PART 2

Higher Education Cooperation and Internationalisation: Global and European Overview

Higher Education and Research Policies: The Current Global Agenda and Implications for International Cooperation

Merle Jacob and Mary-Louise Kearney

Abstract

International collaboration is clearly a key priority in higher education and research (HER) policy and practice. The competition for students and excellent research and teaching staff is now a global one and this is reflected in the increasing salience of phenomena such as the Shanghai and Times Higher Education Rankings for monitoring the performance of HER institutions. This chapter takes its point of departure in the fact of international collaboration and seeks to interrogate and understand the factors that stimulate international collaboration. The chapter focuses on two critical drivers of international academic collaboration: globalisation and the governance initiatives initiated by international governmental organisations (IGOs).

The chapter draws on literature review and an analysis of major global and regional policy priorities to demonstrate the ever-expanding influence of global trends over national HER policy priorities and academia. Numerous IGOs reiterate the importance of knowledge to achieve further progress. Creativity, critical thinking and complex problem-solving capacity are deemed vital. All are intrinsic components of HER policies so support for these domains will surely increase. Academic cooperation, through its partnership with governments and other stakeholders and its renewed role and modalities, emerges as a crucial force to help attain these goals.

The authors contend that international collaboration is an important and persistent feature in an attraction narrative which is intended to position higher education as an entry ticket to a global lifestyle. Reasoning from this perspective, student and scholarly mobility are critical facilitators of globalisation while at the same time being subject to globalising forces. While previous analyses have tended to focus on universities as being objects of globalisation, this chapter extends this.

Keywords

globalisation – knowledge society/economy – HER policy priorities – strategic partnerships – academic cooperation – diverse socio-economic contexts

1 Introduction

The purpose of this introductory chapter is to preface the contributions with an outline of the dominant forces that are shaping international collaboration with the European Union in higher education and research (HER). International academic cooperation was initially defined as student exchange and was, up until the latter part of the 20th century, an optional experience. Today, international academic cooperation has expanded well beyond the boundaries of a few student exchange programmes to include a range of activities that are now classified as internationalisation. Given that the focus of this volume is cooperation with EU institutions, we will take our point of departure in the definition of internationalisation that circulates in EU's HER policies.

Following Knight we define internationalisation as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education. (Knight, 2003, p. 2) HER internationalisation within the EU refers to at least three categories of activities: (i) mobility of students, administrative staff, teachers and researchers; (ii) interorganisational collaboration (e.g. joint/accredited degrees, shared course modules, networked institutions, overseas campuses) and (iii) open and transparent recruitment routines. ERASMUS+, Marie Curie Skłodowska and Bologna are among the initiatives that embody these imperatives. Apart from Bologna, the EU flagship initiatives of HER internationalisation are increasingly inclusive of other regions. For instance, both ERASMUS+ and MC Skłodowska include a component that is open to mobility to and from non-EU member states. Likewise, the European Research Council accepts research applications from applicants regardless of nationality. Internationalisation from the perspective of the EU is clearly not a European affair but a global one and, seen from this perspective, the individual narratives that the chapters in this book present are part of a dialogue that ought to be relevant well beyond the research community in higher education.

For EU member states and their citizens, the HER internationalisation initiatives initiated by the EU represent a clear message but a minority moment in the everyday reality of HER. ERASMUS+ accounts for approximately 5% of the student mobility in the EU region and the Framework programme research

budget also accounts for less than 10% of the research funding in the region. Given that EU Commission-supported initiatives represent such a small percentage of the total volume of international collaboration conducted within HER, it is clear that the drivers of this activity are either inherent to the sector itself or that they represent such a pressing force that they cannot be easily ignored. The latter two issues are important considerations given that HER policies are traditionally anchored in national ambitions. HER policy documents and academic literature converge on the observation that the last three decades have been game changing for HER because the balance between national and global drivers of HER collaboration policies has shifted in favour of the global (Cerdeira Bento et al., 2020; Paradeise & Thoenig, 2015).

This chapter aims to outline two key triggers of HER policies on international collaboration that stand out as of particular import for this volume: (i) the role of HER in the globalisation discourse and (ii) the impact of soft power measures emanating from international governmental organisations such as the OECD and UNESCO. The extent to which each or both of these factors plays a role in the different regional contexts will differ. The contributions in the rest of this volume however confirm these as significant imperatives for HER policies on collaboration. The rest of this chapter is structured in the following way. This brief introduction will be followed by a synthetic discussion of the theme of this book, i.e. international academic cooperation alternatively known as internationalisation. Following this we will focus on some of the imperatives for international collaboration emanating from the HER sector itself. The fourth section will provide a brief overview of the role of intergovernmental organisations in promoting international collaboration in HER. The fifth section will provide some concluding remarks.

