INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

For weekly global higher education news and comment see our partner

University World News

universityworldnews.com

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION
BOSTON COLLEGE

DUZ medienhaus

2

twitter.com/BC_CIHE

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

Anti-Blackness and Racism in International Higher Education

Gerardo Blanco, Philip G. Altbach, and Hans de Wit

COVID-19 is not the only disruptive force currently affecting higher education. 2020 has proven to be a year of awakening to the reality of racism, particularly regarding the worst extremes of anti-Black racism. World headlines about the poor response to COVID-19 in the United States were quickly followed by news of civil unrest in major cities responding to the killings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and many other Black Americans at the hands of police. The movement, which started narrowly as a response to police brutality in the United States, has become a global movement bringing attention to systematic manifestations of exclusion, discrimination, and mistreatment—and the underlying sentiment of anti-Blackness—not only in the United States, but around the world.

Available data illustrate the scope of the problem in higher education internationalization. According to *Open Doors* data, out of more than 340,000 US students abroad, roughly 17,000 or 5 percent chose destinations in sub-Saharan Africa or Caribbean countries with Black-majority populations. Students from these regions are roughly 47,000 or 4 percent of the nearly 1.1 million international students in the United States. Data from NAFSA (Association of International Educators) for the academic year 2017–2018 reveals that Black students comprise 6 percent of US students abroad, even though they represent 13 percent of enrollments of US institutions. Accordingly, Black individuals are underrepresented in every aspect of US internationalization. This crisis should be treated as an opportunity to examine the potential complicities and oversights by international higher education, and to explore how internationalization professionals can also become allies for racial justice.

Global Anti-Blackness

Black Lives Matter has emerged as a global phenomenon, and university students around the world—often a significant contingent in youth movements—are on the frontlines. In the United States and worldwide, students have turned against the complicity of universities that have honored prominent donors and historical figures with ties to slavery and colonialism—as well as against racist policies of all kinds.

Calls to remove Confederate monuments and names from US campuses have reignited movements like the ones calling to remove Cecil Rhodes references from South African and British institutions and across Commonwealth nations. In Latin America, the legacies of colonialism and racism are intertwined. Throughout the region, racial classifications emerged during the Spanish colonial period based on people's racial composition, or their proportion of Spanish-European, indigenous, or African-enslaved heritage—and of course this hierarchy was reflected in the small higher education sector. Not surprisingly, Black or mostly Black groups were at the base of the social pyramid. While this system was abolished with the independence movements in the region, this perceived social structure remains influential. Black Lives Matter in the region has also brought into question the role of prominent colonists, such as Columbus and Pizarro, and their legacy, which is often publicly memorialized, especially in educational settings.

Brazil presents a significant example, where the Black Lives Matter/*Vidas Negras Importam* has resonated deeply. This country was colonized by the Portuguese, who incidentally were also among the first European powers to settle in West Africa, and were key in the transatlantic slave trade. It was the last country in the Americas to abolish slavery. The contemporary, very controversial quota system for admission to public universities illustrates how complicated it is to address the legacy of racism.

Abstract
Racism has negative impacts on all aspects of international higher education. Anti-Blackness is a global and historical phenomenon, but the current racial awakening provides an important opportunity for higher education worldwide. Internationalization scholars and professionals should actively participate in global movements for racial justice.

3

Not unexpectedly, international authorship links tend to be inversely related to population size. Countries with large scholarly communities are in less need of collaborators from other countries.

4

Unfortunately, anti-Black racism is widespread today. In the midst of COVID-19 in China, misinformation suggesting that Black migrant workers were quickly spreading the disease turned into bans from businesses and restaurants against Black individuals. There have also been reports of discrimination against Black students from Africa on Chinese university campuses. Similar examples of anti-African discrimination have taken place in India.

Racism is not limited to anti-Blackness. One has only to recall the anti-Chinese and -Asian reactions in Europe and the United States, also in higher education, at the start of the pandemic. There has been discrimination against Latino immigrants and refugees in the United States and against Muslim immigrants and refugees in Europe—largely concerning restricting access to higher education and to the academic workforce. And these are only recent examples of racism in higher education.

The role of universities in supporting and buttressing colonialism throughout the colonized regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America cannot be overlooked and in many instances was linked to racism. The universities established by the colonial governments trained civil servants for colonial administration—and of course designed a curriculum and ethos that supported the colonial idea. It is not surprising that Cecil Rhodes himself donated the land where the University of Cape Town is located. In the end, however, those colonial universities educated a generation of young people who eventually overthrew the colonial order.

There is much to be done to interrupt anti-Blackness, but a necessary step is to recognize how deeply entrenched racism is in higher education in the United States and elsewhere.

A Local and Global Issue

There is much to be done to interrupt anti-Blackness, but a necessary step is to recognize how deeply entrenched racism is in higher education in the United States and elsewhere. Many have acknowledged and criticized it, but in reality, the higher education system has grown accustomed to its presence without taking action against it. Racism and internationalization have been treated in higher education research and policy as two different issues, one national and the other international. We have to challenge this divide: Both are local and global, as made clear in this issue by other contributions.

It is important to address how anti-Blackness and racism impact all aspects of our work, from student recruitment to education abroad, the experience we provide to Black international students and scholars, our scholarly work, and our policies. ◀

Gerardo Blanco is associate director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College, US. E-mail: gerardo.blanco@bc.edu. Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of CIHE. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Hans de Wit is the director of CIHE. E-mail: dewit@bc.edu.

What Is the Role of Study Abroad in Advancing Antiracism in International Education?

Motun Bolumole and Nicole Barone

Abstract

International education professionals have been persistent about the need to diversify and create equitable and inclusive US study abroad programs. However, issues of race and racism continue to permeate the experiences of students of color who study abroad. We argue that as a field, it may be time for study abroad to move beyond the broad rhetoric of diversity and inclusion and begin to embody and lead an antiracist agenda in international education.

Study abroad researchers and practitioners should be among the leading voices in conversations about institutional racism in higher education, particularly in the area of student development. Study abroad has long championed itself as a source for intercultural competency, staffed and researched by experts in this area, promising to make students more tolerant, understanding, and aware by exposing them to the world and its people. These outcomes should theoretically lead to students committed to antiracism, justice, and respect for all regardless of color, creed, or nationality. However, the very experiences of US students of color who study abroad, and the fact that discussion

on the need for antiracism in the field is only now emerging, suggest that, in fact, the domain itself has ways to go when it comes to race.

Race and Equity in Study Abroad
From the academic discourses that have dominated the field for decades, to how students of color access and experience programs, study abroad has a race issue it needs to continue to contend with at a deeper level. The underrepresentation of students of color in study abroad is an ever-present topic of discussion. Yet, despite public commitments to increasing racial diversity in study abroad participation, particularly at predominantly white institutions (PWIs), scholars and practitioners engaged in these efforts have traditionally done so in ways that overemphasize what students of color lack in terms of navigating access to study abroad rather than holding accountable the systems that create and maintain these barriers. It is no surprise then that efforts to diversify US study abroad programs have been slow moving.

In the US context, study abroad across institution-led programs and private providers is very much an extension of the higher education system as a whole, in which the unwillingness to acknowledge and address long-standing and deep-seated issues of race have amounted to the willful neglect of people of color within institutions. Indeed, the experiences of students of color who do study abroad challenge the very claim that students become more understanding, empathetic, and less inclined to racial stereotyping through study abroad. When Black students study abroad, they report that a significant amount of racism that they experience when away is perpetuated by their white peers, who represent 70 percent of all US study abroad participants. How do we reconcile this with the notion that students return from their experiences more willing and comfortable to engage with difference?

The Language of Diversity
In their book, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Sara Ahmed describes the varied discourse around the term "diversity," including the multitude of ways in which diversity is operationalized—from its presence in equity and inclusion statements and marketing materials to how it is used to signal an organization's values and priorities. This discourse extends beyond institution-wide declarations of diversity, equity, and inclusion—permeating academic and cocurricular programs. Study abroad is indeed an area where posturing has been employed as a substitute for the real work of advancing racial, economic, and social justice. Beyond the symbolic language of "diversity," "awareness," and "understanding" embedded in study abroad discourse (and marketing), little within the enterprise has explicitly sought to combat racism, xenophobia, and other social issues.

Alternatively, antiracism takes aim at how the systems and structures in place act to uphold or oppose racism in the institution. It is a change-oriented philosophy that first demands continuous, ongoing, critical reflexivity, and then an active commitment to choices that promote justice and equity. In order to shift into authentic antiracism work, study abroad must begin by interrogating the discourse around its policies and practices.

Addressing Racial Inequity
The language of institutional diversity is, by design, destined to fail to deliver what it promises. It is time to move beyond this disarming rhetoric toward an unequivocally antiracist, social justice ethic. In practice, the field can address how the status quo works to uphold inequity by:
- Continuing to diversify the field of study abroad and its leadership.
- Rejecting deficit narratives that blame students of color for their underrepresentation in study abroad (e.g., due to their lack of financial, social, or cultural capital) and assessing how institutional policies, such as GPA minimums, can be exclusionary;
- Devoting resources to help students of color study abroad. Underrepresented students of color need more outreach, culturally responsive advising, and financial support;
- Breaking the study abroad bubble that places outgoing students with US peers in US-styled classrooms and extracurricular activities, a model that does little to challenge

6

students' perspectives and views or truly raise their awareness of differences among peoples and cultures.

Most importantly, addressing racial inequity means *embedding an antiracist curriculum into every study abroad program for all students*. The curriculum should, among other things, help students reflect on their privileges and social position in the world; engage students with social justice issues in the host country; prepare students with tools to engage in the host country environment, academic culture, and with the people; and have students reflect on how they might use their experiences in service of others, particularly as leaders of antiracism work on their home campuses.

The need for more defined learning outcomes in study abroad is more crucial than ever. Any effort to transform students will need to be explicit, intentional, and coordinated. While not comprehensive, the steps we have listed above to address entrenched racism and exclusion in the realm of study abroad are meant to begin a dialogue.

> *Most importantly, addressing racial inequity means* embedding an antiracist curriculum into every study abroad program for all students.

Conclusion

According to the Association of International Educators, approximately 341,000 students went abroad in the 2018–2019 academic year, of which 30 percent were students of color. Study abroad is uniquely positioned to lead antiracist education with students of all disciplinary backgrounds. It can give students a "third space" in which, removed from the context of US society, they have the room, both physically and mentally, to observe, experience, and appreciate new and different ways of being and doing. Herein lies the real opportunity for transformation. ◢

Motun Bolumole is a 2020 graduate of Boston College's Master degree in International Higher Education. E-mail: bolumole@bc.edu. Nicole Barone is a doctoral candidate of higher education at Boston College, US. E-mail: baronena@bc.edu.

Black International Student Lives Matter

Chrystal A. George Mwangi

Wherever the Negro goes, he remains a Negro.—Frantz Fanon (1952)

Abstract
International students who are racially Black contend with racistnativism in US society and in their US colleges and universities. This article highlights how Black international students navigate the intersection of their race and nativity in US higher education. It offers considerations as well as demands for US higher education institutions to demonstrate that Black international students' lives matter.

As US higher education institutions (HEIs) grapple with systemic racism on their campuses, it is important to remember that anti-Black racism is an international student issue. Black international students, who predominantly come from sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean, represent 4 to 5 percent of all international students in the United States. Although this percentage is small, Black international students can comprise significant proportions of HEIs' Black student population, particularly at selective institutions and within graduate programs. Yet, it is common for international students who are racially Black to first experience confusion and uncertainty regarding the systemic racism present within US higher education. US racial realities can be distinctly different from socialization and salience of race and Blackness in many of their majority Black home countries. When Black international students come to the United States, the differences they perceive are often in relation to their foreign status/nationality rather than the racial positioning US society imposes. This does not mean that Black international students are not negatively impacted by racism. Their Black lives matter.

Learning (Anti-)Blackness and Racist Nativism in the US Context

The initial disconnection that Black international students experience regarding race in the United States and the ways in which they cope with racism can manifest themselves through attempts to distance themselves from these issues or to ignore them. Yet, the institutionalized nature of racism and anti-Blackness within the United States, and its embedding in higher education, create racial encounters and discrimination on campus that often force students to consider their own racial status and identity in the US context. Over time, Black international students state experiencing more discrimination than their white international peers, including social isolation and exclusion from group work, being called racial slurs, racial microaggressions, and other harassment from faculty, staff, students, and local residents of their college towns. In a recent survey conducted by World Education Services, one-quarter of Sub-Saharan African international students cited discrimination as one of their top three most significant challenges in their educational experience—a higher proportion than all other international student populations.

