey Douglass**

John Aubrey Douglass is senior research fellow at the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. Address: Center for Studies in Higher Education, South Hall Annex, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-4650, USA. E-mail: douglass@berkeley.edu.

The United States pioneered the idea of mass higher education, reaping tremendous economic and social advantages. Now much of the world has embraced this model on its own political and cultural terms. The higher education race is driven by the idea that education will increasingly play a decisive role in national economic competitiveness and socioeconomic mobility. As a result, higher education has become a major global growth sector. Despite significant differences among nations and regions in the structure and culture of their academic enterprises, certain similarities in policy approaches and trajectories are creating, in turn, dramatic enrollment and program growth.

Yet in the midst of this global trend, America has entered a period of stagnant higher education access and graduation rates. This downturn is perhaps not fully understood through-
out the world or in the United States.

**Access in the United States**

Overall, the United States still retains a lead in the number of people with higher education experience and degrees, according to data from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). But about the younger age cohort, a different story emerges. On average, the postsecondary participation rate for persons aged 18 to 24 in the United States was approximately 34 percent in 2005, down from around 38 percent in 2000.

In the United States, more students today are part time, and more are attending two-year colleges. The wealthiest students are in the four-year institutions. Students from lower- and even middle-income families are now more likely to attend a two-year college, less likely to earn a bachelor’s degree, and now take much longer to attain a degree than in the past. This appears as an alarming trend, although with complicated causes that do not lend themselves to easy policy solutions.

In contrast, within a comparative group of fellow OECD countries, many nations are approaching and a few have exceeded a 50 percent participation level of their younger age group in postsecondary education. Another difference lies in the fact that some 45 percent of all students in the United States attend two-year community colleges, whereas most students in the European Union (EU) are enrolled in programs that lead to a bachelor’s degree.

One reason for the US lag is that in 2004 it ranked only 19th in secondary school graduate rates, possibly an optimistic estimate. When compared with other industrialized nations, the United States ranked only 14th in the percentage of the population that enters postsecondary education and then completes a bachelor’s degree or higher. As a result, the United States is one of the few OECD nations in which the older generation has achieved higher tertiary education rates than the younger sector.

In some states—such as California, the first state to invest in a comprehensive approach to mass higher education—access to postsecondary education for the traditional age cohort has declined significantly over the past two decades. In 1970, some 55 percent of all public high school graduates in California moved directly to tertiary education, among the highest rate in the nation; in the year 2000, the rate was a mere 48 percent, with the vast majority going into community colleges, most as part-time students and most destined never to attain a two-year let alone a bachelor’s degree. This has occurred in an economic environment in which demand for a labor pool with postsecondary training and education is expanding.

One 2006 study estimates that by the year 2022, one in three new California jobs generated will require an associate degree, bachelor’s degree, or higher. Jobs requiring higher education are already growing faster than overall employment in the state.

**Observations on Competitors**

Within the EU, the push to increase participation rates in higher education transcends national borders. So important is the expansion of universities for EU nations that many countries are now integrating degree standards (like the American model) under the 1999 Bologna declaration. As of May 2005, 45 signatory countries joined the Bologna process.

In Europe, the rhetoric regarding markets and deregulation does pervade much of the talk about how to advance participation rates. However, governments by and large are launching reforms and creating bureaucratic regulatory regimes focused on access, productivity, and quality.

Moreover, government plays a heavier hand in Europe than in the United States, in part because of historical and cultural differences. The development of public higher education in America has largely followed an organic process of building institutions and creating self-regulated systems over a long time. On the other hand, in Europe and most of the world, until the 1960s (and arguably, later in many countries), higher education constituted an elite function transformed by governments.

**Stagnation in the United States**

What factors contribute to this erosion of America’s once dominant position in higher education? The array of interrelated causes can be boiled down to four main factors.

As noted, one reason is the uneven quality of high schools in the United States and, in some states, real declines in high school graduation rates. Another important cause is the drop in the political interest and government investment in public higher education (where some 80 percent of all American students are enrolled). The federal and state partnership that devoted significant resources to building mass higher education in the United States throughout the last century has dissipated. This phenomenon helps generate a third cause: increased fees without adequate increases in financial aid.

With the exception of political battles in America over admissions to a few selective public universities and concerns over cost containment, American higher education remains a second-tier political issue. The crisis of the public sector—the underinvestment in public colleges and universities, which are the primary providers of postsecondary education—is not a mainstream political concern. For this and a variety of other
reasons, the United States has become relatively complacent in maintaining its higher education advantage.

Author's note: This article is adopted from the author’s new book, *The Conditions for Admissions: Access, Equity, and the Social Contract of Public Universities.*
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**Moosung Lee**

Moosung Lee is a PhD candidate in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota. Address: 269 Appleby Hall, 128 Pleasant Street SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA. E-mail: leex2125@umn.edu.

The increasing global influence of international organizations creates some curiosity about the educational backgrounds of top officials in leading international organizations. This article explores which universities are regarded or preferred as world-class universities by recruiters in the leading international organizations. Data were obtained from the *Year Book of International Organizations* (2005–2006) and *Who's Who in International Organizations* (2006), which include 15,354 leading organizations ranging from United Nations agencies to virtually every type of international organization. As such, the educational backgrounds of 2,563 high-ranking officials were identified—encompassing secretaries—general, directors-general, deputy and assistant directors-general, and department heads. Included in this sample were top officials holding one or more of the higher education degrees (i.e., bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral).

**Education of Global Leaders**

The majority of these global leaders were trained at Western universities. Of the 2,563 high-ranking officials, 88.5 percent of them earned at least one higher education degree at Western universities. In particular, almost half of these alma maters are located in two English-speaking countries: the United States, 27.4 percent, and the United Kingdom, 18.8 percent. These national figures to some extent reflect the percentage of global elite universities located in these two nations, as suggested by the rankings of the *Times Higher Education Supplement* (*THES*) and Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU). For example, the 2005 *THES* ranking reveals that 26.5 percent of the top 200 universities were located in the United States, which is consistent with the percentage of the top officials educated in the United States (27.4% of the top 2,563 officials). Also, 16 percent of the top 200 universities were located in the United Kingdom according to the 2005 SJTU data—similar to the percentage of the top officials educated in the United Kingdom (18.8%). The prestigious universities in those two countries served as the major source for top officials. A striking 11.7 percent of the 2,563 officials were cultivated by only four universities: Harvard (4%), Oxford (3.4%), Cambridge (2.5%), and Yale (1.8%).

Another distinctive feature was that 41 percent of top officials turned out to be educated in western European countries other than in the United Kingdom. The institutions where 29.5 percent of top officials were educated were located in four European countries: France (11.5%), Belgium (8.8%), Germany (4.9%), and the Netherlands (4.3%). These top officials were educated in 19 cities in countries where several well-known universities are clustered—for example, Paris (e.g., Paris I to Paris XIII, and Ecole Normale Supérieure) and Brussels (e.g., Université Libre de Bruxelles and Université Catholique de Louvain).

The leading position of Western universities in supplying officials for these international bodies means that many non-Western universities were thus marginalized in terms of shaping the membership structure of these organizations. Only 11.5 percent of the top officials were educated at universities in Asia Pacific (6.3%), Latin America (2.1%), eastern Europe (1.8%), and Africa (1.3%). Even academically well-known universities in the Asia Pacific region lagged far behind their Western counterparts in generating global leaders. Only 6.3 percent of the top officials were educated at universities in the Asia Pacific region, where 51 universities out of the top 200 (25.5%) were located, according to *THES*. More specifically, while 17 Australian universities were ranked in top 200 by the *THES*, only 0.7 percent of the top officials were educated at Australian universities.

**The leading position of Western universities in supplying officials for these international bodies means that many non-Western universities were thus marginalized**

**Advantage of Geographic Location**

An investigation confirms that this hiring disparity cannot be explained by school rankings. Located in four western European countries, the universities that are producing many global leaders were generally ranked lower than certain well-known universities in the Asia Pacific region and even North America (e.g., Tokyo, Beijing, Melbourne, Australia National University, Michigan, and Toronto). For example, 8.8 percent of top officials were educated in Belgian universities, but only four Belgian universities were ranked among the top 200...
schools by both the THES and the SJTU ranking tables in 2005. Moreover, there were no Belgian universities listed in SJTU’s top 100. By contrast, only 1.3 percent of top officials were cultivated in Canadian universities, despite the fact that, respectively, 8 and 12 Canadian universities were ranked in the top 200 by the THES and SJTU.

