BRITISH COUNCIL

THE SHAPE OF GLOBAL HIGHER EDUCATION: NATIONAL POLICIES FRAMEWORK FOR INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Emerging themes

International
Higher Education

www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe

Acknowledgements

The British Council worked with McNamara Economic Research (MCER) and Education Insight to create this study. In particular, we would like to acknowledge the efforts and expertise of John McNamara and Janet Ilieva.

Expert advice on the structure of the index was provided by Dr Jane Knight, Adjunct Professor, University of Toronto; and Pat Killingley, Higher Education Consultant.

Further support, data sourcing, verification and validation was provided by British Council colleagues across our global network of offices.

Particular thanks go to John Bramwell, Director Education and Society, British Council, Americas for initiating the study; and Michael Peak, Senior Adviser, Education Research for overseeing and managing the project.

Principal author:

Janet Ilieva

Co-author:

Michael Peak

Contents

Foreword **2**

1. Introduction **3**

2. Key findings **4**

3. Aims and objectives **5**

4. Research findings **7**

4.1 Openness of higher education systems and support for the international mobility of students, researchers, academic programmes and university research 8

4.2 Quality assurance of higher education provision (domestic and overseas) and recognition of international qualifications 10

4.3 Equitable access and sustainable development policies 12

5. Emerging themes **14**

5.1 The importance of national strategies on international higher education 14

5.2 Mobility of students 14

5.3 International collaborations in teaching and research 15

6. Concluding thoughts **17**

7. Appendix **18**

Foreword

Professor Jo Beall, Director Education and Society

The British Council has been active in the area of international cultural relations for over 80 years. For much of this time our work has included supporting mobile scholars and researchers; managing collaborative teaching, development and research programmes; training education agents; and initiation and facilitation of country-to-country higher education programmes. The value and benefits of international collaboration, student and academic mobility and exchange are reaped by individuals and institutions, and support the development and building of nations. Indeed many of these values and benefits are core to the British Council's purpose.

Our experience in international higher education (IHE) has enabled us to build a portfolio of research in this area. In 2012, *The shape of things to come: higher education global trends and emerging opportunities* linked economic development to enrolment in tertiary education, and forecasted HE demand and mobility patterns. In 2013 *The shape of things to come 2: The evolution of transnational education* reported the rise of transnational education (TNE) programmes, and described some of the policy ingredients for sustainable success in TNE.

Today, talk is increasingly of 'international HE', but contemporary higher education is fundamentally international. And of course, 'international HE' does not just include student mobility: a truly international approach is not one-dimensional, but multi-faceted.

Recent years have seen the increase in scope and scale of TNE; the continued global rise of international student mobility; more and more countries with ambitions for attracting students to cross borders; and the growing importance and value of international collaboration for increasing the reach, impact and quality of research. There is hardly a country left unaffected by the global flows of students, teaching and research.

The shape of global HE focuses on the national-level landscape for HE in 26 countries, and considers how policies and regulatory frameworks can create an environment conducive to international collaboration and engagement.

The future of higher education will depend on successful, sustainable, mutually beneficial partnerships and collaboration, not just in a single area (such as student mobility) but a holistic approach which facilitates:

- mobility (of students, staff and researchers, as well as qualifications and institutions)
- shared teaching and delivery partnerships
- research collaborations.

This research builds on earlier work carried out by the British Council in 2011 and remains one of the first attempts to provide a comprehensive framework for the comparison of countries' higher education policies and regulatory environments with a view to international collaboration and engagement.

The shape of global higher education can inform a greater understanding of national HE systems and the interplay of various components within them. We welcome this study and believe that this greater understanding can be to the benefit of nations, the benefit of collaborating institutions, and ultimately to the benefit of individual students and researchers.

1. Introduction

International higher education (IHE) has become a policy preoccupation for countries around the globe – from Chile and Colombia through to Turkey and Kazakhstan to the Philippines and Australia. Increasingly, governments are recognising the wealth of benefits available from international engagement, and the importance of national support for this if their higher education sector is to be successful.

This research draws on earlier work by the British Council, the *Global Gauge series*[1] published in 2011, *The shape of things to come 2*[2] from 2013, and other regional studies commissioned by the British Council in 2015.[3]

The main objectives of this study are to evaluate countries' policies on IHE and to identify areas which are supported by national governments. A significant part of this research draws on evaluations of countries' legislative provision with regard to higher education. More than 100 pieces of legislation and national strategies were reviewed and evaluated.

In an attempt to draw comparisons between the 26 countries covered in this research, an index-based methodology was employed. The countries are assessed against 37 qualitative indicators, which make up the index. The description of each indicator is available via an online, interactive tool (which covers 962 descriptive fields in total) aimed at policymakers, higher education institutions (HEIs) and education professionals with an interest in IHE.

1. British Council (2011) *Global Gauge: International Education Index*.
2. British Council (2013) *The shape of things to come 2: The evolution of transnational education.*
3. British Council Mexico commissioned McNamara Economic Research to undertake research with the working title: Internationalisation of higher education – comparative and thematic analysis of national policy approaches.