2 International Collaboration, Globalisation and Higher Education and Research (HER)

A perusal of trade publications, newspapers and the like would reveal that internationalisation is not limited to HER: the business, policy and not for profit sectors are all focusing on this issue either as a way of signalling legitimacy or distinction. It is in part because of this pervasiveness that it is instructive to focus on internationalisation in the HER context. We maintain that the focus on the HER sector will allow us to unmask aspects of internationalisation which are not always visible to the average observer. Additionally, given the fact that HER policies are framed and even experienced as primarily national, the import of internationalisation and ultimately globalisation is sometimes

difficult to grasp. Although there is no consensus on this issue, we argue that most HER scholars would concede that internationalisation should be distinguished from globalisation. We further contend that the last two decades witnessed the evolution of a new and qualitatively different phase of internationalisation in HER. This is the emergence of internationalisation as a key performance indicator for individual academics and higher education institutions (HEI). The latter development is perhaps the most important reason for maintaining a definitional distinction between internationalisation and globalisation.

Student and scholarly mobility are perhaps the two most well-known and important defining features of international collaboration across HEIs. These two features are also the most significant markers of internationalisation because it is through these two that HER alternatively facilitates globalisation and is itself globalised. Many authors in HER research have adopted the practice of using globalisation and/or New Public Management (NPM) as explanatory factors without always necessarily making it clear what aspects of these two phenomena may be the explanatory variable (see for example Henry et al., 2001; Cowen, 2000; Currie, 2004; Zajda & Rust, 2020). This is not a habit that is limited to HER research but it is a particularly unfortunate turn for HER because it obscures the ways in which practices that emerge in the sector are contributing to some of the developments that are attributed to NPM and globalisation. This is despite the availability of a whole range of HER scholarship that provides more nuanced analyses (see for example Gérard & Uebelmesser, 2015).

Pinpointing specific changes in the HER sector and attributing these changes to particular drivers is a complex issue. This complexity increases several fold if one chooses the institution as the level of analysis. Reasoning from the institutional perspective reveals a number of key challenges. One is the diversity of the HER sector and that although global pressures affect all HEIs, situatedness does determine how the HEI would respond to these pressures. Another is that HEIs are not monolithic organisations but are multicultural with each culture providing its own set of imperatives which in turn act as a filter through which global and national pressures are perceived. For instance, the same HEI may at once be engaged in research collaborations with other HEIs and with local national actors about teaching. Some of the collaborations may overlap through staff members but the interest(s) connected with the activity may differ and, in some cases, even conflict. A further complicating factor is that staff agency in initiating and organising collaborative activities in teaching and research differs across HEIs. Many European universities have strong traditions of staff autonomy particularly in research. This implies that at

any given moment, the university itself may not have a full overview of collaborative activities. This has consequences for the degree of credence that may be given to documents such as university strategies for internationalisation.

Another way in which HEIs constantly straddle multiple universes is via the discourses (practices, expectations and regulations) in which they are embedded. For instance, scholars, students and degrees are all outputs of HEIs. The latter two are in some respects seen as plug and play devices, in that they are supposed to be adaptable regardless of context. This is a prerequisite for and at the same time makes international collaboration possible. While all HEIs operate with this expectation, some HEIs treat these products as commodities while others regard them as public goods. This more than any other factor drives the way in which internationalisation pressures have been interpreted by HEIs. Further, one may contend that the commodity/public good provider may be a potential analytical frame for differentiating among HEIs as being driven by or drivers of globalisation.

3 HEIs and Globalisation

Globalisation has become a defining frame for how we understand the interventions and requirements for an interconnected world in a way that trade, telecommunications, international relations and even the Bretton Woods institutions did not achieve. Given that our brief is education, it is fitting to take our point of departure in UNESCO's¹ definition of globalisation as an 'unprecedented acceleration and intensification in the global flows of capital, labour, and information'. This definition, although vague, has the merit of being distinct from internationalisation, which is merely one of the many characteristics of globalisation. What the UNESCO definition hides however is the fact that globalisation has both agency and structure. Capital, labour and information do not flow of their own accord. This flow is facilitated by individual choices, institutions, organisations and the preferences and opportunities they create and obscure. Higher education and research are two activities that contribute to individual agency and ultimately to the structures that promote and mediate capital, labour and information flows. This function is not an artefact of globalisation, it predates globalisation. It also explains why HER is a frontier site in globalisation. Further, technological developments such as information and communication technology (ICT) have enhanced the capacity of HER to promote and mediate the flow of capital and labour. Thus, while universities have always used 'global' or 'international' as part of their blurb, the scale of this activity is now unprecedented in relation to the past. For

instance, the OECD reported that 3.7 million students were enrolled in tertiary education outside their home country in 2009 (OECD, 2011). This is an appreciable increase from the 0.8 million in 1975. These figures, impressive as they may appear, do not account for all forms of student mobility.