Black international students' experiences with racism and anti-Blackness is further intersected by a US sociopolitical climate steeped in xenophobia, antiglobalist rhetoric, and nationalism. For example, many Black international students come from countries that President Trump allegedly identified as "sh**t-hole countries." There has also been an increase in hate speech, a push for nativism, and anti-immigrant sentiment on US campuses. How white American faculty and peers perceive Black international students' accents, languages, and cultural differences can lead to negative stereotypes. This is exacerbated by US society's stereotypical portrayal of Africa as a region of poverty and instability, or of people from the Caribbean as pot smoking partiers, all reinforcing how Black international students are perceived in racist-nativist ways.

Navigating Racial Injustice

Racist-nativist experiences negatively impact Black international students' well-being and college success in many ways, including increased homesickness, reduced academic achievement, weakened self-esteem, greater stress, academic withdrawal, self-isolation, and social withdrawal. Being temporary visa holders in a volatile US sociopolitical environment also makes them vulnerable to retaliation for naming the racist nativism that they experience. Further, because student services related to race are often focused on domestic students and siloed away from international student services, Black international students are left without the direct advocacy and resources needed to serve their multiple marginalized identities.

Black international students may feel uncertain about their role in fighting racial injustice, given that their heritage did not stem from historical racial marginalization in the United States, even as they are impacted by the ramifications of that history. Yet, many Black international students are also committing to antiracist work and the fight against anti-Blackness across the Diaspora by mobilizing through community activism, cultural organizations, and protests around the United States.

What Can US Higher Education Institutions Do?

Over the past decade, sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean have consistently increased their numbers of outgoing students to US HEIs, and the United States has remained a top choice for many African students, particularly from Nigeria and South Africa. However, given the current climate, the United States may no longer remain Black international students' top destination. While US HEIs have pursued international student enrollment for financial reasons, the structural underrepresentation of Black international students makes it more difficult for them to find their place within a group community or mobilize for greater support and advocacy. US HEIs will need to be intentional in recruiting Black international students and increasing their numerical representation. Yet, the recruitment of Black international students should be done alongside improved recruitment for Black Americans, not as a proxy for Black American student representation.

It is also critical that Black international students and their experiences be acknowledged and prioritized, for example, by collecting institutional data that can be disaggregated by race and nativity, so that Black international students are made visible to their institutions. This may require HEIs to collect demographic student data beyond what is

Over time, Black international students state experiencing more discrimination than their white international peers.

needed for federal or state reporting (for example, by asking both for the race and nativity status of students, rather than classifying international students solely by foreign status/nationality—or recognizing that Black international students are less likely to claim a Black race on surveys when the option is Black/African American, because Black international students are not American). Data that can be disaggregated would allow institutions to track the needs and progress of Black international students. Doing so would provide the nuanced information needed to develop or reinforce resources that address the intersection of these students' race and nativity. For example, Offices that serve international students should be prepared to communicate with students about racist-nativism and collaborate with offices such as counseling services, multicultural affairs, and academic affairs in order to serve these students. This would move institutions away from merely recruiting international students, toward a retention-based model.

Yet, US HEIs must go beyond providing Black international students strategies and community to cope with racist-nativist experiences. Improved campus racial and global climate should be integrated into universities' internationalization and diversity strategies to ensure that Black international and other racially minoritized students have equitable opportunities for sustained success. Accessible and safe bias-reporting procedures can also be created, so that Black international students have formal structures to ensure that their racist-nativist experiences are addressed. HEI leaders must recognize that racism is not a simple, singular construct, but exists at the intersection of racism and nativism for these students. Thus, when developing antiracism training and programming for faculty, staff, and students, it is important to target and integrate racist-nativism and anti-Black racism. If US HEIs believe that Black international student lives matter, they must work to dismantle the campus structures that marginalize, oppress, and isolate these students. ◢

Chrystal A. George Mwangi is associate professor of higher education, University of Massachusetts Amherst, US. E-mail: chrystal@umass.edu.

8

#BlackLivesMatter: A New Age of Student Activism

Dana Downey

Abstract
In the wake of the global outcry against police brutality and systemic injustice, university students globally are offering support and solidarity through activism. This builds on a history of students raising public consciousness about social issues and seeding policy change. These current events present an opportunity for global universities to catalyze public action by both addressing institutionalized racism themselves, and resourcing local efforts.

In May 2020, the world erupted in anguish over the killing of black American George Floyd in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Beyond the borders of the United States, the tragic murder sparked peaceful protests in Amsterdam, Auckland, Berlin, Paris, Sao Paulo, and Tokyo—raising public consciousness about ingrained oppression and injustice. The #BlackLivesMatter movement is steeped with students as founders, mobilizers, and facilitators. On campus, students are petitioning their institutions to raise racial consciousness and combat systemic injustices. They are calling for greater representation in the faculty and senior administration, inclusive communications in digital and print, and an institutional commitment to addressing microaggressions, among other things.

The Role of Student Activism
Historically, student activism has played a key role in mobilizing the masses for social change. While students may not be central figures in these movements, they have shaped the messaging and ideology, from the 1928 Youth Pledge (*Sumpah Pemuda*) in Indonesia, where students were among the first to formally voice anticolonial sentiments, to the peaceful student demonstrations in the streets of Budapest in 1956, which preceded the Hungarian revolution. More recently, student voices were influential in the Orange

Revolution of Ukraine. While there is a plethora of examples of student activism that has been civil and orderly, this has not always been the case. Some student-led uprisings of the mid-twentieth century were more violent in nature, including Thai student protests overthrowing leader Field Marshall Thanom Kittikachorn in 1973 and militant students taking hostages in Iran in 1979. Despite the fragmented history of student activism, there is a persistent historical theme of student involvement in social change.

Given the massification of higher education, with less elite students, more flexible learning, and less place-centric content, some had predicted the decline of student activism. Indeed, it has not. The recent demonstrations have reverberated from Minneapolis, where students have demanded that their institution sever its ties with the local police department, across the Atlantic to the University of Oxford, where critical conversations about the roots and history of the Rhodes Scholarship have been reignited. At New York University Abu Dhabi, a liberal arts college in the United Arab Emirates with no majority culture, students are calling for an institutional acknowledgement that racial inequities are a global problem, not just an American one.

Globally, the antiracism movement is intimately connected with campuses. The Brazilian version of the #BlackLivesMatter movement, *Vidas Negras Importam*, advocates on campuses and is actively organizing protests in Brazil. #BlackLivesMatter Nottingham was initiated as an activist–academic partnership between the city and university community, and #BlackLivesMatter was even awarded the 2017 Sydney Peace Prize by the University of Sydney in Australia.

It is noteworthy that most of the student activism is localized, connected to a similar local issue with police brutality or anti-Blackness, and occurring in the Global North. This is resonant of colonial and neocolonial influences, an undercurrent in these contexts widely observed in academic literature. Students are speaking truth to power.

The University Response
With campuses' internationalization and global mobility, student demographics are more eclectic than ever. This lends itself to minimizing racial differences, even as diversity narratives are amplified as a sort of utopian prospect. Recent events have put words to the lived experiences of many, and students are demanding a response from global higher education.

As student masses seek to confront institutionalized inequity and the complicit behavior of universities, institutions are aware that silence is a powerful statement that could jeopardize their internationalization aims. The pipeline of underrepresented groups and international students is delicate, and even more so in this pandemic era.

University responses have been both public and personal. In the United Kingdom, the University of Manchester issued an open letter to students reaffirming its commitment to diversity and encouraging active reporting of embedded racism. The Rhodes Trust of the University of Oxford has issued a statement recounting previous prejudices as well as progress, and announcing new commitments to specific actions as next steps. The University of Western Australia issued a statement calling for an end to Black deaths in custody (including of Aboriginal people), where police brutality is widely documented. New York University Abu Dhabi has shifted its messaging to new students to introduce racial inequities as a potent reality of higher education that will be actively confronted during their time as students. These commitments to action and public messages mark intention more than measurable change, but they embed accountability.

Precipitating Change
The trail of injustice on campuses and the disparities amplified by globalization and massification have long been documented by higher education scholars. At the same time, the university has been cited as a vehicle for public good, producing both social and public benefits like increased quality of civic life, social cohesion, and an appreciation of diversity. With their capacity for research, their role as knowledge brokers and creators, and their tremendous influence on students, they are uniquely positioned to fuel movements like this one.

With burgeoning global racial consciousness, higher educational institutions have a crucial role to play in building local relevance and exploring internal inequities. The

Globally, the antiracism movement is intimately connected with campuses.

activism to date evidences a deep persistent concern, but research can provide infrastructure and inform policy change, where systemic change often begins. Thus, universities are also compelled to take a long and hard look inward, critically evaluating how they have been complicit contributors and how they can do better.

Why is all this crystallizing now? Perhaps it was that the incident was caught on video, or the inhumane ignorance of the police involved, or their affiliation with the state? Perhaps it is the pandemic era provoking hypervigilance? Either way, inclusion is the need of the hour, a key concern of the decade, and tightly wound up in the future of education. Global higher education cannot afford to miss this window. ◄

Dana Downey is assistant dean of students and director, Career Development Center, New York University Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. E-mail: downe174@umn.edu.

10

Should University Presidents Have a Voice in Public Affairs?

Robert A. Scott

Abstract
During a period replete with falsehoods and misrepresentations expressed by prominent individuals, celebrities, and elected officials, who is to speak for truth? Who is to support scientific knowledge and the role of ethics, law, and science in guiding policy development? In the past, university presidents spoke out for truth and justice. This article explores why such voices are needed—yet might be silent today.

During a period replete with falsehoods and misrepresentations expressed by prominent individuals, celebrities, and elected officials, who is to speak for truth? Who is to support scientific knowledge and the role of ethics, law, and science in guiding policy development?

Friends ask, "Where is the moral outrage when science advisors are scorned and health safety rules are rolled back, and when systems for government accountability are removed?" They point to the absence of university presidents in debates about public policy, especially when changes in policy expose the public to danger from air, food, and water pollution, or cause threats to student and faculty rights. These same people often refer to the late Father Theodore Hesburgh, former president of Notre Dame University, as a voice of moral courage when chairman of the Civil Rights Commission.

Some remember campus presidents protesting the war in Vietnam and apartheid in South Africa, or advocating for affirmative action in the United States. "Where are such voices now?" they ask. Where are the voices in support of public schools, gun safety measures, alternatives to fossil fuels? Where are the speeches and newspaper columns about unequal access to education and healthcare, about the millions of homeless children in the richest country in the world?

Are these times different? Are contemporary campus presidents different in moral authority from those in the past? The university is a moral institution whose purpose is to add to the welfare of society. It is chartered by the state and one of its missions is to teach and develop an ethical perspective among its students. While morality is about right and wrong, ethics is often concerned with one "right" or correct action compared to another one.

The role of the university is not only to create new knowledge and curate the history of society. Its mission also includes that of "critic." Institutional leaders can ask "Why" and "Why not?" following analysis and testing of data in an attempt to develop knowledge and foster wisdom.

> *The role of the university is not only to create new knowledge and curate the history of society. Its mission also includes that of "critic."*

The University President as Chief Mission Officer

However, a major change has taken place in the role of the university president over the past few decades. More seem to take seriously the title of Chief Executive Officer (CEO), a title not emphasized in Hesburgh's time. Words matter. What are the duties associated with CEOs? We think of scale and scope of operations, money and markets, people as employees, prices, and profits. But Hesburgh and others like him acted as "Chief Mission

Officers" (CMOs), even if they did not use the title. He and others focused on the mission and purpose of the institution as a moral enterprise for the public good.

I prefer the title Chief Mission Officer. It designates a campus leader who does not ignore money and markets, but who honors the purpose and heritage of the institution. For the CMO, history holds lessons. This includes reminding faculty, staff, students, and trustees of the ethical choices made in the past. Such choices have included expanding admissions and educational opportunity, introducing curricular choices beyond the Western canon, avoiding investments in cigarettes, beer, and liquor, and shunning political speakers wanting to use the campus as a platform.

CMOs are advocates for free speech and academic freedom. When they speak on a topic of moral or ethical concern, they are careful to encourage an exchange of ideas, even those opposite to their own. They also understand that "liberty" means freedom with responsibility as citizens, not freedom from societal obligations, compassion, common decency, and government.

A frequent quote in university mission statements and lofty speeches is that "the truth shall make you free." While the sentiment is from the Bible's New Testament, the idea of "truth" is common to most religious traditions. But what is truth? The Bible quote requires faith and submission to a mystery. This is not the truth of a college or university. That truth is based on facts, not opinion, and evidence, not epiphany.

The Campus President's Role

For the CMO, there is a difference between speaking for oneself and speaking for the institution. Institutions should not express policy positions unless they are taken in proper order by the institution's governing board. Therefore, a campus leader should not speak on behalf of the university regarding investment policy, for example, unless it is board policy. A president's stance can be made known within the confines of the board where he or she can argue for a change in institutional policy.