2. Key findings

1. There is a rise in the number of countries with commitment towards international higher education at national level, which is evidenced through their IHE strategies, some of which are reflected in reformed higher education legislations. These are strong signals of readiness to engage internationally and to support their higher education systems' global positioning.
2. Of the countries covered in this analysis, Germany and Malaysia have the most balanced portfolio of national policies supporting IHE.
3. Financial support for IHE is an area where a large number of countries perform strongly. This is mainly focused on student mobility and policies aimed at ensuring equitable access and brain drain prevention. These are mainly countries with large HE systems such as China, Colombia, Germany, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Turkey.
4. Student mobility is one of the best developed areas of national-level policies on IHE. This is evidenced by the strong performance of 23 out of the 26 countries studied here. While the majority of the countries have introduced student-friendly and welcoming visa policies, a much smaller number (Australia, Germany and more recently Russia) have widened access to their labour market for international students.[4]
5. Quality assurance of HE provision emerges as an area of weakness for the countries studied. So far, the focus in cross-border education appears to have been predominantly on higher education provision and less on quality assurance. The countries faring well are those with an established record of delivering transnational education programmes, such as Australia, Malaysia, Germany and the UK.
6. Another area which requires further development is the recognition of transnational education degrees, including those obtained in third countries. At present, a small number of countries have formal measures in place at a national level to recognise such degrees.
7. HEIs are the major drivers of IHE in a number of countries. This study found some differences in the importance of IHE for governments and HEIs, with the latter deeming IHE as a means through which to build teaching and research capacity. In some countries, to counteract the lack of national support, higher education institutions are leading their own internationalisation initiatives.
8. Research is becoming a policy preoccupation driven in part by the growing influence of the global university rankings. Increasingly, research carried out in international collaborations features in national-level assessments which determine the levels of funding across the research-active HEIs.
9. This research acknowledges the growing need for co-ordination of national policies, and supports Helms' et al. (2015)[5] call for greater synergy between countries' policies with a view to greater impact. Policy co-ordination is likely to counteract some of the unintended consequences of international higher education, such as brain drain.

4. There are other countries, not covered in this research, where this is also the case (for example, selected EU countries, Canada, New Zealand and others).
5. Helms, RM, Rumbley, LE, Brajkovic, L and Mihut G, (2015), 'Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs.'

3. Aims and objectives

The main objectives of the National Policies Framework for International Engagement are to identify the areas of IHE which are supported by national governments and to attempt to draw comparisons between countries' national policies. While sensitive to countries' individual policy idiosyncrasies and priorities, this framework attempts to identify the areas where IHE has attracted the most government support. On this basis, these areas are most likely to become streamlined and to encourage greater international collaboration.

This study identifies three areas where national governments can provide enabling environments to their HEIs to internationalise and forge collaborations:

i. Openness of the respective education system, measured through government-level commitment to internationalisation and the provision of an enabling environment for the international mobility of students, researchers, academic programmes and university research.

ii. A regulatory environment that aims to help the international mobility of students, education providers and academic programmes. This is manifested through quality assurance practices for higher education provision (domestic and overseas) and recognition of international qualifications.

iii. Equitable access and sustainable development policies, drawing on existing infrastructure and funding to promote student and academic mobility and international research collaboration. It considers unintended consequences of internationalisation, such as brain drain and the displacement of students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

This study does not analyse the impact of these policies on the performance of the respective higher education systems nor does it assess their enforcement. However, it provides a large collection of data on national policies across the three main areas identified above.

As mentioned earlier, this study covers 26 countries. The British Council's selection was based on: (i) a mix of countries from different geographical locations; (ii) countries importing higher education and countries with a strong record in higher education exports; and (iii) including several countries eligible to receive official development assistance (ODA). The following countries' national policies on IHE were analysed:

Australia	Kenya
Botswana	Malaysia
Brazil	Mexico
Chile	Nigeria
China	Pakistan
Colombia	Philippines
Egypt	Russia
Ethiopia	South Africa
Ghana	Thailand
Germany	Turkey
India	UK
Indonesia	USA
Kazakhstan	Vietnam

The study commenced with an extensive literature review and desk research. Given the high variability in publicly accessible data on countries' policies, interviews with local experts complemented the desk research to fill information gaps. The issues were also explored in the academic literature, to establish a correct understanding of the regulatory environment in the studied countries. This study uses an index-based methodology to evaluate countries' policies and regulatory environments with regard to IHE. The index is constructed from 37 indicators, grouped into three broad categories: (i) openness and international mobility policies; (ii) quality assurance and degree recognition; and (iii) access and sustainability. These three categories contribute equally to the overall index. The information against each indicator is factual and refers to the country's government guidelines and legal framework. Each criterion is assessed on whether it is fully met, partly met or not met.

With a view to transparency, the 37 criteria used in this framework are presented in a publicly accessible database, which summarises the responses against each criterion and lists the data sources used. **www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre**

Table 1 shows the broad structure of the National Policies Framework and the respective weight allocated to the key categories. A detailed structure of the index, based on 37 indicators, is presented in the Appendix.

Table 1: Structure of the National Policies Framework

Overview: categories and indicators	Weight
1. Openness and mobility	0.33
1.1 IHE strategy	0.25
1.2 Student mobility policies	0.25
1.3 Academic mobility and research policies	0.25
1.4 Programme and provider mobility	0.25
2. Quality assurance and degree recognition	0.33
2.1 International students' quality assurance and admissions	0.33
2.2 Quality assurance of academic programmes	0.33
2.3 Recognition of overseas qualifications	0.33
3. Access and sustainability	0.33
3.1 Student mobility funding	0.33
3.2 Academic mobility and research funding	0.33
3.3 Sustainable development policies	0.33
Total	**1.0**

4. Research findings

The majority of the countries in this study have made significant efforts to support different aspects of IHE. Having the right mix of policies ensures a wide-ranging support for the international endeavours of the higher education sector in the country.

Our analysis of national policies shows that different countries have different priorities and pressures. Some governments are preoccupied with building the research capacity of their higher education systems, and aim at increasing their number of universities in the global league tables,[6] whereas others are focusing their efforts on widening access for their youthful population to higher education. The varying priority placed on internationalisation has affected some of the countries' scores. As a result, a few of the indicators used in this framework have limited relevance to some countries. While these countries score low against these criteria, this framework provides a baseline against which future changes can be tracked.

The countries which appear to have the most balanced portfolios of policies are Germany and Malaysia, both performing strongly against all the broad IHE categories. The category with the largest number of strong performers against the criteria used is 'access and sustainability'. It is worth noting that this category is dominated by countries with high support for funding underpinning student and academic mobility, and policies aiming at equitable access and brain drain prevention. These are mainly countries with large HE systems, the strongest performers in this category being China, Colombia, Germany, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Turkey.

Table 2 provides an overview of the different countries' positions in the national policies framework. This should be used alongside the descriptive narrative for each criterion. Given the wide range of countries included and their varying higher education priorities, caution is advised when interpreting the results.