Higher education is one of the acknowledged means by which the European Union exercises soft power to promote integration of the European Union labour market. The Erasmus and Bologna programmes are the primary tools used to achieve this objective (Teichler, 2012). An indication of the importance of the programme is that the 2014–2020 budget for the ERASMUS+ programme is €14.7 billion. A cursory perusal of the publicity for the ERASMUS+ programme provides insight and introduction to the debatable problem of the student mobility variable in internationalisation. According to the Erasmus impact study, mobility enhances employability, Erasmus+ alumni are more likely to engage in other forms of international mobility later on in life and more than 30% of them marry someone from another nationality (EU, 2017). Parey and Waldinger (2010) and Oosterbeek and Webbink (2009) among others converge on the finding that individual labour market mobility is enhanced by previous mobility. Erasmus+ and other types of student mobility programmes are therefore portals to a global lifestyle for the individual and a channel for net inflow of knowledge for the recipient nation/firm. The mobility narrative is a compelling part of internationalisation on many levels but its attractiveness is perhaps enhanced because it reinforces already existing expectations of higher education such as enhanced employability and social mobility.

Mobility is however just one component of internationalisation and ultimately globalisation. In order for mobility to work, an infrastructure of supporting arrangements has to be in place in the networks of universities that receive these students. This includes accreditation regimes like EQUIS,² AACSB³ and AMBA,⁴ for business schools and generally comparable grading arrangements, course structures, calendars and curricula. International academic collaboration is a key component of this infrastructure. Higher education institutions need to collaborate to facilitate student and staff exchanges represented by ERASMUS, staff need to collaborate across institutions to perform accreditation, etc. Thus, while internationalisation itself may be seen as a requirement that is emanating from outside the HEI context, the collaborative moves HEIs make to facilitate or comply with these requirements are driven from within. The growing prevalence of university networks such as the League of European Research Universities (LERU) and Universitas 21 provide further evidence of the way HEIs are reshaping the sector themselves and creating market differentiation.

The increased importance of global ranking tables of HEIs is perhaps the single most telling sign of differentiation in the HEI sector. For years, *Times Higher Education*, *Macleans*⁵ and *US News*⁶ provided rankings of their respective national universities. These rankings were intended to provide parents with some idea of how to evaluate colleges and universities. This was a pragmatic exercise premised on an early recognition of higher education as a commodity. The ranking business exploded however when the Shanghai ranking was created in response to China's need to improve its national university system and to assess which foreign universities should be prioritised for Chinese students going abroad. Shanghai changed the rankings game in two important ways: (i) it intensified competition between universities that were already in the business of selling higher education and (ii) it enrolled even public universities in the global competition for students.

A glance at the 2019 ARWU (Shanghai) Rankings⁷ of the best universities for excellence in teaching and research shows that 8 of the first 10 places are occupied by American universities. The remaining 2 slots are filled by British institutions. A list for the same purpose proposed by Quacquarelli Symonds (QS)⁸ gives a slightly different result but HEIs in the USA and the UK still dominate. However, a third selection, again proposed by QS, lists the 10 best student cities assessed according to 6 indicators (*affordability, student mix, quality of student life, access to top universities, employer activity and student preferred choice*). Top cities are: London, Tokyo, Melbourne, Munich, Berlin, Montreal, Paris, Zurich, Sydney, Seoul (QS Rankings, 2019).

Ranking the cities as well as the universities is consistent with the narrative of mobility as a portal to another lifestyle and it integrates student life with parallel discourses about urban development. It also provides insight into the importance of HEI collaboration in the facilitation of globalisation. Despite the positive terms in which internationalisation and particularly mobility is framed, there is an emerging critique of this view and several have observed that internationalisation in HER is surprisingly monocultural (Marginson, 2016; Knight, 2011). Knight (2011) observed for instance that while an international student body is universally touted as positive, the reality is different. She argues that foreign students exist in a separate sphere from their local counterparts and in the best of cases interact only with other foreign students. While this might be a description that does not fit all cases, it is common enough to be easily recognisable. Globalisation promotes and is facilitated by the internationalisation of higher education but ironically enough, the more internationalisation is embraced, the less it seems that campuses are able to provide truly international experiences.

If one changes focus to pose the question of who benefits from student mobility, the picture is more nuanced. According to a study commissioned by the European Union, the ERASMUS programme performs similarly to other mobility programmes. Other studies have shown that student propensity to engage in mobility in higher education is largely determined by family background, and experience of mobility prior to university education. EU (2017) claims that student mobility is the most significant indicator of internationalisation for higher education institutions.

If higher education is seen as global, it is perhaps in research that the forces of globalisation are easiest to trace and pinpoint. Research collaboration is also a space where the agenda of internationalisation, excellence and quality converges in a different way from how it plays out in higher education. The researcher is addressed in this narrative not as a teacher sometimes and researcher at other times but as a researcher. Research excellence is therefore distinct from its teaching counterpart and research collaboration is more often an issue that is the province of the group or individual rather than the institution. Researchers may therefore choose to be global citizens or local ones in a way that teachers may not. The HEI-researcher interface in the discourse about internationalisation and collaboration occurs primarily through recruitment, publication/patenting and funding.

