

India is legally restricted to domestic institutions. Short of a new law, which experience suggests is anything but straightforward in India, the government may be limited to tweaking UGC regulations.

A further complication is the role of the All-India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), a parallel body to the UGC. AICTE oversees higher education in “technical” areas, including at degree level. Business, IT, and engineering programs fall under its purview. AICTE has its own rules and approval process for foreign institutions, which permit independent foreign campuses and distance learning, and give no indication that joint degrees are a problem. However, the ten programs approved for 2016/17 are all “twinning” arrangements. The approved programs are from six foreign universities, including DeMontfort and Huddersfield in the United Kingdom and the University of Massachusetts and Valparaiso University in the United States. The list is shrinking—down from 21 approved programs in 2013/14.

GOVERNMENT INQUIRY

Bills to introduce foreign providers date back to 1995. The latest, in 2010, the Foreign Educational Institutions Bill, died in Parliament. A recent government inquiry instigated by Prime Minister Modi recommended that foreign institutions be permitted to be set up in India and proposed three ways forward: 1) a new act of Parliament; 2) a redefinition of the university, to encompass foreign institutions; or 3) tweaks to UGC rules on collaboration. If the HRD minister’s announcement means the government has gone with option 3, the legal framework for foreign institutions remains ambiguous at best. Ten of India’s 29 states recently backed entry of foreign providers, but seven signaled opposition.

There are estimated to be over 600 foreign education providers in India, spanning everything from twinning to faculty exchange and distance learning. According to the recent HEGlobal survey on UK TNE, there are at least nine UK higher education institutions operating in India, offering 82 programs. This contradicts the AICTE list and UGC’s assertion that it has approved zero foreign providers. UGC says existing collaborations must obtain approval within a year or face sanctions, but similar deadlines have come and gone with little action. AICTE’s “must comply” announcements also appear widely ignored.

In many cases, it is not that foreign providers are deliberately flouting the rules. But rather differing approaches to TNE by the central government and individual states, confusing and overlapping jurisdiction by oversight bodies, and uneven enforcement foster ambiguity about exactly what is permissible.

The latest move by the HRD minister may mean a new flow of applications by Indian institutions interested in collaboration. However, foreign interests may continue to be put off by the inability to award their own degrees, and an approval process that permits UGC to scrutinize “infrastructure facilities, facilities available for instruction, faculty, specified fee, courses, curricula, [and] requisite funds for operation for a minimum period of three years (...)” Much TNE may continue to operate outside the rules, viewing employer enthusiasm as more important than government oversight.

When it comes to foreign higher education, India has yet to find the right balance between regulation and innovation. Until that day comes, the government will experience TNE as a headache rather than a benefit. ■

International Faculty Mobility: Crucial and Understudied

Laura E. Rumbley and Hans de Wit

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu. Hans de Wit is director at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu. This article is based on a forthcoming chapter by the authors, “International Faculty in Higher Education: Common Motivations, Disparate Realities, and Many Unknowns,” in International Faculty in Higher Education: Comparative Perspectives on Recruitment, Integration, and Impact (Yudkevich, Altbach, and Rumbley, Eds., Routledge, 2016).

The presence of international (i.e., foreign, nonlocal, or nondomestic) faculty within higher education institutions and systems around the world is an important dimension of higher education in the global knowledge society of today. Increased global competition for talent, research, funding, and reputation/profile/branding not only implies that universities must compete for the best and brightest of undergraduate and graduate students, but they must also seek out talented researchers and teachers on a worldwide scale.

The international mobility of faculty is also important in relation to the specific phenomenon of internationalization of higher education. Here, we note that such elements

as student mobility, curricular innovations, and the cultivation and maintenance of international partnerships are fundamental aspects of many institutional strategies for internationalization—and in all three areas, faculty are crucial actors.

Yet, the scope and nature of international mobility of faculty—particularly in relation to permanent or long-term appointments, rather than short-term or occasional visits—is a rather unknown and understudied phenomenon. Compared to the long list of reports and studies on international student mobility, there is a surprising lack of data and studies on the phenomenon of international faculty mobility. As we seek to gain an ever-clearer understanding of the dynamics implicit in the global circulation of academic talent (at all levels), it is vital to gain insight into what motivates academics to pursue permanent or long-term appointments abroad, why institutions and systems of higher education hire these individuals, how the relationships between mobile academics and their host institutions play out in practical terms, and what effects are exerted by national and institutional policies relevant to long-term faculty mobility. Indeed, recent research on this subject in which we have been involved—encompassing perspectives from eleven different countries and specific universities—suggests that international faculty mobility is a growing and complex phenomenon, fraught with possibilities and inequalities, and ripe for extensive further exploration and analysis.

How we define international faculty around the world remains inconsistent, and the landscape of institutional settings in which foreign faculty are employed is tremendously diverse.

DEFINITIONAL DIFFICULTIES AND CONTEXTUAL COMPLEXITIES

Just as there are a number of different ways in which internationally mobile students are defined or categorized around the world, there is also a lack of consensus with respect to what defines an “international” academic. Is citizenship the defining factor? Or does status as international faculty member have more to do with having received one’s academic training (for example, completing doctoral studies) abroad, regardless of country of origin? Is an international faculty member someone who is considered an “immigrant” in the local context—and, if so, does it matter if this process of immigration occurred before or after the faculty member entered the ranks of academia? Without

definitional clarity or consistency, it is exceedingly difficult to compare and contrast both quantitative and qualitative information related to this population.