Table 2: Overview of the National Policies Framework and countries' scores (rating indicates the level of government support provided)

	Overall score	Openness	Quality assurance and recognition	Access and sustainability
Australia	Very high	Very high	Very high	High
Botswana	Low	High	Low	Low
Brazil	Low	High	Very low	High
Chile	Low	Low	Very low	High
China	High	Very high	Low	Very high
Colombia	Low	Low	Very low	Very high
Egypt	Low	Low	Low	High
Ethiopia	Very low	Low	Very low	Very low
Germany	Very high	Very high	Very high	Very high
Ghana	Low	Low	Low	Low
India	High	High	Low	High
Indonesia	High	High	Low	Very high
Kazakhstan	High	Low	Low	High
Kenya	Low	High	Low	Low
Malaysia	Very high	Very high	Very high	Very high
Mexico	Low	Very low	Very low	High
Nigeria	Low	Low	Very low	Low
Pakistan	High	High	Low	High
Philippines	High	High	High	Low
Russia	High	High	Low	High
South Africa	Low	High	High	Low
Thailand	High	High	Low	Very high
Turkey	High	High	Low	Very high
United Kingdom	Very high	Very high	Very high	High
United States	High	High	Low	High
Vietnam	High	High	High	High

Key:

The scores in the table are graded on a scale between 0 and 10
Maximum score = 10 (criteria fully met)
Minimum Score = 0 (criteria not met)

'Very high' indicates a weighted average score between 7.5 and 10; 'high' indicates a weighted average score between 5 and 7.5; 'low' indicates a weighted average score between 2.5 and 5; and 'very low' indicates a weighted average score between 0 and 2.5.

6. Such as Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) University Rankings and the Times Higher Education World University Rankings.

4.1 Openness of higher education systems and support for the international mobility of students, researchers, academic programmes and university research

This section considers national strategies on IHE and support for the inbound and outbound mobility of students, academics, academic programmes and collaborative research. It covers the following sub-categories:

i. Presence of international education strategy.

ii. Student mobility.

iii. Academic mobility.

iv. Institutional and programme mobility.

The overall results for this category are presented in Table 3. A strong performance in the broad category (an overall high level of support) does not imply that the country excels in all four areas mentioned above. For instance, while Australia fully meets most of the criteria across all the areas in question, the UK's strength is drawn from international strategy and the mobility of programmes and education providers (through transnational education provision), which masks an incomplete set of policies regarding student and academic mobility. Compared with other countries, the UK is not as accommodating in extending working opportunities to students and academics.

An emerging issue is the varying degrees of value placed on IHE by the countries' higher education sectors and governments. To counteract a lack of government support for IHE, associations driven by the higher education establishments in the country have emerged to drive the IHE agenda, such as Colombia Challenge Your Knowledge (CCYK)[7] and the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA).[8] Similarly, although IHE does not appear to be a policy preoccupation across many of the countries in Africa, it has been a key source for capacity building at HEI level, as observed in Jowi et al. (2013): 'The main motivations for African universities to embrace internationalisation are research outputs, knowledge production and

Table 3: Openness and international mobility (rating indicates the level of government support provided)

Number	Country	Score	Rating
1	Australia		Very high
2	Germany		Very high
3	United Kingdom		Very high
4	Malaysia		Very high
5	China		Very high
6	Vietnam		High
7	Thailand		High
8	Turkey		High
9	India		High
10	United States		High
11	Indonesia		High
12	Botswana		High
13	Pakistan		High
14	Brazil		High
15	Russia		High
16	Philippines		High
17	Kenya		High
18	South Africa		High
19	Kazakhstan		Low
20	Egypt		Low
21	Chile		Low
22	Colombia		Low
23	Ethiopia		Low
24	Ghana		Low
25	Nigeria		Low
26	Mexico		Very low

Key:

The scores in the table are graded on a scale between 0 and 10
Maximum score = 10 (criteria fully met)
Minimum Score = 0 (criteria not met)

'Very high' indicates a weighted average score between 7.5 and 10; 'high' indicates a weighted average score between 5 and 7.5; 'low' indicates a weighted average score between 2.5 and 5; and 'very low' indicates a weighted average score between 0 and 2.5.

7. For further details see: www.challengeyourknowledge.edu.co/developer/
8. For further details see: www.ieasa.studysa.org/#!ieasa-home-page/c1wzr

the strengthening of institutional capacity.'[9] This is an issue affecting a number of countries in Africa, and a good example of HEI-led development across national borders is the African Network for Internationalization of Education (ANIE), whose secretariat is based at Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya.[10] A lot of the IHE agenda in the USA is similarly driven at institutional level.

4.1.1 Presence of international education strategy

Criteria used in this section include: (i) national IHE strategy; (ii) a dedicated body tasked with promotion of IHE; (iii) an overseas presence; (iv) bilateral and multilateral agreements over the past five years; and (v) data collection and monitoring of internationalisation.

While a lot of countries have IHE strategies in place, including Australia, Botswana, China, Germany, Kazakhstan, the Philippines, the UK and Vietnam, many lack the infrastructure to monitor the success of the strategy, such as systematic data collections or an overseas presence which facilitates international engagement. For many countries the latter is facilitated through dedicated higher education sections at the respective embassies.

4.1.2 Student mobility

Student mobility policies, supported by friendly visa policies, are the key component of most countries' national strategies. Criteria included in this sub-category are: (i) student visa policies; (ii) student visa procedures for international students; (iii) living and post-study work environment for international students; and (iv) tuition fees for international students.

This is the most developed area in the 'openness category', and 23 out of 26 countries have a 'high' or 'very high' performance. While the majority of the countries have streamlined their student visa policies with a view to attracting international students, a very small number have introduced post-study work opportunities with a view to allowing students to apply the higher-level knowledge they have acquired (usually for a limited period of time). These are Australia, Germany and Russia. Countries with more recent ambitions to serve as regional or international education hubs have been slower to allow international students to engage in post-study employment. This perceived reluctance is often most pronounced in countries which are either affected by brain drain or have high graduate unemployment.