Mobility is an indicator of individual excellence. This implies that in order to get tenure, or even an entry level position, the average researcher must engage in some type of mobility. Likewise, universities must demonstrate commitment to excellence by showing that staff recruitment policies emphasise internationalisation via advocating diversity, gender equality and mobility. These requirements are treated as universally applicable to all disciplines. The focus on internationalisation in recruitment within European Union countries has not been seen as a universal good. On one hand, the transparency that comes with the new guidelines for recruitment is welcome as the research community has long held that recruitment, particularly in some of the top institutions, is subject to cronyism and a tendency to favour 'those trained here'. On the other hand, the focus on international recruitment has facilitated a flourishing global market for academic labour which, critics argue, favours the resource rich organisations in Europe. Further, the holy trinity of mobility, diversity and gender equality do not always cohere when translated to the everyday reality of the individual career. Some careers, particularly of those with high care burdens, are unable to avail themselves as easily of mobility. Unlike student mobility, researcher mobility is heterogeneous in that international mobility is only one aspect; researchers can also be mobile by transiting to another sector e.g. secondment to a firm, civil society or public sector organisation. A third option

would be to move to another university in the same country. While all three types of mobility are acknowledged, international mobility still appears to be the most desirable and most closely linked with excellence. In other words, in an age where researchers can communicate and collaborate at a distance, physical relocation has become an item of merit in the individual cv. This is distinct from the trend in higher education which embraces ICT to provide e-learning and virtual classrooms.

4 IGOs and International Collaboration in HER

In summary, international collaboration with EU HEIs is therefore a process that HEIs are driven to for a variety of reasons that emanate from the changing modes of knowledge production and dissemination as well as the changing missions. The EU and its member states have regarded internationalisation as a sector priority for decades but this discourse is not completely driven by the EU and its HEIs. In the next section, we would like to turn our attention to the other significant group of actors who, individually and together, form a second source of the push for international collaboration in the HER sector: this is the intergovernmental organisations at the international and regional levels (IGOs).

Intergovernmental organisations form a diverse and often difficult to grasp group but, for the sake of brevity, we will divide this group into two main categories, the international and the regional. This is a rather crude designation in so far as all these organisations are strictly speaking international. However, some of them have a global remit (e.g. World Bank, World Trade Organisation) while others are regional. Amongst the main players in HER policies, are the World Bank, UNESCO, the UNDP and the OECD. In addition, those such as the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the InterAmerican Development Bank play critical roles in influencing HER agendas in Asia, African and Latin America. These organisations influence HER policies mainly through a number of soft power mechanisms which together form an advisory framework for cooperative action across different contexts and on varying scales. Considerations of space do not allow us to do an exhaustive coverage of the IGO initiatives nor does it allow us to cover all IGOs. We have decided to focus on a giving insight into a few of the lead actors. On the global level we focus on UNESCO, the OECD and the World Bank because these three have a specific education mandate. We are however mindful of the fact that the World Trade Organisation for instance is of increasing importance for the HER sector particularly for marketised higher education.

5 The United Nations Organisation for Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO) and International Collaboration

UNESCO led the initial worldwide reflection on the future of HER policies via a dual strategy comprising both world conferences and an exercise of continuous reflection involving policy-makers, the academy and social stakeholders. The first event, entitled *Higher Education in the 21st Century: Vision and Action*, was convened in Paris (1998) and was complemented by the World Conference on Science (*Science for the 21st Century*) held in Budapest in 1999. Both examined the challenges for these respective but closely interlinked domains in the 21st century. Both conferences were based on wide-ranging regional debates in Africa, Arab States, Asia, Europe and Latin America. For higher education, these regional dialogues aimed to forge a global pact to promote quality, relevance and international cooperation. The broad agenda tackled issues such as defining quality in relation to context, facilitating equitable access to advanced study and enhancing networking and collaboration amongst the academy worldwide. These ambitious goals would rely on strong public funding, partnership with the private sector and judicious use of the potential of information and communication technologies. In parallel, the UNESCO World Science Conference stimulated debate between the scientific community and society at large. The former group, through its expertise in the many areas of science, can help resolve the societal challenges affecting the lives of the latter group in multiple areas including health, agriculture, transport, communications, the environment and climate change. Both conferences, rooted in UN ideology, mounted a robust defence of academic freedom and scientific enquiry to encourage cooperation and social responsibility among scholars.

The follow-up to these events was a decade-long process involving both regular reflection and reporting along with stocktaking conferences to gauge progress and discuss new trends. From 1999 onwards, regular reporting on higher education change was undertaken by the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI), a partnership between UNESCO and the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP) with support from the United Nations University (UNU). GUNI produces an annual report entitled *Higher Education in the World* covering domains such as *The Financing of Universities* (2006), *Accreditation for Quality Assurance: What's at Stake?* (2007), *Higher Education's Commitment to Sustainability: from understanding to action* (2011) and *Towards a Socially Responsible University: balancing the global with the local* (2017). In tandem, monitoring progress in scientific action and research was reviewed at biennial World Science Fora on topics such as *Harnessing Science to Society*, (2002) *Investing in Knowledge. Investing in the Future* (2007) and *Science*

for *Global Sustainable Development* (2013). This action was complemented by *The World Science Report* which is published by UNESCO every five years. In 2009, UNESCO convened global follow-up conferences: *The New Dynamics of Higher Education and Research for Societal Change and Development* gauged progress towards the 1998 goals and identified new forces affecting the global pact for cooperation amongst governments, HEIs and social stakeholders and the *Budapest +10 Conference on Science* covered similar ground in that particular field.