The advantage these western European universities enjoy appears related to geography. A considerable number of principal secretariats for international organizations are located in western Europe. Specifically, 60.2 percent of 21,612 principal secretariats were located in western Europe. Of the principal secretariats, 32.3 percent were located in the four western European countries already mentioned—France (14.4%), Belgium (14%), Germany (3.5%), and the Netherlands (3.4%)—where 29.5 percent of top officials were educated. By contrast, only 0.9 and 2.2 percent of the principal secretariats were located in Australia and Canada, respectively. Therefore, it can be speculated that these universities located in France, Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands seem to be making the most of their geographical proximity to the headquarters of international organizations in supplying human resources.

**Possible Implications**

Because of their common university backgrounds, the high-ranking officials in leading international organizations probably experienced a similar academic ethos and somewhat homogeneous curricula. Their ways of defining and approaching global problems are likely to have much in common. It is thus reasonable to assume that non-Western voices or mindsets may often not be well heard or applied when global issues are confronted by these international bodies. By recruiting key personnel from the same preferred universities, these international organizations are to some degree instilling particular cognitive and cultural norms.

While the common educational backgrounds may be contributing to similar worldviews among global leaders, the results of this research do not necessarily prove that global leaders are excessively homogeneous. Rather, these leaders are not likely to be monolithic in both their private and public lives as are their universities in terms of vision, orientation, modus operandi, intellectual legacy, and academic culture. Nonetheless, the results do reveal which universities are selectively appreciated, preferred, and accepted as most qualified to supply human resources for international organizations.

---

**Sustaining Oxford as World Class**

David Palfreyman is bursar and fellow in New College, Oxford University, and director of the Oxford Center for Higher Education Policy Studies. E-mail: www.oxcheps.new.ox.ac.uk.

Let’s be forthright in acknowledging the miniherd of elephants now ensconced inside the Oxford University senior common room (SCR), one in each corner and one wallowing by the sherry decanters in the middle of this elegant room. The five are labeled: “Remaining World Class,” “Raising Tuition Fees,” “Protecting Tutorial Teaching,” “Widening Participation,” and “Defending Academic Self-Governance” (the last subtitled “Keeping the Lunatics in Charge of the Asylum”). For space reasons we will concentrate on only the first four of those five elephants.

There is, of course, some overlap among these five themes, and much of what is said here about Oxford also applies to Cambridge, the other UK “top ten” global player—an institution similar to Oxford in terms of intensive and expensive undergraduate teaching (via “supervisions” rather than “tutorials”), costly research activity (even more “big science” than in Oxford), and the socioeconomic background of the students (posh!). Parts of this essay relate to other elites such as University College London, Imperial, London School of Economics, Manchester, and Edinburgh. Put simply, if we want to maintain the lucrative export industry that is “UK higher education plc” (worth some £3 billion per annum to gross domestic product on top of UK higher education’s ca. £40 billion general contribution within the economy), these flagship universities must be adequately funded. The whole national higher education brand depends on the continued success of these elite subbrands. Hence the presence of the elephants in the SCR needs to be addressed if we are to avoid the mediocre and moribund nature of higher education systems in other major European countries.

**Remaining World Class**

In 2004 the Oxford Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (OxCHEPS) and the Ulanov Partnership costed Oxford, using the methodology developed in the United States for the National Association of College and University Business Officers “Cost of College Project” and hence allowing a direct comparison of metrics with Harvard, Princeton, and Berkeley. The essence of the OxCHEPS message was that Oxford needs another £150 million a year on top of its £500 million budget if it is to remain globally competitive. In the context of a halving of the taxpayer-funded “unit of resource”
within UK higher education for undergraduate teaching over some 20 years, the 2006 increase in tuition fees to £3,000 is too little, too late for either Oxford or universities generally. Government is putting in more money for research, but Parliament at the 2009/10 review of higher education funding must not dodge the lifting of the cap on tuition fees for UK/EU undergraduates to a realistic level of at least £10,000. Such additional monies, along with Oxford’s own determined efforts at fundraising from alumni and its exploitation of intellectual property, could mean it keeps pace with its US rivals that currently have three or four times its spending power. It is astonishing that Oxford continues to punch so far above its financial weight, reflecting a combination of praiseworthy academic productivity from underpaid and overworked “dons” compared with their US colleagues and a worrying risk that in living off past investment it is now on borrowed time.

**Raising Tuition Fees**

Any talk of raising tuition fees immediately unites the cunning self-interest of the wealthy middle classes with the naïve residual socialism of Old Labour backbenchers and hence the furor around the 2004 higher education bill that proposed fees of £3,000 and that Prime Minister Blair got through by a mere 5 votes despite a theoretical Commons majority of some 150. Lord Desai, an academic economist Labour peer, has commented: “For 35 years I have heard the same argument: if we charge anything, the poor will not get access. The middle classes are clever; they always use the poor to justify their own subsidies. . . . What is happening now is that by charging a single [low] price we have to ration. Such rationing results in bad education. . . . Who gets such bad education? People from lower income classes and ethnic minorities. . . . The problem is that people around the country, and especially in another place [the Commons], mistake uniformity for equity. . . . The higher education system in this country has been the biggest robbery the middle classes have perpetrated on the welfare state.”

High(ish) fees combined with generous grants and loans carefully targeted at students from the lower socioeconomic groups create a higher education system that is far more socially equitable than the supposedly fair free public good systems. On grounds of both social equity and also a good business sense Oxford should be charging annual undergraduate tuition fees of about £10,000 to those students and their families who can afford to pay (and many of them will anyway have been paying private school fees of around that amount or even higher). In charging such fees Oxford must, of course, be utterly needs blind in selecting students, operating a rigorously fair and methodologically robust student financial aid system of grants and loans so that no applicant is unable to take up a place for financial reasons. At the same time annual increases in fees clearly need to be kept within reasonable bounds (unlike the runaway hikes characterizing UK independent school fees and US private universities) by applying firm cost-control, maximizing alumni giving, utilizing corporate bond cheap debt, achieving full economic cost recovery of overheads on research projects, managing endowment investment with flair, and generally earning income wherever possible from conferences, tourism, and other sources.

**Protecting Tutorial Teaching**

Oxford and Cambridge, unlike many elite universities in the United Kingdom and United States, still take undergraduate teaching seriously. Notably, the Oxbridge colleges as teaching machines, countering the weight of the academic departments as primarily research operations, protect the institutional commitment to education, in contrast to other elites where teaching has been shortchanged to free resources to pursue “the kash & kudos of research.” That said, tutorial teaching is under pressure in Oxford: it is an expensive commodity at 1:2 rather than the 1:12/15 seminars norm elsewhere; it is dependent on both tutor and tutee making the best of it. The Oxford tutorial has an almost mystic, cult status. But is it also an anachronism, a sacred cow to which Oxford pays mere lip service as it quietly shifts to “small-group teaching”? Or is it to be preserved at all costs as a pedagogical gem, the jewel in Oxford’s crown as the best way to challenge, stimulate, and truly educate young minds in the crucial “lifelong-learning” skill of a liberal education, and as sound analysis and critical thinking, to the wider benefit of society and the economy? Is the added value of demanding from students more written work than their counterparts at other universities get the opportunity to submit—and then putting them on the spot to discuss the work in a way that now rarely happens at other elites—worth the expense and duly appreciated by the students and their future employers? A proper market in tuition fees may answer at least the question of whether the student or family is really interested in intensive undergraduate education.