4.1.3 Academic mobility and research collaboration

This category draws on the following criteria: (i) streamlined academic visas; (ii) visa procedures for academics; (iii) the living and working environment for academics; and (iv) the inclusion of international research in national research assessment for the purpose of funding.

Almost a third of countries support international research collaborations by including them in their national research assessment reviews. These are either countries with well-established research traditions (such as Australia, Germany and the UK) or countries aiming to build research capacity through international collaborations (such as Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Turkey and Vietnam). However, only a very small number of countries (such as Australia, China and Germany) actively support academic mobility through streamlined academic visa policies and opportunities to work in the country.

4.1.4 Programme and institutional mobility

The criteria considered in this category are: (i) scope for foreign education institutions to set up teaching and research entities; (ii) provision of cross-border programmes; (iii) clarity and application of regulations for foreign institutions; and (iv) scope for domestic HEIs to set up independent teaching and research entities overseas.

Initially, programme and institutional mobility were well developed in countries where access to higher education was not an issue (for example Australia, Germany, the UK and the USA), as their HEIs have been able (and allowed) to export their HE offer outside their home country. Others that initially imported higher education through transnational education (TNE) have now become key players in providing higher education at home and abroad, such as Malaysia, Hong Kong and Singapore (of which only Malaysia is included in this study). Other countries which allow their HEIs to set up branch campuses overseas include Chile, India, Pakistan, Russia and South Africa.

9. Jowi, J, Knight, J and Sehoole, C (2013, p.15) 'Internationalisation of African Higher Education: Status, Challenges and Issues' in Sehoole, C and Knight, J (eds) *Internationalisation of African Higher Education*. Available online at: https://www.sensepublishers.com/media/1739-internationalisation-of-african-higher-education.pdf
10. For further details see: www.anienetwork.org/index.php/about_anie/

4.2 Quality assurance of higher education provision (domestic and overseas) and recognition of international qualifications

This section studies the regulatory environment and the degree to which it supports countries' IHE strategies. It considers the following categories:

i. Quality assurance of international students.

ii. Quality assurance of programme and provider mobility.

iii. Recognition of international qualifications.

Quality assurance agencies play a key role in safeguarding high standards of teaching delivered by the countries' HEIs, both at home and beyond the national borders. Co-ordination between quality assurance agencies' activities and the mutual recognition of degrees enable greater collaboration between the respective countries' HEIs.

Equally, a recognition of international students' prior attainment and degrees obtained abroad aids student mobility. It is equally important to communicate details of degree comparability to the domestic labour market.

Overall, quality assurance of HE provided by domestic and overseas HEIs emerges as the least developed area of this framework. The countries faring well are the ones with established records in delivering transnational education programmes, such as Australia, Germany, Malaysia and the UK. However, of these four only Australia and Malaysia assure the quality of foreign providers. The overall performance of the selected 26 countries is summarised in Table 4.

Table 4: Quality assurance and degree recognition policies (rating indicates the level of government support provided)

Number	Country	Score	Rating
1	Australia		Very high
2	United Kingdom		Very high
3	Germany		Very high
4	Malaysia		Very high
5	Vietnam		High
6	Philippines		High
7	South Africa		High
8	Russia		Low
9	China		Low
10	Kenya		Low
11	Pakistan		Low
12	Kazakhstan		Low
13	Thailand		Low
14	India		Low
15	United States		Low
16	Turkey		Low
17	Botswana		Low
18	Egypt		Low
19	Indonesia		Low
20	Ghana		Low
21	Brazil		Very low
22	Colombia		Very low
23	Ethiopia		Very low
24	Nigeria		Very low
25	Mexico		Very low
26	Chile		Very low
		0 2 4 6 8 10	

Key:

The scores in the table are graded on a scale between 0 and 10
Maximum score = 10 (criteria fully met)
Minimum Score = 0 (criteria not met)

'Very high' indicates a weighted average score between 7.5 and 10; 'high' indicates a weighted average score between 5 and 7.5; 'low' indicates a weighted average score between 2.5 and 5; and 'very low' indicates a weighted average score between 0 and 2.5.

4.2.1 Quality assurance of international students

This sub-category uses the following criteria: (i) entry and selection criteria for international students; (ii) code of practice for teaching and assessing international students; and (iii) policies and guidelines for engaging with recruitment agents.

Countries with established reputations as study destinations tend to have streamlined international student admission requirements and quality-assured education provision. This sub-category studies whether the selection process of international students is fair and whether students with equivalent levels of academic ability to domestic

students are being admitted. Lower scores against this category do not indicate a lack of entry standards: in most instances they represent varied practices in student admissions which are set by the HEIs, meaning that there is a lack of nationwide admission standards for international students.

In addition to the traditional study destinations, such as Australia, Germany and the UK, more recent developments in Malaysia and Vietnam indicate good practice in selecting international students. The Vietnamese Ministry of Education and Training issued universities' admission rules for the recruitment of international students in 2014, which specify threshold requirements for qualifications depending on the level of programme students are being admitted to and the minimum language requirements.[11]

Increasingly, countries are using education agents for international student recruitment. Australia performs well against a criterion wherein all higher education providers are obliged to have a contractual relationship with the respective education agents. A new code of ethics for education agents working with Australian universities was announced in August 2015.[12]

Similar initiatives are found in countries where foreign HEIs use education agents. This is another area where Vietnam performs strongly: while Vietnamese universities do not engage education agents for international student recruitment, other countries' HEIs use education agents in Vietnam. Since 2013 the Vietnamese government has overseen education agents operating in Vietnam. There are strict requirements for agencies providing Vietnamese students with services and advice relating to study abroad, and the Ministry of Education and Training can revoke the education agency's certificate and suspend their operation if irregularities are found.[13]

Another example of government oversight of education agents is found in Kenya, where foreign HEIs and their agencies have to apply for a licence which lasts one year, after which it has to be renewed.[14]

4.2.2 Quality assurance of programme and provider mobility

This category draws on the following indicators: (i) monitoring of foreign institutions; (ii) monitoring of domestic institutions overseas; (iii) enforcement action; and (iv) collaboration with regional and international quality assurance agencies.