The principal report for the 2009 Higher Education conference merits particular attention. Entitled *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution* (Altbach et al., 2009), this documented the vastly changed context for the higher education sector which was resulting from globalisation policies. The authors concluded that an academic revolution had occurred, comparable in impact to the Humboldtian change in university organisation in 19th century Germany. Four critical motors were identified: massified enrolments (many of which are now offered by private provision), the reality of globalisation (a more economic model than internationalisation), addressing the consequences of the Knowledge Society and Economy and the impact of ICT. In short, this report described a new world marked by financial precariousness in terms of public support but often attracting generous private funding. Resulting problems included steeper tuition fees for students and an academy with more restricted tenure and rising contract teaching.

The report further noted that in 2009, 72% of university research was still financed by governments in OECD countries, though this was shifting from block grants to project-specific funding. Increased partnership with the private sector (the so-called Triple Helix linking governments, universities and industry) was strongly encouraged and the academy had become a major stakeholder in the growing and lucrative field of intellectual property. Already this had impacted on institutional management and organisation with the advent of university science parks and research management offices. Furthermore, the world's top research universities, notably the Super Research Universities famed for their scientific excellence and for attracting the best academics and students, were mainly located in the wealthiest nations. Certain middle level economies such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa were striving to ensure access to this world of advanced R+D and innovation but low income countries with limited public budgets were virtually excluded. Thus, such unequal access to advanced knowledge was considered a dangerous problem for global development, necessitating urgent action by governments and donors to prevent an ever-widening gulf. The report concluded that, while institutions of post-secondary learning would continue to thrive, their mission and operating

strategies had undergone irrevocable redefinition to meet the new socio-economic world order. This reshaping of the academy would also affect its future approaches to international cooperation.

6 The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

The OECD has now grown from 24 countries in 1957 to 37 members in 2020. Using evidence-based research as its principal tool, the OECD has been able to nudge countries to adopt innovative policy-making measures for over six decades.

The OECD's 1998 Report *Redefining Tertiary Education* constituted an early landmark analysis of post-secondary education because it provided data on the changing situation in the HER sector in 10 countries. *Redefining Tertiary Education* showed that demand for post-secondary learning and training was increasing at the same time as student profiles were undergoing radical change. The prognosis was that further differentiation of HEIs might occur with universities becoming the primary institutions for academic research and research-based teaching. Other types of employment-specific training would be undertaken in a range of institutions, while advanced research would continue to be done in highly specialised locations. Tertiary Education emerged as the term to describe this new landscape, necessitating diversified institutions and provision, both public and private, to satisfy the steady growth in demand. A decade later, the OECD report, *Tertiary Education for the Knowledge Society* confirmed the principle and practice of tertiary education based on case studies from 24 countries with another 14 special reports and contributions from multiple partners including other IGOS, NGOs, foundations and the OECD Committees which liaise with business and industry and with trade unions respectively. This document (often referred to as TEKS) constituted an operational blueprint for countries to design their post-secondary education systems with due consideration for their specific context and resources. Internationalisation was one of the thematic issues singled out for particular attention. The proposals for achieving internationalisation included national strategies for quality assurance and to strengthen the international comparability of internationalisation strategies amongst countries.

To complement this policy initiative, the OECD specialised institute CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation) undertook a global research-based reflection entitled *University Futures* to analyse important subjects (e.g. technology, demographic change, globalisation, market and quasi-market

forces, the future of university research and labour market needs). This also addressed primarily economic issues arising from increased internationalisation, such as returns on cross-border provision, international academic mobility, teaching and research delivery costs and returns on investment in access and quality assurance. These issues are now central to the economic performance of certain OECD member countries. For example, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)⁹ reported that the country had 398,563 international students in higher education who injected some U\$32 billion into the national economy. Similarly, Universities UK reported that tuition fees paid by overseas students accounted for 14% of universities' incomes in 2018 (the UK being the second most popular destination for foreign students with Business Studies as the preferred field of study).

7 The World Bank and International Collaboration in HER

The World Bank is a major player among international governmental organisations, particularly for low and middle income countries. The Bank is both a funder and a source of policy expertise in HER. The Bank collects and publishes data on *inter alia* enrolment levels, public investment in tertiary education, the percentage of a population with tertiary qualifications, the R+D percentage of GNP, academic research citations and intellectual property indicators such as patents, trademarks, licenses and royalties. This data is for many countries an important source for national policy-making and bench-marking.

The World Bank has published landmark reports on higher and tertiary education to chart the progression to the knowledge society such as *Constructing Knowledge Societies. New Challenges for Tertiary Education* (2002), *The Challenges of Establishing World-Class Universities* (2009) and *What Matters Most for Tertiary Education Systems* (2016). The World Bank's influence on HER comes primarily through its collaboration with the regional IGOs such as the African Development Bank and its policy support.