**Conclusion**

The United Kingdom is a world leader in financial services (the City of London) and in higher education (Oxford and Cambridge). The former was saved from oblivion by major deregulation in the 1980s; the latter now needs to be liberalized by way of a much higher fees cap (if not uncapped fees) from 2010 onwards. Along with other sources of increased income, enhanced tuition fees will enable Oxford to keep up with its global competitors. It would be a bonus to do all this while remaining a self-governing academic community; and it might anyway be wasted effort if Oxford were to damage itself by becoming corporatist and managerialist. It would be a pity if Oxford’s exceptionalism is not allowed to thrive at a time
when another major European country (Germany) is, at last, beginning to reform its higher education system by granting greater autonomy to institutions, introducing tuition fees, and funding 10 of its universities as elites to compete with Oxford, Cambridge, and the US Ivy League. Life in the top echelon of globalized higher education is not going to get any less competitive (not least as China’s universities develop), and the best chance of survival lies in being as free as possible from the dead hand of government interference in pricing the product—a freedom, however, that rightly demands in return that Oxford remains an open and accessible academic meritocracy.

**Author’s note:** This article is a short version of the author’s chapter in Hugo de Bergh, Jeremy Black, and Anna F. Fazackerley, eds., *Can the Prizes Still Glitter: The Future of British Universities in the Changing World* (2007). See www.agora-education.org.
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Worldwide, two major transformations in higher education are simultaneously under way. Many scholarly and media accounts of these two changes present them as polar opposites, creating more conflict than harmony within the university. The first trend, often considered pedestrian, is the unprecedented expansion and massification of higher education in most nations, not only in wealthy nations such as the United States. This expansion follows an educational revolution in most nations, not only in wealthy nations such as the United States. However, other wealthy nations, such as Germany, are having a difficult time producing even one such university. The model for the American super research university has become so incorporated into modern culture that mass higher education, often thought of in the past as a mere fantasy, is rapidly spreading across the world.

Schooling everyone across the lifespan is a truly revolutionary idea in the development of human society with substantial implications for how we think, work, and live. This idea has become so incorporated into modern culture that mass higher education ascended into rapid expansion. In the United States, for example, every decade sees a substantially larger proportion of students going on to higher education for research, a large private sector, and so forth. What is frequently missed in this approach is the exceptional societal support that the United States has been able to generate for education—particularly in general and higher education. The United States has achieved this model, first through a comprehensive system of secondary education that provides graduates with aspirations and expectations for more education and, second, through a relatively open and comprehensive higher education system. This has led to the belief in American society that the university, particularly the super research university, is not an elitist or esoteric enterprise but rather a remarkably democratic and useful institution. The fact that so many Americans attend and have deep connections to institutions of higher edu-

---

**The American Super Research University**

The advent of the super research university in the United States over the past several decades is an equally stunning educational development. The small but growing number of these institutions are able to produce unprecedented levels of science, technology, and knowledge about human society. In spite of the unprecedented founding and recurring expenses, these institutions continue to expand and increase in the United States. However, other wealthy nations, such as Germany, are having a difficult time producing even one such university.

The model for the American super research university has become attractive to many other nations. From this model, policymakers identify factors to mimic—including faculty working conditions, competitiveness-based governmental support for research, a large private sector, and so forth. What is frequently missed in this approach is the exceptional societal support that the United States has been able to generate for education—particularly in general and higher education. The United States has achieved this model, first through a comprehensive system of secondary education that provides graduates with aspirations and expectations for more education and, second, through a relatively open and comprehensive higher education system. This has led to the belief in American society that the university, particularly the super research university, is not an elitist or esoteric enterprise but rather a remarkably democratic and useful institution. The fact that so many Americans attend and have deep connections to institutions of higher edu-

---

**Mass Higher Education**

Only a few decades ago as wealthy nations were completing expanded secondary schooling, many pundits predicted either a death of educational expansion at the university’s gate or even a social crisis because of too much expansion of higher education. Instead, higher education ascended into rapid expansion. In the United States, for example, every decade sees a substantially larger proportion of students going on to higher education. For example, the National Center for Education Statistics recently reported that the percentage of all high school graduates enrolling in higher education increased from 49 percent in 1972 to 69 percent in 2005, and completions of the bachelor of arts and associate in science degrees grew by 33 percent and 46 percent, respectively, from 1989 to 2004. At even a faster rate similar growth is occurring worldwide, where currently around a fourth of all youth enroll in higher education, a nearly 10-fold increase since the middle of the 20th century.

Higher education is a freedom, however, that rightly demands in return that Oxford remains an open and accessible academic meritocracy. The advent of the super research university in the United States over the past several decades is an equally stunning educational development. The small but growing number of these institutions are able to produce unprecedented levels of science, technology, and knowledge about human society. In spite of the unprecedented founding and recurring expenses, these institutions continue to expand and increase in the United States. However, other wealthy nations, such as Germany, are having a difficult time producing even one such university.
cation in all of their many types translates into wide societal support for the costs of super research universities, even if only a small proportion of Americans attend one of the highly selective research institutions.

The super research university model is an expensive one to pursue, requiring a wealthy society. Private money now makes up substantial funding in the United States. Many super research universities are privately controlled. While these factors certainly have enhanced the development of the super research university model, they are not its root cause. Instead, the origin of the super research university is related to how American society has generated widespread societal support for higher education, and included in this are elite research universities. In other words, formal education in the United States has been an early leader in the movement toward mass higher education and all the factors that such an idea includes. Instead of assuming that mass access to higher education and the model of the super research university are mutually exclusive zero-sum forces, what the American case illustrates is that in reality these two trends support one another.
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The university is undergoing a cultural transformation to play a significant role in knowledge-based society. Universities have different missions. The teaching university is based on education and dedication to human capital development. The research university combines production of knowledge with teaching in a creative tension that has proven more productive than separating these activities. The entrepreneurial university encompasses teaching, research, and service for society. In the course of the “second academic revolution,” following the academic revolution that integrated research with teaching, the university is raising economic and social development, its third mission, to the same level as its previous missions.

Entrepreneurial universities have arisen from strikingly different academic foundations, with the first revolution, research, at times occurring simultaneously with the second revolution of economic and social development. An entrepreneurial mode is typically an overlay on a research university, but it can also be a strategy for development from a teaching university, with the phases accomplished simultaneously or even in reverse order to the usual progression. For example, the State University of Rio de Janeiro Friburgo campus began with a PhD program in information technology, accompanied by an incubator, in an innovative academic and regional development strategy.

Infused with entrepreneurial attitudes and strategic vision, the university collaborates with other actors to bridge the gap between discovery and application. In fact, university-industry interaction is often conducted across boundaries, utilizing a variety of linkage mechanisms and arms-length relationships. However, traditional modes of university-industry relations, such as a lump sum payment in exchange for first review of intellectual property rights (e.g., Novartis/Scripps) are problematic due to the tendency for company priorities to shift and the early-stage nature of academic findings with commercial potential that typically requires a translational research process. As a way to address these problems, some universities have utilized the concept of “Professors of Practice” to enhance the academic spin-off process.

**Professor of Practice**

Founded in the mid-19th century, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) was the first entrepreneurial university. For its development it drew upon various streams of academic formats invented in or imported to the United States during the early and mid-19th century for the purpose of establishing a close relationship between the university, technology, and the economy, initially in agriculture and then in industry. During the late 19th century, when MIT was an engineering teaching college, independent consulting engineers were invited into the university as professors to jump-start research.

A similar phenomenon may be currently identified in universities that are utilizing a “Professor of Practice” (PoP) model to further the mission of economic and social development. Typically, the model is a distinguished practitioner who is invited into the university. A PoP with a half-time appointment in
the university and a half-time commitment as a venture capitalist may be found in the Haas Business School, University of California, Berkeley, as head of an Entrepreneurship Center. The PoP manages a “stable of adjuncts,” full-time business people who teach individual specialized courses in the Haas entrepreneurship specialty within the MBA program.

PoP is used to cover various formats, but the basic usage in the United States denotes that category of nontenure faculty whose primary duty is to teach. This role is similar to that of the adjunct professorship and the research professor, who also have limited and specific duties. At MIT, the term is reserved for distinguished practitioners who have had a world-class impact on fields important to MIT’s academic programs and are committed to enhancing those programs.

**Expanding the PoP Model**

In principle, the PoP model can be used to combine internal and external roles in any of the three main missions of the university.