Similarly to the above, the countries which perform well against this category are Australia, Germany, Malaysia and the UK.

Overall, countries with strong inbound TNE are very good at assuring the quality of foreign education provision, such as Botswana, Ghana, Pakistan and Vietnam. Except for Malaysia and Australia, traditional higher education 'exporting' countries, where the need to 'import' higher education provision is not as pronounced, tend to under-perform with regard to the quality assurance of inbound TNE. This presumably reflects the remit of the national quality assurance agencies, which are mainly focused on safeguarding domestic higher education provision. Foreign higher education provision does not require a formal quality assurance in either Germany or the UK.

4.2.3 Recognition of international qualifications

This section considers national qualification frameworks and practices which streamline international students' access to the country's higher education system by mapping their previous qualifications against local equivalents. The following criteria are considered as part of this sub-category: (i) foreign degree recognition; (ii) recognition of TNE qualifications; (iii) communication with the labour market; and (iv) collaboration with regional and international recognition agencies.

In addition to the four countries mentioned in the sections above (Australia, Germany, Malaysia and the UK), China, Kenya and the Philippines perform well across most of the indicators covered here. An increasing number of countries have streamlined degree recognition practices, presumably reflecting their ambition to attract international students. Further to the countries already listed in this paragraph, recognition of international degrees and qualifications is also observed in Pakistan, South Africa and Turkey.

However, TNE degrees, especially if obtained in a third country, are still to attain recognition. At present, only three of the countries studied have formal measures in place at a national level to recognise such degrees: Australia, the Philippines and the UK.

11. For further details see Circular No. 03 / TT-BGDDT 25.02.2014 Minister of Education and Training issued the Regulation on Management of foreigners studying in Vietnam. Available online at: http://vied.vn/vi/van-ban-thu-tuc/van-ban-quy-pham-phap-luat.html
12. For further details see: https://ministers.education.gov.au/pyne/new-code-ethics-international-education-agents-0
13. For further details see Chapter 3 of Decision No. 05/2013/QD-TTg dated January 15 2013 of the Prime Minister: Regulation on overseas study of Vietnamese citizens. Available online at: https://luatminhkhue.vn/en/decision/decision-no-05-2013-qd-ttg.aspx
14. For further details see Part X at: www.cue.or.ke/images/phocadownload/university%20regulations%202014.pdf

4.3 Equitable access and sustainable development policies

This section considers some of the unintended consequences of internationalisation, such as brain drain and displacement of students from disadvantaged and vulnerable backgrounds by international students. It also studies policies for sustainable development, such as funding for inbound and outbound student and academic mobility, and support for international research collaboration.

The following categories are considered:

i. Funding of inbound and outbound student mobility.

ii. Funding of inbound and outbound academic mobility and international research collaborations.

iii. Sustainable development policies.

Compared with the openness and quality assurance sections of the national policies framework, this section has the highest number of countries which are strong performers. Except for Germany, none of the traditional study destination countries (Australia, the UK and the USA) perform strongly. Countries with expanding HE systems perform well against most of the categories, such as China, Colombia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Turkey.

A broad overview of the countries' comparative performance is illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5: Equitable access and sustainable development policies (rating indicates the level of government support provided)

Number	Country	Score	Rating
1	China		Very high
2	Germany		Very high
3	Thailand		Very high
4	Indonesia		Very high
5	Turkey		Very high
6	Colombia		Very high
7	Malaysia		Very high
8	United States		High
9	United Kingdom		High
10	Vietnam		High
11	Kazakhstan		High
12	Russia		High
13	Chile		High
14	Brazil		High
15	Pakistan		High
16	Mexico		High
17	Egypt		Low
18	India		Low
19	Australia		Low
20	Philippines		Low
21	South Africa		Low
22	Nigeria		Low
23	Ghana		Low
24	Kenya		Low
25	Botswana		Low
26	Ethiopia		Very low

Key:

The scores in the table are graded on a scale between 0 and 10
Maximum score = 10 (criteria fully met)
Minimum Score = 0 (criteria not met)

'Very high' indicates a weighted average score between 7.5 and 10; 'high' indicates a weighted average score between 5 and 7.5; 'low' indicates a weighted average score between 2.5 and 5; and 'very low' indicates a weighted average score between 0 and 2.5.

4.3.1 Funding of inbound and outbound student mobility

This sub-category adopts a balanced approach towards student mobility in that it places equal importance to inbound and outbound student mobility. It considers the following criteria: (i) outbound scholarships and student loans for study abroad; and (ii) inbound scholarships or loans for international students.

More than half the countries studied provide scholarships and loans supporting outbound student mobility with notably strong performance in countries from Latin America. Until recently, Brazil had one of the largest study abroad programmes in the world – Science without Borders. Colombia has one of the best student support systems in comparative terms. The country's key funding bodies Colciencias, El Instituto Colombiano de Crédito Educativo y Estudios Técnicos en el Exterior (ICETEX) and Colfuturo support outbound student mobility through scholarships. This is further strengthened by student loans which students are able to take abroad, should they decide to study overseas.

Support for inbound student mobility is more limited. Leaving aside EU-funded programmes, countries with generous support for international students include China, Germany, Indonesia, Russia and Turkey.

4.3.2 Funding of inbound and outbound academic mobility and international research collaborations

This sub-category considers the following indicators: (i) outbound academic programmes; (ii) inbound academic programmes; and (iii) funding of international research collaboration.

Similarly to the above, a wider range of countries support outbound academic mobility. In addition to support for international engagement, outbound academic mobility can also be deployed as a means for building research capacity through access to opportunities for training and secondment overseas. Countries with generous schemes are China, Germany, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Thailand, the USA and Vietnam.

Almost half of the countries covered in this study (Australia, Chile, China, Colombia, Germany, Indonesia, Malaysia, Russia, Thailand, Turkey, the UK and Vietnam) have evidenced strong support for international collaborations through funding schemes and large-scale projects.