This is not to say that the president or vice chancellor is mute outside the boardroom, however. He or she can argue for academic freedom, social justice, world peace, and the freedom of speech for faculty, staff, and students. He or she can underscore the need to provide educational opportunities and distinguish opinion from fact. He or she can call for truths based on facts rather than on feelings, superstitions, or political posturing.

Some presidents hesitate to speak on policy issues because they feel that they will be "damned if they do and damned if they don't," as one told me while discussing this topic. They are fearful of upsetting trustees, donors, alumni, and elected officials who hold other views. They are concerned about retribution that could threaten government aid and even the institution's tax status. For this reason, I think it is better to advocate for an ethical perspective rather than simply criticize a policy. Presidents need to create bridges to understanding rather than deepening the divide. The president can promote civility by demonstrating that one can disagree without being disagreeable.

The current political climate in the United States adds to presidential caution. Conservative politicians, journalists, and commentators criticize higher education for being too "liberal." They say that they do not trust universities. They charge that campuses claim to promote free speech but do not support conservative speakers

Guardians of the Ethical Perspective

As Chief Mission Officers, university leaders have an obligation to remind the campus and broader community about compassion and the ethical perspective. The "teachable moment" in a controversy is not an opportunity to lecture but to ask about the justness of policies and actions. Is it just to provide inadequate support for public schools? Is it just to outsource prisons and nursing homes to companies that will put profit ahead of healthcare? Is it just to use war instead of diplomacy as the first act of government? These are the ethical questions of "Why" and "Why not?"

Especially today, we need the voices of those leading universities to speak out about falsehoods, injustice, and abrogation of the rule of law. University presidents must regain the mantle of Chief Mission Officer, remind their communities of the importance of history, encourage debate and respect for others, and be models in the use of an ethical perspective. ◀

12

Abstract

Learning outcomes are increasingly used in qualifications frameworks and quality assurance processes. As such, they aim to secure and foster public trust among education providers. Yet, against the backdrop of internationalized higher education, questions arise on whether learning outcomes can fulfill this function on a global scale and whether there is a way, and need, to verify if learning outcomes have been achieved.

Beyond being a vehicle for promoting outcome-based, student-centered learning, learning outcomes have another fundamental goal: to secure and foster public trust among education providers.

Learning Outcomes and Public Trust in Higher Education

Tia Loukkola and Helene Peterbauer

Learning outcomes are statements of what a learner should know and be able to do at the end of a learning experience or sequence. Within higher education institutions, they are meant to guide the development of curricula and the work of teachers in delivering curricula. They should be aligned with pedagogical and assessment methods, thus ensuring that the core aspects of the educational experience are geared toward the same outcomes and student learning. In the 2018 Trends survey conducted by the European University Association (EUA), almost half of the respondents reported that the introduction of learning outcomes had to some extent driven methodological change in teaching. Among other benefits reported were revision of course content and assessment and enhanced awareness of learning objectives among students.

Beyond being a vehicle for promoting outcome-based, student-centered learning, learning outcomes have another fundamental goal: to secure and foster public trust among education providers. They are a tool to enhance transparency and accountability within higher education and in relation to its stakeholders, not least society, which needs to be assured of the added value of the higher education that it contributes to funding. Enhanced transparency is believed to enable understanding and comparability across borders—this is the basic ideal driving the Bologna Process in Europe.

Defining Intended Learning Outcomes

With this dual function in mind, an important role has been attributed to learning outcomes in many of the frameworks developed over the past two decades with the aim of enhancing public trust in higher education. For example, they are at the core of qualifications framework developments around the world. In the European Higher Education Area, all 48 countries have a national qualifications framework or are in the process of developing one. As regional collaboration in higher education increases, regional (reference) qualifications frameworks have emerged. To give a few examples, there are regional frameworks in Europe and in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and one is currently being developed in Africa. The aim of these frameworks is to increase the transparency and comparability of qualifications by using learning outcomes as descriptors against which to reference qualifications, allocated within given framework levels.

The underpinning philosophy is that all study programs should be correctly aligned to their respective national qualifications framework, to assure the public that graduates have the knowledge and skills of the corresponding level in the framework. Frameworks allow actors and stakeholders outside the education sector to "read" and understand graduates' knowledge and skills, and thus to assess how these fit into the labor market, to name only one example. The frameworks also allow for comparison between qualifications from different systems and thus support freedom of movement for education and employment purposes.

Verifying Achieved Learning Outcomes

But is there a universal, transferable method of verifying that students have achieved the prescribed learning outcomes of their programs, and that the approach is working? A decade has passed since the OECD launched its Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO) Feasibility Study, which aimed to develop an international assessment framework and instruments to measure what first-degree graduates know and can do. One of the starting points for this much-needed study was the perceived need to provide internationally comparable data on the effectiveness of higher education learning. This need was primarily driven by demands for more accountability and transparency

within higher education, with an emphasis on the comparability of the levels of student achievements. Eventually, the AHELO experience signaled a set of methodological issues regarding the global perspective of such an assessment instrument. As a result, the project was abandoned and there have not been any comparable endeavors since.

With the same objective in mind (i.e., finding a way to compare students' achievements in different countries in a meaningful manner), but taking a different angle than the AHELO project, the CALOHEE project (Measuring and Comparing Achievements of Learning Outcomes in Higher Education in Europe) emphasizes different institutional and program profiles in the assessment. The work of the project, which is coordinated by the International Tuning Academy, is ongoing; hence the results and success of the methodology are not yet known.

For all these reasons, standardized tests measuring higher education learning outcomes and providing comparability remain rare, if nonexistent. However, there are other approaches to verify the effectiveness of education using learning outcomes while still respecting individual systems and institutional profiles. In Europe, the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area stipulate that higher education institutions must ensure that their programs have defined learning outcomes (standard 1.2) as a basis for student assessment (standard 1.3). Thus, this framework anchors learning outcomes and their appropriate assessment in internal quality assurance. It assigns responsibility for adequate articulation and implementation of learning outcomes to the higher education institutions themselves. And each institution may do this differently.

Comparability above Accountability?

While learning outcomes are based on a common approach, this does not necessarily mean that they, or their assessment, must be comparable in the sense of being standardized, let alone being the same across various higher education systems. The inadequacy of large-scale attempts at comparing learning outcomes at the international level does not entail that learning outcomes as a concept are flawed in terms of their transparency function, because transparency does not negate diversity. Learning outcomes create many benefits for both higher education institutions (as demonstrated by EUA's 2018 Trends survey) and their stakeholders, and their value is versatile. For this reason, they constitute a key element of a variety of European transparency and accountability tools.

The decentralized manner in which learning outcomes are currently defined and assessed poses challenges to other comparative tools, such as ranking exercises. The EUA recently conducted a mapping of indicators of education quality used in international university rankings, which highlighted a lack of indicators linked to learning outcomes or quality of learning across all rankings covered in the mapping. This finding concurs with the overall conclusion of the study (of which this mapping was a part), that there has been no substantial development in the use of indicators of quality or effectiveness in higher education in the recent past. This suggests that there is no meaningful, one-size-fits-all tool to define and assess the outcomes of higher education. However, as stated, learning outcomes can foster public trust in higher education institutions through a variety of other means.

◀

Tia Loukkola is director for institutional development at the European University Association (EUA). E-mail: tia.loukkola@eua.eu. Helene Peterbauer is a policy and project officer at EUA. E-mail: helene.peterbauer@eua.eu.

Challenges in a Disrupted World: Branch Campuses from the United States

Daniel C. Kent

14

Abstract
Branch campuses from the United States have proliferated across the world in recent decades. Many have found success, but a significant number have failed. While these branch campuses seem promising to many institutional administrators, leaders should be aware of the myriad challenges that they may face in setting up and continuing these ventures, especially in the current shifting global landscape.

Setting up branch campuses, however seemingly lucrative for the home institution, is a tricky business.

Since *International Higher Education* first released a series of articles on international branch campuses (IBCs) in 2010, this unique higher education enterprise has continued to evolve and grow in complexity. In a rapidly changing global context, however, IBCs, like all of higher education, face unprecedented challenges.

The popularity of international branch campuses as an endeavor of US universities highlights their multifaceted uses: providing a new source of revenue, study abroad sites for domestic students (thereby keeping study abroad revenues previously lost to international competitors), and prestige in domestic and foreign markets, touting their international influence and presence. According to 2017 data from C-BERT's listing of IBCs, US-affiliated campuses make up nearly one-third of all open branch campuses in the world—in line with the United States' current international prominence in international higher education prestige and resources. Other countries from which large numbers of branch campuses originate are the United Kingdom and France, followed by Russia.

But out of the close to 100 branch campuses that US institutions have established, 25 have failed and closed their doors, reportedly all in the period between 2000 and 2015, according to C-BERT data. This rate is much higher than other countries that lead as exporters of IBCs. Only four out of 42 UK-affiliated campuses have failed, and only one of the 28 campuses established by French institutions has closed.

Challenges and Forced Closures
Setting up an IBC can seem very appealing to universities interested in diversifying revenue and internationalizing, especially for US institutions. But often, US higher education leaders have miscalculated the challenges and potential payoff of setting them up, resulting in their forced closing. And many of these challenges will only magnify due to the global COVID-19 crisis, imperiling IBCs in development or those without solid financial footing.

The first challenge facing US-based IBCs is a perpetual one not likely to change: Setting up branch campuses, however seemingly lucrative for the home institution, is a tricky business. Universities inexperienced in setting up branch campuses may be caught unawares by the significant investment in time, money, infrastructure, and effort required. These miscalculations have plagued institutions like the Community College of Qatar (CCQ), originally founded as a branch campus of Houston Community College (HCC). It was reportedly ill-managed from the outset with its opening and operation bungled by its US administrators. Institutional leaders failed to acquire accreditation for the school, leadership turnover resulted in a tumultuous first few years, and miscommunications between Qatari and HCC officials led to confusion on basic issues of educational administration. The college has since come under full local control and is still in operation, but not as a branch campus. HCC's only involvement remains as a consulting entity.

Navigating a foreign government context may also be a hurdle for which American administrators fail to adequately prepare. For one, gaining accreditation from local governments has been a challenge for many IBCs, differing substantially from US accreditation standards. Even after getting accreditation from a US agency, the New York Institute of Technology's campus in Bahrain received a poor review from the local accreditation agency. The campus was barred from enrolling new students in its business program one year before a ban on enrolling new students altogether, and was thus forced to cease operations. But even assuming success with accreditation and regulations, many IBC

contracts allow governments to change their minds quickly. While not met with nearly the same level of press and controversy as many other IBC closings, Boston University's dental program campus in Dubai ended after only the second class had graduated. The local government decided to take the institution under full local control, rebranding it as the "Dubai School of Dental Medicine" with no affiliation to Boston University.

Offering the quality of a US higher education program with matching faculty prestige and student experience is also a costly endeavor, which institutions can only support with strong enrollment and often necessary financial support from the local government. The reliance on these two revenue streams is aggravated by a lack of robust fundraising, a resource that most US institutions are accustomed to, in the form of research grants, foundation funding, and alumni donations. It should thus be unsurprising that many of the 25 failed US-affiliated branch campuses were closed due to lack of financial resources, either by overprojecting student demand or losing needed government aid. George Mason University's campus in Ras Al Kaimah, United Arab Emirates, faced pressure to selectively admit students to replicate the quality offered on its main campus in Virginia. But the school was never able to attract a significant pool of students both qualified and interested in their programs—at its height enrolling only 120 students in its degree programs. The campus closed in 2009, not having graduated any students and with student enrollment and tuition revenue below projections. Five years into its venture abroad, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas' college of hospitality in Singapore became unviable after its costs increased such that its local sponsoring institution would have had to double its financial support of the campus. And the University of La Verne Athens closed after losing 40 percent of its student body over five years and becoming the most expensive higher education option in Greece.

A changing world will further roil international higher education and the environment in which IBCs find themselves. Governments around the world are increasingly turning to nationalistic, insularly focused posturing and policy, hostile to foreign ideologies and potentially to their pedagogies. In this surge toward nationalism that many countries are experiencing, it may be impossible for new US branch campuses to be set up—and existing campuses may face an unfamiliarly hostile environment.

There is also the threat of unpredictable global challenges, such as the COVID-19 crisis, further weakening an already wilting movement toward globalization. And with many branch campuses supplying funds back to their home institutions through lucrative deals with foreign governments, threats to branch campuses also represent a threat to their originators.