The northeast United Kingdom, a source of the original industrial revolution, is determined to reverse its fate as a declining industrial region. Facing a situation similar to MIT and New England in the early 2oth century, Newcastle University has initiated a “science city” project to renew its region through knowledge-based economic development, focusing on four themes: aging and health, energy and environment, molecular engineering, and stem-cell and regenerative medicine. The implementation plan seeks to redevelop a former industrial site with laboratories for firms and university research groups.

To jump-start attraction of high-tech firms to the region, Newcastle University has turned the PoP concept on its head, from a teaching to a research model. An initial set of four chairs—half supported by the university and half by One Northeast, the regional development agency—has been created. The chairs are designed to attract PhD high-tech firm founders, in the science city theme areas. They are expected to have developed ideas for research that are too advanced to be pursued in their firm but that could be the basis for a university research group, to attract external funds. The optimum expectation is that all or part of a PoP’s firm might follow them to Newcastle.

Within the university, the PoP is expected to serve as a role model for faculty members contemplating initiating a start-up and as a link between the university’s business school and science departments. These faculty are expected to work closely with the science city theme leaders, making significant contributions in developing translational activities and associated education programs.

**Conclusion**

In principle, the PoP model can be used to combine internal and external roles in any of the three main missions of the university. PoPs may be extended across the university and from senior to junior positions. For example, the English Department could draw in a PhD from the publishing industry to help start a university press. The concept can also be applied to faculty members engaging in start-up activity in a serious but not full-time capacity, obviating the choice of leaving the university completely.

As some faculty members move from a regular full-time professorship to a half-time PoP, they will complement those coming in to the university, creating a two-way flow between university and industry. In practice, any university has the potential to assist economic and social development, irrespective of level and previous mission. However, only an entrepreneurial university, with professors recruited from academic and nonacademic venues, has the capacity to complete a virtuous circulation of academic development and societal engagement.
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Globalization and growing worldwide competitiveness are increasingly shaping policies and setting the agenda for the future of European higher education. These responses are formulated and implemented at European, national, regional, and institutional levels. Examining policies and efforts undertaken at the European level reveals the need for a greater political commitment to achieve the intended 3 percent gross domestic product (GDP) target for R&D expenditure and the 2 percent GDP target for higher education expenditure, mainly by stimulating private investments in these areas.

**Complementary Engines for Action**

In the late 1990s, awareness of global competition rose, leading to various initiatives. In 1998, the ministers of 4 countries (the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Italy) called for the harmonization of degree structures, triggering the Bologna
process, eventually joined by more than 45 countries. This important bottom-up and voluntary initiative engaged in system convergence with a view to enhancing employability in Europe and the international competitiveness and attractiveness of European higher education. While the European Commission (EC) served as a partner in the Bologna process, its role became more prominent after 2000 when the heads of state and government declared in Lisbon that by 2010 the European Union (EU) should become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge economy in the world. Shortly thereafter education was defined as one of the key sectors for achieving this goal, providing the EC with an important political mandate in education policy (though this mandate was not supported by any extended legal power). The EC quickly developed a wide range of initiatives known as the Lisbon strategy.

The Bologna process and the Lisbon strategy are the main frameworks guiding the European response to globalization in higher education. While the two initiatives hold some different patterns and could be characterized as intergovernmental (Bologna) versus supranational (Lisbon), they seem to be gradually forming one umbrella approach.

**Convergence and Divergence**

The first phase of the Bologna process focused strongly on convergence and transparency agenda among European countries (i.e., reform of curriculum and degree structures). The second phase has centered more on the “external dimension” in terms of enhancing international competitiveness and attractiveness and connections to other regions. This was paralleled by the development of the European higher education area (EHEA) and the European research area (ERA), as part of the wider Lisbon strategy, and by the creation of ERASMUS MUNDUS program.

The Bologna process is implemented quite differently across countries, weakening its harmonizing or convergence effects. Divergent trends can also be observed, especially within countries. This indicates that the current dynamics in European higher education are at times characterized by harmonization and transparency as well as searching for greater diversity. Both trends are considered important to enhance competitiveness in the global context. Increased participation rates among domestic students, fostered by diversified provision, are seen as enhancing each country’s potential as a knowledge economy. Rising cross-border mobility within Europe and attracting more students from other regions, objectives fostered by harmonization and convergence, are seen to enhance the performance of the European knowledge economy as a whole.

**Mixed Performance**

The progress in the Lisbon strategy has led to optimism with respect to the objectives of economic growth, employment, and productivity. The proportion of employees with tertiary education is steadily rising. In 2006, 29 percent of the workforce in the EU-15 countries had tertiary education, up from 25 percent in 2000. As for research, however, progress is still unsatisfactory; throughout the EU-15 the share of GDP spent on R&D remains firmly stuck at 1.9 percent, far below the prominent Lisbon target of 3 percent of GDP by 2010. Considerable differences between countries can be observed: Italy and Spain demonstrating very low scores, while in contrast Sweden is way out front. Also for the share of private investment in R&D, the Lisbon objectives have not yet been met.

**Ranking and Classification**

Policy initiatives at European and national levels often relate to the position of universities in the worldwide rankings. Politicians set targets as to how many institutions should rank among the top 20 or 50 institutions as symbols of achievement and prestige and as engines of economic growth in a global knowledge economy. This approach illustrates the role that international rankings of universities play regarding global competitiveness.

**Conclusion**

Europe demonstrates impressive progress, but it also faces the complexity of policies and strategies at national and/or European levels. Deeply rooted differences in performance exist between countries and systems. The EU includes some of the top higher education systems in the world, performing on par or even higher than the United States and Japan, as well as a range of new member states at a different overall level than that of the EU-15 group. Accommodating this diversity and the lack of cohesive supranational decision making will require major institutional reforms at the EU level, which have yet to be established.

This article is based on a longer paper presented on 23 March 2007 at the Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley (http://cshe.berkeley.edu/events/crisis/).
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European higher education, especially the traditional research university, is currently in a state of institutional flux. In Europe, higher education institutions have historically played an important role in nation building—supplying states with educated manpower, building national consciousness and identity, integrating national elites, and providing a national research capacity for economic and social development. Consequently, higher education institutions have long been regarded as national institutions, with the national authorities responsible for regulations and funding. The Treaty of Maastricht (1992), which forms the legal basis for the European Union (EU), also viewed higher education as national entities, implying that the European Commission could not undertake any initiative itself for harmonizing higher education.

Growing Involvement of the EU

Recently, however, the need for a joint European policy perspective on higher education has become more widely accepted. The European commission, in particular, has claimed that a dynamic knowledge-based economy requires modernization of European universities and colleges. The president of the commission (José Manuel Barroso) and the commissioners responsible for higher education and for research state that higher education has never featured so high on the commission’s agenda, that the political interest in higher education is growing, and that reforms are urgently needed.

In line with this, the commission has produced a stream of documents promoting radical reforms. A “Charter for Researchers” specifying roles and responsibilities has been developed; the European Research Council is presented as an important institutional innovation and an autonomous entity under scientific leadership. The European Institute of Technology is promoted as Europe’s “knowledge flagship,” bringing together research, education, and innovation. Its governing board is to consist of academics and businesspeople seen as able to select the best areas for long-term investment in research within a 10-to-15-year period.

A New University Model?

This EU focus on higher education is accompanied by an intense mistrust of university traditions, as can be illustrated by the following quote from Commissioner Ján Figel: “We need a new model... to demonstrate to countries where university models still hark back to the days of Humboldt that today there are additional ways of doing things.”

The “new model” proposed by the commission emphasizes leadership, management, and entrepreneurship more than individuals’ academic freedom, internal democracy, and the organizing role of academic disciplines. Higher education institutions should gain greater autonomy but must also produce more accountability. This transition requires new internal governance structures involving strategic priorities and professional management. Universities and colleges must overcome their fragmentation into faculties, departments, laboratories, research centers, and administrative units and instead target their efforts collectively on institutional priorities for research, teaching, and innovation. This mission should include multilateral consortia, joint-degree arrangements, networks, and collaborations. The commission also supports a further separation of teaching from research and more differentiation and stratification among higher education institutions yet with fewer differences between countries and more within each country.