8 Regional IGOs, HER Policies and International Academic Collaboration

Regional IGOs are perhaps the frontline organisations for countries in the low to middle income category. Regional IGOs function also as a collaborative partner for organisations such as UNESCO and the World Bank. In the rest of this section, we will use the African Development Bank (AfDB), the Asian

Development Bank (ADB) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) to highlight the role of regional IGOs in facilitating international collaboration.

The African Development Bank (AfDB) collaborates closely with the African Union (AU) which is charged with defining major sectoral policies for development in the region. The AU's *Continental Education Strategy for Africa 2016–2026* (known as *CESA 16–25*) deals with a range of HER topics including university leadership and management, academic networking, graduate education, quality assurance, R+D +Innovation, promoting the STEM disciplines, public-private financing partnerships, access to HER for women and strengthening ICT capacity.

Since 2000, demand for Tertiary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa has doubled from 4% to 9%. According to a report in *The Economist* (17 August 2019), African students overseas doubled between 1997 and 2017 to some 374,000. International collaboration has been an important mechanism for meeting this increased demand. The European Union is however competing with universities globally as a potential collaborative partner. The pattern of collaboration exemplifies a new model for international collaboration, i.e. the overseas campus or a domestic HEI, which is accredited by a prestigious foreign partner. The AfDB invested US\$13 million in the first American campus in the region jointly set up in 2012 by Carnegie Mellon University in partnership with the University of Rwanda and focused on IT and engineering capacity. The Toulouse Business School is a paradigmatic example of international collaboration with the African region. Others include the Centrale Superelec, EIGI Business School in Casablanca and ESSEC in Rabat.

The demand for internationally recognised academic qualifications is a significant driver for international collaboration and apart from overseas campuses; internationally accredited institutions such as Rwanda's Kepler College exemplify another strategy to achieve this end.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, IGO action in the HER sector is sharply contrasted. *The Inter-American Development Bank* (IDB),¹⁰ founded in 1959, helps to shape development policies by providing loans and funding technical assistance projects to boost socio-economic modernisation and competitiveness amongst 48 member countries. The region of 639 million people has traditionally been led by Brazil, Mexico,¹¹ Colombia and Argentina which also boast the best universities according to the QS rankings due to their robust academic heritage and the influence of the Catholic church. After 30 years of military regimes (1960–1990) involving 11 countries, democracy and economic renovation stimulated rapid change in the region. In 2012, the IDB was already cooperating with the OECD's PISA programme to benchmark student achievement and by 2018, the institution had created *IDB Invest* to deal with

private sector investment including SMEs. Development projects have focused on areas where advanced education and research capacity were required *inter alia*, US\$70 million for TVET (Technical and Vocational Training) in the Dominican Republic; US\$75 million to modernise university teaching, quality and relevance in Peru; US\$8 million for digital skills in Uruguay; US\$600 million for energy reform in Mexico; and US\$34 million for water management in Haiti. This direction continued in 2019 when some 150 loans related to human capital and education were approved.

Concurrent with this action, the OECD's relations with the region have quickly consolidated as countries have stabilised politically and embraced free-market economic policies in line with global trends. At the present time, Mexico, Chile and Colombia are OECD members with Costa Rica in initial accession talks. Brazil is a key member of the OECD Development Centre which has also designed tailor-made programmes for Argentina and Peru and cooperates with numerous LAC states including the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay for data collection and adherence to OECD reporting mechanisms.

In the HER sphere, action has also thrived as witnessed by the global diversity of academic cooperation arrangements. As examples, Science Po (the International Relations School of the University of Paris) has some 50 agreements with Latin American counterparts including 6 dual degree programmes and ISEG (the Business School of Lille's Catholic University) has 48 academic partnerships in the region under the Erasmus+ Programme; Montreal University offers joint doctoral programmes with Brazilian institutions. Edinburgh University has agreements with the top 10 THE (Times Educational Supplement) Latin American universities as well as a Regional Centre in Chile to manage joint public and private research and innovation opportunities in health, energy and business. Melbourne University's 12 partnerships and Auckland University's 3 agreements attest to increased linkages between Australasia and Latin America both for international study and advanced research cooperation in strategic fields for Pacific Rim development issues; the Columbus Association, set up in 1987, links some 50 universities in Europe and Latin America for capacity-building and innovation exchanges.

Scientific research is a robust area with the Academy of Science of Cuba (1961) and of Argentina (1869) as regional pioneers. Others proliferated with Brazil (1916), Venezuela (1917), Colombia (1933), Mexico (1959), Bolivia (1960) and more recently, Honduras (1985) and Uruguay (2009). Also, two regional coordinating bodies exist: the LAC Academy of Sciences set up in 1982 in Venezuela and sponsored by the Vatican's Pontifical Academy of Sciences and the Caribbean Academy of Sciences established in Trinidad and Tobago in