Looking Ahead

How US-based branch campuses fare in the future is not set in stone. Several have found great success, with thriving student bodies, active research faculty, and a solid financial base on which to stand, directly benefiting their home universities and the countries and regions in which they operate. But not all institutions that have extended their reach with a physical presence abroad will be—or have been—so lucky. As the world enters a considerably more disrupted and uncertain era, there will be significant ripple effects reverberating throughout civil society. Higher education, and in particular those institutions which have set up campuses abroad, will have to adapt to face these challenges, or risk shuttering. ◢

Daniel C. Kent is a higher education researcher based in Philadelphia, US. E-mail: danckent@gmail.com.

16

Abstract
Since the Internet began in 1990, there has been rapid worldwide growth in research funding and science paper output. Bottom-up global collaboration has expanded rapidly, many lower middle-income countries have their own science systems, and almost one-quarter of all papers have international coauthors. Research agendas are now often shaped in the global network, not national systems. Research power has become more diversified, with China and East Asia, India, Iran, Brazil, and others becoming stronger.

Collaboration between countries brings in more nations and quickens their development.

World Research: Networking, Growth, and Diversification

Simon Marginson

After the Internet began in 1990, universities and scientific institutes across the world became joined in a single collaborative research network, for the first time in history, and in the manner of networks, global science began to expand continually with exceptional speed. World research is shaped by five simultaneous trends that feed into each other and are transforming the processes whereby human societies create and share knowledge. First, rapid growth in investment in research and in science paper output. Second, expansion in the number of research-active countries with their own science systems. Third, growth in the proportion of papers coauthored from more than one country. Fourth, the increasing weight of the networked global science system compared to national systems. Fifth, the distribution of leading research power among more countries.

OECD data shows that between 1995 and 2018, almost every country expanded its spending on research. This more than doubled in the United States in real terms, almost doubled in Germany and the United Kingdom, and multiplied by 5.6 times in South Korea and by an incredible 16.5 times in China. This growing financial capacity was associated with proportional expansions in numbers of PhD graduates and employed researchers, and published science. Between 2000 and 2015, the number of doctoral graduates increased by 2.9 percent per year in the United States, 4.7 percent in India, and 10.9 percent in China. The total number of papers listed in Scopus rose from 1.072 million in 2000 to 2.556 million in 2018, a growth of 4.95 percent a year, which by historical standards is very rapid.

Lower Middle-Income Science Countries

The networked global science system has developed as a common storehouse of knowledge. Nations need their own science capacity, including doctoral education, so as to be able to effectively access that storehouse. Collaboration between countries brings in more nations and quickens their development.

Science capacity is spreading across the world. There were 15 countries that published more than 5,000 papers in 2018, where between 2000 and 2018, the number of papers grew faster than the world average rate of 4.95 percent per year. In nine of these 15 fast-growing science countries, incomes per person were *below the world average of US$17,912 in 2018*—in other words, they were lower middle-income countries. In the year 1987, 20 wealthy nations accounted for 90 percent of all published science. By 2017, it took a more mixed group of 32 nations to make up the first 90 percent, indicating this process of global diversification of capacity.

The new science powers include Indonesia, the world's fourth largest country in population, where researchers had 26,948 papers in Scopus in 2018. Indonesia's annual output grew by an incredible 26.4 percent from 2000 to 2018. India, now the third largest producer of science after China and the United States, published 135,788 papers in 2018, and saw an annual growth of 10.7 percent a year in the period from 2000 to 2018. Other fast growing national science systems with more than 5,000 papers in 2018 were Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Tunisia. Though the United States retains a long lead in the number of high-citation papers, China's published science expanded by 13.6 percent a year between 2000 and 2018 and it passed the total output of US research for the first time in 2016.

The growth of total science is also associated with growth in the number of "world-class universities" with large outputs. The Leiden ranking shows that between the four-year counts of 2006–2009 and 2014–2017, the number of universities with more than 5,000 science papers rose from 131 to 215.

Collaboration

Perhaps the most striking indication of the change in global research is the growing number of papers that involve international partners. In 1970, internationally coauthored papers constituted only 1.9 percent of articles indexed in Web of Science. By 2018, 22.5 percent of all papers in Scopus had more than one national affiliation. The proportion was very high in Europe, where the research grant system favors multicountry teams: for example, 50.2 percent in Italy, 61.7 percent in the United Kingdom, and 71.8 percent in Switzerland. It was 39.2 percent in the United States, well above average, but lower in emerging China, India, and Iran, where the number of potential domestic partners has been growing very rapidly.

International collaboration is especially important in disciplines where equipment is cost shared (e.g., telescopes, synchrotrons), or where the subject matter is intrinsically global (e.g., climate change, water management, epidemic disease). In 2016, 54 percent of all papers in astronomy were internationally coauthored, while in social sciences it was only 15 percent.

Research on the global network by Caroline Wagner, Loet Leydesdorff, and colleagues suggests that collaboration is driven primarily not by national science policy but by bottom-up cooperation among researchers themselves. It expands freely so as to take in new countries and research groups. Existing strong countries do not act as gatekeepers: Researchers in emerging systems often network directly with each other. Increasingly, the agenda of science is set at the global level rather than the national level.

Research is not a level playing field. The United States remains much the strongest player at the global level. English is the only global language, and work in other national languages, especially in the humanities and social sciences, is marginalized at world level. Scientific capacity and achievement are steeply stratified within and between countries. However, the growth and diversification of science are associated with a partial pluralization of research power.

The great change is the rise of East Asia, especially China, South Korea, and Singapore, joining Japan. East Asia is very strong in physical sciences and engineering, less so in life sciences and biomedicine. China is now number one in mathematics and computing research. Tsinghua University has joined MIT in the United States as one of the two top STEM universities in the world. India, Iran, and Brazil are also becoming increasingly important.

Good News

Global research collaboration is a good news story in a difficult time. It is not a dog-eat-dog market. Researchers who compete for status in science also collaborate freely across borders and respect each other. At this stage, global research has not been caught in the vortex of parochial nationalism, and the COVID-19 pandemic has heightened the intrinsic value of global cooperation and open science in biomedicine.

Cross-border research cooperation is less vulnerable than cross-border student mobility and has been maintained during the pandemic. While research benefits from conferences, site-based visits and exchange of personnel, and large laboratories and institutes are inhibited by social distancing protocols, most forms of research cooperation can be sustained for a time online.

The national pushback against globalization and common systems is severely affecting trade and technological cooperation and is a threat in science. It is likely that US–China relations in research, including joint appointments and foreign students in doctoral education, will be disturbed by the new cold war geopolitics between the two countries. However, researchers in each nation, the two powerhouses of world science, will continue to network elsewhere—and US–China cooperation may prove more potent than the Trump administration would want. Providing that the flow of resources supporting research is maintained, total research and collaboration at global levels will continue to increase.

Simon Marginson is professor of higher education at the University of Oxford, director of the ESRC/OFSRE Centre for Global Higher Education in the United Kingdom, a leading researcher with the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, and editor-in-chief of Higher Education. *E-mail: simon.marginson@education.ox.ac.uk.*

The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Global Research

Xin Xu

18

Abstract
The COVID-19 pandemic is transforming the academic world. International collaboration and competition continue through the crisis. The global research community is showing openness, resilience, and humanism. The forced immobility of researchers raises both challenges and opportunities for change. Inequality, ethical concerns, and questions on research impacts are intensified by the pandemic. A reflection on current changes helps to reimagine and rebuild future global research.

COVID-19 is reshaping the world, including the academic world. What we were familiar with as "normal" is fading away and will need to be rewritten. This article reviews the impact of COVID-19 on global research and proposes a new definition of the post-COVID academic world.

Research Networks: Collaboration and Competition

The world is witnessing a fast-growing body of research on COVID-19. International organizations, governments, scientific journals, and funding bodies have been calling researchers to join forces to tackle the crisis. Early bibliometric evidence suggests a continued existence of cross-border, interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral, and multilateral collaboration.

On the other hand, competition and rivalry persist. The global race for a COVID-19 vaccine is a telling example of the influence of competition, and how scientific research and the intrinsic pursuit of knowledge is tangled with individual interests, institutional benefits, commercial values, public good, and (geo)political factors. In particular, the pandemic has exacerbated existing geopolitical tensions, resulting for instance in further restrictions on academic mobility and partnerships between China and the United States, two major influential producers of global research. It remains unclear if research in China, the United States, and other countries will be reoriented toward a more global, regional, national, or local agenda.

Research Ecology: Humanism and Openness

The COVID-19 pandemic is reshaping the ecology of global research, rebuilding the relationship among humans (e.g., researchers, participants, stakeholders) and with nonhuman subjects (e.g., knowledge, resources, publications).

The research world is showing resilience, solidarity, and humanism. The lockdown period is not a work retreat. Rather, it is a challenging time for academics to work under restrictions and uncertainty. Nonetheless, research continues worldwide. Academics have quickly adapted to the complete transfer to online teaching, online meeting, and online research. Many are offering their colleagues, participants, and students compassion and mutual support, sharing vulnerability and solidarity. Furthermore, managerial culture seems to be temporarily giving way to a humanistic approach, prioritizing researchers as human beings rather than "producers of research outputs," and emphasizing wellbeing rather than performance and productivity. Research assessments, such as tenure track clocks at US universities, are being postponed. Funding bodies have adjusted their plans for projects, researchers, and students, allowing extensions and changes.

While countries are being locked down, science has become more open.

While countries are being locked down, science has become more open. Since the outbreak of COVID-19, an increasing number of funding bodies, publishers, journals, institutions, and researchers are embracing open science. Publications, courses, archives, and databases are shared online freely, openly, quickly, and widely. Such open data, including genome sequences, has enabled an early start worldwide to develop diagnostics and vaccines against COVID-19. For COVID-related research, the number of preprints soars, peer-review procedures are accelerated, and open access to publications is granted with special temporary schemes to remove paywalls.

Research Life: Immobility and Inequality

Due to travel restrictions, the academic world has moved to a combination of physical immobility and disconnection, coupled with virtual mobility and connectivity. This is redefining the concept of, and approaches to, international collaboration and partnership. Emphasis has shifted from cross-border movements of people and equipment to a focus on cross-border

flows of data, information, and knowledge. Conferences and meetings have been cancelled or postponed, with many moved to online platforms. Transfers to virtual spaces have increased the inclusivity, accessibility, cost-efficiency, and environmental friendliness of such events, but also trigger concerns over digital equality, security, and privacy.

The pandemic impacts academics disproportionately—they are weathering the same storm, but under different shelters. For instance, journals' statistics reveal a lower submission rate from female researchers during the lockdown. Academics from Black, Asian, and ethnic minority groups are facing threats, attacks, or extra emotional labor due to COVID-related racism. As a result of funding cuts and revenue loss, there are less available academic positions, particularly disadvantaging those without tenured positions.

Emerging evidence suggests exacerbated inequality within academia, depending on factors like gender, race, faith, ethnicity, social class, health condition, caregiving responsibility, discipline, institution, career stage, administrative or teaching role, country or place of birth, and country or place of residence. The inequality is not only showcased by declined research productivity within certain groups, but also by negative impacts on their short/long-term financial status, job security, career advancement, physical health, and mental wellbeing. The pandemic did not create the inequality that we are witnessing, but it has intensified it: Underlying the tip of the iceberg, is preexisting and institutionalized injustice in global research, with imprints of managerialism, performativity, discrimination, othering, marketization, and the politicization of research. Treating only the symptoms of inequality is not enough, it is the system that needs restructuring.

Research Ethics and Impact: Integrity and Responsibility

The scientific world faces new or intensified ethical challenges. Due to the limitation on mobility and social contact, researchers have to adapt to digital and innovative methods, resulting in ethical concerns over such approaches. The race for fast-track and COVID-related funding, projects, activities, and publications triggers questions on the rigor, integrity, quality, impact, risk, and value of such research for research communities, participants, funders, and society. Moreover, the emphasis on "urgency" marginalizes disciplines not directly related to COVID-19 (particularly in the humanities and social sciences), while research fields with a potential for immediate impact become predominant, better acknowledged, and well-funded.

During the pandemic, research serves as a beacon of hope. Scientific evidence is considered influential to governments' responses and public behavior. However, to what extent has research generated positive societal impacts, to what extent has it been used and communicated responsibly, and to what extent is it trusted? Answers to these questions vary across governments, media channels, and communities. Misinterpretation and misuse of research happens, such as using preprints that have not gone through peer review as clickbait or as "solid" evidence for policy claims.

Redefining Future Global Research

We are standing at the crossroads of our past, present, and future. We are carrying historical baggage and knowledge into the current crisis. Meanwhile, our present experiences will be marked in history books and looked back upon by future generations.

At this point, it is crucial to reflect on the changes that are currently taking place. Changes can be temporary, but decisions to act on them or not will be transformative for our future. For instance, will the current open and humanistic culture become a "COVID limited edition," or will it remain as a new set of norms? Immobility can be temporary, but repositioning relationships—with ourselves and with others—is long-lasting.