International competitiveness and higher education’s contribution to society’s economic and social progress are seen to be held back by the role historically played by governments. In the new model the state should serve less predominantly as funder, receiver of graduates, and user of knowledge. There should be governance by standardization, dialogue, benchmarking, and exchange of “good practice.” Higher education’s mission for society requires an external system of quality assurance and accreditation and a move from state control to being accountable to society and customers. External controls are called for—through increased competition, externally defined standards and goals, demands for results that can be documented in numbers, and external monitoring units.

Reforms are driven both by the fear of falling behind and by promises of new resources. With a funding deficit, investments in European universities need to be increased and diversified. Compared to the United States, on average an EUR 10,000 gap in resources per student exists, according to the European Commission. The commission stated that higher education as the “knowledge industry,” like other industries, urgently needs reform and that the goals and remedies are basically the same as for other sectors. As was argued last year...
by European Commission President Barroso, “Europe’s economic future depends on having the most highly educated and trained people, with the full range of skills and the adaptability required in a ‘knowledge economy.’ That is why we must boost investment in higher education significantly. The commission is suggesting a target [investment for higher education] of 2 percent of gross domestic product by 2010.”
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Public money for private higher education is a major policy issue for governments, the general public, and of course private institutions—all the more so as the private sector has risen to roughly 30 percent of total global enrollment and is continuing to grow. Yet, a key baseline is the fact that public funding of private higher education is the exception, not the rule. This reality is often obscured by contrary examples that lead to the absurd notion that source of income does not seriously distinguish the two sectors of higher education. In fact, just as public higher education is overwhelmingly sustained by public money, private higher education is just as overwhelmingly sustained by private money. This generalization is particularly strong in the developing world and the postcommunist world—the two greatest sites of private higher education expansion. Nonetheless, examples of public money for private higher education are significant and increasing.

Full-Blown National Cases

Probably the most-cited cases where private higher education depends on public funding, to almost the same extent as public higher education does, are found in Belgium and the Netherlands. The roots lie early in the last century, with the idea that religious and cultural groups could have their own private universities, and since all groups hold that same right the public would legitimately fund all institutions. This is essentially a voucher principle. Though not as much in governance as in finance, private universities would resemble public ones except for the one area of cultural distinctiveness.

Chile by midcentury came to provide a clear developing country case of public funding of the private sector. Alongside the two public universities, all six private ones (both religious and secular) became basically publicly funded. A startling change then ensued under military neoliberal rule in the 1980s: the proliferation of truly private universities. These constitute the “private sector,” whereas the six prior institutions are labelled “old privates.”

With independence, India saw a massive shift in funding and governance. An enormous network of private colleges, affiliated to universities, became essentially public. Here, too, however, a fresh wave of private proliferation has exploded onto the scene, accounting now for perhaps 30 percent of total enrollments.

Other cases of public takeover were even more extreme but concerned abolition of private higher education, not just public funding of still formally private institutions. In the 1970s Turkey was one example and the communist bloc the major set of examples.

Rationales

Justifications for public funding are multiple, as are arguments against that policy. One rational is fair and equal treatment of students, regardless of their institutions. Another is access, particularly if the private sector offers slots beyond what the public sector provides yet needs certain cost-sharing. The access rationale strengthens in areas where the populations are less privileged. More broadly, in public-private partnerships the public side pursues public goals, with public money, but entrusts management largely to private nonprofit organizations. Sometimes this policy involves direct contracting out for a specific public end but often just general ongoing grants.

Other major rationales involve quality and incentives. Where this orientation is found the whole private sector does not qualify for funding; instead, public money is dispersed according to sets of criteria. Funding is thus “sector blind,” which hardly insures equal amounts to the two sectors. Indeed, most private institutions and units within favored institutions may not receive such money. Public money may motivate private institutions to improve (e.g., seek accreditation) or expand; in turn, governments may relish forcing public universities to compete for some of their funding. Often, private institutions continue to carry out their most basic goals
supported by private money but go further when they can add public money. Research and graduate education are examples.

In much of Asia, decades of reliance on private higher education for the bulk of enrollments supported access but left concern over quality and breadth, providing a strong rationale for public funding to enable the private sector to reach the next level. In the Middle East, a number of governments have joined local private (and sometimes international) actors to launch a private sector, even if no plans exist for permanent public funding. An overlapping rationale can be to provide higher education opportunity so as to limit high rates of studying abroad.

THE US MODELS
Most of these rationales have long affected the US system. The US case constitutes the largest fountain of ideas and precedents. Two types of funding dominate at the national level, though often with a strong echo at state levels.

First, regarding research, almost wherever major costly research has been carried out at private universities, public funding has been essential. Leading US private research universities often outdraw public university counterparts in winning federal research funding. In Latin America, Brazil and Chile represent the foremost examples of open competition for public research funds. Similarly, they and other countries in the region have rewards for productive professors regardless of whether they are at public or private institutions.

The other major type of US public funding subsidizing private higher education is student grants and loans.

Second, regarding students, the other major type of US public funding subsidizing private higher education is student grants and loans. Students are eligible as long as their institutions are accredited; this funding applies even to for-profit institutions. The grants and loans are usually needs-based and go hand-in-hand with access and efficiency rationales. The idea inspires international applause (at least where not extended to for-profit institutions). While still a limited reality, such forms of student funding could be introduced if feasible domestic modalities for loan repayments are found. Thailand is an example of where income-contingent loans have recently been established (along with grants-in-aid) for private higher education.

It is unknown how far public funding of private higher education will extend internationally or in what forms. Some of the pertinent policy issues show parallels at the primary and secondary education levels. Public funding of private higher education remains unusual internationally, but changes in public policy may occur.

PRIVATE DEEMED UNIVERSITIES IN INDIA
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Though the third-largest system in terms of enrollment, with more than 10 million students, India has almost half of the world’s institutions of higher education—almost four times more than in the United States and Europe and over seven times the number of institutions in China. Most of the 18,000 institutions in India are colleges and only around 370 are universities. While universities award their own degrees, the colleges award degrees through the university to which they are affiliated. Only 120 of the 370 universities are the affiliating type, the rest are unitary with no affiliated colleges. Academic degrees in India can only be awarded by a university. Both the national Parliament and the state legislatures can authorize the establishment of universities. In addition, the national government can grant “deemed university” status to an institution initially founded as a private or public college.

The distinction between a private and public institution in Indian higher education is somewhat blurred. If the government promotes and sets up an institution, it is referred to as a public institution. On the other hand, an institution promoted and set up by a private promoter is referred to as a private institution. However, some private institutions (both universities and colleges) are government supported and highly regulated. Though technically private, these are de facto public institutions. Hence, private institutions here include only institutions that are set up by private promoters and do not receive government funding.

PRIVATE GROWTH

Over the past 20 years, the higher education capacity in the country has increased largely through private institutions. Currently, 43 percent of institutions and 30 percent of enrollments are in the private sector. Among the countries for which information has been gathered by the Program for Research on Private Higher Education (PROPHE), India’s level of private enrollments exceeds 35 countries and trails just 12.

Until recently, these private institutions consisted mostly of colleges. These private colleges are subject to government control via the public universities with which they are affiliated. They lack the autonomy to offer new programs, innovate curriculum and evaluation, or change policies in matters of admissions and fees. Many people believe that the affiliating structure is a bane on Indian higher education. However, the affili-
ating system did ensure rapid expansion, while maintaining the sanctity of admissions and fees. Wherever academic supervision was effective, it also ensured minimum standards were maintained.

By the mid-1990s, promoters of private colleges saw the regulatory control of the affiliating university and state governments as cumbersome, impeding the full utilization of the colleges’ market potential. Thus, they wanted university status to wriggle out of control of state governments and the affiliating universities. This resulted in the proliferation of private universities and private deemed universities. Now state legislatures have established 10 private universities and 70 private deemed universities.

Debate over private universities has continued for more than a decade. In 1995, the Private Universities (Establishment and Regulation) bill was introduced in the Parliament. While a central legislation for private universities is still pending for want of a consensus, several state governments have established private universities through state legislation. Today, there are 10 private universities in Indian higher education.

**Private Deemed Universities**

To ease the pressure of central legislation over private universities, the government began liberally granting deemed university status to private institutions. The transition from private college to private deemed university is now a new and growing trend.