4.3.3 Sustainable development policies

The following criteria are considered in this section: (i) anti-displacement policies; (ii) anti brain drain policies; (iii) aid to developing countries and regions; and (iv) foreign language and intercultural competence policies.

Consideration was given to 'internationalisation at home' agendas in higher education. However, given that most of the evidence is at institutional level, it was hard to arrive at national-level policies. The nearest proxy to internationalisation at home is foreign language and intercultural competence policies in the country.

Equitable access policies and the presence of sustainable development are areas where developing countries outperform mature higher education systems (except Germany). The countries meeting most of the criteria are Botswana, Ghana, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Vietnam and also China, Colombia, Indonesia, South Africa and Turkey.

The majority of the countries listed above also have anti brain drain policies. These policies are supported by strong access policies favouring students from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds.

Higher education provision in foreign languages is strongest in non-English speaking countries, such as Chile, China, Colombia, Germany and Malaysia, all of which are offering increasing numbers of courses taught in English and other languages.

5. Emerging themes

This section provides a brief overview of the emerging themes from this analysis. These themes will be explored further in a follow-up series. The themes cut across the three broad categories of national policies (openness of higher education systems and mobility; quality assurance and degree recognition policies; and equitable access and sustainable development policies).

The emerging themes cover the following policy developments, which require further analysis:

i. National-level strategies on international higher education.

ii. Mobility of students.

iii. International collaboration in teaching and research.

5.1 The importance of national strategies on international higher education

Increased commitment towards international higher education is evidenced through countries' IHE strategies, some of which are reflected in reformed higher education legislations. These are strong signals of readiness to engage internationally and to support their higher education systems' global positioning.

The most recent developments in this space are marked by Malaysia's Education Blueprint 2015–2020,[15] which enhances some of the Ministry of Higher Education's main objectives regarding the recruitment of international students and research collaborations with universities across the globe.[16] Further examples of the heightened profile of IHE can be found in Brazil's Strategic Institutional Plan 2015–2018[17] and Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst's Strategy 2020 which focuses on student mobility, research collaborations and enhanced structures to support intensified internationalisation in Germany and abroad.[18]

A growing number of countries are making fresh commitments to internationalisation, mainly expressed through international student recruitment targets. Recent examples include Egypt, Turkey and Vietnam. Egypt's Supreme Council of Universities declared the country's ambition to quadruple its number of international students between 2015 and 2018. Turkey's 2014 report *Growth, quality and internationalisation* identifies IHE as one of the key priorities to restructure the country's higher education system. Vietnam has signalled its commitment through a new Higher Education Law, one of whose chapters focuses on international collaboration.[19]

The countries which, in comparative terms, appear to have the most comprehensive and balanced international strategies are Australia, China, Germany, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and the UK.

Conversely, activities in areas which appear to have attracted less support from national governments have been mainly driven by higher education institutions. This is evidenced by the efforts of national association of universities, such as IEASA and CCYK, but also regional associations when the issues in question span several countries, an example of which is ANIE.

5.2 Mobility of students

Earlier research carried out by Helms et al. (2015) identifies student mobility as the prevalent 'building block' of countries' IHE strategies.[20] This is supported by the findings of this research. Student mobility is the policy area which has attracted the most government support, with more than half the 26 studied countries either declaring international student recruitment targets or identifying international student recruitment as an IHE priority. The majority of these countries have streamlined student access to their higher education systems through student-friendly visa policies. The countries with the most supportive environments for international students include Australia, China, Colombia, Germany, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Russia, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, the USA and Vietnam.

While streamlined visa policies appear to be a prevalent theme, only a few countries have opened their labour markets to international graduates, such as Australia, Germany and most recently Russia.

The above initiatives are supported by national schemes supporting outward student mobility. An example of this which also considers brain drain is found in Colombia. Funding provided by Colfuturo, often topped up by ICETEX and Colciencias, partly waives tuition fees if the funded students return to Colombia. In addition, there are specially designed programmes to combat brain drain, such as Return.[21]

15. For further details see: http://hes.moe.gov.my/muat-turun/awam/penerbitan-dan-jurnal/pppm-2015-2025-pt
16. For further details see: http://jpt.mohe.gov.my/
17. For further details see: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=17232-mec-planejamento-estrategico-institucional-2015-2018&category_slug=marco-2015-pdf&Itemid=30192
18. For further details see: https://www.daad.de/medien/jahresbericht_2014_englisch.pdf
19. For further details see Chapter VI (in Vietnamese language): http://thuvienphapluat.vn/van-ban/Giao-duc/Law-No-08-2012-QH13-on-higher-education-143159.aspx
20. Helms, RM, Rumbley, LE, Brajkovic, L and Mihut, G (2015, p.51) *Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs*. Available online at: www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/Project%20Page/Policies%20Part%201%20Global%20FINAL%20web.pdf
21. For further details see: www.colfuturo.org/financiacion-para-posgrados-en-el-exterior and www.colfuturo.org/el-mejor-talento-colombiano-para-su-empresa

Conversely, countries which have struggled in the recent past to meet domestic higher education demand are also preoccupied with equitable access to higher education and sensitive to the unintended consequences of internationalisation.

5.3 International collaborations in teaching and research

National levels of support have been studied in two main areas of operation: teaching and research.

5.3.1 Collaborative provision in teaching

The most comprehensive national-level policies with regard to teaching collaborations consider the needs of both students and HEIs.

Countries which recognise and allow inbound and outbound cross-border education require strong quality assurance frameworks to ensure high teaching standards are maintained both by the domestic HEIs providing HE outside the home country and equally by foreign HEIs operating in the jurisdiction of the home quality assurance agency. In this respect, the welfare and interest of both home and international students (based at home and abroad) are catered for.