What will the "new norms" imply for global research? Can things that are currently changed become transformed forever? More specifically, witnessing how global research can jointly benefit humankind, how can research be understood beyond a zero-sum game, as a global common good? With evidence for potential positive changes, how can we sustain those changes and build a global research community that is open, equal, ethical, robust, sustainable, humanistic, diversified but also collaborative, responsible, and trustworthy?

There may not be immediate or definitive answers to these questions. Nonetheless, addressing them will require a long-term vision, structural changes, and collective commitment from all academics, stakeholders, institutions, and countries around the world. ◢

19

Xin Xu is an ESRC postdoctoral researcher at the Centre for Global Higher Education (CGHE), Department of Education, University of Oxford. E-mail: xin.xu@education.ox.ac.uk.

Needed More Than Ever: Internationalization of Medical Education

Anette Wu, Geoffroy P. J. C. Noel, Betty Leask, Lisa Unangst, Edward Choi, and Hans de Wit

20

Abstract
How has internationalization translated to the sphere of medical education? This article considers that question in the US context, pointing to the distinct, yet overlapping, concepts of global health and internationalization of medical curricula, and advocating for an interdisciplinary approach. Failure to incorporate internationalization into medical education will limit medical students' understanding of the global, social, cultural, and ethical issues associated with medical practice and research, with implications for the current pandemic and beyond.

The COVID-19 pandemic is demonstrating the need for efficient international collaboration in biomedical research, education, and patient care. Such global health emergencies require efficiency in international communication, expert and culturally competent healthcare leadership and practice (locally, nationally, and internationally), rapid international public health action, and collaborative international biotechnology and medical science research. Today more than ever before, these are not optional choices, but represent essential components that should be included in medical education curricula globally.

Defining Internationalization of Medical Education
Currently, internationalization of medical education is a broad term understood in different ways. Our research shows that in the United States, for example, it is frequently delivered primarily through global health programs that largely represent global North–South initiatives, or by addressing issues around social determinants of health locally. However, internationalization of medical education should include consideration of *all* aspects of internationalization; of how intercultural and international issues might impact professional practice and medical education—locally as well as globally. Internationalization of medical education needs to include exposure to both higher-income and lower-middle income countries.

Given the current healthcare environment, internationalization of medical education can help in building awareness of international health challenges, create a foundation for international collaboration and exchange, and introduce a global perspective of medical practice to students, so that the next generation of medical professionals can work efficiently and collaboratively on world health issues.

Internationalization of Medical Education and Global Health—Two Distinct Areas
In today's world, it is no longer appropriate to use the terms "internationalization of medical education," "global health," or "global health education" interchangeably. While there is overlap between internationalization of medical education and global health, these two areas are distinct. Internationalization of medical education is understood as an educational concept, a framework, and a means to achieve an international educational goal in medical education—not a goal in and of itself. Medical competencies achieved through internationalization of medical education can ultimately improve global health. Although often understood as an area of social justice in healthcare, the classical definition of global health includes improving aspects of health for *all* people worldwide. While the ultimate educational goals of global health and internationalization of medical education overlap (i.e., cultural competency), internationalization of medical education focuses on the comparative aspects and analysis of differences between nations with regard to healthcare (e.g., international health systems, economics, law, ethics, outcomes measures) and on international understanding. In this context, internationalization of medical education highlights learning meaningful differences between individual nations, whereas global health issues transcend individual nations.

Goals and Outcomes

Internationalization of medical education is paramount to ensuring that future physicians practice medicine within a global frame of reference. Furthermore, it can provide the foundation and framework for international leadership and collaboration, and provide physicians with skills in cultural competencies, ultimately improving healthcare worldwide and thereby enhancing global health.

Goals and outcomes associated with internationalization of medical education include, but are not limited to, improvement of sensitivity to social, intercultural, and ethical differences; knowledge and appreciation of differences between healthcare delivery systems; understanding of global public health challenges; in-depth understanding of global biomedical research; and international networking, leadership, and collaboration competencies. As a result, physicians and medical leaders are able to practice medicine as globally minded and socially accountable medical practitioners.

International educators need to see the importance of focusing on developing all medical students' understanding of the social, cultural, and ethical issues associated with medical research and practice. However, despite the potential positive impact on global healthcare, how to achieve the above goals and outcomes has not been a shared priority of study worldwide.

The Call for Internationalization of Medical Education

To date, international education in medical schools is fragmented, competencies are not agreed upon, and internationalization programs vary, without official guidelines or agreed upon formats. Published work is mainly found within periodicals of other health professions (i.e., nursing and public health), with few in medical journals. In order to bring awareness of global aspects to medicine, internationalization of medical education needs to find its place in standard medical school curricula and has to be established as an investigational area of educational research.

Internationalization elements should be an essential part of medical education, and not an optional extracurricular part of medical school. Nor should internationalization elements be considered in competition with other subject matters. For many institutions, extracurricular student outbound mobility currently serves as a synonym for internationalization of medical education. However, these programs are accessible only to a small percentage of students. We argue that this approach is insufficient and call for an internationally informed approach that focuses on all students and medical educators.

Internationalization of medical education can be achieved on many levels in academia—including governmental and institutional levels, within a university, and among faculty and students—at home and abroad. There is no "one size fits all" approach. Healthcare professionals, medical educators, global health educators, and scientists in the social sciences need to come together to work out best formats and practices regarding what fits best for each school and country—with an interdisciplinary and international approach. Given the current environment, we argue that this is a high priority area of educational research and professional practice.

Medical school curricula designed and delivered in ways that are informed by research into curriculum design, teaching, learning, and internationalization are urgently required. This will, in turn, require internationally minded and interculturally competent medical educators. As we have learned in 2020, the future of successful global healthcare lies in the collaborative and international competencies of the next generation of medical leaders. Failure to incorporate internationalization of medical education into medical education will limit the full potential of developing all medical students' understanding of the global social, cultural, and ethical issues associated with medical practice and research—impeding what medical higher education can contribute to: shaping a global medical world and improving global health.

> *To date, international education in medical schools is fragmented, competencies are not agreed upon, and internationalization programs vary, without official guidelines or agreed upon formats.*

Anette Wu is assistant professor, Department of Pathology and Cell Biology, and founder/director of "International Collaboration and Exchange Program – Preparing Global Leaders for Healthcare," Columbia University, New York, US. E-mail: aw2342@caa.columbia.edu. Geoffroy P. J. C. Noel is associate professor and director of the Anatomical Sciences Division, Department of Anatomy, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. E-mail: geoffroy.noel@mcgill.ca. Betty Leask is professor emerita at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia, and in 2018–2020 was a visiting professor at the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), Boston College, US. E-mail: leaskb@bc.edu. Lisa Unangst is a PhD graduate in international higher education, Boston College, and incoming postdoctoral fellow at Ghent University, Belgium. E-mail: unangstl@bc.edu. Edward Choi is a PhD graduate in international higher education, Boston College, US. E-mail: eddie.chae@gmail.com. Hans de Wit is director of CIHE, Boston College, US. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu.

COVID-19 and Internationalization in the MENA Region

Giulia Marchesini

Abstract
In the Middle East and North Africa, both higher education and internationalization face challenges. Young people experience high levels of exclusion and unemployment. The attractiveness of the region is limited. A World Bank/Center for Mediterranean Integration (CMI) report analyzes the status of internationalization in the region today. It suggests that, in the COVID-19 context, internationalization at home represents a key starting point for MENA to catch up on the internationalization agenda.

Despite MENA's rich history in tertiary education and mobility of students, scholars, and knowledge, today the region is lagging behind in terms of internationalization.

The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region has a long and rich academic tradition, and in recent decades there have been huge increases in access, enrollment, and number of institutions. However, the region lags in terms of internationalization. According to the most recent Internationalization of Higher Education Survey by the International Association of Universities (IAU), MENA is the least attractive region for institutions worldwide to develop partnerships.

The Regional Context
Young people in MENA, especially disadvantaged groups, face serious problems of access to higher education and extremely high unemployment. For many, education has failed to fulfil its promise to prepare them to enter the labor market and take on active roles in the political and social life of their countries. The COVID-19 crisis is likely to exacerbate these challenges. As a result, so far institutions have been closed, courses have been cancelled, and international students have remained stranded. The longer-term effects of the pandemic on education and international mobility, and the expected economic recession are likely to intensify its impact. This is set against a global backdrop of increased nationalism and anti-immigrant resentment, likely to increase pressure on governments to continue hardening their borders and looking inward. Yet this same crisis is showing just how essential mobility is for the world today.

Two elements are imperative for the MENA region: a shift toward opening up to the world, and serious investment in human capital, by rethinking education in terms of skills to equip the region's youth for a globalized world. Internationalization can help reach these objectives. And currently, the COVID-19 crisis may be an opportunity for MENA to invest in internationalization at home, where it has a comparative advantage.

Status of Internationalization in MENA
Despite MENA's rich history in tertiary education and mobility of students, scholars, and knowledge, today the region is lagging behind in terms of internationalization. When developing international partnerships, few institutions worldwide consider MENA a priority.

The region does host a very high number of international branch campuses (IBCs), albeit mostly concentrated in the Gulf countries: Qatar and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) figure in the top five host countries worldwide for IBCs. Among the six internationally recognized education hubs, these same two countries are characterized as such. In addition, there is significant evidence of internationalization at home activities, including internationalization of the curriculum and instances of collaborative online international learning (COIL). Further internationalization efforts include the cross-Mediterranean partnership model, which during the past decade has led to the establishment of several international universities in countries like Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia.

Student mobility, both from and to MENA, is relatively high. The inbound mobility rate to the region is close to double the world average, and the outbound rate is significantly higher than average. However, upon closer analysis, a more nuanced picture emerges. Inbound mobility concerns only a handful of countries; notably, in the UAE and Qatar, international students make up just under half and just over a third of all students, respectively, while most other MENA countries fall in line with—or below—the world average. Nonetheless, over the past decade, inbound mobility to the region has grown steadily, and in almost all MENA countries international enrollment has grown faster than

domestic enrollment—at a faster rate in some countries than in others. Most countries can be classified either as "emerging" destinations (the Gulf countries and Morocco), where foreign student populations have been growing rapidly, or as "mature" destinations (Egypt, Jordan, and Lebanon), where both domestic and foreign enrollments have been growing moderately.

Outbound mobility rates also represent a mixed picture in terms of distribution across the region. Several Gulf countries and some Mashreq countries experience high outbound mobility rates, while numbers in some countries in North Africa are significant too, with Morocco and Tunisia sending abroad more than double, and around three times, as many students than the world average, respectively. Analyzing where mobile students come from and travel to helps explain the region's limited attractiveness: Just over half of the region's inbound students come *from within* the region itself, while a large and increasing majority of its outbound students leave to study *outside* the region.

COVID-19 and the Way Forward

To develop pertinent policy recommendations, certain elements must be recognized. First, internationalization efforts will only have a significant impact if part of wider reforms: Addressing the issue of institutional governance, including autonomy, is key, since without this, internationalization is unlikely to take hold. Second, context matters: Some Gulf countries are indeed advanced in terms of IBC concentration and student mobility, but given the huge differences in political and socioeconomic contexts across the region, strategies that are appropriate in those countries may not be relevant in others. Third, more research on internationalization, its implementation, and its benefits, is necessary. Finally, this is a fragile region, ridden with conflict, and with considerable numbers of refugees and displaced people. Refugees' access to tertiary education is a critical issue, so a move toward increased internationalization in the region would also need to focus on including refugee students and faculty.

Internationalization needs to become a higher priority, mainstreamed into institutions' and governments' tertiary education policies. In a post-COVID-19 world, given mobility restrictions, economic challenges, and wider impacts, higher education institutions will need to radically change and adapt. Before the crisis hit, an approach focusing more on internationalization at home already stood out as a key starting point, thanks to its proven benefits in terms of skill boosting and employability gains—and also its relatively low cost and ease of implementation. Today, these benefits are combined with changes that are necessitated by the crisis. Strengthening internationalization at home appears more relevant than ever. MENA institutions stand to benefit if they intentionally embrace and adapt to the post-COVID-19 "new normal," by adopting new and innovative learning models. One example would be to capitalize on the move toward online learning and push forward with elements such as virtual mobility, international coteaching, etc. In the current context, seizing the opportunity to increase internationalization at home activities across the region could enable MENA to truly advance on internationalization and further reap its benefits. ◀

Giulia Marchesini is senior partnerships officer at the World Bank's Center for Mediterranean Integration (CMI), Marseille, France. E-mail: gmarchesini@worldbank.org.