Earlier, the deemed university provision that empowered an institution to award its own degree was sparingly used to allow leading institutions to offer programs at an advanced level in a particular field or specialization. The Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore and the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in Delhi were the first two institutions to be declared deemed universities in 1958. This number increased to 29 in 1990/91 and 38 in 1998 and now stands at 110. Most of the post-1998 deemed universities are private.

Initially, only public and government-aided institutions became deemed universities. In 1976, the Manipal Academy for Higher Education, a pioneer in private higher education, became the first financially independent institution to be declared a deemed university. In 1998, to encourage the development of educational opportunities in emerging disciplines, the procedure was changed to favor new institutions.

Granting deemed university status, particularly using the new provisions, raised many issues. The process was temporarily suspended in 2002, and efforts were made to frame more stringent guidelines, which the government, however, did not approve. In 2005, attempts were also made to increase the transparency of the process by introducing a screening system, but this initiative was also abandoned. The somewhat opaque and arbitrary granting of deemed university status leads to a perception that the process is susceptible to political manipulation. Meanwhile, the number of private deemed universities continues to increase.

Between 2000 and 2005, 48 institutions including 26 private ones were declared deemed universities and 107 proposals were pending. By the end of 2005, there were as many as 93 deemed universities; this number now stands at 110. Besides 17 public regional engineering colleges that became deemed universities and were renamed National Institutes of Technology, only an insignificant number of public institutions have been declared universities. A large proportion of the private colleges seeking this status are in Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra, states with the highest proportion of private colleges. A history of political patronage to private initiatives in these states is said to account for the institutions’ success in acquiring deemed university status.

For most successful private colleges, the deemed university status represents a worthwhile pursuit. For one thing, the government control via the affiliating public universities does not apply to deemed universities. Colleges that have maintained a certain degree of control through self-financing gain a higher level of freedom through deemed university status. They enjoy freedom in matters of fees and admissions. Thus large nonrefundable deposits are the norm for gaining admission, and tuition fees tend to be high.

Private deemed universities are mostly run by powerful families that either play an important role in politics themselves or earn political patronage by dispensing favors, like preferential admissions. They wield great influence in shaping policy on private higher education, for the purpose of consolidating their own operations.

Deemed universities obtained many concessions from the University Grants Commission and the government. Such institutions can now use the term “university” in their title and initiate teaching programs at both the undergraduate and the postgraduate levels in disciplines of their choice. This brings them on par with public universities.

Most private deemed universities operate in low-risk, high profit fields that essentially train the workforce of the future—with a few exceptions such as the Birla Institute of Technology, Pilani, and Thapar University (earlier Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology), Patiala. While many of these institutions are of decent quality, they rarely focus on postgraduate education and research. Many of them generate enough surplus funds not only to meet their operating expenses but also to expand and improve infrastructure and facilities.
Conclusion
In reality, while some private deemed universities are innovative and entrepreneurial, meeting market demands, they are also susceptible to cutting corners on infrastructure or staffing and indulging in unfair practices in matters of fees and admissions—to increase profits. Overall, the policy on private deemed universities is so ambiguously spelled out that less-reputable ventures have come to dominate.

Though small in numbers, private deemed universities would increasingly shape the future of private higher education in India. Even the foreign institutions would be given deemed university status under the proposed Foreign Educational Institutions (Regulation of Entry and Operation, Maintenance of Quality and Prevention of Commercialization) Bill currently under consideration.
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Foreign education activity has become a relatively recent but rapidly growing phenomenon in Latin America and the Caribbean. The past few decades have seen a surge in external tertiary providers within a region once largely overlooked as a site for transnational higher education.

Opportunities and Risks
There is a growing flurry of foreign education activity in Latin America and the Caribbean. Branch campuses have been set up by European and US-based institutions, such as the Universities of Bologna (Italy) and Heidelberg (Germany) and Endicott College (United States), just to name a few. The growing diversification of actors suggests that not only Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking providers see a potential for operating in the region. While still a modest trend, the market for foreign online and distance learning is attracting interest, particularly in regions such as the Anglophone Caribbean. The number of for-profit providers has also been on the rise, with the US giants Sylvan/Laureate and the Apollo Group as the forerunners of expansion. The number of students in the region in transnational programs, while currently modest, is expected to undergo expansion.

However, transnational higher education continues to encounter a mixed reputation in the region, with widespread concerns over the quality and relevance of provision. Cases of low-quality or “fly-by-night” operators has prompted some countries like Argentina, Brazil, and Colombia to impose relatively strict requirements on foreign institutions. Language constitutes an obvious barrier. Domestic institutions do not seem to be offering many courses taught in English, and inadequate language skills remain a barrier for a major proportion of Latin American students seeking to study in English, at home or abroad.

There is a growing trend toward the “Latin Americanization” rather than “transnationalization” of higher education. A number of the regional countries (e.g., Mexico and Chile) have begun to export transnational programs, in response to an attempt to internationalize the “Latin American way.” A number of the countries have expressed a desire to attract foreign providers exclusively from within the region. In Ecuador and Bolivia, for example, nearly half of all external providers are from South America, mainly Chile, Brazil, Colombia, and Argentina. The Latin Americanization model could impact the market entry of external tertiary providers—supporting those able to integrate into the local system and improve perceptions of the developmental impact of foreign higher education delivery.

Major Players and Provision
The vast majority of foreign institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean have linguistic, cultural, or historical links to the region. Spain continues to dominate the market. Latin American institutions are also becoming increasingly active in the region, in line with the broader Latin Americanization trend. The Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, in Mexico, is the most active Latin American transnational provider in the region. It has learning centers in five regional countries and operates a virtual university enrolling over 12,000 students throughout the Americas.
Regarding the exporting potential of institutions, over the past decade some Latin American countries have targeted the Spanish-speaking migrant populations in the United States. Institutions from Puerto Rico, for example, have set up learning centers in Miami and Orlando for the Hispanic community of Florida. Various initiatives have sought to bolster the participation rate among the Hispanic population, which overall is underrepresented in US higher education.

The vast majority of transnational provision in the region is at the postgraduate level, in some cases due to national regulations. However, there appears to be a growing transnational market for upper-level technical university preparation and professional degrees. The main language of instruction is Spanish. The most common subject areas are economics and business administration. There are very few external providers offering courses in resource-intensive areas such as health sciences, engineering, or technology. Overall, transnational providers appear to be focused on offering courses with minimal costs and maximum output. From this viewpoint, although it serves to satisfy some unmet demand, transnational delivery also exacerbates the enrollment imbalance in the region.

Emerging Issues and Implications
Over the past five years, the rise in external tertiary providers has inspired largely controversial discussions about the developmental impact, in the region, of foreign education activity. There have been repeated claims about the "McDonaldization" of higher education, but little data have been collected to validate or refute these opinions. Some countries have been characterized by a laissez-faire approach to foreign institutions, while others have shaped the sector as less of an open market for external providers. A dichotomy, then, has emerged between the regional countries for and against the import of transnational higher education, in many cases creating a fragmented, ambiguous, and controversial environment for external institutions seeking to operate in the region.

Quality Assurance in Colombia
Iván Pacheco

Iván Pacheco served as an official responsible for quality assurance in the Ministry of Higher Education of Colombia. He is currently a doctoral student in higher education at Boston College. E-mail: ivan.pacheco@bc.edu.

Quality assurance of higher education has been a concern in Colombia since the 1960s when, pressed by the overwhelming creation of programs and institutions, a legal project to create an accreditation system was drafted. The project did not become a law; but further efforts, the most important a decree in 1980 and a law in 1992, produced today's complex system of quality assurance.

Currently, the Colombian government exercises control in higher education through the tasks of inspection and surveillance. The Ministry of Education authorizes the start-up of new programs and institutions and imposes administrative penalties on institutions that break the law. Academic peers have gained influence in the system, and today they have a significant role in the evaluation process.