Meanwhile, there are also very different profiles for the institutions recruiting these individuals. On one end of the spectrum, we may find elite research universities with “superstar” attraction status. These institutions are in a position to recruit the world’s most sought-after academics and, indeed, consider all faculty searches to be essentially global in nature, as they seek out the best talent from anywhere in the world. Among the scant literature on international faculty mobility, a considerable amount of attention has been paid to these kinds of prestigious institutions. At the other end of the spectrum, however, there are institutions or systems facing local shortages of faculty, which recruit regional or international faculty in order to meet basic operational needs. In between these two extremes, a range of middle- and upper-tier universities may actively be seeking out international academics to some degree, or simply responding as needed to nonlocal job seekers.

How we define international faculty around the world remains inconsistent, and the landscape of institutional settings in which foreign faculty are employed is tremendously diverse.

CONCENTRIC CIRCLES OF ANALYSIS: NATIONAL, INSTITUTIONAL, INDIVIDUAL

It is impossible to make generalizations about international faculty mobility without extensive and in-depth analysis over time. However, our research suggests that making sense of the international faculty mobility experience anywhere in the world hinges on an understanding of the distinct, yet interlocking, dynamics of policy and practice at the national and institutional levels, while taking into account the complex realities of the fundamental human experience at the level of individual academics themselves.

At the national level, potential foreign faculty are presented with a set of tangible and intangible factors and options. Whether they will find them attractive or not depends on a multitude of variables. These variables range from the policy framework that actively stimulates (or complicates) their recruitment and legal or professional status in the country, to the aspects of daily life—such as language, cultural norms, and practices—that enable (or inhibit) their integration, to the broader issues of geopolitics and the environment, which can set the overall tone and tenor for their own experience and that of any family members who may accompany them. The national context is therefore a crucial dimension of the international faculty story.

Meanwhile, the lives of internationally mobile faculty are also colored heavily by the circumstances they face within the specific institutional context where they are hired.

Our research indicates that there is a range of rationales for international faculty recruitment and a wide array of ways in which foreign academics are recruited. Terms of employment can also differ—they may be identical to those offered to domestic faculty, or unique for internationals, with either scenario potentially resulting in challenges and opportunities for all involved. Further, the manner and extent to which the presence of foreign faculty exerts an impact on their host institutions seems rarely explored, documented, or leveraged systematically.

Finally, the story of international faculty mobility is not complete without a consideration of what this phenomenon means at the most fundamental level—that of the individual academic. Here, our research shows that mobile faculty are often motivated by attractive employment opportunities or a sense of duty or desire to contribute to a “larger agenda” that they believe in. They are sensitive to the personal supports that the host institution or country can provide. The universities examined in our study, however, vary widely in terms of systematic provision of such supports.

WHAT WE DO NOT KNOW

There is much to explore and yet to understand about the international faculty mobility phenomenon. Some of the key issues we see on the horizon for future research include the way immigration/migration policies affect international faculty mobility; international faculty mobility in developed versus emerging societies, in the public higher education sector versus the private and for-profit sectors, and across disciplines, age, and gender; the impact of online education on international faculty mobility; and the differences in the realities of faculty mobility across various institutional types. ■

Brexit: Challenges for Universities in Hard Times

SIMON MARGINSON

Simon Marginson is professor of International Higher Education, Institute of Education, University College London, and director, ESRC/HE-FCE Centre for Global Higher Education, UK. E-mail: s.marginson@ucl.ac.uk.

With the referendum of 23 June 2016, in which 72 percent of the electorate voted (highest turnout since 1992), the British voted to take their country out of the European Union by a margin of 52/48 percent. Though it was unclear in the early weeks what “Brexit” meant, even

whether the United Kingdom would leave the European Union at all, the post-Brexit landscape is now emerging. In the House of Commons, in March 2017, Prime Minister Theresa May will table the complex bill to leave the European Union.

For higher education, one UK sector where the relationship with Europe has been unambiguously positive—a win-win for both European countries and the United Kingdom—the consequences will be every bit as destabilizing as was predicted before the vote.

BLOCKAGES TO PEOPLE MOBILITY

The government of Theresa May has made it clear the era of free people movement between the United Kingdom and the European Union is over. Above all, it was migration resistance that determined the referendum result. There will be a new migration program, in which people of all origins will be treated on a common basis, favoring high-skill migration. In addition, May wants a significant reduction in the overall level of migration into the United Kingdom. The prime minister sees both measures as essential to the political survival of the Conservative Party government.

What happens to EU citizens in UK universities is unclear. Currently there are 43,000 EU staff and 125,000 EU students. However, the Brexit process cannot be completed before March 2019, by which time most current students will be through their courses. While EU staff are likely to retain residence rights, this is still uncertain, as no announcement has been made. Their position may depend on whether reciprocal rights of residence are negotiated successfully for UK citizens presently resident in Europe.

The decision to give priority to closing down EU people movement has momentous consequences, signaling a “hard Brexit” in which the United Kingdom loses access to the single market in Europe. Even partial economic participation in Europe, as in Switzerland and Norway, depends on support for free people movement. A “hard Brexit” directly undermines the UK finance sector in the City of London, the strongest British industry and one of two domains where the United Kingdom is a clear global leader. The other is higher education.

UK-based finance will lose the special “passport” that enables foreign banks and other companies operating in London to access the European market without needing separate licenses for each country. On 18 September, the president of Germany’s central bank, the Bundesbank, predicted that many financial services will relocate to Frankfurt. In addition, London will lose its role as a principal trader in euros. The Japanese government has stated it will relocate its banks if the “passport” is lost. Hitachi, Honda, Nissan, and Toyota have large plants in the United Kingdom as their base for accessing Europe. They may also have