1988 with 200 members. The original intention of these bodies was to recognise and network excellent scientists primarily as an academic exercise. Now, the role of the “modern academy” is wider with particular responsibilities in terms of national development and international connections. As a result of the NMP strategies, national authorities have now understood the importance of research management capacity in universities and related R+D+I bodies to address the challenges of this competitive space including funding opportunities. Obviously public investment in R+D is a primary issue and indicates socio-economic development. Brazil leads the LAC region ranking 11th in the world and investing 1.17% in R+D followed by Mexico in 27th place with 0.941% and Colombia (47) with 0.24%. These contrast with Ecuador (69) 0.12%, Costa Rica (73) 0.47%, Bolivia (83) 0.25% and Paraguay (89) 0.13%. The leading economies usually locate their research management entities in relevant ministries (e.g. Chile’s CONICYT, FONDECYT and FONDAP¹² are in the Ministry of Education; Mexico’s CONICYT and Brazil’s CAPES Foundation¹³ which manages programmes such as Science Without Borders with its counterpart, CNPq, are in the Ministry of Science and Technology). However, even well-managed systems will flounder if national economic performance adversely affects resources. In 2019, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)¹⁴ reproached Argentina for its austerity measures citing reduced career openings for PhDs in sciences and engineering.

9 The Asian Development Bank (ADB)

Asia’s rapid rise in the global economy in recent decades is well documented. With a population of 4.5 billion already, Asia controls US\$31 billion of the world’s GNP ahead of North America (US\$24 billion) and Europe (US\$21 billion). Asia is a success story with increasingly skilled and mobile populations. As an IGO, the Asia Development Bank (ADB) founded in 1966 has grown from 31 to 49 members (19 of which come from other regions including the USA, UK, Armenia, Georgia and Niue) and the ADB Institute ranks amongst the world’s top 25 think tanks. The ADB invests in priority capacity-building for more vulnerable nations (strengthening employment skills for Mongolia’s Tourism sector and innovative Higher Education strategies in Sri Lanka in 2019), as well as region-wide projects such promoting Brain Networking amongst the ASEAN Economic Community (ADB, 2017) as an important component of knowledge societies.

Asian academic cooperation plays a crucial role in development activities but has specific features not found elsewhere. Firstly, many nations invested

early in modernising their universities to become key entities in the approaching knowledge society. As Asian governments anticipated the economic benefits of globalisation, their universities addressed development challenges. Secondly, the key motor of this action was China's carefully planned academic modernisation. The global proliferation of Confucius Institutes¹⁵ has spear-headed cooperation with a view to Chinese academic supremacy before 2100. From 1975 to 2000, China steadily built powerful academic capacity involving post-graduate study (often in STEM disciplines) for selected cohorts both at the leading research universities (generally in the USA and the UK) and also in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Thirdly, international undergraduate study has increased exponentially with young Chinese often choosing market-related skills in fields such as finance and business, computer science and media as well as English proficiency and remaining abroad after graduation to join local workforces. Consequently, international HER is a booming and lucrative domain at all levels and for all fields and the ARWU (Shanghai) Rankings with their emphasis on STEM-related excellence have gained special geo-political influence. China has also accelerated investment in its own universities. The American Institute of Physics reported that Chinese PhD graduates in S+E fields rose from 8,000 in 2000 to 34,000 in 2014. In 2016, China led the world in S+E publications with 18.6% of the global share (AIP Science Policy News, 31 January 2018).

The economic purposes of academic cooperation across the Asia /Pacific region is evidenced by the commercial character of activities. Numerous universities have established branch campuses in Asia for local delivery or Liaison Offices to recruit international students and negotiate strategic R+D+I partnerships. Universities are expected to be entrepreneurial and competitive, especially those in the top 100 of the Shanghai Rankings. Their contribution to country GNPs are closely monitored by national data agencies both public and private. Examples include the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Education New Zealand,¹⁶ Singapore's BERD,¹⁷ Japan's MEXT,¹⁸ NISTEP¹⁹ and RIKEN,²⁰ the NIIED agency in the Korean Ministry of Education²¹ and Council for University Education (KCUE),²² RBC Economic Research (conducted by the Royal Bank of Canada²³) and the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU)²⁴ located in Hong Kong.

10 Conclusions

In summary, international academic collaboration with the EU is a small but growing part of a larger cross section of activity. Internationalisation is clearly

a strategic priority for HEIs. Actors such as intergovernmental organisations play an important role in promoting internationalisation but a great deal of the impetus comes from within the HEI sector. Drivers such as the emergence of a global competition for students and scholars as well as the increased emphasis on institutional competitiveness imposed by regimes such as global rankings, international accreditation and other benchmarking exercises push HEIs to prioritise the internationalisation of their educational offerings. On the research side, internationalisation, like publication, is a performance indicator for scholars and determines the individual scholar's suitability for recruitment. Likewise, the level of internationalisation of the HEI also enhances or detracts from its attractiveness as a prospective employer.

Our analysis shows that far from being merely impelled by globalisation, HER is one of the activities that facilitates globalisation. This is achieved through the inscription of mobility as an imperative for employability for both scholars and students. Mobility in its turn demands infrastructures of standardisation such as accredited degrees, modular educational offerings, etc. The mobile student and scholar do not exist in a vacuum. Living conditions in the cities that compete for students and scholars are important contextual factors in enhancing what the HEIs that inhabit these cities offer. It should come as no surprise therefore that the synergies between urban development and internationalised HEIs is a rapidly expanding part of the urban studies discourse.