24

Abstract
A major question in the ongoing debate about the shape of higher education in the wake of COVID-19 is whether the pandemic will provide new energy and new thinking to internationalization at home (IaH). Getting unstuck will require seizing the moment, creating new language and a renewed sense of purpose, and commitment and leadership at many institutional levels.

Internationalization at Home: Seizing the Moment

Madeleine Greene

As scholars and practitioners ponder the future of internationalization, a major question is whether the pandemic will give new energy to internationalization at home (IaH), especially given that mobility will be curtailed in the foreseeable future. Will this disruption of the status quo push institutions to focus their attention on the academic and sociocultural benefits of IaH and rediscover the underlying values and principles of internationalization that have been overshadowed by the economic aspects? Will the benefits of increased access to global learning, a lower carbon footprint, and diminished brain drain provide new impetus for IaH? Can higher education envision an integrated, rather than an "either/or", approach to IaH and mobility? Progress to date on IaH has been spotty at many institutions. As outlined below, a number of conditions will have to be present in order for IaH to get unstuck.

Taking Advantage of the Moment
More often than not, a sense of urgency is required to generate the energy for important changes. Such pressure is usually a result of an external force or set of circumstances—budget crises, changes in government policy, and now COVID-19. Although IaH has moved slowly on most campuses, there is now a window of opportunity to turn campus attention to IaH. If students are not going to be mobile in the near future, what other ways are available for them to develop global knowledge and skills? An internally generated change such as IaH usually starts with the perception that something is not working (a problem) or at least that it could be working a lot better (an opportunity). IaH represents both a solution to a problem (the need to provide students with greater global knowledge and intercultural skills), and an opportunity (to reach a much larger proportion of students, faculty, and staff). A first step for change leaders is to seize the moment to develop a shared recognition and definition of the problem and of the opportunity that circumstances present for addressing that problem. This requires that leaders give visibility to IaH, start the conversation, and catalyze abundant discussions among faculty, usually at the department and program level. These conversations should lead to agreement on the nature of the problem, shared goals, and a strategy for action.

Reframing the Discussion: Ends, Not Means
A theme of current internationalization discourse is that internationalization is not an end in itself. Rather, it is a means of furthering institutional and societal goals—enhancing the quality of teaching and research, fostering an educated citizenry, and solving local and world problems. Reframing the discussion in terms of internationalization's goals rather than processes should enable a focus on IaH as a key methodology for promoting global learning. This would diminish the dichotomy between IaH and mobility, allowing for a "both/and" rather than an "either/or" approach. Any such mental shift is never easy, and making this happen will require subtle leadership by international officers and more visible championing of IaH by faculty members.

Leadership at Many Levels
Enduring academic change requires strong faculty leadership as well as visible rhetorical and practical support from the top. Putting greater emphasis on IaH requires new thinking about what students need to learn and what goes on in an individual professor's classroom. Administrative fiats may result in some level of compliance, but they rarely produce shifts in thinking or the belief that the new approach is anything but a passing fad. By the same token, change supported by a few faculty champions rarely

gets enough traction to spread. Faculty need to be encouraged by the support, resources, and policy changes that administrators can provide. In short, an accelerated course for IaH will require an articulate group of faculty leaders who are encouraged by vigorous institutional support.

Collective as Well as Individual Action

The infamous silos of academe and the lack of collective ownership of the curriculum, sometimes even within academic departments, have resulted, in many institutions, in a curriculum that is not greater than the sum of its parts. Professors own their courses, and departments may or may not provide a study program that is coherent, progressing in a such a way that students build on prior knowledge and connect the concepts from one course to another.

Just as a fragmented curriculum is largely due to the lack of collective ownership, the inability to integrate IaH into the curriculum and campus life in a systematic way can be largely attributed to a lack of collective action. Internationalizing specific courses is certainly a good idea, but it will not ensure that students will gain global knowledge or intercultural skills throughout their studies. Similarly, a smattering of international research projects will enhance the quality of those particular efforts, but will likely have no effect on others.

The curricular and extracurricular changes required by IaH will require collective examination of current curricula and campus life, developing a shared sense of goals and direction, and agreement on a shared course of action that provides broad commonalities and at the same time allows each faculty member and administrator to achieve those goals in an autonomous fashion.

A Positive Agenda

Most institutions aspire to produce globally literate and competent graduates—a goal that should resonate especially today. In a world roiled by COVID-19, perilous inequality, and growing nationalism and xenophobia, institutions need to be, and be seen as, beacons of progress and hope. The pandemic represents an opportunity for institutions and their faculty and administrators to make a strong statement to students and the public about their values and their contributions to society. IaH represents an important strategy to make such a statement and has the potential of rallying wide support.

While COVID-19 may present a window of opportunity for IaH, without seizing the moment, new language and sense of purpose, and commitment and leadership at many institutional levels, progress is likely to continue to be slow and IaH will remain a low priority. It is an ambitious change, requiring many faculty members to think differently about their disciplines and courses, and administrators to develop a different frame of reference for the workings of the institutions and of the relationship between IaH and mobility. The challenge is great, but the opportunity is there for the taking. ◄

25

In a world roiled by COVID-19, perilous inequality, and growing nationalism and xenophobia, institutions need to be, and be seen as, beacons of progress and hope.

Madeleine F. Greene is senior fellow at the International Association of Universities and chair of the board of directors of the International Student Exchange Program (ISEP).

Inclusivity in Study Abroad: Supported Exchange Programs?

Mary MacKenty

Abstract

This article presents a critical look at the challenges and advantages of exchange programs in US study abroad. It asks whether better support for exchange students could lead to more inclusivity in study abroad.

26

So why are US students paying more for organized study abroad?

Universities' study abroad websites are covered with photos of groups of young students in front of important international landmarks. Rarely are they depicted actually "studying abroad" alongside local students at a host university. Most US students use "island" or "hybrid" programs run by US higher education institutions and third-party providers, which organize their academics (many in-house), travel, housing, and extracurricular activities. The more independent option through an exchange program is the least utilized, despite being the least expensive. Considering that cost is one of the primary barriers to inclusivity in study abroad, why then do universities not take better advantage of their exchange programs?

Exchange agreements allow US students to directly enroll at a partner institution while paying tuition at their home university and maintaining their financial aid. Students organize their flights and accommodation and therefore do not pay additional program fees. In fact, exchange programs are commonplace in many parts of the world, the Erasmus program in Europe being the most well-known. Host institutions boast a wide academic offering that can boost inclusivity in underrepresented majors and minors. Exchange programs also open doors for second-generation students who may already possess the required language skills. Finally, they are often developed with a larger geographical variety of host institutions, allowing for more diversity in options.

So why are US students paying more for organized study abroad? Perhaps it is the easiest option to guarantee credit transfer? Perhaps exchange programs are too challenging, both logistically and academically? Perhaps the US ethnocentric worldview has created a perception of lower quality higher education abroad, which is not worth the home tuition fees? Or, perhaps it is the image that has been marketed and therefore students perceive study abroad programs as the only way to study abroad? While this socially accepted conceptualization of study abroad may be convenient for both the student and the university, an unfortunate consequence is that it creates US "bubbles" that limit interaction with the local environment. Is not the goal of going abroad to immerse oneself in another culture and grow from the challenges that it presents, rather than be sheltered from cultural differences? With the current uncertainty surrounding the impact of COVID-19 on study abroad, enrollment drop-offs may cause programs to become unsustainable. Perhaps it would be pertinent to further examine exchange programs, both for the opportunities they provide and the challenges they present, as a viable alternative for increasing inclusion in the uncertain future ahead.

Deeper Cultural Immersion

Often, researchers and practitioners in the field raise concerns about the lack of language and intercultural learning in study abroad, which is due, at least in part, to the lack of cultural immersion. Programs encourage interaction with the local culture through host-stays, internships, volunteering, language exchanges, and courses that support intercultural and/or global learning. Nevertheless, getting students to develop local friendships continues to be a struggle as they choose to spend time speaking in English with conational peers. Programs' structures inherently shelter students by placing them in a comfortable US center, whereas exchange programs challenge them to learn to navigate the foreign environment by interacting with local people and institutions.

Students on exchange programs must organize their academic agreement, travel plans, housing, and social life by themselves. The absence of on-site staff who act as interlocutors for program students pushes them to communicate with the host institutions' personnel to organize their stay. Orientation is also provided by the host institution,

so their first contacts are local and international students rather than US counterparts. Students take classes alongside local students, gaining yet another opportunity for social interaction and discovering new perspectives. The experience of learning in a new environment helps them develop transversal skills such as adaptability, flexibility, and intercultural teamwork ability, which are valuable competences in the twenty-first century workplace. They may not live in host families; however, common housing arrangements are in dormitories or shared flats with local students. Students learn through the experience of problem-solving in another country, which can lead to increased self-confidence and independence. The cultural immersion is inherently deeper, thus providing more opportunities for intercultural, language, and academic learning.

Too Much Challenge?
Nevertheless, study abroad programs are popular for a reason. They guarantee that logistical matters will run smoothly and provide emotional support for culture shock as well as practical support for any problems that arise. Additionally, for those who enroll in a few local classes, programs maintain a preapproved list of courses in which past students have been successful. One could assume that students must require these supports if most programs are charging for them; however, we would be wise to reexamine which are truly necessary and furthermore, if they could be provided by the home and host institutions instead.

In the case of logistical matters, if we suppose students are independent enough to organize leisure travel for themselves, surely with today's technology millennials can book their trip and arrange their student housing online. Host institutions also do provide students with logistical information specific to their city. On the other hand, academic advising and ensuring credit recognition provide a bigger challenge. At the home university, advisors manage numerous agreements making it difficult for them to obtain a deep understanding of the intricacies of each host university's academic system, degree programs, and specific courses. Host institutions may not offer academic advising beyond providing course lists and timetables. This can result in students enrolling in incompatible courses for their academic background just to obtain credit approval. Finally, support for exchange students' social and cultural integration has improved at host institutions through the prevalence of buddy programs and an offer of local history and culture courses; however, there are no on-site personnel providing round-the-clock assistance.

Providing Support for Exchange Programs
Exchange programs have the potential to improve inclusivity in study abroad. However, more support is required to overcome curricular and cultural challenges. More information is necessary about host institutions' academic programs to ensure that students are enrolling in academically relevant classes that will allow them to be successful. Institutions must become aware of their own academic cultures to properly convey them to their partners. Courses designed to facilitate intercultural learning in study abroad could be modified for exchange programs by imparting them online during the semester. It would also be pertinent to add modules related to cultural differences in academic settings, creating a space for students to reflect on their direct enrollment experience. More research should also be done on the specific challenges of exchange students to improve their experiences. Finally, a shift in the perception of what constitutes a US study abroad program away from the service provider model is needed, if we are to successfully promote exchange programs as a viable, cost-efficient, culturally immersive option for study abroad.

27

Mary MacKenty is a PhD candidate at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. E-mail: mary.mackenty@estudiante.uam.es.

Teaching Mission and Pedagogy at African Universities

Harris Andoh

28

Abstract

The theoretical concepts and applied methodology of teaching academic subjects are central to the teaching mission of African universities. However, it is an area that African universities have only brushed over in their structural and directional plans. This article evaluates the first mission of African universities, teaching, and the state of pedagogical training among African scholars. It further enquires whether current programs and efforts are enough to solve the problems associated with teaching and learning.

The mandate given to all African universities during their inception in the 1940s was teaching, research, and community engagement. In the early 1970s, most African universities focused more on teaching than on other core activities such as community service and research. Although they were never considered "teaching institutions" in the traditional sense, it is clear that this description suited them well up until the late 1980s.

Few among the newer missions and strategic plans and policies of African universities include teaching as a core mandate. For instance, Eduardo Mondlane University in Mozambique declares itself a "fundamentally teaching-driven institution," the University of Ghana seeks to be a "high quality teaching" institution, and the University of Ibadan in Nigeria mentions "excellent teaching and learning" as its new mission. On the other hand, the University of Namibia and the University of Botswana aim to focus on transnational research in addition to quality education, while Aswan University, a leading university in Egypt, does not even mention teaching in its new mission statement.

The new policies and strategic plans of African universities clearly lack a serious emphasis on teaching as a core mission and on the development of teaching methods and skills of faculty as an explicit objective. Yet, to ensure effective teaching at all levels, pedagogical skills are essential for the transfer of knowledge to the students. The sooner African universities acknowledge teaching as their first mission, the more rapidly they will succeed in improving their teaching structures.