Institutional and Program Evaluation
Evaluation is carried out at three levels— institutions, programs, and students. The establishment of a new public or private higher education institution starts with the application, consisting of several documents related to academic, legal, and financial requirements; followed by the evaluation by a group of consultants, hired by the Ministry of Education, and a group of academic peers designated by CONACES (the Inter-institutional National Commission for the Quality Assurance of Higher Education), which is a collegiate body formed by scholars and organized by areas of knowledge; and finishes with the decision issued by the Ministry of Education. When the deci-
sion is positive, the new institution is allowed to operate without a time limit.

Before beginning operations, every academic program, at both graduate and undergraduate levels, must obtain government authorization, called “qualified registration,” and must be included in the National Information System for Higher Education. Qualified registration certifies the fulfillment of minimum conditions of quality. The process to obtain this authorization includes academic peers’ evaluation; a concept by CONACES, based on the peers’ report; and the formal authorization of the program by the Ministry of Education. The qualified registration is granted for a seven-year period, and it is required for seeking accreditation.

Accreditation is voluntary and is granted for a period of 4, 7, or 10 years to programs and institutions that demonstrate their excellence in academic and administrative issues. Managed by the National Accreditation Council (CNA), the accreditation process includes application, evaluation of initial conditions, self-study, on-site evaluation by peers, and a final concept issued by the CNA to the Ministry of Education, which issues a resolution recognizing the accreditation. Since accreditation is linked to the idea of continuous improvement, self-evaluation and external evaluation are aimed at producing corrective voluntary actions.

There are 4,432 graduate programs authorized, and from these, only 369 (8 percent) have been accredited. CNA is the only accreditation agency in the country; however, institutions may apply for accreditation with foreign agencies. These other accreditations do not have relevance in the country, yet they can be used for marketing purposes and to facilitate international recognition.

The existence of two different procedures related to programs and institutions (authorization and accreditation) creates a double filter aimed at improving quality. Nevertheless, given the differing numbers of authorized and accredited programs, clearly a reexamination is called for of these two processes that sometimes duplicate requests of information and may produce conflicting results. Recent efforts to reduce this risk have been carried out, but it is still a reason for concern.

**Student Evaluation**

Students are evaluated twice by the state—before the beginning of their higher education and then before its completion. There are antecedents of a general admissions test from 1934. However, the current version of the higher education admissions test can be traced back to 1980; it is called the Exam for Access to Higher Education and it is typically scheduled at the end of 11th grade, the last grade of high school. Most higher education institutions use these results as a criterion in the admissions process, while the government uses them to collect information on students’ level of knowledge as well as to gather demographic information.

The second test is called Exam of Quality of Higher Education (ECAES). Since 2002 the test has been assigned to the students who are in the last two semesters of every academic program. ECAES is obligatory but it is not a requirement to obtain an undergraduate degree. However, some institutions have defined minimum scores in this test as a requisite for graduation.

**Quality Assurance and Autonomy**

An ongoing debate continues on whether quality assurance, as conducted by the government and supported in the academic community, violates the constitutional guarantee for universities’ autonomy. People who believe that the policy does not violate institutional autonomy consider that it is part of the constitutional obligation of the government to oversee higher education’s quality. Others believe that the mere fact of authorizing (or denying authorization to) a university to offer a program violates its autonomy.

Student evaluation has also been accused of violating universities’ autonomy, since the content of the exam is based on a homogeneous body of knowledge, methodologies, and contents. The government and people who support this evaluation assume that a common denomination (e.g., medicine, law, engineering, etc.) implies a minimum set of common knowledge and skills that are evaluated in these exams.

**Conclusion**

The great complexity of this quality assurance system is its main strength, as well as its weakness. The sustainability of the system currently depends on the ministry’s efficiency, although ministries are not supposed to carry out such operational tasks. To be able to handle its current level of complexity, the Colombian system will have to decentralize many of the procedures currently concentrated in its Ministry of Education.

It is imperative to simplify the programs’ and institutions’ evaluation process, by focusing on the essential characteristics and indicators of each kind of evaluation as well as on widening the gap between the authorization and accreditation processes. The tension between governmental control and universities’ autonomy will continue. However, the growing demand for accountability will provide the government with stronger arguments to exercise its control over higher education.
Higher Education Corruption in Ukraine: Opinions and Estimates

Ararat L. Osipian

Ararat L. Osipian is a doctoral student at Vanderbilt University. E-mail: ararat.osipian@vanderbilt.edu.

The Constitution of Ukraine guarantees the right of education. The law says “the state guarantees free access to preschool, secondary, professional, vocational, and higher education in the state and municipal educational institutions.” In reality the positions of the free, state-funded higher education have been seriously undermined by the growing corruption in admissions, grading, and graduation.

The president of Ukraine, Victor Yushchenko, pointed out corruption in education in his address to the students at Kiev National University on March 9, 2007: “We are talking about the way to eradicate corruption in higher education institutions, starting from the entry examinations; how to create an independent system of conducting competitive examinations; how to make it possible for the state funds that now extend to 54 percent of all students in higher education institutions to support those specialists requested by the state who come through truly transparent and honest competition.” Symbolically, in June 2007 the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine hosted a conference in Kiev titled “the major corruption schemes in the education system and the ways to eradicate them.”

Estimates
In July 2006 the head of the Department of Economic Crimes Prevention of the Ministry of the Interior reported 210 cases of bribery registered in higher education institutions in that year, of which 11 were in Kiev. He mentioned a departmental chair in Lugansk who demanded that students pay his bills from the electronics and construction stores, and he accepted cash as well. The corrupt chair was arrested while receiving a bribe of $2,000. In yet another case, the deputy director of the Kiev National University’s college was arrested while receiving a bribe of $6,000. The number of investigated cases appears to be the tip of the iceberg as corruption in education is believed to be widespread.

The minister of education refers to the survey conducted by the Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in 2006 targeting students in the leading educational centers of the country—including Kiev, Kharkov, Donetsk, Lviv, and Odessa. Around 20 percent of the respondents reported that they know cases of bribery, but the number of such cases has declined; around 27 percent of students said that bribes were accepted by faculty members at about the same level as in previous years; 7 to 8 percent think that bribery is now flourishing. The number of students who admitted paying bribe for entering the college or university declined from 19 percent in 2005 to 13 percent in 2006.

Private tutoring is thought to be a form of corruption in admissions as well. A payment of $2,000 to $4,000 to a private tutor who is also a professor at a leading university may help in gaining admission to the program where he or she teaches.

The head of the Department of Higher Education in the Ministry of Education says that the survey of freshmen conducted in 2006 showed that two-thirds of them did not face bribery, nepotism, or protectionism. He apparently misses the point that one-third of all freshmen entered higher education institutions either by paying bribes or with the help of their relatives and other acquaintances. Moreover, half of all freshmen in public higher education institutions pay full tuition and enter without competition or bribes. Thus around 60 percent of all students who entered state-funded programs did pay bribes or used their personal connections.

Corruption in higher education is not limited to academic corruption. Facts of embezzlement, fraud, gross waste, misallocation of resources, and other corrupt activities are found throughout the country. One of the latest investigations reports that former president of the Lugansk branch of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, the largest private higher education institution in the country, embezzled $200,000. The State Attestation Commission withdrew licenses of 116 educational programs, branches, affiliates, and colleges in 2006 alone.

Independent Testing
The standardized computer-graded test is introduced gradually to reform college admissions. The head of the Department of Higher Education considers independent external testing as a good and effective tool to fight corruption in admissions. He confirms that the test is intended to provide independent estimates of high school graduates’ knowledge and that test scores should be the major criterion in admissions decisions in colleges. The head of the Center of External Evaluation thinks that by 2008 it will be possible to run admissions to higher education institutions based on the test results.
The majority of rectors of colleges and universities are against the test. The president of Kiev-Mohila Academy anticipates clear sabotage carried out by some of the rectors to compromise the test. He does not believe that the test will somehow reduce corruption in higher education. The test may need several years to prove successful.

Opinions on Corruption

The minister of education and science of Ukraine acknowledges the presence of corruption in the system and points out corruption in obtaining good grades in secondary and higher education and good results in college entry examinations. He claims to have developed a set of organizational, economic, and legal anticorruption measures.

The official position of all the rectors remains intact: there is no corruption in higher education institutions, and the highest consideration is given to the knowledge of applicants. The head of the Institute of Journalism of Kiev National University says that only parents whose children are not strong enough academically seek illegal ways of gaining admission for their children.