HER has traditionally been international but has simultaneously been mired in the national psyche. The current era is loosening this link between the national and the HEI as HER itself becomes more tightly integrated into a global culture and set of practices and norms. What does this imply for the future of an activity that has often been funded by the public purse and motivated by its potential contribution to growth and national development? Who are the potential winners and losers of international collaboration in HER? Is there a particular EU profile that may be forged and if so what would this profile look like?

Notes

- 1 The United Nations Organisation for Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO), The future we want: the role of culture in Sustainable Development, see <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/culture-and-development/the-future-we-want-the-role-of-culture/globalization-and-culture/>
- 2 European Quality Improvement System (EQUIS), see www.efmdglobal.org
- 3 Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), see www.aacsb.edu
- 4 Association of MBAs (AMBA), see www.associationofmbas.com

- 5 *Macleans Magazine*, Canada, see www.macleans.ca
- 6 US News College Rankings, see www.usnews.com
- 7 Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), see www.shanghairanking.com
- 8 Quacquarelli Symonds, United Kingdom, see www.qs.com
- 9 Australian Bureau of Statistics, Government of Australia, see www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS
- 10 Inter-American Development Bank. IDB Invest, see www.idbinvest.org
- 11 Mexican Council for Science and Technology, CONACYT, www.conacyt.gob.mx
- 12 Chile Ministry of Education: CONICYT, FONDACYT, FONDAP, see www.gob.cl/ministry-of-education
- 13 CAPES, Brazil, see www.capes.gov.br
- 14 American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), see www.aaas.org
- 15 The Confucius Institute, see www.harban.org
- 16 Education New Zealand, see www.enz.govt.nz/keystatistics
- 17 Business Expenditure on R+D (BERD), Singapore, see www.data.gov.sg
- 18 The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan, see www.mext.go.jp
- 19 The National Institute for Science and Technology Policy (NISTEP), Japan, see www.nistep.go.jp
- 20 Basic and Applied Scientific Research Institute (RIKEN), Japan, see www.riken.go.jp
- 21 The National Institute for International Education (NIIED), Republic of Korea, see www.niied.go.kr
- 22 The Korean Council for University Education (KCUE), Seoul, Republic of Korea (<http://english.kcue.or.kr>).
- 23 Royal Bank of Canada, RBC Economic Research, see www.rbc.com/economics
- 24 Association of Asia Pacific Rim Universities (APRU), see www.apru.org

References

- African Union. (n.d.). *Agenda 2063: The Africa we want*. www.au.int/agenda2063
- African Union. Continental Education Strategy for Africa 2016–2026. CESA 15–25. www.edu-au.org/strategies
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education, tracking a global academic revolution: A report for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. UNESCO.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 2007(11), 290–305.
- American Institute of Physics. (2018). *AIP science policy news*. www.aip.org
- Batalova, J., Shymonyak, A., & Sugiyarto, G. (2017). *Firing up regional brain networks, the promise of brain circulation in the ASEAN economic community*. Asian Development Bank, Manila.
- Cerdeira Bento, J. P., Martínez-Roget, F., Pereira, E. T., & Rodríguez, X. A. (Eds.). (2020). *Academic tourism: Perspectives on international mobility in Europe*. Springer.

- Cowen, R. (2000). The market-framed university: The new ethics of the game. In J. Cairns, R. Gardner, & D. Lawton (Eds.), *Values and the curriculum* (pp. 93–105). Woburn Press.
- Currie, J. (2004). The neo-liberal paradigm and higher education: A critique. In J. K. Odin & P. T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 42–62). University of Hawaii Press.
- European Union (EU). (2017). *The Erasmus impact study: Effects of mobility on the skills and employability of students and the internationalisation of higher education institutions*. Study DG Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/culture-and-development/the-future-we-want-the-role-of-culture/globalization-and-culture/>
- Gérard, M., & Uebelmesser, S. (Eds.). (2015). *The mobility of students and the highly skilled* (pp. 83–104). The MIT Press.
- Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F., & Taylor, S. (2001). *The OECD, globalisation and education policy*. Pergamon.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2–3.
- Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62, 14–15.
- Marginson, S. (2016). High participation systems of higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(2), 243–271.
- Marginson, S., & Van derWende, M. (2009). The new global landscape of nations and institutions. In *Higher education in 2030* (Vol. 2, pp. 17–57). OECD Publishing.
- Marmolejo, F. (2016). *What matters most for tertiary education: A framework paper*. SABER Working Paper, No. 11. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/26516>
- Oosterbeek, H., & Webbink, D. (2009). Does studying abroad induce a brain drain? *Economica*, 1, 1–29.
- Paradeise, C., & Thoenig, J. C. (2015). *In search of academic quality*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parey, M., & Waldinger, F. (2010). Studying abroad and the effect on international labor market mobility: Evidence from the introduction of Erasmus. *The Economic Journal*, 1, 1–29.
- Sehoole, C., & Knight, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Internationalisation of African higher education: Towards achieving the MDGs*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-311-9>
- Teichler, U. (2012). International mobility and the Bologna process. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 7(1), 34–49.