Key Challenges

To enhance good teaching in African universities, there will be a need to identify the key challenges associated with teaching policies and the weaknesses of current pedagogical efforts. African universities are not seeking to strengthen the teaching of relevant theories and concepts in the various fields of studies. University lecturers focus their teaching discussions in and outside of classrooms on general social concepts, not on pedagogical theories and concepts. There are several key challenges associated with teaching and pedagogical issues in African universities, including appointing academic staff with no teaching background or formal qualification in teaching; the lack of compulsory training for staff as part of teaching development; and the absence of teaching policies to guide universities on how to improve teaching development skills among their staff.

Skills development of academic staff at African universities is focused on research methodology rather than on teaching and learning. Only in South Africa, as a result of its historic past, has the government prioritized the distribution of a Teaching Development Grant (TDG) to universities. Where grants have been awarded, though, the type and quality of pedagogical training offered to staff are insufficient to equip beneficiaries with adequate skills for a teaching career at university level.

Teaching policies will guide universities in promoting quality teaching among their faculty. An online search on African universities' policies shows that only Stellenbosch University, in South Africa, has a teaching policy adopted in 2018, which seeks to contribute to achieving its Vision and Institutional Strategic Framework. Other prominent universities such as the University of Ghana, the University of Ibadan, and the University of Cape Town either lack a teaching policy or have not made it available online. In contrast, universities in Europe emphasize the importance of academic staff holding teaching qualifications.

A Scopus search on "pedagogy" and "Africa" shows that, apart from South Africa, which has 635 published articles in the field, Ghana, Kenya, and some other African countries

have an average of five in the last 30 years. Further research shows that 62 percent of these publications are primarily on educational research.

The University of Ibadan does not offer any official training on pedagogical skills to its faculty, but instead offers workshops on teaching and learning for newly employed academic staff. At the University of Ghana, there is an initial training program for new staff that has a teaching component. Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in Ghana provides lecturers with pedagogical skills only upon request. At the University of Cape Town, the New Academics Practitioners' Programme only offers basic teaching skills training to its faculty. The university's Academic Staff Development (ASD), a program including teaching improvement initiatives, aims in addition to develop a culture of reflective practice and continued learning for teachers. The Tshwane University of Technology in South Africa has collaborated with the Haaga Helia University of Applied Science in Finland since 2015 to offer staff a postgraduate diploma in Vocational Teaching, and is by extension considered a leader in the field.

These examples among prominent African universities show that efforts to improve pedagogy have not had a significant impact. To overcome challenges at the levels of the institution and of individual faculty, implementing deeper structural changes in the teaching mission and emphasizing teaching policies and pedagogical training focused on quality should be explicitly prioritized. Good teaching should be the result of sound and accepted pedagogical approaches including behaviorism, constructivism, and social constructivism.

The Way Forward

African universities should design and implement structured plans to improve good teaching and learning practices. Efforts have been made at the University of Ghana, where discussions have led to the decision to establish a teaching and learning center, but there is a lack of urgency.

A better structured teaching policy should tackle key theoretical issues such as the decolonization of curricula, inclusivity, correctly aligning teaching to the specific content of the subjects, and strengthening the teaching of theoretical concepts and pedagogical approaches needed to enhance teaching and learning. A teaching policy should also include administrative issues such as the weight of teaching as a criterion for staff promotion, and focus on quality and teaching and learning outcomes rather than on the number of years spent teaching.

African universities should acknowledge that teaching without adequate pedagogical skills has an adverse effect on learning outcomes, and that proper and systematic pedagogical training should be included in future strategic plans and transformation agendas of African universities. This is a critical measure in the pursuit of true academic success. Finally, as a means to monitor and evaluate progress in advancing pedagogy at African universities, annual teaching and learning reports to the university senate or governing body should include information on activities undertaken by staff to obtain a recognized teaching qualification. ◢

These examples among prominent African universities show that efforts to improve pedagogy have not had a significant impact.

29

Harris Andoh is a visiting research and higher education policy evaluation expert at the Directorate of Research & Higher Degrees, Vaal University of Technology, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa, and at the Science and Technology Policy Research Institute (STEPRI) of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Accra, Ghana. E-mail: andoharris@gmail.com.

China's Elite Tertiary Education

Guo Congbin

Abstract
During the past 25 years, China's elite higher education system has been systematically developed and supported by constructive projects, such as Project 211 & 985, C9 League, and the Double First-Class Plan. China's elite universities have also proliferated during this process, and some of them are already rated among the world's top universities. This article gives a general introduction to China's elite higher education projects.

Many students set their hopes on an Ivy League education, though only a handful are ever likely to realize their dreams because of the highly competitive nature of these universities. In China, the Ivy League equivalent is universities ranked in "Project 211," "Project 985," and the latest upgrade, "Double First-Class Plan."

Project 211 & 985

In the early 1990s, China laid down a national strategy of "rejuvenating the country through science and education." Project 211 was launched in 1995, setting a visionary goal of developing approximately 100 higher education institutions and critical disciplines by the turn of the century. The funds required for establishing Project 211 came from the state, departments, localities, and the higher education institutions themselves. Disciplines of vital national value were developed in priority, and infrastructures at the selected institutions were provided for as well.

Following the positive outcome of Project 211, the central government set a higher goal for higher education—Project 985. The project got its name during its launch in May 1998, at the centennial anniversary of Peking University. From 1999 to 2013, Project 985 was carried out in three phases, of which the first was 1999–2002, with a transition phase in 2003; the second 2004–2008, with a transition phase in 2009; and the third 2010–2013. It is noteworthy that no specific descriptions or guidelines were made public as to how a university could be selected for Project 985. In the first phase, Peking University, Tsinghua University, Fudan University, Shanghai Jiaotong University, and some others were selected as the first batch of Project 985, followed by Wuhan University, Xiamen University, Sun Yat-sen University, Nankai University, and others as the second batch. In the second phase, China Agricultural University, Central University for Nationalities, and East China Normal University entered the ranks of the Project 985 universities. Generally speaking, the sooner universities and colleges joined Project 985, the more financial support they received. Project 211 & 985 delivered some remarkable outcomes. Within two decades, it promoted the rapid development of Chinese universities as institutions, and of specific disciplines. As a result, China has now become the second leading nation after the United States in terms of global scientific publications, including in Science Citation Index (SCI), Engineering Index (EI), and Conference Proceedings Citation Index—Science (CPCI–S). Moreover, in the decade after 1995, the number of teaching staff and students increased considerably, and universities situated in remote and underdeveloped areas succeeded in attracting more talent.

C9 League

Nine presidents from Project 985 universities held the first First-Class University Construction Seminar in 2003, during which the C9 League was established. The C9 League includes Peking University, Tsinghua University, Fudan University, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Nanjing University, Zhejiang University, the University of Science and Technology of China, Harbin Institute of Technology, and Xi'an Jiaotong University. It stands for the leading segment of China's tertiary education system. The ministry of education and the ministry of finance have dedicated significant funding to C9 League universities to turn them into world-class universities by reforming their institutional governance, strengthening their research platforms, and promoting international exchange and cooperation. C9 League universities received about half of the total funding of Project 985 in each of its stages. Peking University and Tsinghua University received the equivalent of approximately US$250 million for Project 985 during the first stage, about the same amount in the second stage, and an increase to about US$375 million in the third stage. Besides, in 2009, these universities signed an agreement on "Cooperation and Exchange of Elites between First-Class Universities" to share academic resources and cultivate top students.

Under this agreement, they can exchange undergraduate and postgraduate students, host C9–Summer Schools for brand effect and to attract talented students, and establish collaborative web repositories to share academic resources and review dissertations.

The result has been remarkable. In terms of global rankings, the mainland Chinese universities that entered the top 200 of QS World University Ranking from 2012 to 2019 and the top 200 of *THE* World University Rankings from 2018 to 2019 were all C9 League universities. In the QS rankings, Peking University and Tsinghua University in particular went up from #46 and #47 respectively in 2012 to #41 and #25 in 2015, and continued to improve to #30 and #17 in 2019. In the *THE* rankings, the trend was the same for Peking University and Tsinghua University, from #49 and #71 in 2012 to #42 and #47 in 2015 respectively. In 2019, the two universities reached #31 and #22.

Double First-Class Plan

After the end of Project 985 in 2013 and a three-year transition period from 2014 to 2016, China launched its latest strategy in 2017, the "Double First-Class Plan" (DFP), with the intention of establishing a large number of world-class universities and disciplines by the end of 2050. There are currently 137 DFP entities, of which 42 are first-class universities, and 95 are first-class disciplines. DFP universities are more evenly distributed geographically than Project 985 universities. From the original Project 985 universities, Zhengzhou University in the central plains region, Yunnan University in the southwest region, and Xinjiang University in the northwest region were selected as DFP universities. To a certain extent, this compensated for the insufficiency of the original Project 985 in terms of colleges and universities from the central and western regions. The DFP selection process is more transparent, with the establishment of a council and the participation of third parties. Furthermore, it is a competitive mechanism that takes into consideration the universities' performance in recent years. DFP universities are divided into Class A and Class B as an encouragement to carry on with improvement measures.

The DFP has now become an essential reference for the government and for enterprises and universities to locate talents. Compared to Project 985 & 211, the DFP has changed the mode of resource investment and the management system. It is shifting the resource investment mode from being government-oriented to becoming more diversified. It also tries to create a management system that is built together by the government, the universities, social organizations, the public, and third parties, to allow the market to gradually drive resource allocation to higher education. In other words, the government wants to change its role from decision-maker to coordinator, and to create a fairer environment to promote the universities' market competitiveness. Besides, the DFP implements a dynamic management rolling budget system, to regularly monitor and evaluate the efficiency of how the funding is used, internally and externally. Finally, rather than being equally distributed like before, the DFP investment is preferentially allocated to colleges and disciplines with high standards and distinctive characteristics, to develop advantageous disciplines and strengthen disciplines required by emerging industries and national strategy.

Along the Path of Progress, Does Money Matter?

Back in 1995, when Project 211 was launched, China's fiscal revenue was about US$75.2 billion. Fast-forwarding to 2017 when the DFP was established, this amount skyrocketed to about US$2.69 trillion. While the total budget estimate of top universities is a complicated figure to approximate, the proportion of funding dedicated to education has considerably increased. This is remarkable, as just seven decades ago, four-fifths of the population was impoverished and illiterate.

While the financial situation has improved significantly, China's higher education still has some issues that need to be resolved. The management of the university funding system needs to be streamlined, for instance by simplifying the application process and evaluation procedure, granting researchers more decision-making rights and a more relaxed research environment to choose and adjust research approaches, giving them ownership of, or full right to use research results, and so on. Although universities in China are no longer suffering from extreme budget shortages, increased autonomy in the use of funds for researchers will stimulate their sense of initiative and innovation. ◀

31

The DFP has now become an essential reference for the government and for enterprises and universities to locate talents.

Guo Congbin is professor at the Graduate School of Education and director of the Center for Research on Education Data, Peking University, China. E-mail: cbguoguo@pku.edu.cn.

Vietnam: Human Capital As a Public Good

Chi Hong Nguyen

Abstract
Since the 1990s, Vietnam has used and encouraged contributions from various sources of human capital as key factors to create a national competitive advantage for sustainable development. Human capital has become an indispensable component in the state's development processes. While human capital is widely considered an individual good, it is now a social property used by the Vietnamese government to enhance its political image as a democratic and progressive socialist country.

Vietnam is facing shortages of skilled labor. Despite its large population of 90.7 million in 2014, only 6.9 percent and 0.2 percent had obtained university and postgraduate degrees, respectively. In 2011, the Vietnamese government issued Decision 579/QD–TTg, which ratified several strategies to develop human capital from 2011 to 2020. This decision considered human capital as the most important asset for sustainable development and national competitive advantage.

Ambitions to Improve the Skilled Workforce
To achieve this target, the Vietnamese government increased education expenditures from 3.57 percent in 2000 to 5.7 percent in 2013, with education remaining the largest item on the state's budget. A large share of the funding has been invested in improving the quality of 10 domestic higher education institutions to reach an international level, and another four to reach world-class level in 2020. Doors to higher education were opened wide, with an increase in the number of higher education institutions from 103 in 1993 to 322 in 2007 and 419 in 2014. The number of students enrolled in colleges and universities grew from 133,000 in 1987 to 2.12 million in 2015. This was achieved through academic relations with foreign universities, calls for investment from the private sector, providing English-taught academic programs, and collaborating with world-class universities. The government also encouraged lecturers and students to study abroad by applying for domestic and international scholarships, or through private funding.

The number of university lecturers obtaining doctoral degrees is expected to increase to 35 percent by 2020. Project 911 (the continuation of Project 322) sponsors full scholarships for 10,000 lecturers to pursue doctoral programs at world-class universities, 3,000 lecturers to study "sandwich" doctoral programs (a sandwich program usually includes a research period in the home country), and another 10,000 to follow doctoral programs at domestic universities from 2010 to 2020. Project 165, which was initiated in 2008, provides study abroad scholarships for leaders (or individuals planning to become leaders) in education. Through their study abroad programs, they aim to increase their foreign language and leadership skills, as well as explore international cooperation opportunities. If candidates in this program are admitted to a postgraduate program at a foreign university, they are given a full scholarship.