Countries with limited provision of inbound TNE tend to regulate the quality of provision through quality assurance of the local partner HEI. Both in Colombia, which mainly supports double and dual degrees (Henao and Velez, 2015)[22] and the Philippines, the local partner has a greater stake in ownership of the teaching collaboration. For example, current regulation in the Philippines caps foreign ownership of any transnational education venture to a maximum of 40 per cent.[23]

Countries where TNE is not allowed or not recognised, and which also have unmet local higher education demand, face the issue of students opting for courses with varied quality, mainly delivered by overseas providers.

While many countries in this study (such as Australia, Chile, India, Malaysia, Pakistan, Russia, South Africa, the UK and the USA) allow their HEIs to engage internationally and set up independent entities overseas, a very much smaller number of countries have regulatory provision which safeguards the reputation and quality of HE provision. Countries which have strong quality assurance in place with a view to the cross-border delivery of their HE are Australia, Germany, Malaysia and the UK.

So far, the focus in cross-border education appears to be predominantly on HE provision and less on quality assurance. The latter policy area leaves much room for improvement. In addition, more needs to be done regarding the recognition of qualifications obtained through TNE.

5.3.2 Research collaborations

Research is increasingly becoming a policy preoccupation. This is manifested through international research collaborations attracting funding through national-level research evaluations which determine the levels of research funding across the research-active HEIs. For example, the research activity in Malaysia is measured by the Malaysia Research Assessment Instrument (MyRA) developed by the Ministry of Higher Education. MyRA is composed of nine sections, each with corresponding indicators, which are used to score individual universities. Most of the assessment sections take into account international engagement and collaborations (for example, staff being principal investigators in internationally funded research; awards and recognitions through international academic and professional bodies; international publications, international patents; networking and linkages).[24]

22. Henao, KM and Velez, JV (2015, p. 222) 'Colombia' in de Wit, H , Hunter, F, Howard, L and Egron-Polak, E (eds) *Internationalisation of Higher Education* study produced for the European Parliament. Available online at: www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/540370/IPOL_STU(2015)540370_EN.pdf
23. For further details see: Commission on Higher Education (CHEd)'s CMO 2 2008. Available online at: www.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/CMO-No.02-s2008.pdf) and Manual of Regulations for Private Higher Education Institutions 2008. Available online at: www.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Manual-of-Regulations-for-Private-Higher-Education.pdf).
24. For further details see MyRA Statistics (www.research.usm.my/announcement/2012/myraii.pdf) and MyRA indicator (www.sqc.unimas.my/images/MyRA_Instrument.pdf).

The UK provides another example of support for international research collaborations. Research in the UK higher education system has dual support at national level: through the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and the UK's Research Councils (RCUK). While the REF guidelines on collaborative research do not mention international collaboration, the analysis of the REF submissions found that 40 per cent of the submitted output had at least one international co-author.[25] In addition, to better support international research collaborations on the ground, RCUK has four overseas offices across the UK's major research partner nations (the USA, India and China) and the European Union. The seven research councils which make up RCUK actively engage and fund international research activities.[26]

While research has attracted a high level of national support, the enabling infrastructure which would enhance collaboration through academic mobility (inbound and outbound) is still lagging behind. This is further complicated by unintended consequences of internationalisation such as brain drain. Countries sensitive about brain drain are reluctant to support academic mobility, but their HEIs see international collaborations as a means for capacity building, as highlighted by Jowi et al. (2013).[27]

Unaligned policies regarding the mobility of researchers may further disadvantage countries with protectionist policies by leading to brain drain. While these countries have no barriers to home-grown academics taking research positions overseas, there are barriers to academics from abroad coming in, which most likely results in the country losing researchers in net terms. This is also true of advanced economies which lack visa policies supporting academic mobility and the flow of talent.

25. For detailed analysis of the REF submissions see: www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/interdisc/Title,104883,en.html
26. For details on RCUK's international engagement, see: www.rcuk.ac.uk/international/
27. Jowi, J, Knight, J and Sehoole, C (2013, p. 15) 'Internationalisation of African Higher Education: Status, Challenges and Issues' in Sehoole, C and Knight, J (eds) *Internationalisation of African Higher Education*. Available online at: https://www.sensepublishers.com/media/1739-internationalisation-of-african-higher-education.pdf

6. Concluding thoughts

International higher education is increasingly becoming a global policy preoccupation. Increased commitment towards IHE is evidenced through countries' national strategies and reforms to higher education legislation. These are strong signals of countries' readiness to engage internationally and to support their higher education systems' global positioning.

Student mobility is one of the most prominent and often the only component of countries' strategies. While international student mobility has been broadly supported by strong funding and student-friendly visa policies, the majority of the countries have been reluctant to allow their international graduates to access the local labour market (exceptions being Australia, Germany and Russia).

IHE is also used by some governments to support the building of local research capacity. Different university league tables, mainly based on research indicators, have added to the pressure on governments aspiring to greater representation in the tables for their home HEIs. This is manifested by support for international research collaborations, consideration of collaborative research outputs in national research assessments for funding purposes, and support for outward academic mobility, mainly for training purposes.

Given the growing prominence of government engagement in international higher education, and the interdependencies between national HE systems, there is a need for greater co-ordination between policies with a view to achieving greater impact. Helms et al. (2015)[28] call for greater synergy between national policies. Indeed, much greater alignment of national policies is observed in regional initiatives such as the European Higher Education Area, and initiatives aimed at the greater synchronisation of higher education systems across the Association of South East Asian Nations, the Pacific Alliance[29] (Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Peru) and the members of the Mercosur trade bloc (Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela).

In addition to this greater impact, alignment and synergies between nations' policies are likely to counteract some of the unintended consequences of internationalisation, such as brain drain.

28. Helms, RM, Rumbley, LE, Brajkovic, L and Mihut, G (2015) *Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs.*
29. Alianza del Pacifico: http://alianzapacifico.net/en/what-is-the-pacific-alliance/#what-is-the-pacific-alliance

7. Appendix

Table 1 (extended): Structure of the National Policies Framework

1 Openness and mobility	
1.1 IHE strategy	
Internationalisation strategy	Has the ministry of education (or equivalent) produced a detailed international higher education strategy (e.g. covering student mobility, research collaboration, development goals)?
Dedicated body	Is there a dedicated body (or bodies) promoting the internationalisation of higher education?
Overseas presence	Does the ministry of education or dedicated internationalisation body have a significant overseas presence, e.g. by way of overseas representative offices or participation in conferences, trade fairs and marketing events?
Bilateral agreements	Over the past five years, has the government made efforts to sustain or increase the number of bilateral agreements/memoranda of understanding signed between itself and foreign education ministries on the topic of collaboration in higher education?
Data collection and monitoring of internationalisation	Does the government monitor and produce data on the internationalisation of its higher education system, e.g. by producing data on international student and faculty mobility, programme and provider mobility, and research collaboration?
1.2 Student mobility policies	
Student visas	Do restrictions exist on foreign students and researchers to obtaining entry visas, e.g. depending on country of origin?
Visa procedures for international students	Are procedures for foreign students to obtain visas clear, transparent and consistent?
Living/working environment for international students	Do policies exist to make it easier for foreign students to come and live in the country, such as concerning employment (including post-study employment opportunities) or bringing spouses?
Fees for foreign students	Do public institutions have the authority to charge different fees to foreign students?
1.3 Academic mobility and research policies	
Academic visas	Are there any special regulations in place to make it easier for foreign teaching faculty and researchers to gain employment?
Visa procedures for academics	Are procedures for foreign teaching faculty and researchers to obtain visas clear, transparent and consistent?
Living/working environment for academics	Do policies exist to make it easier for foreign faculty and researchers to come and live in the country, such as concerning employment or bringing spouses?
Inclusion of international research in national assessment/review	Is research produced via international collaboration included in the national research assessment/review?
1.4 Programme and provider mobility	
Setting up operations by foreign institutions	Can foreign institutions set up their own legally recognised teaching/research entities?
Cross border programme provision	Do regulations exist to allow for the provision of cross-border programmes by foreign providers, e.g. by way of twinning, programme articulations and distance learning?
Clarity and application of regulations for foreign institutions	Are legal regulations for foreign institutions clear, transparent and evenly enforced?
Domestic institutions abroad	Are public domestic institutions permitted to set up legally recognised teaching/research entities abroad?

2. Quality assurance and degree recognition	
2.1 International students' quality assurance and admissions	
Entry/selection criteria for international students	Are education institutions provided with timely information, support and guidance by academic recognition bodies (or other bodies) to help select appropriately qualified foreign students for entry?
Code of practice for teaching/ assessing international students	Are there national bodies or other systems in place to monitor, revise and advise on institutions' procedures for teaching and assessing foreign students, e.g. by way of best practice surveys, advisory bodies or networks?
Policies/guidelines for engagement with recruitment agents: at home and overseas	Are there policies or procedures in place to advise local institutions on how best to engage with international agents for the recruitment of international students? This area includes framework of engagement, guidelines and code of conduct related to the country's HEIs engagement with agents based overseas and/or, equally, national-level oversight of education agents active in the respective country.
2.2 Quality assurance of academic programmes	
Monitoring of foreign institutions	Do national quality assurance agencies regularly monitor, and if appropriate, accredit the cross-border activities of foreign institutions (e.g. distance learning, programme collaboration, branch campuses) in the home country of the quality assurance agency?
Monitoring of domestic institutions overseas	Do national quality assurance agencies advise, monitor and accredit the cross-border activities of domestic institutions (e.g. distance learning, programme collaboration, branch campuses)?
Enforcement action	Are national quality assurance agencies active at enforcing their standards and requirements, either for foreign institutions, domestic institutions overseas, or both if appropriate?
Collaboration with regional/ international QA agencies	Do national quality assurance agencies take an active part in international collaboration on quality assurance standards, e g. by adopting the UNESCO/Council of Europe Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Transnational Education and by taking part in regional and international networks?
2.3 Recognition of overseas qualifications	
Foreign degree recognition	Is the process taken by national academic recognition bodies in recognising foreign qualifications clear, transparent, and consistent?
Recognition of TNE qualifications	Do national academic recognition bodies make efforts to recognise TNE qualifications, e.g. by way of guidelines or TNE code of good practice?
Communication with labour market	Do national academic recognition bodies work to provide clear and timely information to the labour market and other professional bodies on the comparability of foreign/TNE qualifications?
Collaboration with regional/ international recognition agencies	Do national academic recognition bodies take an active part in attempts to improve recognition procedures across borders, e.g. by signing up to UNESCO regional conventions; the Bologna Process, and, where appropriate, by establishing bilateral agreements on degree recognition?

3. Access and sustainability	
3.1 Student mobility funding	
Outbound scholarships/access to student loans for study abroad	Do scholarship programmes for studying abroad exist, are they well-publicised and are they available at all levels of study?
Inbound scholarships/access to student loans for international students	Do scholarship programmes for foreign students exist, are they well-publicised and are they available at all levels of study?

3.2 Academic mobility and research funding	
Outbound academic programmes	Do funding programmes exist for teachers and researchers to undertake posts abroad?
Inbound academic programmes	Do funding programmes exist to allow foreign teachers and researchers to undertake posts in the home country?
Funding of international research collaboration	Do funding programmes exist to promote international collaboration in research … addressing issues of global importance … agreements between national and foreign funding bodies?

3.3 Sustainable development policies	
Anti-displacement policies	Does the state actively seek to avoid the displacement of low-income or marginalised domestic students by foreign students, e.g. by way of quotas, grants or scholarships?
Anti brain drain policies	Does the government actively seek to counteract brain drain by attracting outbound students and scholars to return home, e.g. by offering employment or by linking return to funding?
Aid to developing countries and regions	Does the government engage in development projects to support capacity building in international higher education either at home or abroad, e.g. by offering grants to students from low-income countries/regions or by investing in technical capacity-building projects?
Foreign language and intercultural competence policies	Does the government have policies in place to promote second-language competence and intercultural awareness?

© British Council 2016/F310
The British Council is the United Kingdom's international organisation for cultural relations and educational opportunities.