According to the minister of education, many students either create a potential for corruption or would not miss a chance of improving their grades in exchange for bribes. The leader of the Peoples Democratic League of Youth agrees. The survey shows that the number of such students comprises 21 percent in the Donetskaya oblast, 29 percent in Kiev, 28 percent in Lviv, 25 percent in Odessa, and 30 percent in Kharkov. Another 15 percent of the respondents said that they would not take advantage of such an offer but would inform their friends of the existing opportunity. Only 21 to 26 percent of all students, depending on the region, would not advise such unfair tactics. Finally, only 3 to 8 percent would inform the police of corruption.

Conclusion

The widespread corruption in higher education in Ukraine is a proven fact. It has plagued academia and includes bribery and nepotism in admissions, grading, and graduation, as well as diploma mills, fraud, embezzlement, and gross waste of the state funds. Many believe that the standardized test will not solve the problem of corruption in admissions. An academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine says that "corruption in our country is not a narrow phenomenon confined to a particular branch or an industry. This is a country-wide problem. Hence, the fight against corruption should start with the independent testing of state bureaucrats and politicians." Further democratic reforms are needed along with the restructuring of the higher education industry and the nationwide independent testing.

New Publications


Albornoz, one of Latin America’s senior sociologists, has provided a two-volume compilation of some of his essays on higher education, mainly focusing on his country of Venezuela. The broad theme is academic populism and how it is playing out in the context of contemporary Venezuela. There are discussions of academic freedom, the Venezuelan revolution and its impact on education, the role of ideology, elites, and higher education, and other topics.


One of the first full-scale analyses of higher education in Ethiopia, this book provides discussion of such topics as the basic structure and direction of the higher education system; challenges such as governance, equity and access, quality, research; and others. A discussion of relations with donor organizations, a key issue for African higher education, is also included. Current statistics are provided.


A discussion of the role of philanthropic foundations in the United States and their role in helping education at all levels, this book features a section on higher education. Specific foundation-assisted projects are analyzed as well as relevant broader issues.


Focusing in part on trends in higher education development in eastern Europe, this book also includes chapters on e-learning in Europe, the role of women, entrepreneurial education in Latin America, the accreditation of experiential education, and others.


A short but reasonably comprehensive overview of Canadian higher education policy, this book focuses on the relationship between the provinces and the central government in Canada’s complex federal system. Specific attention is given to Quebec as an exceptional case.

The life stories of 14 Asian American students who attended Dartmouth College, one of America's elite schools, are featured in this book. The national backgrounds include Korea, India, China, Japan, and other countries. Personal, family, campus, and educational experiences are recounted.


The United Negro College Fund is an organization established following World War II to help support black colleges and universities in the United States. This volume provides a historical analysis of how the organization worked for its goals in the contest of the Cold War and the civil rights movement and its efforts to move beyond its white base of donors.


A comprehensive analysis of the American public research university, this book focuses on central themes facing these key institutions. Among the topics are the multiple missions of public research universities, financing issues, the role of teaching and learning, the service function, knowledge production in public research universities, and competition and the private universities.


In 2000, the UK government established the Cambridge-MIT Institute to link these two universities for the purpose of bringing MIT's practices to the United Kingdom. This assessment of some of the work of the institute considers such issues as student exchanges, the role of entrepreneurship, curriculum design, interdisciplinary programs, and curricular development in graduate study.


With a comprehensive perspective on the field of sociology of higher education, the authors review both the literature and the realities of key aspects of higher education. The discussions are largely focused on the United States and American research literature. Among the themes are colleges and universities as organizations, academic departments, the impact of college, the academic profession, higher education policy, and diversity issues.


Published in cooperation with UNESCO's Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge, this book provides case studies from Japan, the United States, Norway, Mexico, Australia, and China. In addition, there are analyses of changing patterns of academic work, university management, the academic profession, and other themes.


An analysis of how European higher education trends, stimulated mainly by the Bologna process, is affecting European universities, this volume studies institutional developments. A series of chapters discusses different approaches to institutional arrangements, including hierarchy, democratic visions, and a rule-governed academic community.


An analysis of the process of "turnaround" for struggling American academic institutions, this book features discussions of key themes by experienced academic leaders. Among the themes discussed are marketing and branding of institutions, financial issues, academic revitalization, presidential leadership, and the role of donors, trustees and accreditors.


Based mainly on interviews with American university presidents, this book discusses the challenges of leadership and the themes that the interviews presented. Among these are university relations with society, fund raising, communicating the core academic ideals, and other topics.


Focusing on the authors' experience at Tufts University in the United States, this book provides a practical guide to how universities can be environmentally conscious. Most of the volume is concerned with how universities can conserve energy and focus on the environment, including reducing emissions, saving energy on campus, and other issues.


This book is a set of essays by Sheldon Rothblatt, a prominent American historian of higher education, around the broad theme of merit in higher education. Among the topics discussed are affirmative action, elites, the role of examinations, the relation of schools to universities, and others.


This annual compilation of research-based essays, now in its 22nd year, is one of the most valuable sources of research reviews. Written for an American audience and focusing on US literature for the most part, the essays provide comprehensive overviews of key themes. Among the topics included in this 22nd edition are the role of prestige in higher education, accountability and assessment, the Pell...

One of a growing number of critiques of the admissions policies of elite American universities, this volume focuses on Yale University, but it has implications for the entire elite sector. Sociologist Soares argues that meritocratic norms in admission are compromised by social class, family income, and whether parents of the applicant or other relatives have attended the institution. Reforms are suggested to make the system more meritocratic.

NEW PUBLICATIONS FROM THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

The American Council on Education is the main coordinating organization for US colleges and universities, with more than 1,600 affiliated institutions. ACE is concerned with international higher education issues. These three new publications will be of interest to an international audience.

A Brief Guide to U.S. Higher Education. (2007). 63 pp. $25 (pb). This concise publication describes how US higher education is organized, the nature of institutional governance, the role of the faculty, and student issues. Its purpose is to provide basic information for an international audience.


NEWS OF THE CENTER

The Center’s Web site is now available in an Arabic translation. Most of the materials on the English version of the Web site have been translated into Arabic. The link to obtain these materials can be found on the CIHE Web site. The CIHE’s podcast initiative continues to grow. It is coordinated by Laura Rumbley. New interviews are added regularly. Please see the CIHE Web site for details and links.

Several visiting scholars will be in residence at the CIHE this coming academic year.

Jane Knight, adjunct professor at the University of Toronto, Canada. Dr. Knight is a New Century Scholar of the Fulbright Program

Anthony Welch, associate professor at the University of Sydney, Australia. Dr. Welch is a New Century Scholar of the Fulbright Program. He has previously been a CIHE visiting scholar.

In addition, Keiko Yokoyama and Ulla Kriebernegg were visiting scholars during the summer. Liudvika Leisyte continues as a visiting scholar, sharing her time between the Center and CHEPS in Twente, the Netherlands.

Philip G. Altbach, CIHE director, has worked with the Government of Saudi Arabia on a plan for the future of higher education in the Kingdom for the next 25 years. In October, he will speak at a conference at Seoul National University in Korea, at a conference on world-class universities at the Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and at the Beijing Forum in Beijing, China.

The CIHE welcomes Iván Pacheco as a graduate assistant and doctoral student. Iván served as an official of the Ministry of Education in Colombia and has recently completed his master’s degree in higher education at Boston College.
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NEW CIHE PUBLICATION

Philip G. Altbach and Patti McGill Peterson’s edited book Higher Education in the New Century: Global Challenges and Innovative Ideas, has been jointly published with UNESCO. This volume contains summary insights from the Fulbright New Center Scholars Program. 2005–2006. The themes include the academic profession, access and equity, higher education and social cohesion, international student circulation, the public-private mix, and the emerging global research university. A limited number of copies are available from the CIHE. The book is also published by Sense Publishers, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.
THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)
The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the International Higher Education quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

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

CIHE WEB SITE
The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE
The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master’s and doctoral degrees that feature a social science–based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/.

Our work is supported by the Ford Foundation and the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. We are indebted to these funders for core sponsorship.
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