In October 2005, the ministry of education and training signed Decision 6143/QD–BGD&DT, sponsoring 1,015 students from the Mekong Delta region for study abroad (81.3 percent to study master programs and the rest for doctorates). From its start in 2005 until April 2015, this project sent 502 students to study master programs and another 50 to study doctoral programs at 160 higher education institutions in 23 countries (51 percent in Europe, 24 percent in Asia, 19 percent in Australia, and 6 percent in North America).

Another strategy of the Vietnamese government is to send skilled labor to other countries. Skilled workers are encouraged to work overseas for a period in order to help the country deepen its multilateral relations with international friends and increase national revenue. In 2011, remittances earned by Vietnamese skilled and semiskilled labor force working overseas reached US$2 billion. Remittances from Vietnamese expatriates reached US$9 billion, accounting for 8 percent of Vietnam's GDP. While crossing national borders was a highly selective privilege before the 1986 economic reform, studying or working abroad is currently leveraged to improve the quality of the domestic workforce and change the political image of Vietnam in the global arena, as a democratic and progressive Communist country.

Another strategy of the Vietnamese government is to send skilled labor to other countries.

A Two-Pronged Approach

To facilitate and control the return of these human resources, the government practices a two-pronged approach. On the one hand, individuals are encouraged to and supported in study or work abroad. On the other hand, to minimize possible nonreturns of students and workers, the government has issued several decrees (e.g. Decrees 81/2003/ND–CP and 144/2007/ND–CP) introducing a financial penalty to their families in Vietnam, confiscating their savings, and, if they return late, prohibiting them from going overseas in the following five years. The ministry of education and training requires students who have successfully secured international and/or domestic scholarships to sign work contracts in Vietnam. Upon completion of their studies, they are required to work in Vietnam for a period three times longer than the time spent studying overseas, although this duration is negotiable according to local demands for labor. Any violation of these contracts leads to prosecution and confiscation of relatives' assets.

The government has also called for Vietnamese expatriates' economic and knowledge contributions through strategies targeting the diaspora. Decision 40/2004/QH11 in 2004 proposed generous schemes for foreigners of Vietnamese descent to seek temporary or permanent residency. They can, for example, rent houses in Vietnam on a long-term basis, establish branches of their companies, as well as receive tax reduction and legal support. This decision also announced the establishment of advanced research centers at two national universities in Ho Chi Minh City and Ha Noi, aiming to attract prominent researchers from Vietnam and abroad to teach and conduct scientific research.

Since July 2009, Vietnamese expatriates have been able to retain their Vietnamese citizenship if the countries where they are residing allow dual citizenship. They are entitled to full rights as Vietnamese citizens. Since 2014, Decree 87/2014/ND–CP allows provinces to hire highly skilled members of the Vietnamese diaspora if these individuals have obtained patents in agriculture and technology, publish internationally, or hold a doctoral degree. In return, these individuals are awarded financial benefits, accommodation, and promising working conditions.

Human Capital as a Multifunctional Social Asset

In Vietnam, human capital is developed, used, and retained as a commodity to increase the national competitive advantage. In other words, this commodity is not solely individually owned—it is a shared social good. It is measurable, and represents the government's efforts to participate in the global race for talent and change the political image of Vietnam into that of a democratic country. This commodity is produced by a joint effort of the state, the governments of countries that sustain bilateral relations with Vietnam, domestic and foreign universities, as well as the students and workers themselves, who are guided by the state's political ideology. In the state's view, a highly skilled labor force needs to possess foreign language proficiency, professional expertise, and relations abroad that can bring benefits to national development. In that sense, investment in, and use of, human capital is politically oriented. Human capital, as such, is not solely the property of individuals, it is a multifunctional asset that is socially representative. It allows the country to extend its image as a friendly socialist nation in political and diplomatic affairs.

Chi Hong Nguyen is head of the English Department at FPT University, Can Tho Campus, Vietnam. E-mail: chinh6@fe.edu.vn.

34

Measuring Access to Higher Education in India

Pankaj Mittal and Bhushan Patwardhan

Abstract

The gross enrollment ratio (GER) is a universally accepted indicator for the level of participation in higher education. India has adopted policies to increase the GER by expanding its higher education capacity and by promoting distance and online modes of delivery. However, the low number of students eligible for admission to higher education is a major limiting factor. The eligible enrollment ratio (EER) is a more realistic indicator.

The GER is the ratio between the number of enrollments in higher education and the total population in the 18–23 age group. A high GER indicates a high degree of participation. According to 2017 UNESCO data, the GER in higher education in India is relatively low, at 27.4 percent, compared to the global average (29 percent), and it is substantially lower than the GER of higher-income countries such as the United States (88.2 percent), Germany (70.3 percent), and the United Kingdom (60 percent). It is low even in comparison with other lower-middle-income economies such as Brazil (51.3 percent) and China (49.1 percent). In this article, we discuss the appropriateness of the GER for a country like India.

Why Is the Indian GER Low?
In India, successful completion of the 12th grade in secondary school grants basic eligibility for enrollment in higher education. The relatively low GER in higher education in India is primarily due to a shortage of eligible candidates. This shortage is mainly the result of low enrollments and high dropout rates at the school level. Several factors, including gender, language of instruction, and socioeconomic constraints are responsible for the gradual decrease of the number of students during secondary school. This shortage of eligible candidates represents a major bottleneck hindering an increase of the GER in higher education.

Obviously, this cannot be resolved by increasing the number of colleges or universities, or by promoting higher education via distance or online modes. To increase the number of students who are eligible to enroll into higher education, India needs to focus on increasing the number of youth completing higher secondary school. The availability, accessibility, affordability, and quality of higher education and its relevance for employment also have significant bearing on the GER. Many countries with a substantial gap between the gross number of individuals in the 18–23 age group and the number of those actually eligible to enter higher education face a similar situation. For lower-middle-income countries like India, the GER may not be the most appropriate indicator to measure access.

Eligible Enrollment Ratio (EER)
For a fairer comparison between higher- and lower-income countries, the EER may be a more appropriate indicator. The EER is defined as the ratio between the number of students enrolled in higher education and the number of students in the 18–23 age group having successfully completed 12th grade. The EER is a judicious measurement of enrollment because it takes the eligibility parameter into account, thus improving the precision of the indicator.

As data on the number of students having passed 12th grade in the relevant age group is not readily available in most countries, we used data relating to the completion rate (CR) for our study to compare GER and EER (Measuring Access, Quality and Relevance in Higher Education). According to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the CR is defined as the number of individuals in the relevant age group who have completed the last grade of a given level of education, expressed as a percentage of the total population of that same age group. The EER can be expressed in terms of the formula EER=GER/CR. We used this formula to determine the EER of 10 representative countries from both higher- and lower/middle-income economies, including Brazil, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Comparing GER and EER

We studied data collected over five years (2013–2017) by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics. The missing data for the CR was calculated using a forecast tool incorporating a linear regression model. The EER obtained for the 10 selected countries was compared with their respective GER. We discovered that the absolute difference between the EER values of higher-income countries and those of lower-middle-income countries was much smaller than the respective differences in GER values.

Interestingly, we also noticed that while the GER and EER were both consistently high for higher-income countries such as the United States (GER 88.2 percent, EER 93.5 percent), France (65.6 percent, 75.5 percent) and the United Kingdom (60.0 percent, 63.1 percent), the difference between GER and EER for these same countries was less than 10 percentage points, which is an indication of relatively stable and mature education systems. Our study shows that India (EER 64.3 percent) offers better access to higher education than the United Kingdom (EER 63.1 percent). The GER of Indonesia (36.4 percent) is higher than in India, however its EER (57.7 percent) is lower. Pakistan ranks last among the selected countries both in terms of GER (9.4 percent) and EER (43.3 percent). India ranks eighth in terms of GER, but ranks sixth when using the EER as an indicator. A large difference between GER and EER indicates a large gap between age group and eligible population. In 2017, the difference between GER and EER in India was 37.5, the highest among all selected countries. This is an indication of the poor state of the school system, aggravated by a low rate of access to higher education. For a country like India, the EER offers a more realistic estimation: Considering educational eligibility in addition to age gives better precision when measuring the level of participation in higher education.

The hallmark of policy for any country is the quality of its higher education. Higher-income countries like Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States are able to effectively participate in the knowledge economy thanks to their high quality education focusing on skills acquisition and concern for employability. These countries also attract a large number of international students—which contributes to boosting enrollments. In addition, with the current trend of making use of continuing education coupled with rapid changes in technology and job markets, the working population above 23 make up an increasing share of enrollments. Therefore, the definition of the GER, which is linked to a specific age group, needs to be reconsidered.

Conclusion

Higher-income and lower-income countries should be compared on equal terms. The GER is not an appropriate indicator to measure the level of participation in lower-income countries, where school systems are less developed and the number of international students is minimal. The EER is a more relevant indicator, as it takes into account imbalances at entry level. More in-depth study is necessary to optimize the EER as a new indicator to measure the level of participation in higher education. ◢

Our study shows that India (EER 64.3 percent) offers better access to higher education than the United Kingdom (EER 63.1 percent).

Pankaj Mittal is secretary general, Association of Indian Universities, New Delhi, India. E-mail pankajugc@gmail.com. Bhushan Patwardhan is vice chairman, University Grants Commission, New Delhi, India. E-mail: bpatwardhan@gmail.com.

CIHE PUBLICATIONS

CIHE Year in Review, 2019–2020
In its series *CIHE Perspectives*, the center published the "Boston College Center for International Higher Education Year in Review, 2019–2020," edited by Tessa DeLaquil and Hans de Wit. This 4th annual report provides a collection of articles by staff, graduate assistants, visiting scholars, and research fellows of CIHE, as well as an overview of the center's activities in the area of teaching and training, research, and dissemination.

Trends and Issues in Doctoral Education, A Global Perspective
In its series *Studies in Higher Education*, SAGE published "Trends and Issues in Doctoral Education, A Global Perspective," edited by Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Hans de Wit. This publication provides a comparative overview and analysis of policies, practices, and developments in doctoral education in 16 countries around the world.

New Publication in CIHE Brill/Sense, Series: Global Perspectives on Higher Education
Global Trends in Higher Education Quality Assurance: Challenges and Opportunities in Internal and External Quality Assurance
Series: Global Perspectives on Higher Education, Volume: 48
Editors: Susanna Karakhanyan and Bjørn Stensaker
Paperback ISBN: 978-90-04-44030-2

CIHE UPDATES

CIHE Conference
On October 23–24, 2021, CIHE will organize its first International Higher Education Conference, an event originally planned for October 2020 to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the center and its flagship publication *International Higher Education*. The conference will have two tracks: International Higher Education and Internationalization of Higher Education. We invite you to send us a proposal for a paper, with a title, an abstract of maximum 500 words, and a short bio of 175 words. Submissions should be sent to internationalhighered@bc.edu by **May 15, 2021**. Please explicitly label your e-mail "Conference submission."

CIHE News

On July 1, 2020, Associate Professor Gerardo Blanco joined CIHE as associate director, and Assistant Professor of the Practice Rebecca Schendel was promoted to managing director of CIHE. As of November 1, 2020, Hans de Wit will step down as full director of CIHE, and together with founding director Philip G. Altbach, will assume part-time responsibility for the center as academic director.

They form the team in charge of the center's activities in the area of teaching and training, research, and publication, with the support of CIHE's current graduate assistants: Tessa DeLaquil, Jo Wang, Maia Gelashvili, and Mathew Rombalski, and Administrative Assistant Salina Kopellas.

Inaugural Conference on International Higher Education

Marking the 25th anniversary of the Center for International Higher Education

OCTOBER 22–23 2021

BOSTON COLLEGE
Lynch School of Education and Human Development
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Including
Keynote presentations
Panel discussions
Individual paper presentations

Interested in presenting?
Submit an abstract by May 15, 2021
» **BC.EDU/CIHE**

Are you a graduate student or early career professional? Join us at the next WES-CIHE Summer Institute on

INNOVATIVE AND INCLUSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Boston College | June 9–11, 2021
To learn more and submit a proposal, visit:
wes.org/2021-wes-cihe

WES WORLD EDUCATION SERVICES

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION
BOSTON COLLEGE

IHE Advisory Board

International Higher Education has an advisory board of distinguished higher education experts to provide insights, suggest topics, and increase the visibility of the publication.

The Editorial Advisory Board is comprised of the following members:

39

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

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perpective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through International Higher Education, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide.