

OST-WEST DIALOG 11

Iryna Yuryeva

Internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine

kassel
university



press

UniKassel**Transfer**

Ost-West-Wissenschaftszentrum

Reihe OST-WEST-DIALOG

OST - WEST - DIALOG 11

Irina Yuryeva

Internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine

Serial OST-WEST-DIALOG

Editor: Ost-West-Wissenschaftszentrum
University of Kassel
www.owwz.de

Bibliographic information published by Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationabibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at
<http://dnb.d-nb.de>

ISBN print: 978-3-86219-076-8
ISBN online: 978-3-86219-077-5
URN: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0002-30761>

kassel university press GmbH, 2011
www.upress.uni-kassel.de

Cover: Bettina Brand grafikdesign, München
Printed in Germany by Unidruckerei, University of Kassel

Internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine

Iryna Yuryeva, M.A.

Acknowledgments

This publication presents the results of the research completed within the framework of the Master degree thesis. It was written at the support and encouragement of many people, including but not limited to:

- Prof. Dr. Barbara M. Kehm, the supervisor of the research – for wise guidance of the process;
- Mr. Vjacheslav Jamkoviyy, the Adviser of the Minister of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine – for consultations on the indicators of higher education development in Ukraine;
- Dr. Sergiy Kurbatov, the Senior Scientific Fellow of the Institute of Higher Education of the Academy of Pedagogical Science of Ukraine – for sharing his reflections on internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine;
- Mr. Volodymyr Romakin, the Head of International Office of the Black Sea State University, and Mr. Hrygoriy Baran, the former Head of International Office of the Kherson State University – for cooperation in development of the case studies of institutional internationalisation in Ukraine;
- Dr. Ed. Linell Fromm, (The Fromm Group, USA) – for the comments on the content, structure and style of the publication.

0 Contents

0	Contents	2
1	Introduction. Importance, uniqueness and tasks of research on internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine	4
2	State of research in internationalisation of higher education internationally and in Ukraine	6
2.1	State of research in internationalisation of higher education internationally	6
2.2	State of research in internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine	7
3	Internationalisation of higher education: a conceptual framework	10
3.1	Definitions	10
3.2	Key terms in relation to internationalisation used in the research	11
3.3	Analysis structure	12
4	Internationalisation of the higher education system in Ukraine at the sector level	17
4.1	A brief overview of the higher education system in Ukraine	17
4.2	Political, economic and social contexts of national higher education internationalisation	20
4.3	Historical overview of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine	21
4.4	Rationales for internationalisation	25
4.5	Meaning of internationalisation	26
4.6	Approaches to internationalisation	28
4.7	Internationalisation players	29
4.8	Internationalisation stakeholders	32
4.9	National policy of internationalisation: development and implementation	33
4.9.1	Policy documents	34
4.9.2	Participants of the national policy implementation and their functions	35
4.9.3	Programmes	39
4.9.4	Concluding remarks on internationalisation policy	41
4.10	Achievements and challenges of higher education internationalisation	41
4.11	Implications for the national policy development to support internationalisation	46
5	Internationalisation of higher education at the institutional level	46
5.1	National trends of institutional internationalisation	46
5.2	Institutional internationalisation: two case studies	54
5.2.1	Internationalisation at the Kherson State University	55
5.2.2	Internationalisation at the Black Sea State University	61

5.3	Chapter conclusions	67
6	Effects of internationalisation on the higher education system of Ukraine	69
7	Conclusions	71
	Reference list	75
	Appendix 1	88
	Appendix 2	89
	Appendix 3	90

1 Introduction. Importance, uniqueness and tasks of research on internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine

Internationalisation of higher education is very topical. Internationalisation of higher education can be discussed for hours, interpreted in multiple ways, praised or skewered, but it has existed since the dawn of universities due to the international character of knowledge and has always played a role in the development of higher education. In the recent century this process gained importance as an instrumental part of higher education serving the development of international relations of countries and regions, where international cooperation and exchange were aimed at political expansion – Hans de Wit (1995, pp. 6-9) analyzed this correlation in his review of the stages of internationalisation development.

The latest stage of internationalisation of higher education development started in the 1980s and exploded in the 1990s (Söderqvist, 2007, p. 14), mirroring the fantastic speed of economic globalisation and the increasing role of higher education in providing globally economically competitive workforce – “global citizens with global competences” (Altbach, 2009, p. 17).

With the rise of the “knowledge society”, the de-colonisation of the developing world, the expansion of higher education, the decrease of public funding and the quick development of global economic process, internationalisation added the function of updating and improving higher education systems in response to globalisation, since national higher education systems are supposed to contribute heavily in nations’ economic competitiveness on the international arena. De Wit remarks that “the third period [of internationalisation] is characterized by the emphasis on economic arguments to promote international cooperation and exchange in higher education” (1995, p. 9).

According to the UNESCO 2009 World Conference Report, individual student mobility grew from 1,8 mln in 2000 to 2,8 mln in 2007 (53 % increase!) (Altbach et al. 2009, p.25) and is predicted to achieve 7,2 mln in 2025 (188% increase of the 2006 year level!) (Böhm et al, 2002, in Altbach, 2009, p.25). If the figures of the staff mobility and professionals involved in international educational cooperation were added, these simple statistics would itself show the importance of internationalisation coverage, to say nothing of the fundamentally important cultural and social functions of preserving national identity of the higher education systems in their splendid diversity and promoting peace and understanding among people of different nations.

Ukraine, with the breakdown of the USSR in the beginning of the 1990s, abandoned the Soviet model of international cooperation in higher education, framed by the foreign

policy of the superpower country. With the coming of independence and opening of borders the country started a new practice in the field of higher education internationalisation which was dictated by the newly formed political and economic aspirations. At present, Ukrainian higher education has been objectively affected by economic globalisation and global processes in international higher education. It is pursuing reforms to cope with the increasing number of students and providers of educational services, to improve the quality of education in the view of demands of national and international employers and to gain social benefits from training of well-educated citizens. The country is following the international scenario in higher education development, therefore it is logical to presume that internationalisation of national higher education is instrumental in making the system responsive to the needs of time. But officially, the importance of internationalisation and interest in it were not clearly articulated until May 2005.

In May 2005 the situation changed as Ukraine signed the Bologna Declaration. This was an official announcement of the intention to become a part of the regional higher education area. The National Doctrine of Education Development proclaimed integration of national education to European and world education areas as the overall objective, reflecting the political aspirations of the country to join the European Union.

At this point internationalisation gained official importance, but only as notorious so-called “Bolonisation” or, in other words, “Europeanisation” process. An average student, professor, or higher education official in Ukraine will equal internationalisation to Europeanisation, though the latter is only the regionally focused type of internationalisation.

Therefore, it is not surprising that not a single attempt to research internationalisation nationally in a systemic mode with the reference to the achievements of international theory in the field so far has been undertaken by Ukrainian or foreign scholars.

This study will aim to explore the following issues:

1. The current state of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine on the national and institutional levels including context, rationales, meaning, actors and stakeholders, policies, policy implementations, achievements and failures, stage of development;
2. Similarities with international trends and specifics;
3. Contribution of internationalisation into the development of higher education in Ukraine.

To provide a systemic analysis of the topic, it is reasonable to review, first, the state of research in internationalisation of higher education both internationally and in Ukraine Chapter 2 will lay out the theoretical conceptual framework of the analysis of the

phenomenon for the national/sector and institutional levels based on the works of the international researchers. The empirical analysis of internationalisation on the national/sector level will be presented in Chapter 3. The following Chapter 4 will provide the description of the national trends in institutional internationalisation, accompanied by the illustration with two case studies. Chapter 5 will evaluate the role of internationalisation in the development of higher education in Ukraine. The last chapter will summarise the specifics of the process in Ukraine and will provide implications for the acceleration of internationalisation.

2 State of research in internationalisation of higher education internationally and in Ukraine

2.1 State of research in internationalisation of higher education internationally

De Wit (2002, p.212) marks that research in internationalisation of higher education “has still a long way to go” on the international level. Kehm and Teichler (2007, p. 260) state that “the general state of research is characterised by an increase of theoretically and methodologically ambitious studies without a dominant disciplinary, conceptual or methodological “home”. Söderqvist ascertains the absence of the agreed concept and understanding of internationalisation and states that “theories of HEI [higher education internationalisation] are still practically non-existent” (Söderqvist, 2007, p.16). In general, both theorists and practitioners feel unsatisfied with the state of research (Söderqvist, 2007, p.19).

This status of research in the field is explained by the “young age” of the modern stage of internationalisation development that started in the beginning of the 1990s (Söderqvist, 2007, p. 14). In the present “wave” references to the first publications on internationalisation come back to the same period – de Wit (1995), Scott (1992), Block (1995), Smith (1993). By mid-1990s internationalisation grew into “one of the key thematic areas” (Teichler, 2005, in Kehm and Teichler, 2007, p. 261), though the complaints are still heard that “Internationalisation of higher education lacks recognition as a theme within higher education studies” (de Wit, 2002, p.213). The major challenge of the research in internationalisation of higher education owes to the fact that it is complex, fuzzy, interdisciplinary, often theme-oriented and lacks comprehensiveness (Kehm and Teichler, 2007, pp. 260-261).

Kehm and Teichler (2007, p. 261) in their overview of the research on internationalisation reference the steady quantitative increase and quality improvement in the publications in the field. Major issues of discussion regarding internationalisation include the scope and interrelations of internationalisation and globalisation, the concept and definitions, terminology, quality issues

in internationalisation, ratio of practice and policy-driven publications to the research-oriented publications, multidimensional character of internationalisation (closeness to management, policy, funding, etc.), viewing internationalisation as the topic with strong political background, increasing the diversity of themes. Thematically, the prevalence of the following topics has been traced: internationalisation of the substance of teaching, learning and research; institutional strategies of internationalisation; mobility of students and academic staff; mutual influences of higher education systems on each other; knowledge transfer.

The present study will utilise the works of “gurus” that constructed the conceptual foundation of the topic: P. Altbach, J. Knight, H. de Wit, P. Scott, U. Teichler, M. van der Wende, B. M. Kehm. The multiple analyses of the case studies of internationalisation of national higher education system in different countries have been completed by Knight (Canada, 1997), Rouhani (South Africa, 2007), Huang (China, 2003), Ninomiya, Knight and Watanabe (Japan, 2009), McLellan (South Africa, 2008), Adams (Australia, 2007), Avila (Latin America, 2007) and many others. These works will serve as exemplary case studies and a source of reflections for the case study of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine.

The publications on internationalisation at the institutional level are abundant in the *Journal of Studies in International Education* – e.g. Childress (2009), Knight (2001), Taylor (2004), de Jong and Teekens (2003). They will provide the examples of the structure of the analysis on internationalisation of specific Ukrainian universities.

2.2 State of research in internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine

Since the area of research in internationalisation of higher education is only in the process of formation of the conceptual ground and framework, it is quite natural that in Ukraine it has not so far been recognised as a specialised topic of research. The young age of modern internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine also explains the infant state of research on the subject. In Ukraine the area of higher education and higher education administration has been separated as a thematic area and researched only since recently. In the USSR only pedagogical science was recognised and supported and only ideological guidance was undertaken instead of professional management. Even today the research institution that specialises on the issues of higher education research in Ukraine – the Institute of Higher Education (founded in 1999) – is a structural part of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine (<http://www.apsu.org.ua/ua/structure/institution/Invysh/>). Nevertheless, some practical knowledge on internationalisation has been brought to university professionals

working in international cooperation by the publications of the European Association of International Education (Forum Magazine, Occasional Papers).

K. Hahn and U. Teichler remark that “the terms ending with “a -sation” signal a process that has gradually become a prominent key issue” (2005, p.40). In the view of this judgement if the term “internationalisation” is not in wide use in the higher education of Ukraine, the phenomenon is not critically important for the sector and for the nation. The correctness of the judgement is proved by the scarceness of national scientific publications in the area.

Research publications on separate aspects of internationalisation appeared in Ukraine in mid-1990s, but the term has not been widely used up to now. The main aspects of discussion are:

- Internationalisation as the result of globalisation, the difference of two processes, viewing globalisation as negative and internationalisation as positive (Gurova, 2008; Titarchuk, 2005; Sandrygailo, 2009; Saginova, 2010a, 2010b);
- Influence of globalisation as a driving factor of internationalisation (Gurova, 2008; Titarchuk, 2005);
- Internationalisation activities (Gurova, 2008, Verbits'ka, 2008);
- Positive outcomes of internationalisation (Gurova, 2008; Sandrygailo, 2009);
- Rationales for internationalisation (Trohymets, 2009; Sandrygailo, 2009);
- Goals of internationalisation (Yandul'ski, 2008);
- Issues and challenges associated with internationalisation (Yandul'ski, 2008; Saginova, 2010a, 2010b).

These not numerous works were found on the Internet as a result of a long search. The articles are written sporadically (not within the scope of the complex study), at different universities, as a tribute to the fashionable trend and a potentially eye-catching topic. Whenever the concept of internationalisation is analysed, mostly the case studies of foreign countries are presented (e.g., Borisova, 2009), whereas the situation in Ukraine is not investigated. The citations of international scholars on the topic constitute the biggest achievement of Ukrainian scholars but these citations do not present concepts, systems or approaches.

This happens due to several reasons. First, importance of internationalisation for Ukrainian higher education has been recognised only with the coming of the Bologna process. Second, internationalisation as a topic of research has been substituted in Ukraine by the Bologna process and is understood as Europeanisation (Titarchuk, 2005), which promotes

internationalisation but does not stand for it. Third, the achievements of theoretical discussions, published mostly in English, are not available in Ukraine because the Ukrainian scholars are unable to travel to international conferences or work in libraries abroad due to shortage of funds and poor knowledge of the foreign languages. Fourth, internationalisation until recently has been understood in Ukraine as international cooperation of universities (process and activities approach). Higher education professionals treated international cooperation as a specific elite type of activities, as the target in itself, not the instrument for further development. Fifth, obtaining statistical data or review is highly problematic due to bureaucracy in the major source of statistical information on international activities of universities – the Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine. Sixth, research on internationalisation depends on external funding (Kehm and Teichler, 2007, p.263) which is miserable in Ukraine.

Consequently, there are no research centres or individual researchers potentially interested in developing the topic. Examination of the dissertation pool in higher education of Ukraine did not reveal a single topic devoted to internationalisation, whereas the publications on the concept, practice, legal and methodical issues and prospects of the Bologna Process in Ukraine are abundant, including articles of professional periodicals “Vysha osvita Ukrainy (Higher Education of Ukraine)”, “Vysha Shkola (Higher School)”, “Humanitarni Nauky (Humanities)”, the materials of multiple round tables and conferences as well as individual publications. The Kandidate of Nauk (Candidate of Science degree, an approximate equivalent of Ph.D.) dissertations on internationalisation do not exist. Only two works were found on the state governance in higher education as related to the Bologna Process – Sikors’ka (2006) “Enhancement of state governance of higher education in the context of European integration” and Andreichuk (2007) “State governance in reforming the higher education of Ukraine in the context of Bologna Process”. Sikors’ka (2006, p.90) notes that the issues of international academic cooperation and its management by the government have not been formed as a separate research direction.

It is quite natural in this context that the external analysis of internationalisation in Ukraine has not been done either. The publications of Western scientists on the Central and Eastern Europe do not include the case studies of Ukraine – e.g. Bremer (in Kälveemark and van der Wende (Eds.), 1997), Altbach and Knight (2007).

3 Internationalisation of higher education: a conceptual framework

3.1 Definitions

This publication will not discuss the wide pool of definitions of the term “internationalisation”. Instead, the latest definition by Knight (2003, p.2 in Knight, 2004, p.11) will be used: “Internationalisation is the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education”. This definition describes the phenomenon at all levels, covers the scope of its current and future developments. The definition is applicable to the system of higher education of Ukraine and shows “the relation of international dimension to all aspects of education and the role it plays in the society” (Knight, 2004, p.11).

Internationalisation in this research will be understood as the process (mobility, projects) and results (new courses, improvement of courses, new management and delivery structures). Following Knight (2004, p.5) internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine will be analysed at two levels: the national/sector level and at the institutional level.

Due to extensive use of comparison of internationalisation and Europeanisation phenomena, internationalisation will be understood as reflecting “a world order which continues to be characterised by national states but leading increasingly to transnational and strategic relationships of exchange and cooperation” (Scott, 1998, p. 126 in Kehm, 2003, p.110).

Europeanisation will be seen “as “internationalisation light”, as a space which is characterised by a common and shared history and culture, and finally as an economic, political and internationalisation and cultural alliance vis-à-vis the rest of the world” (Teichler, 2002, p.8 in Kehm, 2003, p.110). In this research Europeanisation will be treated as the regional variant of internationalisation.

The definition of “Bolonisation” was not found but it is understood in the research as the synonym for Europeanisation because it pertains to the Bologna process aiming at convergence of educational systems and at achieving of the universal European standards for higher education. For Ukraine, Bolonisation as a specific model of internationalisation is used as a reforming instrument to upgrade the quality of higher education system and improve its reputation internationally, specifically in Europe.

3.2 Key terms in relation to internationalisation used in the research

Due to the complex nature of the studied phenomenon, there exists “Myriads of terms related to internationalisation’ (de Wit (Ed.), 1995, p. 5). Alongside with the terms “internationalisation” and “Europeanisation”, this research will utilise the terms:

- *Bologna process*: “making academic degree standards and quality assurance standards more comparable and compatible throughout Europe”; (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lisbon_Recognition_Convention);
- *International cooperation*: cross-border professional links of educational or education-related organizations and institutions;
- *Internationalisation strategies*: planned and integrated approaches to the implementation of internationalisation (Knight, 2004, p. 13);
- *Internationalisation policy*, where policy means “decisions that are designed to guide future decisions, or to imitate and guide the implementation of previous decisions” (Haddad, 1995, pp.9-10) – decisions regarding internationalisation. At the national/sector level “all policies that affect or are affected by an international dimension of education are included” (Knight, 2004, p.13). At the institutional level *policy* means “statements and directives that refer to priorities and plans related to the international dimension of the institution’s mission, purpose, values and functions” (Knight, 2004, p.16).
- *Internationalisation programs* are understood as “one of the policy instruments or, more generally, as one of the ways policy is actually translated into action” (Knight, 2004, p.16) and will include sets of activities and events grouped by specific common targets or characteristics;
- *Indicators of internationalisation*: qualitative and quantitative parameters along which the process of internationalisation is measured;
- *Rationales of internationalisation* are understood as driving motives of the process;
- *Internationalisation approaches* will be treated as the way in which internationalisation is implemented;
- *National\sector level*: following Knight, (2004, p.8), the term “sector level” will be used instead of “national level” because, like in other countries, “the internationalisation of higher education is only on the agenda of the education-related departments and organisations”;
- *Institutional level* means the level of institutions – the higher education providers;
- *Internationalisation at home*: “internationalisation activities that occur on the home campus” (Knight, 2004, p. 16);

- *Internationalisation abroad* – internationalisation activities that occur across borders (Knight, 2004, p. 16).

3.3 Analysis structure

The empirical analysis of the case study of internationalisation in the higher education of Ukraine was constructed using the systemic concepts of Knight (2004) and de Wit (2002). At first, *analysis structure at the sector level* should be defined.

Description of *internationalisation context* will include a) the historic vertical context; and b) the horizontal context represented by economic, political, cultural and social factors that conditioned the present state of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine. *Motivations/rationales* section will analyse which group(s) of rationales are dominant in higher education internationalisation of Ukraine, based on the classification of de Wit (2002, p.85-99) who differentiates political, economic, academic, social/cultural and recently introduced groups of national rationales. The latter includes human resources development, strategic alliances, commercial trade and nation building (Knight, 2004, p.23). In *Stakeholders* the groups interested in the promotion of internationalisation will be named and their motivation will be specified. *Major actors of the process* will be described following the classification of Knight used for the project survey “Internationalisation of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges. 2005 IAU Global Survey Report” (2006, p. 29). It will be checked which actors out of national governmental organisations (Ministries, Agencies), international governmental organisations, national and international foundations and NGOs, educational agencies of foreign countries, professional associations, educational institutions and providers participate in internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine. Also, it will be investigated at which level they act (national, bilateral, sub-regional, regional, inter-regional, international), what roles they play (policy-making, regulating, advocacy, funding, programming, networking, information dissemination) and through which activities (scholarships, academic mobility, research, curriculum, quality assurance, etc.). *The meaning of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine and approaches to internationalisation* will be analysed bearing in mind two classifications.

The one of de Wit (2002, pp. 116-118) specifies four approaches. The *Activity approach* presupposes description of internationalisation in terms of types of activities. The *Rationale approach* focuses on purposes or intended outcomes. The *Competency approach* views internationalisation as forming new skills, attitudes and knowledge in staff, faculty and

students. The *Process approach* interprets internationalisation as a process that integrates an international dimension into the major functions of the institution.

The classification of Knight (2004, p.19) differentiates between five approaches. The *Programs approach* presumes availability of the funded programs that facilitate opportunities for international activities. In the *Rationales approach* the reasons for the importance of internationalisation are emphasised. The *Ad Hoc approach* understands internationalisation as the reactive response to new opportunities. The *Policy approach* is based on existence of policies that emphasise importance of internationalisation. At last, in the *Strategic approach* internationalisation is viewed as the key element of the strategy.

National policy and conditions section will look into the actual policies, programs and strategies that promote or impede internationalisation at the national level. The vision of Knight, who discusses “all policies that affect or are affected by an international education” (Knight, 2004, p.13), will serve as the basis. The researcher enumerates all policies that act outside the sector of education, such as foreign relations, development assistance, trade, immigration, employment, science and technology, culture, social development, etc., and the policies within the sector of education, related to licensing, accreditation, funding, curriculum, teaching, research and regulation of postsecondary education (Knight, 2004, p.13). The national policy regarding internationalisation will be contested following Veld et al. (1996, p.34) against three dimensions of the policy system: decision-making (degree of decentralisation in decision making), points of reference for steering (inputs and outputs), policy instruments (enforcement, money and persuasion). Also, it will be identified whether steering by incentives or steering by regulation prevails in the national policy (Veld et al., 1996, p.78). *Policy implementation* section will discuss the outcomes of the policy implementation. Specifically, it will look into achievements and failures, obstacles and supporting factors as well as how they promote or impede internationalisation.

The study will use the documents analysis (Law on Education, National Doctrine of Education Development, etc.), analysis of statistics obtained from the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, interviews with the officials from higher education and Ukrainian scholars, empirical observations and experience at the time of my service as the Head of the International Cooperation Office at the Donetsk State University of Management (1999-2004).

Internationalisation is a phenomenon that takes place on the institutional level primarily, and consequently policies and programmes are developed on the national level to

regulate, stimulate and facilitate the activities of international dimension of the universities. Therefore, *analysis at the institutional level* is also required.

At the beginning, the “generalised model” of internationalisation at a Ukrainian university will be described, following the scheme by J. Knight (2004). *Influencing factors (external and internal context)* include mission, student population, facility profile, geographic location, funding sources, orientation to local, national and international interest (p. 25). In *Rationales* the same four groups of rationales named for the national level plus the recently acquiring importance institutional group of rationales, such as international branding and profile, income generation, student and staff development, strategic alliances, knowledge production (p.23), will be investigated. Though the groups are the same, the prevailing rationales might differ from the ones prevailing at the national/sector level. *Institutional policies* as “statements and directives that refer to priorities and plans related to the international dimension of the institution’s mission, purpose, values and functions” (Knight, 2004, p. 16) will be studied. *Programs* will be discussed “as the policy instrument, or more generally, as one of the ways in which policy is actually translated into action” (Knight, 2004, p. 16). It should be checked if they exist at the level of universities because the fact of internationalisation programmes signals about the quite advanced stand of affairs at the university. *Strategies* (both program and organisational initiatives) used to entrench internationalisation “into the culture, policy, planning and organisational processes of the institution so that it is not marginalized or treated as a passing fad” (de Wit, 2002, p. 124) will be identified. The universities will be checked against the following elements of organisational strategies, formulated by Knight and de Wit (1995, pp.20-22): the commitment of the board and the senior administration; the support and involvement of a critical mass of faculty and staff; the international office or a person affiliated with coordinating the international activities; adequate external and internal funding; policy; incentives and rewards for faculty and staff; annual planning, budget, and review process. According to the results of the analysis the prevailing organisational strategy (mix of strategies) out of the four will be chosen: Governance, Operations, Support Services, and Human Resource Development (Organisation strategies) and Academic Programs, Research and Scholarly Collaboration, External Relations and Extracurricular as Program Strategies (Knight, 2004, pp. 14-15). The constituents of these strategies are made by specific activities. *Activities* will be analysed in two streams, following the division for the purpose of the survey and empirical analysis (Knight, 2005, pp. 27-28) – “internationalisation at home” and “internationalisation abroad”. The “internationalisation at home” stream as “activities that happen on a home campus”

(Knight, 2005, p. 27) will cover activities in a) curriculum and programs, b) teaching/learning process, c) extra-curricular activities, d) liaison with local/ethnic groups, e) research and scholarly activities. The “internationalisation abroad” stream (rather than “cross-border education” or “transnational education” which cause active discussions) will cover a) movement of people, b) delivery of programs, c) mobility of providers, e) international projects.

Further on, the case studies of two universities will be investigated along the same parameters. Also, the thesis will strive to analyse internationalisation at the institutional level against *seven models*.

The first set is made by four organisational strategies.

Neave’s (UNESCO) model presupposes two sets of polarity placed in the system of coordinates. It differentiates, on one side, between centralised and decentralised models of internationalisation administration. In this polarity the first one is “leadership driven”, that is initiated and monitored by central administration. The second is “base unit driven” in which the central administrative units are considered as supporting initiatives coming from specific units (de Wit, 2002, p. 126). Additionally, it identifies the administration model as either “definitional” (synonymic to “proactive” and based on planning, initiating activities, setting procedures) or “elaborative” (synonymic to “reactive” and based on coordinating, monitoring, screening, applying). This applies to both the level of central administration and the base unit level.

Rudzki’s (UK) model (in de Wit, 2002, p. 128) is based on the four key dimensions of internationalisation – student mobility, staff development, curriculum innovation, organisational change. He identifies:

- 1) Five stages of the reactive mode: a) stage of contact (limited mobility, engagement of academic staff in international contacts, curriculum development, no clear formulation of purpose of the contacts); b) stage of formalisation (formalisation of links in institutional agreements, resources might be available or not); c) stage of central control (expansion of activities and gaining of control over international contacts by administration); d) stage of conflict (organisational conflict of management and staff and possible decline of international activities); e) stage of maturity or decline (possible shift to a proactive approach or complete decline);
- 2) Five stages of the proactive mode: a) stage of analysis (awareness of the importance of internationalisation and understanding of its meaning, taking decision whether internationalise or not, strategic analysis of the objectives, resources, staff professional

training); b) stage of choice (elaboration of a strategic plan and policy, performance measures defined and resources allocated); c) stage of implementation (measuring performance); d) stage of review (assessment of performance against policy or a plan), e) stage of redefinition of objectives (issues of quality and improvements).

Davies's quadrant of strategies, based on counter polarity of “central-marginal” and “systematic – ad-hoc” of international work (Davies, in Block, 1995, pp. 16-17), emphasizes the organisational strategies in response to combination of internal institutional environment formed by the mission, traditions and self-image; SWOT analysis of programmes, personnel, finance; organisational leadership structure and external environment formed by external perceptions of image and identity of a university; evaluation of trends and opportunities in international market; assessment of competition. He differentiates between:

- A central-systematic strategy, showing intensive multiple and cohered activities, where the international mission of a university “is explicit and followed through with specific policies and supporting procedures” (Davies, 1995, p.16);
- An ad-hoc strategy, characterised by a high level of international activities at a university undertaken without a clear concept in an ad-hoc character;
- A systematic-marginal strategy is represented by limited but well-organised activities based on a clear concept;
- An ad hoc- marginal strategy, reflected in little activity not based on clear concepts.

Van Dijk and Meijer's (Dutch) model (in de Wit, 2002, pp.132-133) upgrades Davies's quadrant into a cube based on the simultaneous consideration of three aspects: “policy” (importance of internationalisation), “support” (support to internationalisation) and “implementation” (method of implementation). A policy can be marginal or central, the support – one-sided or interactive, implementation – systematic or ad hoc. Different combinations of these aspects, like cells in the cube, reflect different routes towards making internationalisation an institutional priority in the organisations, allowing distinguish between “slow starters”, “organised leaders” and “entrepreneurial institutions”.

The second set is formed by the *process and activity models*:

Söderqvist's five stage evolution (Finnish) model is based on the dominant types of activities. The zero stage is represented by internationalisation as marginal activity, the first stage is characterised by the student mobility, the second stage emphasises curriculum and research internationalisation, the third stage concentrates on institutionalisation of internationalisation, the fourth stage bases on commercialising of the outcomes of internationalisation (<http://www.eaie.org/pdf/F41art2.pdf>).

Van der Wende's (Dutch) model relies on understanding of internationalisation as an innovation process. The researcher distinguishes between four stages of an innovative process: 1) recognising the need for change; 2) planning and formulating a solution; 3) initiating and implementing a plan; 4) institutionalisation or termination (Van der Wende, 1999, p.7).

Knight's internationalisation cycle describes six phases of integration of internationalisation into the culture and the systems of higher education institution: 1) the phase of awareness of needs and benefits of internationalisation for all groups at a university; 2) the phase of commitment by all groups (board, senior administration, staff, students); 3) the phase of planning through identifying goals, needs and resources, priorities, strategies; 4) the phase of operationalisation in academic activities and services, using guiding principles and organisational factors; 5) the phase of review based on assessing and enhancing the quality and impact of activities as well as assessing the progress of the strategy; 6) the phase of reinforcement characterised by development of incentives, recognition and rewards for all groups involved in international activities (de Wit, 2002, p. 135).

The analysis of the case studies through several models will reveal different aspects of internationalisation: 1) "Measuring the formal, paper commitment of institutions against the practice to be found in concrete operating structures" (de Wit, 2002, p.133); 2) Checking institutions for implicit or explicit internationalisation strategies; 3) Identifying strengths and weaknesses of the process at the institution.

The generalising "prototype" will be based on the empirical observations of institutional internationalisation in Ukraine since 1999. The research material for the case studies will be formed by the institutional documents (plans, reports, programs and policies) and the interviews of the officials in charge of international cooperation.

In the end of the chapter, the differences and similarities between the case study universities and the prototype will be identified. Also, similarities and differences in internationalisation of the two universities will be detected.

4 Internationalisation of the higher education system in Ukraine at the sector level

4.1 A brief overview of the higher education system in Ukraine

The higher education system of Ukraine includes two major educational levels, namely basic higher education and full higher education. The legislation on education established the

following educational and qualification levels: Junior Specialist, Bachelor, Specialist, Master, as well as scientific degrees of Candidate of Sciences (similar to Ph. D.) and Doctor of Sciences (similar to Habilitation). Main indicators of higher education development in Ukraine include basic and derivative ones. They are presented in the chart below.

Chart 1. Main indicators of higher education development in Ukraine

Basic indicators	Derivative indicators
1. Number of higher education institutions (including the publicly funded ones)	1. Number of higher education students per 10000 population
2. Number of students (thousands)	2. Share of public higher education institutions in the overall network of institutions (%)
3. Student enrolment (thousands)	3. Share of private higher education institutions in the overall network (%)
4. Student graduation (thousands)	4. Share of full-time higher education students in the overall student number (%)
5. Number of teaching staff (thousands)	5. Share of the full-time student enrolment in the overall enrolment (%)
6. Overall area of the teaching and research buildings (thousands of m ²)	6. Share of student graduation from the full-time studies in the overall graduation (%)
	7. Area of the teaching and research buildings per a full-time student (m ²)

Source: Education of Ukraine. Informational-analytical review, 2001, p.26

The system of higher education of Ukraine incorporates 861 higher education institutions of different accreditation levels, including 86% public and 14% non-public ones. The private higher education institutions are legally acknowledged and controlled by the state through the licensing mechanism and accreditation. According to the status of higher education institutions, the following four levels of accreditation are distinguished:

- Level I: vocational schools and other institutions equalled to them which train junior specialists, using educational and professional programs (EPPs);
- Level II: colleges and other higher education institutions equalled to them which teach bachelors, and, if needed, junior specialists, using EPPs;
- Level III: institutes, conservatories, academies and universities which teach bachelors and specialists, as well as junior specialists, if needed, using EPPs;
- Level IV: institutes, conservatories, academies and universities which teach bachelors, masters and specialists, if needed, using EPPs (http://www.ednu.kiev.ua/edu_h_e.htm).

Normative training cycles under different educational and qualification levels are:

- 3 years for a Junior Specialist (on the basis of full comprehensive secondary education);
- 4 years for a Bachelor (on the basis of full comprehensive secondary education);

- 1 year for a Specialist (on the basis of the first degree);
- 1 year for a Master (on the basis of the first degree).

According to the State Statistics Committee (<http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua>), 511 vocational schools and colleges (I-II level of accreditation) and 350 institutes, conservatories, academies, universities (III-IV level of accreditation) function in Ukraine at present. All in all, 2.6 million students are enrolled in the higher education system in 2010 which constitutes about 5.7% of the total population of 45.8 million. In the academic year 2004-2005 the proportion of the Master's level students to the overall student body was 2.9% (Higher education and science, 2005, p.31). The number of doctoral students ("aspirants" and "doctorants") amounts to 35578 (<http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua>). Studies of 60% of students at Bachelor's and Master's level are covered by state funding. The rest of the student body pay for studies because since 1995 the paid educational services were introduced at Ukrainian higher education institutions. The studies of doctoral students are completely covered by the state funding.

The chart below shows the most vivid trends of higher education development in Ukraine since 1991.

Chart 2. Dynamics of higher education development in Ukraine

Year	Population mln	HEI, all	HEI I-II accredit. level	HEI, III-IV accredit. Level	HEI students, all, thousand	HEI doctoral students	HEI students per 10000 population
1991	51,9	910	754	159	1615	13374	310
1995	51,7	1010	778	232	1533	16570	297
2000	49,4	971	658	313	1789	23487	360
2005	47,3	966	619	347	2575	29683	545
2010	45,8	861	350	511	2597	35578	567

Source: Higher education and science – the most important spheres of responsibility of the civil society and the basis for innovative development. Informational-analytical materials of the final board of the Ministry of Education and Science, 2005, pp. 8-27

The first trend is massification in all study cycles. The chart shows that the number of students increased since 1991 by 60%, the number of students per 10000 of population – by 83%, the number of doctoral students ("aspirants" and "doctorants") – by 166%. The other trends include the diversification in the form of property; the optimisation of the higher education institutions network through vertical and horizontal mergers; the increasing portion of citizens with higher education degree in the context of demographic shrinking; stable expenditures for higher education (in the years 200-2004 this was 0.3% of GDP, *ibid*, p. 14).

The higher education system of Ukraine is the descendant of the higher education system of the Soviet Union which was characterised by both positive features (a well-developed and multifunctional system, solid fundamental and life sciences and engineering, strong pedagogy, state-formed demand for graduates) and negative ones (distance to the international community, ideological colouring, disproportional emphasis on technical fields of studies and ignoring social sciences, strong vertical administrative structure, primarily teacher-oriented approach, etc.).

4.2 Political, economic and social contexts of national higher education internationalisation

The internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine since the beginning of the 1990s was stimulated by the combination of factors.

The political factor was expressed predominantly by the opening of the country to the world. New political orientations in the foreign relations policy were significantly facilitated by the international organisations that came in Ukraine. The largest of them are the European Commission, the World Bank and the United Nations Organisation.

The economic factor revealed itself in the deep economic changes, including the liberalisation of trade and the arrival of international corporations that called for the new western-type knowledge and the new type of workforce. These new higher education stakeholders acquired an increasing influence in Ukraine and stimulated pressure on the labour market for global “economic utilitarianism” in the form of the more applicable knowledge, universalism and high professionalism in the narrow specialisations. “We are now in a new era of power and influence. Politics and ideology have taken a subordinate role to profits and market-driven policies” (Altbach, 2004, pp.11-12).

At this time a new “Westernised” type of citizen was forming with the stress on a personality role in the society and the growing importance of education for the wellbeing. This caused the increasing demand for higher education access and, as a result, the growth of the higher education sector and its diversification. The constantly shrinking funding in the light of demographic reductions stimulated competition of universities and appearance of private universities. Massification of higher education in combination with the outdated infrastructure decreased the quality of the provided educational services and the loss of higher education prestige in the society. Consequently, “brain drain” of best students and graduates abroad as well as the outflow of the teaching staff from the field started.

The sector clearly needed reforms, but which ones? Signing the Bologna Declaration made everything simple: the Ukrainian higher education sector chose the European Higher Education Area as its beacon. Ukraine committed to adopting international standards of education and adjusting to them in the light of its international ambitions, proving the statement: “One major trend of globalisation related to reforming and restructuring higher education is the intention to make the higher education systems more globally competitive” (NG, <http://www.docin.com/p-72331117.html>). This means that the issues of improving the international status of the whole system became equally important to the system alongside with responding to the needs of society, specifically to the needs of the market.

4.3 Historical overview of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine

Grass-root international cooperation of universities before 2005

In the period of fundamental social and economic changes in Ukraine the internationalisation served as an instrument in “attaining European standards in terms of access to education, revival of national traditions, modernising content, forms and methods of teaching, and the development of the nation’s intellectual capital” (Kremen and Nikolajenko, 2006, p. 18). This “modern” period of the internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine started simultaneously with the commencement of the active phase internationally. Before 1991, in the Soviet higher education, internationalisation primarily focused on the attraction of foreign students from the “socialist camp” countries as well as from the Asian and African countries; the spot exchange of student groups with “socialist” and “capitalist” countries; rare internships of teaching staff abroad.

In the 1990s, national higher education was pushed to introduce reforms that envisaged an increasing autonomy of educational institutions, a reconsideration of state control in education, diversification of educational planning and financing and a democratisation of academic governance (Kremen and Nikolajenko, 2006, p. 18). Internationalisation of higher education in this period can be considered a part of a strategy for economic reforms, pursued by many countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Internationalisation, first of all, provided the academic community of Ukraine with the opportunity to re-join the international community of scholars (Bremer, 1997, p.205). Second, the bunch of new activities was on rise: westernised curricula were introduced, new areas and thematic studies appeared, studies of foreign languages gained importance, the influx of foreign lecturers grew considerably. At this time the first students and teaching staff headed for foreign countries for studies, internships and professional exchanges independently and

with the support of the foreign embassies (the most active were USA, Germany, France, Great Britain, Sweden, Canada) and cultural educational intermediary organisations (American Councils for International Education, DAAD-German Academic Exchange Service, Alliance Francaise, British Council).

The growing area of activity required, at least, some level of coordination at universities. This is why the offices of international cooperation were set up in the period 1992-1995 and their supervision was charged to one of the vice-rectors. No procedures of implementing international grass-root activities existed at that point and every new contact and initiative was welcomed. The new Law of Ukraine on Education (1996) incorporated the section that put integration of Ukrainian higher education into the international educational community as a priority goal. It formulated the goals of international cooperation and stipulated the rights of the universities in undertaking international academic, research and economic activities and charged the Department of International Cooperation of the Ministry of Education with supervision and coordination of international dimension nationally.

In the mid-1990s, the projects aimed at the systemic restructuring of universities came to Ukraine led by the EU-funded TEMPUS. The program “focused on improvements of university governance and management, upgrading old curricula and developing new courses and programs, professional development of teachers” (<http://www.tempus.org.ua/en/tempus/tempus-v-ukraini.html>). This was the turning point where internationalisation shifted from being the goal in itself to serving as “an important resource in the development of post-secondary education” (Lajos, 1996 in Bremer, 1997, p. 206). The US funded University Cooperation Projects played the same role but their number was modest (17 three-year partnerships of US and Ukrainian Universities under FSA program for years 1999-2007 (unpublished data) as compared with 115 TEMPUS projects within the same period. “This allowed introduce joint study courses, new principles of higher education institutions management, develop modern manuals, elaborate approaches to mutual recognition of degree stating documents” (Kremin (Ed.), 2004, p. 6).

To sum up, this internationalisation period can be labelled as the period of bottom-up initiatives when universities developed their own opportunities of international cooperation using the funding support of the international intermediary organisations.

Top-down structural internationalisation after 2005

In the early 2000s Ukraine shifted the political interest towards the European Union. To a great degree, this happened due to the fact that it lost the status of the prioritised object of strategic interest and funding of the USA, which in the previous period served as the principal

investor in the programs of mobility and reforms. For the year 2001, 60% of international financial aid in higher education was reported to come from Europe (Education of Ukraine, 2001, p. 17). Besides, at this time the country left the orbit of Russia's political dominance.

The higher education system, copying the national political trend, turned its eyes towards the European Higher Education Area. In 2005 a new period of internationalisation started in Ukraine. The national government, having in mind to become a member of the European Union, signed the Bologna Declaration in aspiration to integrate into the political, social and cultural European space through upgrading and reforming higher education. This event signalled the commencement of the top-down internationalisation of higher education, introduced by the corresponding principal state body – the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. “The Programme of actions towards implementation of the provisions of the Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education and science of Ukraine” was designed and introduced. Similar to Europe, hot discussions of educational experts, professionals in education, teaching staff followed introduction of the designed reforms, especially at the institutional level. Guliajeva (2005, p.78) indicates as one of the trends of higher education development in Ukraine the unclear indication of the place and the role of Ukraine in the system of coordinates of international education area and the striving to join the structures that might cause the loss of the national model of higher education. But, as any politically grounded initiative, the Bologna process was enforced slowly and gradually and grasped the minds of administrators, teachers, students and researchers. All changes in the structure, content and administration in higher education are perceived at present in the light of “European dimension”, though few experts can intelligibly explain the meaning of this term and the envisaged benefits for the educational system of Ukraine. Nevertheless, activities undertaken within the framework of the Bologna process are considered “innovative” which in Ukraine is understood as potentially bringing benefits.

Major goals of the Programme of implementation of Bologna standards formulated in the “Action programme regarding the implementation of the provisions of the Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education of Ukraine” envisage a complex of innovations (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>). The document formulates the targets to improve the two-degree structure of higher education system, adopt the transparent and understandable scale of diplomas, degrees and qualifications, introduce the universal system of credits and diploma supplement, taking into consideration the European practice of accreditation and quality assurance of education, support and develop the European quality standards, eliminate barriers to the mobility of students, teaching staff and researchers,

introduce modern approaches to integration of higher education and science in training at Master's and Doctoral degrees, assure further development of autonomy and self-governance in the system of higher education and science.

“Bolonisation” in Ukraine is administered at the central national level by the Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine (MESYSU) which before December 2010 was titled the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MESU). The process is strictly planned and legally framed. It enjoys programmatic and informational support articulated in the corresponding documents laid out at the website of MESYSU (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher/bolpr>) and in the reference books and manuals (e.g. “Higher education of Ukraine and Bologna Process” manual by the then-Minister Vasily Kremin', 2004). The legal basis was formed by multiple orders, resolutions and directive letters, for example MESU Order № 49 dated 23.01.2004 “On approval of the Programme of actions on implementation of the provisions of the Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education and science of Ukraine for 2004-2005”, MESU Order № 774 dated 30.12.2004 “On introduction of credit-module system of educational process organisation” (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher/bolpr>). The reform is unfolding in accordance with the long-term and short-term plans formulated in the Order № 612 “On approval of the Plan of actions to assure quality of higher education of Ukraine and its integration into the European and world community for the period till 2010” dated 13.07.2007 (ibid).

Following the requirements of the European bodies the Bologna process is monitored and its results are assessed in national reports on the achievements, such as “Ukraine's national report 2005-2007”, “Principal trends of modernisation of higher education structure in Ukraine”, “Main developments in the higher education system of Ukraine 2007-2009” (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>).

In this period internationalisation diversified in forms and activities, its driving goal was shaped and formulated for the coming five-ten years. Regarding this process Bremer can be cited (1997, p. 206): “This is an interesting phenomenon: the interim results of reform, being achieved partly through international cooperation, are having the effect that further reform efforts are being targeted towards internationalisation”.

Thus, whereas before commencement of the Bologna process internationalisation served higher education in responding mostly to the needs of the Ukrainian society, later it was called additionally to make the sector more internationally competitive and attractive for foreign students.

4.4 Rationales for internationalisation

Kehm and Teichler (2007, p.262) note: “Internationalisation is associated with strong political undercurrents”. As the previous sections show, the present *political rationale* for internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine, namely the striving of the Government of Ukraine to join the European Community, serves as the driving force (foreign policy factor in classification of Knight) and this rationale is regionally coloured (regional and national identity) in the view of Europeanisation. Also, the government of Ukraine seeks to re-new the international recognition of the system enjoyed under the times of the Soviet Union.

Of equal importance is the economic rationale. OECD indicates that at least 40% of European countries’ internationalisation is partly driven by economic rationales related to international competitiveness (OECD, 2004, p. 100). In the USSR only the state coordinated and controlled higher education, but after 1991 the market started gaining influence alongside the remaining strong power of the state, whereas the role of institutions increased, but not considerably. “Higher education has become commercial, whether we like it or not” says Söderqvist (2007, p.14) and this is applicable to Ukraine. More emphasis on the market economy and trade liberalisation, decreased public support of education, including higher education, made international cooperation an important resource of funding for international activities and structural innovations which substitutes state budget allocation for internationalisation. *The economic rationale* is expressed in the wish to cooperate with international organisations because they provide funding not only for mobility as part of internationalisation, but also for university structural reforms, development and modernisation of content and teaching instruments (financial incentives and technical assistance). “Higher education internationalisation has become a key entrepreneurial issue for educational institutions” (Reichert and Wächter, 2000, p. 32, in Söderqvist, 2007, p.16) and Ukraine has not been an exception in this aspect.

The group of *social/cultural rationales* is weak in Ukraine because the issues of national and cultural identity, intercultural understanding and citizenship development are not popular in the social life of the country, though they are declared as priorities in the policy documents on higher education (e.g. in National Doctrine of Education Development).

Development of a strong international reputation is important for Ukraine and all programmatic documents (Programme “Osvita” (1993), National Doctrine of Education Development (2000), Law of Ukraine on Education (1996), Law of Ukraine on Higher Education (2002) stress the importance of “developing higher education of Ukraine towards the level of achievements of developed countries of the world and its integration into the

international scientific-educational community” (Law of Ukraine on Education, 1996). The necessity to enhance the international reputation of the Ukrainian system of higher education brings forward the *academic rationale of internationalisation* in the expectation to upgrade the quality of provided services and to approximate it to the international academic standards through adding the international dimension to research and teaching, the extension of academic horizon and innovative institution building.

Observations show that out of the “new” group of rationales, such as human resources development, strategic alliances, commercial trade and nation building (Knight, 2004, p.23) two rationales are important. Human resources development is a high priority in Ukraine and it goes hand in hand with the demand of the labour market for well educated, highly competitive professionals. Building of strategic alliances in the case of Ukraine is the by-pass result of international collaboration, not the targeted and expected result.

Therefore, more pragmatic – academic, political and economic – internationalisation rationales prevail over the cultural and social ones in Ukraine, revealing similarity the international trend.

4.5 Meaning of internationalisation

Internationalisation has different meanings, understandings and notions in different countries. In Ukraine the following meanings can be traced:

Focus on activities

Until 2005 internationalisation was understood as “international cooperation activities”. This term and the term “international links” dominate in major policy documents at the sector level. The term “internationalisation” is still rarely used and few professionals in higher education will dare assign it with a grounded definition. International cooperation has been always understood as an instrumental but peripheral process in Ukrainian higher education, serving the operational goals of bringing funding, adding bonuses to the status, enjoying exotic and exciting activities rather than making an international dimension a part and parcel of the policy and strategy.

Assessment based on quantitative indicators and detailed reporting

Reflecting the activity approach, the results of the international cooperation of universities reported to MESYSU have always been accumulated in enlisting of activities and assessment of these activities by quantitative indicators, such as the number of international agreements, figures of mobility and amounts of allocated funds. There are six forms of annual reporting

circulated out to universities as parts of the annual Letter of MESYSU “On international cooperation” (e.g. the letter dated 05.12. 2008) which requests for:

- Information on cooperation with foreign universities (name of the university, date of agreement signing, major area of cooperation);
- Information on the foreign language studies at a university (number of students that study the first foreign language, the second foreign language; number of students that study foreign language optionally; number of teachers of foreign languages);
- Information on foreign trips of administration, teaching staff and students, including the goal of the trips (participation in conferences, language courses, full study course, partial study course, teaching, doctoral courses), number of people who undertook the trips;
- Information on participation of a university in international organisations, programmes and projects (area of cooperation, partner, project period, volume of funding, expected results);
- Information on visiting lecturers and experts (sending country, number of guests, goal, period of stay);
- Information on the Rector’s foreign trips (country, goal of the trip, dates, host organisation).

Focus on individual mobility

Internationalisation in Ukrainian higher education is understood, first of all, as individual mobility financed from own sources or by international organisations. Individual mobility is the cornerstone of all strategic contacts, though the numerous obstacles (financial shortage, unfriendly immigration rules, lack of administrative and legislative support at the national and institutional levels) impede its more active expansion. Here I do not agree with Bremer (1997, p.237) who states: “Whereas in EU countries focus of internationalisation is put on the individuals, in Central and Eastern European countries it is placed on the institutional level”. This trend is not characteristic for Ukraine.

Internationalisation = Bologna Process

For majority of researchers and professionals in Ukraine internationalisation equates to the Bologna Process. Being only a kind of internationalisation, it is highlighted as the central priority, actively promoted and cultivated, whereas traditional international cooperation is still considered as less important.

With the start of the Bologna provisions implementation, quality and structural results of internationalisation came into consideration. Whereas before 2005 curriculum development, foreign languages and mobility were prioritised, after 2005 the importance of the mentioned activities stayed unchanged, but the issues of structural reforms and quality

assurance came into the first sight.

4.6 Approaches to internationalisation

The previous reflections show that the approach to higher education internationalisation in Ukraine can be characterised, predominantly, as the Activities approach, which according to de Wit (2002, p.116) “describes internationalisation in terms of categories or types of activities”. At the same time, participation in the Bologna reforms brought the elements of the Rationale approach “which defines internationalisation in terms of its purposes or intended outcomes”. This approach is applicable to the part of internationalisation aimed at joining the European Higher Education Area and duplicating the European educational structures, proving the statement of the Chinese researcher NG: “Reproducing or duplicating Western educational polices and institutions is part of the internationalisation process” (p.9, <http://www.docin.com/p-72331117.html>).

In the view of the above stated goal, *the Competency approach* “which looks at internationalisation in terms of developing new skills, attitudes, and knowledge in students, faculty and staff” (de Wit, 2002, p.117) also can be traced in the internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine but rather at the institutional level. As mentioned by de Wit, learning, career and global (transnational or international) competences are still rare as principal targets of internationalisation activities. *The Process approach* is not observed in Ukraine because national higher education internationalisation cannot be characterised as the process “that integrates an international dimension or perspective into the major functions of the institution” (Wit, 2002, p. 118) or the higher education system in this case. Therefore, in terms of de Wit’s classification, the Rationale and the Activities approach are dominant.

Under Knight’s classification, internationalisation in Ukraine combines the features of the Rationales approach, the Ad Hoc approach and the Policy approach. *The Rationales approach* in which “internationalisation is presented in terms of why it is important that a national education sector become more international” (Knight, 2004, p. 19) is reflected in the political and economic rationales. *The Ad Hoc approach* presumes that “internationalisation is treated as an ad hoc or reactive response to the many opportunities that are being presented for international delivery, mobility, and cooperation in postsecondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 19). In Ukraine, the national higher education system is primarily reactive to external opportunities. Internationalisation, to a great degree, is developing due to national (employment market) and international (influence of supranational organisations) factors. In *the Policy approach* “internationalisation is described in terms of policies that address or

emphasise the importance of international or intercultural dimension” (Knight, 2004, p. 19). Ukraine shows the features of this approach by participating in the Bologna process.

In conclusion, it can be said that before 2005 the Ad Hoc approach prevailed, whereas after 2005 the Rationales and Policy approaches additionally acquired higher importance. The Strategic and Programs approaches are not reflected in the case of the sector level of Ukraine.

4.7 Internationalisation players

The pool of internationalisation players has been progressively expanding and is quite diverse, as well as the level and the degree of influence on the internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine.

National players

Governmental departments and agencies

The Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine, like in any centrally governed system, plays the primary role in every educational initiative. According to the 2002 poll its level of influence on the decisions in education is 62.4%, as compared with business (5.6%) or the educational community with 16% (The system of education in Ukraine: main indicators, 2002, p. 44). This body executes policy-making, regulative, coordinative and controlling functions related to higher education internationalisation. The functions are assigned mostly to the Department of International Cooperation and European Integration, partly to the Department of Higher Education and the Department of Licensing, Accreditation and Nostrification. MESYSU’s mission regarding internationalisation is formulated as “assurance of integration of the national education and science as well as of the state system of protection of intellectual property into the international community while preserving and protecting national interests” (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=international>). MESYSU interacts with the Government, the Supreme Council, other ministries and higher education institutions at the national level, with international organisations at the international level and with the corresponding ministries, educational agencies and assistance programs at the bilateral level. The responsibilities of the Ministry include:

- In cooperation with the Ministry of International Affairs to organise selection and training for the embassies and representative offices of Ukraine at international organisations of employees who will be responsible for scientific and scientific-technical cooperation;
- Initiate and sign international agreements on cooperation in science and education; take responsibility for their implementation;

- Promote cooperation of higher educational institutions of Ukraine with higher educational institutions, scientific organisations, NGOs and foundations of other countries; contribute into international events for youth and students;
- Organise and coordinate international cooperation in the areas of education, science, innovative activities and intellectual property;
- Promote participation of scientists, researchers and teaching staff in development and implementation of international scientific-technological programmes and projects
(<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=international>).

In reality, MESYSU through the Department of International Cooperation signs international agreements on cooperation, monitors all aspects of international cooperation process through the special reporting forms submitted by the universities regulates the process and results of internationalisation (the structure and the content of study courses), assures recognition of foreign education degrees through the “nostrification” service¹.

The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the Supreme Council of Ukraine and the Ministry of Justice in cooperation with MESYSU form the legislative basis for international cooperation of the sector and participate in policy-making at the national level. The Ministry of International Affairs regulates immigration issues of international mobility. Therefore, it interacts with MESYSU and the immigration offices at the national level and with the counterpart ministries of foreign countries. The Ministry of Finance in cooperation with MESYSU monitors the financial issues of international cooperation at both sector and institutional levels.

National professional and buffer organisations, like regional rectors’ councils, are not powerful in Ukraine and do not influence the internationalisation policy formation and implementation.

Education providers (state and private universities) are undertakers of academic and scientific international cooperation which promotes their internationalisation.

International players

The group of international players of internationalisation in Ukraine is constituted by governmental organisations, semi-governmental international cooperation organisations, international professional associations, international foundations, offices of international

¹ Nostrification is the procedure of recognition of the foreign education documents which is carried out through establishing correspondence of academic, professional rights and educational, educational-qualifying degrees of the foreign documents on education (qualifications) to the state standards of education of Ukraine aimed at assuring the rights of the citizens who completed education in the foreign countries to continue education and undertake professional activity in Ukraine and is provided on the individual basis (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=nostr>).

programmes and projects, offices of educational and cultural cooperation of the embassies of foreign countries in Ukraine.

Governmental organisations (the United Nations Organisation, the European Commission, the World Bank, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) and international development agencies (the United States Agency on International Development, the Swedish Agency on International Development, the Canadian Agency on International Development) perform activities at the international and regional (meaning European region for the European Commission) levels.

Semi-governmental international cooperation organisations (educational and research agencies of foreign countries) act at the bilateral level and include German Service of Academic Exchanges, Alliance Francaise, British Council, Swedish Institute, etc.

Cooperation with *international professional associations* is beneficial on both levels. For example, cooperation of the MESYSU with the European Network for Quality Assurance and cooperation of universities with European Association of International Education at the institutional level is strong.

International foundations and offices of international programmes and projects, offices of educational and cultural cooperation of the embassies of foreign countries in Ukraine. International foundations, such as Friedrich Ebert Foundation, Renaissance Foundation, etc.; offices of international programmes and projects, like US Fulbright Programme, US International Research Exchanges, American Councils for International Education, Trans-European Mobility Programme for University Studies (TEMPUS) of the European Union; and offices of educational and cultural cooperation of foreign countries in Ukraine are well known by international cooperation professionals in Ukraine as a source of multi-facet support for universities, individual students and researchers. Most of the above listed organisations perform activities at the international or bilateral level. Their influence and role in the internationalisation of the higher education sector in Ukraine cannot be overestimated.

First, they contribute to the internationalisation-supportive policies and influence the national priorities of international cooperation and the national higher education policy. Second, they provide major funding for international cooperation. For example, in 2002 alone the annual assistance of the international organisations exceeded \$ 25 million (The system of education in Ukraine: main indicators, 2002, p. 20). Third, they provide methodological and informational support in developing new courses and university structures. For example, in September 2010, representative offices of the United Nations and the European Commission

in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Science and the Ministry for Family, Youth and Sports designed and launched the Gender Studies Departments at five Ukrainian universities. Also, these organisations assist in networking and information dissemination regarding opportunities of international cooperation and studies abroad.

Summarising the roles of higher education internationalisation players in Ukraine, we can say that the national governmental offices tend to play regulative, policy-making and coordinative roles, whereas international organisations participate in policy making and perform the functions of stimulation and funding. The cooperation is traced at the following lines: *international organisations – Ukrainian governmental bodies in higher education, international organisations – Ukrainian universities, Ukrainian governmental bodies in higher education – Ukrainian universities*. Cooperation involving all these players simultaneously is not popular yet which reduces the speed and the results of internationalisation at the sector level.

4.8 Internationalisation stakeholders

The group of stakeholders of higher education internationalisation in Ukraine includes the State, the university (university management, the academic oligarchy and students), the market (employers) and international organisations.

The State in the form of the MESYSU pursues political interests in internationalisation and heads towards Bolonisation hypostasis of internationalisation. The Ministry does not consider complex and continuous internationalisation as a priority. Therefore, it has no internationalisation strategy or plan and funding required for implementation of such complex initiative. Rather, international cooperation serves as a status aspect showing that top managers of the higher education system play the “*comme il faut*” game. The university stakeholder group includes sub-groups of university management, academic oligarchy and students. Top managers of universities understand that the internationalised profile makes their higher education institution more competitive in different aspects. Therefore, they support international cooperation but the degree of their support depends on the importance they assign to it and resources available. Major stakeholders interested in the dynamic internationalisation of universities are, certainly, talented and active students searching opportunities to develop skills and acquire new knowledge that increase their competitiveness at the graduate labour market in Ukraine. Unfortunately, employment in European countries is unrealistic for Ukrainian graduates due to the “the developing country” status of Ukraine and resulting tough labour migration limitations. Therefore, unlike the European situation,

internationalisation promotes internal employment of higher calibre. The academic oligarchy represented by teaching staff and researchers are interested in international linkages, joint project cooperation in academic affairs and research in terms of enhancing their professionalism. Employers who provide well paid qualified jobs (usually these are international and national corporations or offices of international organisations) express demand for the knowledge and competencies that can be formed through innovative forms and content of teaching, international context and experience. International and supranational organisations that are dedicated to assisting Ukraine in integration into the international economic community, further development of democracy and promotion of educational services provided by their home countries (relates to bilateral educational organisations) can be also considered a group of internationalisation stakeholders.

Though several groups of stakeholders exist, their efforts are not well coordinated, especially in national internationalisation policy formation and, as a result, do not produce a synergic effect.

4.9 National policy of internationalisation: development and implementation

Knight (2004, p.6) indicates: “The national/sector level has an important influence on the international dimension of higher education through *policy, funding, programs, and regulatory frameworks*”. At the national level internationalisation can be understood as “all policies and activities of governments and higher education institutions at making higher education (more) responsive to the challenges of globalisation” (Huisman and van der Wende, 2005, p.11). Therefore, it is important to analyse what national policies regarding internationalisation have been developed in Ukraine, by which bodies, and what factors of influence can be tracked in the process.

Bremer (1997, p. 240) states that development of national policy is an interplay of international, national and institutional forces and, at present, market forces. How is this applicable to the national policy of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine and what is the weight of each force in the policy implementation?

The analysis of the coordination mechanism in higher education of Ukraine according to the Clark’s triangle (Clark, 1986, p. 143) shows that the state authority has been dominant in Ukraine since the times of the Soviet Union. After independence the market plays an ever increasing role, but unlike the dominant situation in which “the balance between regulation and competition in higher education has shifted dramatically in favour of competition” (Lynn Meek, 2002, p. 68), the state dominance survived in Ukraine. Additionally, supranational

organisations are becoming increasingly active. These actors mostly affect national policy formation, including the aspect of international cooperation. The role of institutional forces, unfortunately, has not increased significantly since 1991, though universities are primary important in higher education internationalisation.

The model of relations between government and higher education is predominantly bureaucratic-political in Ukraine. The same model, if the labels are selected from the four-model classification of de Groof et al. (1998, p.9) can be identified as dominant in the institutional governance. Therefore, the relationships within the higher education between universities and the national governing body copy this model, including the sphere of international relations.

It is supposed that national higher education policy regarding internationalisation is framed by the country's foreign policy and its striving to demonstrate national identity (Bremer, pp. 209-210). Ukraine has not developed an active identity demonstrating foreign policy because it has no strong vision in this aspect. Since 1990s it has been balancing on the bi-vector between "the West" (Europe and USA) and "the East" (mostly Russia); its international dimension of higher education policy was not clearly explicit before becoming a Bologna Process signatory.

The analysis of the documents regulating the international cooperation of higher education in Ukraine did not reveal any document describing the national policy or a program of internationalisation of higher education specifically. Instead, separate national policy regulating international cooperation of universities and the policy of the Bologna process implementation can be traced. This can be viewed as mainstreaming in the direction of structural Europeanisation in contrast to many developed European countries in which attraction of foreign students and formation of intercultural competencies is considered the focus of internationalisation.

4.9.1 Policy documents

The national policy regarding international cooperation of the higher education in Ukraine is laid out in the following documents: "Osvita" (Education) National Programme (1993); National Doctrine of Education Development (2002); The Law of Ukraine *On Education* (1996); the Law of Ukraine *On Higher Education* (2002); the Law of Ukraine *On Scientific Research and Scientific Research-Technical Activities* (1992); President of Ukraine's Orders regulating higher education issues; decisions of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on higher education.

All these documents proclaim integration of national education to European and World education areas as one of the priorities of the national higher education policy and can be characterised as declarative because they highlight the importance of international cooperation but do not assume any practical actions or programs. The Law of Ukraine on Higher Education contains the section “International Cooperation” including article 66 “State policy regarding international cooperation in higher education”, article 67 “Major areas of international cooperation in higher education” and article 68 “Foreign economic activity in higher education” (<http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=2984-14>). The “Osvita” programme in the part “International links” declares international links as a potential powerful instrument in joining the international higher education community: “International links in education are directed at ensuring of integration of Ukraine into the world educational-scientific area with the aim to access achievements of foreign education, science, technology, culture, attracting foreign investments in terms of development of the national education and science, joint training and re-training of professionals” (http://uazakon.com/documents/date_5x/pg_irwjos/index.htm).

The documents regulating national policy related to internationalisation (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=laws/education/prof-tech/7/0001>) can be divided into: a) laws that legalise national programmes and activity plans in the field of international cooperation of universities; b) letters and orders of MESYSU regulating specific events, scholarships, issues of recognition, international cooperation projects, that are utilised for the *controlling and regulative* function of MESYSU; c) fifty agreements on cooperation in education and science between the Government of Ukraine and governments of foreign countries and agreements of MESYSU with corresponding ministries of foreign countries, international and supranational organisations and projects (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=international>) create legal provisions for international cooperation of universities.

Additionally, the Ministry regularly conducts meetings with the representatives of the sections of education and science of the embassies of the foreign countries and international organisations to discuss the progress and strategic directions and forms of cooperation.

4.9.2 Participants of the national policy implementation and their functions

MESYSU is the major force in the development and implementation of the national policy of internationalisation. Its major functions are: a) participation in the policy formation; b) assurance of policy implementation through monitoring and coordination of international

activities of universities; c) quality assurance; d) recognition of academic and professional qualifications gained through studies abroad.

The Ministry primarily serves as the *regulating body*: it issues the documents that regulate international contacts and activities of universities. For example, The Order “On the Plan of Events to implement the State Programme on informing the Public regarding Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine for years 2004-2007” dated 16.03.2006 (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/integration>) provides detailed directives on how to conduct informational campaign, describes monitoring and reporting procedures and assigns responsible persons.

Also, MESYSU ensures implementation of the Laws of Ukraine, Orders of the President and the Cabinet of Ministry of Ukraine or State Programmes in the related field. For example, the Letter “On celebrating the Day of Europe in Ukraine” № 1/9-322 dated 10.05.06 (http://www.mon.gov.ua/laws/list_1_9_322.doc) assures implementation of the assignment stated in the Order of the President of Ukraine № 339/2003 dated 19.04.200 “On Europe Day” (http://search.ligazakon.ua/l_doc2.nsf/link1/U339_03.html). The letter of MESU gives the list of expected activities to be conducted on Europe Day, the directions on assigning the responsible officials and the time periods for reporting on the results of the events.

The *controlling function* is equally important. MESYSU and the regional executive bodies (educational departments of the regional and city executive councils, regional and city immigration offices) execute the detailed supervision of international cooperation of public universities through gathering various data regarding their international cooperation. To exemplify the statement, since 2002 all international cooperation projects and participation of universities in technical aid programs have been monitored by MESYSU jointly with the Ministry of Economics and European Integration (later the Ministry of Economics) through the Order № 648 “On implementation of international projects in the sphere of education” from 12.11.2002 (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=laws/education/prof-tech/7/0001>). This order obligates universities to agree all stages and activities of international projects with two ministries and report on every detail of cooperation, including description of activities, expected results and funding volumes. Unfortunately, no feedback, analysis or recommendations on the reported data are provided by MESYSU.

Recognition of the documents proving the educational degree obtained at higher education institutions in a foreign country is also a function of MESYSU and is regulated by the Order “On approval of the Regulation on recognition of the foreign education certificates”

№ 563 dated 20.08.2003 which states the rules and the procedure of recognition (“nostrification”).

The *planning function* of MESYSU in internationalisation became topical during the implementation of the Bologna Process. The Order № 49 dated 23.01.2004 “On approval of the Action Programme aimed at implementation of the conventions of Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education and science of Ukraine for years 2004-2005” was unique due to its not only programmatic but also planning character. The Action Programme states the goals and the tasks of the implementation of the Bologna Declaration in the higher education system of Ukraine, describes the expected results, presents the plan of events with the indication of the content of the activity direction and formulates the tasks to be completed. Also it nominates the executing offices within MESYSU and in the related ministries and agencies, states schedules, describes the procedure of monitoring and reporting on the accomplished activities. For example, the first item “Modernisation of the system of higher education and science of Ukraine in accordance with the ideas and provisions of the Bologna Process” envisages nine tasks, like “Develop methodical manuals for higher education institutions with the explanation of the requirements of the documents related to the Bologna Process”, “Create in Ukraine regional centres of the support of the Bologna process”, “Undertake a pedagogical experiment on introduction of the credit-module system into teaching process in higher education institutions based on ECTS criteria”, etc. All in all, the Programme assumes six thematic areas: 1) the earlier mentioned modernisation of the system of higher education and science of Ukraine in accordance with the ideas and provisions of the Bologna Process; 2) introduction of the Diploma Supplement; 3) creation of comparative system of recognition of foreign documents on education in Ukraine 4) introduction of national documents on education in the countries-members of Bologna process; 5) elaboration of comparative methodologies and criteria of assessment and enhancement of the system of education quality assurance; 6) development of cooperation with the member countries of Bologna process in the part of recognition of documents on education. The responsible executors of the plan include Department of Higher Education, Department of International Cooperation and European Integration, Department of Innovative Development, higher education institutions, Scientific-Methodical Centre of Higher Education. This plan has been serving as the roadmap of implementation of Bologna provisions in higher education of Ukraine till present because some tasks were not completed in the expected period by the end of 2005 (Diploma Supplement was introduced only in 2010).

The “Plan of actions on assurance of the quality of higher education of Ukraine and its integration into European and world community for the period till 2010” serves as the logical continuation of the Order № 49 described above. It was adopted in 2007 and it also formulated the directions of modernisation of the national higher education system with the view of the Bologna Declaration. It formulates the tasks in the areas pertaining to implementation of the provisions of the Bologna process in higher education of Ukraine: the system of degrees, national system of qualifications, quality assurance, recognition of degrees and study periods, life-long learning, joint degrees, higher education and research, social dimension, mobility, enhancement of teaching, attractiveness of EHEA, creation of the joint with Europe informational area, formation of legislative and financial bases of the Bologna process implementation.

The *promotional function* of MESYSU is weak because it is supposed to be based on public funding for this purpose which is severely limited. Before 2005 almost no funding was allocated for implementation of national policy in the part of international cooperation. For implementation of Bologna process some state funding (but not significant) has been allocated mostly for creating different bodies and committees and for conducting conferences, discussions and informational campaigns. Public funding of international activities cover:

- State stipends for a limited number of foreign students studying in Ukraine under international bilateral agreements, for example scholarships for 100 citizens of Prydnistrovje region of Moldova in 2009;
- Partner funding of bilateral projects (Ukrainian French programme “Dnipro”, Ukrainian-French partner master programmes competition, Ukrainian-Greek joint research projects of 2005-2007, Ukrainian-Austrian joint research cooperation program 2011-2012);
- Operational activities of the Department of International Cooperation and European Integration of MESYSU;
- Foreign trips of the employees of MESYSU in the framework of international cooperation.

Unfortunately, the volumes of funding are not disclosed by MESYSU. The only figure found on the MESYSU website is the volume of research funding under international scientific-research programmes. It amounts to 17.8 million Ukrainian Hryvnia and equals approximately to 1.8 million Euro, according to the data of MESU budget 2009, http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=budget/vik_derzh).

The Ministry also performs the function of *information dissemination* – its website regularly informs about international scholarships, projects or forums

(<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=international>) but the information delivery is not systemic and the principles of the information selection are not clear.

Thanks to the Bologna process, internationalisation, partly, has acquired clear goals and earmarks as compared with previous general declarations. Whereas Bologna's reasonability and applicability to the Ukrainian higher education has still been disputed by Ukrainian researchers and professionals, the implementation of the Bologna provisions pushed the system towards more specific and visible model of internationalisation.

The role of international organisations is important in both policy development and implementation through funding programmes, methodological and other support, as it was discussed earlier in the Players section. Another example of such support is facilitation of immigration rules for the mobility of students and researchers presented by the "Agreement between the European Community and Ukraine on the facilitation of the issuance of visas" was signed and enacted in 2008.

The role of market is not prominent either in internationalisation policy development or implementation and is limited to formulation of requirements to the competencies of graduates which are formed under the influence of global economic trends. Employers do not participate in development of legal basis or higher education internationalisation policy. They do not stimulate, initiate or fund international cooperation at the sector or institutional level.

Higher education institutions serve as internationalisation policy implementers but their role in policy formation is insignificant due to their low weight in the national coordination triangle.

4.9.3 Programmes

The EC-funded TEMPUS programme is considered one of the major instruments of internationalisation (Bremer, 1997, p. 211) because it considerably contributes to reforming of the universities through providing financial, methodological and expert support as well as analysing the programme impact. The report "Changing rules. The review of the projects of the TEMPUS program in administration" (<http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus>) states that in many aspects the programme performs the role supposed to be completed by MESYSU.

The geography of TEMPUS projects covers most regions of Ukraine since 1993. In the first two phases the program focused on improvements of university governance and management, upgrading the curricula and developing new courses and programs, professional development of teachers, especially in the disciplines of economics, foreign languages, social science, European studies and law.

During the third phase of the program in 2000-2006 with the view of Ukraine's plan to join European Higher Education Area, TEMPUS shifted its focus in Ukraine. The pool of eligible participants expanded to companies, non-governmental and non-for-profit organisations and state authorities. The list of priority disciplines in this phase expanded by business management, agrarian science, IT and environment.

Currently, the priorities and directions of TEMPUS program in Ukraine support the advancement of the Bologna process. New courses and curricula were developed to meet the current requirements of Ukrainian labour market.

The summary of TEMPUS impact on higher education internationalisation in Ukraine, presented at the website of the National TEMPUS Office in Ukraine (<http://www.tempus.org.ua/en/tempus.html>), states that cooperation with European universities under TEMPUS projects enabled provision of the teaching staff with new knowledge, teaching skills and evaluation techniques. This resulted in greater competitiveness of their universities and enhanced their status and standing. On the whole, the TEMPUS program facilitated the internationalisation of Ukrainian universities, helped to establish long-term partnerships between them and their European counterparts and assisted with the initiation of new research projects or exchange programs. TEMPUS projects support national and international mobility, encourage joint degrees in all three cycles within the framework of joint programmes. All in all, from 1993 to 2006 during the three phases of the TEMPUS Program in Ukraine 299 projects have been approved with the total budget of 53.6 million Euro (<http://www.tempus.org.ua/en/tempus/tempus-v-ukraini.html>).

In 2010 the Government announced *the first programme of annual scholarships* for the best 3000 students to study at foreign universities. Its launching is planned for 2011. (<http://news.finance.ua/ru/~1/0/all/2010/10/26/214502>).

The “Action Programme of implementation of the provisions of the Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education and science”, “Action Programme aimed at implementation of the conventions of the Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education and science of Ukraine for years 2004-2005” and “Action plan to assure quality of higher education in Ukraine and its integration into European and world education community for the period till 2010” mainstream the activities on structural reformation of the national system and aim at improving the state of mobility. It should be mentioned though that many provisions of international activities in these programmes up to date have not been implemented, especially those containing the financial constituent (namely development of mechanisms of the formation of national funds, scholarships and other resources to support the

Bologna process). The excuses are made by budget financial constraints, frequent change of ministerial management following the change of the Government (in 2005, 2007, 2010), bureaucratic impediments in operational interaction of departments within the Ministry and between ministries, resistance of the structures to be eliminated or re-organised (for example, Higher Accreditation Committee that awards scientific degrees and is reluctant to change the existing system of degrees).

4.9.4 Concluding remarks on internationalisation policy

As it is shown above, there is no specific policy or funding regarding internationalisation in Ukraine, governance is executed through the legal framework and the programme of Bologna reforms implementation. Unfortunately, regulations form an unfavourable environment and provoke extreme bureaucracy in all procedures related to the recognition of foreign educational qualifications, course accreditation, excessive volume of reporting documentation required by all types of regulating and controlling bodies. Bureaucracy and legislation exhaust universities and individual researchers and also impede introduction and approbation of new products, structures and relations (Changing rules, pp.9-10, <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus>).

Huisman and van der Wende (2005, p. 224) postulate that the following factors foster internationalisation: a) change in steering mode, public funding and a national policy that stimulates entrepreneurialism of universities; b) flexible regulative framework that promotes institutional autonomy. In the end of the policy analysis, it can be argued that in the case of Ukraine slight changes of steering mode towards planning and programming function, severe constraints in budget leading to absence of funding for specific internationalisation programs, non-flexible regulative steering and lack of university autonomy impede internationalisation of higher education.

4.10 Achievements and challenges of higher education internationalisation

Declared achievements

The publications highlighting the results, trends and activities of internationalisation are not numerous. The latest major ones are: the article “The System of Education in Ukraine: the state and prospects of development” in the periodical “National Security and Defence” (2002); the monograph “Higher education in Ukraine” edited by Kremen and Nikolajenko (2006) and the report of the ex-Minister Vakarchuk “Higher education of Ukraine – European dimension: state of the art, issues, perspectives” (2008).

The monograph “Higher education in Ukraine” enumerates the principal lines of international cooperation of Ukrainian universities which include exchange of students, teachers and researchers for the purposes of joint research, international conferences, teaching programmes, joint publishing activities, etc. (Kremen and Nikolajenko, 2006, p.59). Reporting of achievements is based on traditional quantitative indicators used for the progress reports by MESYSU. For example, in the year 2006 over 10000 Ukrainians studied abroad and about 25000 students from 110 countries studied in Ukraine, including 28 from European countries, 40 from Asian countries, 30 from Africa, and 12 from Latin America; 59 Ukrainian higher education institutions hosted 3152 foreign specialists from 59 countries. In years 2003-2004 2364 foreign specialists visited Ukraine for teaching and research (ibid, pp.59-60). Also, the monograph states that some of universities are in the process of active internationalisation, but what is meant by this statement is not clear.

The Decision of MESU Board dated 2008 “Higher education of Ukraine – European dimension: state of the art, issues, perspectives” (<http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>) reports that for the year 2008 133 agreements on cooperation with 77 countries were signed (of them 22 agreements are on mutual recognition of the education documents) and 90 projects were in the process of elaboration. Ukrainian universities participated in 36 TEMPUS projects in 2007, 132 Ukrainian students and teaching staff participated in the Erasmus Mundus mobility program.

The comparison of these two publications shows that sporadic figures are shown and the progress is not tracked consistently. The chart below provides the review of indicators from available publications and illustrates non-systemic recording of internationalisation progress.

Chart 3. Indicators of higher education internationalisation in Ukraine

Year	International cooperation agreements (including mutual recognition agreements)	Students and staff that were abroad for conferences, research, projects	Number of destination countries	Incoming foreign scholars and visitors	Home countries of foreign students and scholars	Ukrainian students studying abroad	Foreign students in Ukraine	Annual assistance of international org-tions, \$ mln
1999-2000	46 with 46 countries ¹	About 3000 ¹	70 ¹	2500 ¹	68 ¹	1500 ¹	1112 ¹	30 ¹
2002	93 ^a	6000 ^a /2000 ²	71 ^a	31522 ²				20 ^a
2003	8(8) ²			1054 ²				
2004				1313 ²				
2006 ²	128 with 60 countries (16) ²				59 ²	10000 ²	25000 ²	
2007					129 ³		40000 ³	
2008	133 (22) ^o				133 ^o		43000 ^o	

Sources:

1. *Education of Ukraine. Informational-analytical review. Ministry of Education and Science, 2001*

2. *Higher education of Ukraine*

3. *Resolution of the Board of the Ministry of Education and Science dated 21st March, 2008*

0. *Resolution of the Board of the Ministry of Education and Science dated 4th April, 2009*

a. *The system of education in Ukraine: state and prospects of development. National Security and Defence, #4 (28)*

Unfortunately, the Department of International Cooperation and European Integration of MESYSU does not provide any systemic statistical data and analysis of the internationalisation dynamics, though the data are collected regularly from higher education institutions. Despite the shortage and confusion of statistical data, it can be stated that the quantitative indicators of internationalisation (figures of mobility and exchange, joint programs, joint publications, attendance of international conferences) show the steady trend of growth.

The implementation of the Bologna process brought new qualitative and structural landmarks, and, according to these landmarks, after five years of implementation (2005-2010) impressive results have been achieved (National Report 2007-2009, pp.2-5). First, the list of educational specialisations for bachelor programmes adapted to the demands of economy and to the European requirements has been developed. Second, a two-cycle educational model (Bachelor, Master) has been introduced. Third, starting in the academic year 2006-2007 at all

universities the teaching process is executed following the recommendations of ECTS. Fourth, the Diploma Supplement has been developed and introduced in 2010. Other achievements are not so impressive but still show that Ukraine has been moving along the European path. The country joined the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR) in 2008; the Ukrainian Association of Student Self-Governance joined European Student Union in 2007; mechanisms increasing student participation in the university management, quality control have been developed; amendments to the Law on Education to harmonise it with the requirements of the Bologna Declaration have been elaborated and presented for public and expert discussion.

Challenges

Alongside with achievements, multiple issues remain unchanged officially and make internationalisation a complex and unattractive endeavour. Regarding internationalisation in general, these are the absence of internationalisation programmes, the funding shortage and the strict regulatory and immigration framework for foreign students. No measures are taken to reduce “brain drain” of students and staff and make studies in Ukraine more attractive for foreign students. A modest number of programmes taught in foreign languages, no export of programs or international marketing, overwhelmingly bureaucratic recognition of qualifications, closeness of statistical data on internationalisation and poor availability and quality of research of the process impede further the process. Also, the quality of international contacts and their efficiency both at the sector and institutional levels is an issue for study and discussion.

Regarding the implementation of the Bologna process as contributing to the content and structural part of internationalisation, a lot still needs to be done. Typical for bureaucratic systems, multiple working groups and committees related to the process have been created and are funded and trained with the funding support of the European Union: interdepartmental Bologna Follow-up Commission, Bologna promoters’ group, the working group on the development of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). But the system in general is not welcoming reforms because the conservative culture of higher education management in Ukraine is static and changing slowly, not immediately by the adoption of a law or a resolution. Therefore, official reports look more optimistic than the real state of things. The ECTS practice is mastered very slowly and at higher education institutions few students do not experience problems with recognition of study abroad periods. Major parts of Quality Assurance System are still under the authority of the MESYSU, not independent professional accreditation agencies. Students’ participation in university management and quality

assurance is also formal and students do not execute real influence on the processes. The true autonomy of the universities is only partial and this part is small. The introduction of the Doctor level looks threatening for the degree awarding “oligarchy” and is persistently blocked. The internal and external mobility of students is low and this issue is one of the most problematic (“Main developments in the higher education system of Ukraine 2007-2009”, <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher/bolpr>) because it triggers migration issues, financial issues, issues of study process regulations and recognition issues. The frequent change of higher education priorities formulated by MESYSU is also a challenge. The educational ministers have changed three times, following the change of the Government since 2005. Influence of the political orbit on higher education policy formation brings inconsistency and impossibility to execute long-term strategies. In the overall view, implementation of the Bologna provisions in Ukraine reminds to a high degree the renovation of the cover, not modernisation of the idea and content.

As in the European countries, higher education in Ukraine is experiencing problems with the functioning of the two-level cycle, provision of national funding to universities, relations between universities and the graduate market, the social relevance of higher education. This likeliness can be also considered as “internationalisation of symptoms” on the way to convergence of Ukrainian higher education with the European higher education systems.

Another issue that has not been analysed yet by policy makers in Ukraine is the low weight of internationalisation and Europeanisation in developing multicultural and intercultural characteristics of Ukrainian teachers and students to stimulate their becoming “global citizens” not only in the sense of professional competencies, but also in understanding and appreciating different cultures and national and international citizenry formation. This function is underestimated by the Ukrainian higher education, following the international mode to care for political and economic rationales and miss “the humanising process” (NG, p. 12) of internationalisation.

The challenge of “duplicating Western polices” (ibid, p. 10) in higher education of Ukraine is not serious at the moment but it might become such because of the absence of understanding of the uniqueness of the system and the wish to copy others’ path in national policy formation without due consideration of differences in the societies and different perception of internationalisation in the developed and developing countries.

4.11 Implications for the national policy development to support internationalisation

To promote the efficient internationalisation of national higher education, a series of measures should be undertaken. Diminishing the discrepancy between the declarations of official documents and the real actions should be expressed in complex sufficiently funded programs and more efficient interaction of universities and MESYSU. This will facilitate institutional international cooperation. To the same purpose will serve more active work of MESYSU in increasing the number of international cooperation agreements and agreements of recognition of Ukrainian higher education degrees abroad. Granting universities independence in the issues of international cooperation, accompanied with the financial, informational and methodological support in promoting internationalisation, will stimulate qualitative and quantitative expansion of institutional international cooperation.

Of paramount importance is the developing of the system of professional training of the university staff involved in the management of international cooperation. This will enhance awareness on internationalisation within an institution, form political support of international initiatives and improve the quality of international cooperation.

5 Internationalisation of higher education at the institutional level

5.1 National trends of institutional internationalisation

The empirical analysis of internationalisation of Ukrainian universities will be illustrated by two case studies, preceded by the descriptions of trends and issues of institutional internationalisation, typical for universities in Ukraine. The generalised portrait will serve as a starting point in identifying later how and why the case universities stick to or deviate from the generalised model. The study will cover public and private higher education institutions under the jurisdiction of MESYSU because other institutions of post-secondary education function beyond the framework of this state governing body (mostly, this concerns MBA schools). The model was constructed based on author's experience in the area of international cooperation in the function of the head of international cooperation office, communication with colleagues, observations and comparison of the activities of Ukrainian universities directed at internationalisation. In many aspects the trends of internationalisation of universities in Ukraine are similar to the trends, described in the case studies of developing countries by Kishun (2007), Avila (2007), McLellan (2008).

Rationales

First, the rationales for institutional internationalisation should be investigated. Institutional

internationalisation in Ukraine serves, first and foremost, to improve the quality of education and research and to promote institution building. It is expected that international cooperation, exchange and mobility will contribute to staff development, modernisation of curricula and expansion of research activities. The *academic* rationale was the starting point of internationalisation in Ukraine and has remained the most important for institution leadership, faculties, department chairs and individual teaching staff, though for the leadership, naturally, the academic rationale is a tool to enhance recognition and competitiveness. The situation is similar to the case in Germany described by Hahn and Teichler (2005, p.50) and is true for universities in different countries committed to internationalisation: “While the leadership and senior management is very much driven by the idea of positioning the institution on the local, national and global market of higher education and to push forward also the implementation of the “Bologna-Declaration”, we see more academic rationales driving the activities at the level of faculties”.

The second rationale is *economic* one. Universities gain little profit from a modest number of foreign students from Asia and Africa and these students come only to big technical, agrarian and medical universities of Ukraine. In 2008, about 200 higher education institutions were training only 43000 foreign students from 133 countries (Decision of MESU from 02.04.2009, <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>). Research cooperation with international businesses is also not a decisive source of funding and concerns mainly technical universities. Therefore, the third-party international funding is crucial for the majority of universities to cover specific academic purposes, in particular, development of new courses, conducting research, educational events and more. “Earning money is typical for universities with financial problems, especially in countries where governments cut funding”, say Altbach and Knight (2007, p. 292). This money helps enhance research and knowledge capacities. In this case funding does not produce profits but substitutes public funding. Thus, institutional internationalisation in Ukraine is close to traditional understanding. According to Altbach and Knight (2007, p. 293) “traditional internationalisation is rarely a profit-making activity, though it may enhance the competitiveness, prestige, and strategic alliances of the college”.

Further comes the social rationale, driving forces for which were referred to by Huisman and van der Wende in “Cooperation and competition II” (2005, p.220). These forces are true not only for the countries of the Western Europe analysed in the aforementioned publication, but also for Ukraine. They are: a) the belief that involvement in international work, especially attraction of international finance to the local area, enhances the reputation

and standing of the higher education institution or faculty locally and nationally (social-economic rationales); b) The wish to be a global or a regional player; increase competitiveness locally (social rationale).

Therefore, “Internationalisation is seen as related to institutional profile building and the position the institution seeks in a global, European, regional or local hierarchy” (Huisman and van der Wende, 2005, p. 219). The first part of this is true for all Ukrainian universities, but depending on the reputation in the local hierarchy they seek a place locally, nationally or internationally. At present, only the oldest and the biggest universities of Ukraine are seeking international recognition, though they do not belong to the most prestigious international league tables. The rest of the universities use internationalisation to improve reputation and competitiveness nationally or locally. The international dimension is very important for branding and ranking which is gaining increasing popularity in Ukraine. Two of the national annually conducted rankings, the UNESCO Chair in Ukraine ranking (http://www.dt.ua/img/st_img/2009/747/12_vo_send_ukr.gif) and the Ministry ranking (<http://www.osvita.org.ua/abitur/entrance/ratings/19.html>, <http://www.osvita.org.ua/abitur/entrance/ratings/20.html>), both conducted annually since 2007 consider international activity of a university as an assessment indicator.

The MESYSU ranking assesses internationally recognised academic, cultural, and sporting achievements with 12 indicators weighted 12 points out of total 112. These indicators assess diverse international activities: international academic cooperation of universities, participation of staff and students in international exhibitions, cultural and sports events, and academic international contests (<http://www.osvita.org.ua/abitur/entrance/ratings/19.html>, <http://www.osvita.org.ua/abitur/entrance/ratings/20.html>).

The “Top-200 Ukraine” ranking is exercised by the Chair of UNESCO in Ukraine in cooperation with “Dzerkalo Tyzhnya” weekly newspaper in accordance with the guidelines of the International Ranking Expert Group (http://www.dt.ua/img/st_img/2009/747/12_vo_send_ukr.gif). The internationalisation constituent (one of the three indices) is made up by the number of foreign students, membership in international associations, and informational software. Though the choice of indicators is highly disputed, their use proves that internationalisation gains weight in identifying the position of a university in the national league in the competition for fee-paying students and best student talents.

Therefore, in Ukraine the academic, economic and social rationales are important for internationalisation at the institutional level.

Influencing factors

“International activities reflect different national traditions, institutional histories and missions”, state Huisman and van der Wende (2005, p. 219). De Wit also mentions mission, student population, facility profile, geographic location, funding sources, orientation to local, national and international interest as influencing factors (2002, p. 25).

Older Ukrainian universities in big cities with relatively well-developed infrastructure and extended national and international network (the national “Ivy League”) tend to enjoy more active international cooperation (all National Universities in regional centres). Technical universities are especially popular as potential partners for foreign universities (NTUU “KPI”, Donetsk National Technical University, Eastern-Ukrainian Dal University, etc.). At the same time, younger ambitious universities with entrepreneurial spirit also gain internationalisation pace due to the commitment of the administration and the clear vision of the internationalisation role in the strategic development of the university (Kyiv-Mohyla National Academy, Ostroh Academy).

Geographical location of a university also plays a role in the choice of foreign academic partners. The universities of Western Ukraine more actively cooperate with the universities of neighbouring countries (Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Romania) as compared with the countries of the Eastern region, which have more partners in Russia, Belarus the countries of Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan). The countries of the Southern region and the Crimea are active in cooperation with the countries of the Black Sea region (Georgia, Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, Serbia) than universities of other regions. The indicated regional peculiarities complement the traditional for all regions cooperation with Western-European and American universities funded by international and bilateral organisations and foundations (more popular) and Asian Universities of Japan, China, Vietnam (less popular).

Strategies

In terms of being dynamic and successful, internationalisation at the institutional level requires specific instrumental strategies: favourable policy, clearly articulated and not contradicted by the existence of hidden informal policies of ignoring international activities, commitment of all players (administration, staff, students), adequate budget, support services, monitoring procedures and adjustments (Söderqvist, <http://www.eaie.org/pdf/F41art2.pdf>). Do these strategies exist at Ukrainian universities?

Internationalisation of Ukrainian universities to a great degree depends on the dedication of the senior administration articulating in the open or hidden form if international

activities are made a priority in the institutional development. Quite often the informal policy should be analysed in stating the true priorities, because any university plan or concept will, similarly to national policy documents, declare the importance of international relations, but in reality bureaucracy and neglect of international cooperation produce de-motivating effects on staff and students. The situation is similar to what Kishun states in his case study – there is a gap between what university leaders say about international education and actual practice: “This gap is also noticeable in the differences between institutional mission statements and the reality of institution practices as revealed by their strategic plans, policies, and resource allocations” (2007, p.465).

Following the trend in internationalisation at the sector level, internationalisation at the institutional level is not implemented through specially designed and funded programs. Rather, the contacts are developed spontaneously, through the personal contacts of the staff or students, receive institutional approval in the form of the signed agreement and, though the agreement is considered institutional, it is implemented by the initiators of cooperation personally, by their departments or chairs. Sometimes, these contacts spread to other departments or faculties.

Annual planning of international activities is obligatory but not efficient because only regular project activities can be scheduled. Primarily, these are the events of “internationalisation at home” (new courses, invitations of foreign teachers, contacts with local cultural organisations, participation in annual intercultural events, conducting international conferences and workshops at the university). Regarding “internationalisation abroad” (scholarships, attendance of conferences, research visits), Ukrainian universities are still at the stage of spontaneous or non-planned mobility. Therefore, reporting reflects the results but does not envisage programming of these activities. Reporting within the university is undertaken along the report forms to be submitted to MESYSU and does not presuppose analysis, review or adjustments.

Typically, coordination of international activities is affiliated with the office of international relations (cooperation). Its functions are regulated by the university Regulations. The office activities are supervised by a Vice-Rector, usually the Vice-Rector on Educational or Educational-Research Affairs. More rarely a specially appointed Vice-Rector on International Relations might supervise the area. The few positions in the offices of international cooperation are funded by the institution but the rest of positions and activities rely on the third-party funding which in many cases makes international cooperation spontaneous and episodic. Traditionally, the offices of international relations coordinate and

track international activities of the faculties and departments, facilitate and support international contacts of the staff and students, provide support services in visa and immigration issues.

The incentive system for staff involved in international cooperation is limited to verbal praise and is not an indispensable part of academic career. Rather, international involvement is important for the individual professional development and prestige of the staff. Therefore, it cannot be said that responsibility for internationalisation is shared across campus. Rather, it is the “privilege and punishment” of ambitious professionals and departments.

In Ukrainian higher education institutions the Activity approach in 1990s shifted to the Rationale Approach in 2000s with diversification and streaming of internationalisation, but in strategies the Programs prevail (major domestic and cross-border elements of Academic Programs, Research and Scholarly Collaboration, External Relations and Extracurricular Events are present). Some elements of Organisation strategies can be also traced. Governance approach with commitment of leaders, involvement of staff and articulated goals in full spring is not typical, but it is progressively developing. The Operations approach is reflected in the support structure, formal and informal systems of communication and coordination, balance of centralised and decentralised management of international activities.

The “average” stage of a Ukrainian university internationalisation in the classification of Söderqvist may be characterised as the combination of the *first stage* (student mobility, awareness of internationalisation, ECTS becomes an important instrument, the office of international cooperation functions), the *second stage* (internationalisation of curricula through teachers and coordinators, mobility of the teaching staff, internationalisation as the instrument of quality enhancement) and some elements of *the third stage* (networks, partnerships, strategic alliances become important).

Activities

Following the division of internationalisation activities internationally, they will be considered under “internationalisation abroad” and “internationalisation at home”.

In “internationalisation abroad” the prevalent activity is individual mobility of staff, researchers and students into Western European countries and USA under scholarships provided by DAAD, British Council, Fulbright, Nuffic, Swedish Institute and exchange programmes (Erasmus Mundus). Attendance of conferences, workshops, cultural and sports events also make a substantial part of an outgoing mobility.

In “internationalisation at home” the trends described below are reported. In the corpus of incoming foreign students the students from Asian and Arab countries prevail but

this number is not increasing significantly due to a suppressive legal framework, absence of a friendly infrastructure and a pile of bureaucratic procedures. For example, in 2008 the figure increased only by 3000 as compared to the previous year (Decision of MESU Board dated 23.03.2008, <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>).

Joint programmes with double degrees are developing, especially at the Master's level (e.g., Kyivs'ka Politehnika – Ecole Polytechnique). Around 3% of Ukrainian higher education institutions have joint degrees with foreign counterparts. The most popular are joint programs in information and communication technologies, natural sciences, economics, business (Ukraine's national report 2007-2009, p. 27).

Private Universities of foreign origin appear (e.g., Wisconsin International University). Joint and international centres at universities are growing (e.g., Ukrainian-Polish and Ukrainian-Japanese centres at Kyivs'ka Politehnika, ten UNESCO Chairs at Ukrainian universities).

Universities actively participate in international projects of university cooperation (TEMPUS, Jean Monnet, projects funded by DAAD), in regional, international or bilateral research projects (Framework Programme 7, Black Sea United Network), in international university associations (European Association of International Education, International Association of Universities, European Association of Universities). They cooperate with international and regional organisations in education, culture and research (e.g. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, United Nations International Development Organisation, the Committee on Data for Science and Research, International Council for Science) and receive grants for research activities from foreign governments (e.g., Government of Japan, Government of Korea rewarded grants to NTUU "KPI").

In the part of curriculum, the range of foreign language studies made by English, German and French is extended by Spanish, Polish, Chinese, Romanian, Italian, etc. Also, special full-course studies are taught completely in foreign languages, and this trend is typical for technical faculties (e.g. French, German and Dutch programs at Donetsk National Technical University, English programme at National University of Bio Resources and Nature Utilisation of Ukraine, etc.). Partial (international aspects) and full (innovative courses) internationalisation of the curricula is also a trend. Recently multiple courses predominantly focusing on European dimension have been designed. Among them are European Studies, Bologna Process and Higher Education, European Management and Businesses and many others.

A large number of international agreements are reported, but many of them are inactive. In many cases the subscription to an agreement is considered more a protocol event than a true commitment to collaborate (Avila, 2007, p.402). But recently MESYSU obliged universities to report only agreements that were active in the reported year.

Internationalisation models

Now, the typical model internationalisation organisation at Ukrainian universities will be identified.

In Neave's model the majority of universities are "base unit driven" in the initiation and operations of international activities but are centralised in coordination and regulations. In terms of Rudzki's model the Ukrainian universities typically function in different stages of reactive mode: stages of contact, formalisation and central control. They often rather respond to "an offer made by donating organisations than to an institutional strategy for educational development" (Avila, 2007, p. 402). From the point of Davies's quadrant of strategies, the prevailing trend in institutional international work is "central – ad-hoc" centralised in governance mode and ad-hoc in creating opportunities and benefiting from them. A more detailed model of Van Dijk and Meijer's shows that the importance of internationalisation is recognised (priority cell in the cube), support is mostly formal (one-side) and implementation is ad-hoc, which is characteristic for entrepreneurial universities. In Van der Wende's classification of the innovative cycle stages, universities in Ukraine are shifting from the stage of recognising the need for change to the stage of planning and formulating the goals. Following Knight's internationalisation cycle, a typical Ukrainian university shifted from the stage of Awareness to the stage of Operationalising without formulating a strategy or a long-term plan.

Challenges

The challenges of internationalisation of Ukrainian universities most frequently identified by the administrators of international activities can be categorised in several groups.

The most affecting challenges, staying, to a high degree, beyond the power of universities are legal and financial constraints as well as bureaucracy at the ministerial level. Legal constraints do not allow specific activities and procedures or complicate them and, thus, leave little chance to be overcome. For example, the necessity to register all international technical assistance projects with two ministries (MESYSU and the Ministry of Economics) makes universities highly dependent on MESYSU and provides basis for bureaucracy and corruption. Also, a regulatory framework issue, such as the absence of bilateral academic and

research cooperation agreements between Ukraine and many countries, deprives universities of many opportunities.

Financial constraints are reflected in the absence of national funds and shortage of funding and physical resources at the university to support international cooperation which makes them dependent on the assistance of international organisations. Therefore, internationalisation is very much shaped by the will and opportunities of governmental bodies and international organisations.

The second set of issues is generated within a university. Here are policy and strategy issues at the level of senior leadership, like lack of interest and recognition of internationalisation by the university administration, competition of priorities (time and resources) at the university not in favour of international activities.

Even when the appropriate vision and commitment exist, numerous obstacles that decrease efficiency and restrain opportunities have to be eliminated. These are absence of a policy/strategy to manage the process, lack of interest of the teaching staff towards internationalising of teaching and research because of low awareness, limited foreign language proficiency and modest experience and knowledge of the teaching staff in international cooperation.

Insufficient theoretical and practical knowledge on internationalisation and management of international cooperation as well as a low professional level of international coordinators and officers that are usually promoted to this position only because they know English and can communicate with foreigners limit the management and leadership potential of internationalisation activities.

At the majority of universities the whole list of challenges can be traced, but the impact of them might be weaker or stronger in each specific case.

5.2 Institutional internationalisation: two case studies

This sub-chapter offers the two case studies of institutional internationalisation from the Kherson State University and the Black Sea State University.

The choice of the universities for the case studies was geared by several principles. First, the universities should be dynamic, willing to undertake changes and having produced impressive results within rather a short period of five-seven years. Second, these should be regional universities of the middle level that demonstrate typical models of institutional internationalisation in Ukraine. Third, internationalisation should be understood at the specific university as an important tool to stimulate academic improvements and this should be

reflected in the policy. As a partial reflection of this policy, the heads of the international cooperation offices to be interviewed should be willing to cooperate, that is share openly their reflections on the state of internationalisation at their universities as well as provide the related documentation. Finally, the interviewees should be the persons who showed their personal commitment and willingness to promote internationalisation at home institutions. The combination of the stated factors was considered when selecting the universities and officials for the interview.

The interview included three stages. At the first stage the previously filled questionnaire (Appendix 1) was discussed. The questionnaire used the indicators from the research described by Knight in her publication “Internationalisation of higher education: new directions, new challenges. 2005 IAU Global Survey Report” (2006).

Further, the models and the stage of internationalisation according to different classifications at the specific university were identified. The independent identification of the models before the interview caused difficulties because the classifications of models were not quite clear to the interviewees and had to be explained additionally. The third part of the communication was devoted to free reflections on internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine in general and on internationalisation of interviewee’s university specifically.

5.2.1 Internationalisation at the Kherson State University.

A brief university overview and factors that influence internationalisation

The Kherson State University (KSU) is a classic university that was transformed from the Kherson State Pedagogical University (started in 1917). KSU is situated in the oblast city Kherson of the Southern part of Ukraine. It is one of the oldest higher education institutions in the region. According to the recent UNESCO ranking of Ukrainian universities (2010), it takes the 88th position out of 200. The institution employs 1500 staff and has 8000 students. The training is provided in 34 specialties by 5 institutes (Institute of Foreign Philology, Institute of Philology and Journalism, Institute of Biology, Institute of Psychology, History and Sociology, Scientific-Research Institute of IT) and 7 faculties (Faculty of Engineering and Technology, Faculty of Economics and Law, Faculty of Sports, Faculty of Mathematics, Faculty of Physics and IT, Preparatory Faculty (equivalent to the student college), Faculty of Culture and Arts and Faculty of Re-training). The university has a well-developed infrastructure: an observatory, a botanical garden, an educational-training complex at the seaside, recreational and health treatment facilities, research laboratories (<http://www.ksu.ks.ua/About.aspx>).

International cooperation belongs to the priorities of the university's activities. The brief reference description of KSU states: "One of the priorities of the university is design and implementation of international academic and research projects, attraction of funding from international foundations and organisations. At present, the focus of international relations is placed on the long-term programs and projects targeted at enhancing effectiveness of educational and scientific-analytical activity and quality of education up to the international standards level". This statement was the red line articulated by the Head of International Cooperation Office Mr. Hrygoriy Baran during the interview conducted on June 30, 2010.

Rationales for internationalisation

The highest priority for KSU's international activities is the financial rationale: attraction of the third-party funding was marked as the highest priority (5) in the questionnaire. The academic rationale (to attract more talented staff and students, to enhance research potential, to increase international and intercultural awareness of teachers and students, to upgrade the quality of study programs and stimulate innovative courses) comes as less important (4). International and local competitiveness and identity are even less important (2-3) and are not the driving force of international activities.

Activities and results of internationalisation

"Internationalisation at home" at KSU is presented by cooperation agreements with foreign universities, visits and stays of foreign scholars for teaching and research, recruitment of foreign students. Internationalisation of teaching is reflected in an establishment of the so far only one joint degree programme, introduction of international or intercultural aspects into the curricula (e.g. European Economy and Management in Business Studies), design of thematic courses with international orientation (e.g. Intercultural Communications), extensive foreign language studies (10 languages) and the use of international case studies. Of great value for KSU is participation in international projects, out of which TEMPUS is the most popular. International research activities are expressed in publications by foreign researchers in the university periodicals and organising international conferences at the university. Intercultural activities are imprinted in contacts with local cultural and international groups (e.g., Euroclub) and organisation of international and bilateral centres.

"Internationalisation abroad" activities are presented by outgoing mobility of staff and students (mobility in the framework of the Erasmus Mundus, scholarships for studies, research and teaching abroad). Teaching at foreign universities is in infancy and is developing with difficulties. The label of a growing activity can be applied to the publications in the

international periodicals. Unfortunately, only a limited number of teachers can produce such publications due to insufficient language knowledge and limited research activities. The university does not export educational services or operate branches abroad.

The favourite activity is participation in international projects because they provide complex support for internationalisation activities and mobility and are funded by international organisations. Recruitment of foreign students is gaining importance due to the shrinking income from local fee-paying students.

Some of major achievements of KSU are stated on the university's website (<http://www.university.kherson.ua/About/InternationalRelation/Internationalprojects.aspx>). The overall volume of project funding received by the university from the European Commission amounted to 1.5 million Euro and over \$ 200 000 was received from the US Department of State. 50 (3%) members of the teaching staff participated in professional development programmes in the partner foreign higher education institutions and the management views this as a positive development. KSU to date has conducted 10 international conferences. It is involved in active partnership with 20 universities worldwide (France, Germany, Spain, Italy, Poland, Turkey, USA, Russia, Moldova, China, Canada, etc.) (<http://www.university.kherson.ua/About/InternationalRelation/Internationalpartners.aspx>). The geography is versatile but the majority of cooperation partners are located in the countries that provide funding for cooperation. Three international centres have been started (Information Centre of the European Union, the Turkish-Ukrainian Centre and the Polish-Ukrainian Centre). International cultural centres are a comparatively new phenomenon, requiring a considerable effort from universities. Therefore, having three centres is very good for a middle-size Southern oblast city in Ukrainian reality.

It was reported that the university has the strategic development plan and international cooperation belongs to the priorities, which is stated by the KSU's mission. At the same time there is no specific internationalisation strategy at the university, the activities are undertaken according to the annual plan. The goals and principles of international cooperation are presented in the Statute of the University and the Regulations on the International Cooperation Office.

Internationalisation policy and strategies

The institutional policy on internationalisation can be regarded as neutral to supportive. The Rector and the Board do not put forward strategic goals in the area of international cooperation but the Rector approves final decisions. The development and implementation of the policy is supervised by the Vice-Rector on Scientific-Educational Affairs and

International Relations. His personality and reputation among the senior administration is crucial in the influence on the decisions made by the Rector. Personal and departmental initiatives are cornerstone in establishing international links. Therefore, they are welcomed and supported. It is agreed that any type of international cooperation is beneficial for improvement of the quality of the provided educational and research services. The results of internationalisation of the faculties and of the whole university are reported in the format submitted to MESYSU, described in the Chapter 3. They are not reviewed systematically in terms of dynamics analysis or further planning.

To implement the policy, the executive internationalisation structure has been created. The International Office performs informational, supporting, coordinating, monitoring and supervising roles, though the Regulations do not distinguish these roles, only enumerate them. These functions cover:

- Establishment and coordination of cooperation with foreign higher education institutions;
- Development and signing of agreements on academic and cultural cooperation with foreign higher education institutions and international organisations;
- Design and implementation of international academic and research projects and attraction of funding from international foundations and organisations to implement projects;
- Establishment and coordination of cooperation with international foundations and organisations to obtain funding for research and academic exchange of teaching staff and students;
- Logistic support of visits of foreign partners, scholars and foreign exchange students from the partnering foreign universities;
- Supervision and support of the academic mobility of the teaching staff and students.

(<http://www.university.kherson.ua/About/InternationalRelation.aspx>)

The executive structure spreads down to the Dean Assistants on International Cooperation at each faculty who are responsible for information dissemination and reporting to the International Office.

The programmes of international activities exist in the form of the annual plans, but no specific budget is allocated for their implementation. Only six positions in the International Office are funded by the University, the funds for the representative visits of foreign delegations are not planned and are provided in the ad-hoc format when necessary.

In general, no strong commitment of the board or senior administration to international cooperation has been made. Around 10% of the teaching staff is involved in international activities since no special incentives are designed for prominence in the international

activities. The international activeness is considered only in nominating the best faculty. Exclusion is made for the fundraising staff members as they are rewarded by specific influence and monetary bonus.

The university shows the elements of all Program Strategies following Knight's classification: Academic Programs, Research and Scholarly Collaboration (all constituent elements) are dominant, External Relations and Extracurricular are given less devotion. These strategies prevail as compared with Organisation strategies. In Organisation strategies are evident the elements of Operations reflected in the appropriate organisational structures, balance between centralised and de-centralised promotion and management of internationalisation. The Services are incarnated in the student support service for incoming and outgoing students. At last, Human Resources are found in the support of international assignments and sabbaticals.

Obstacles to internationalisation

The most influential obstacles to internationalisation of KSU (5) are: a) administrative inertia and bureaucracy at the level of MESYSU; b) absence of financial support at the sector level; c) a lack of funds and physical resources at the university. Of less impact (4) are: a) limited international experience and knowledge of the teaching and support staff; b) a low level of professionalism of managers and staff involved in international cooperation; a lack of professional training; c) inadequate level of foreign language knowledge. A lack of interest from the staff side and competition for resources within the university were ranged in the group of middle effect. The absence of a clear strategy and obstacles caused by the regulatory framework were marked as not important. The issues of recognition are not topical either due to insignificant mobility figures.

Internationalisation models

According to Neave's model, KSU might be identified as "*unit-driven*" in initiation but *centralised in management of international activities*.

Following Rudzki's model, the university is at the *stage of central control* of the *reactive model* which is described by "growth in activity and response by management who seek to gain control of activities" (de Wit, 1995, p.25): the university tends to benefit from the opportunities offered by foreign organisations and institutions.

From the point of view of Davies's quadrant, different activities at KSU are central or marginal. For example, recruitment of foreign students shifted recently from the marginal to the central position. The same is applicable to the polarity "systematic – ad-hoc" dependent

on the availability of funds. Overall, the prevailing model is “*central – ad-hoc strategy*”, though this model does not allow a wide spectrum to best indicate the status of the university internationalisation.

Following Van Dijk and Meijer’s model, international cooperation at KSU can be identified as a *priority with interactive support and ad-hoc implementation* which “indicates a quick response to external developments, a great variety of activities at different levels and much commitment which is only at a later stage organised in a more systematic way” (De Wit, 1995, p. 24). According to de Wit, this allows consider KSU an entrepreneurial university.

The stage of institutionalisation in Van der Wende’s model of innovative process was identified as the present stage of KSU.

Following the interviewee, KSU is at the third level of internationalisation (*institutionalisation of internationalisation*) in the Söderqvist’s classification because the university has an internationalisation structure, networking through travel and ICT, partnerships and strategic alliances, attention is paid to the quality of internationalisation, an internationalisation manager is in place. At the same time the university is attempting to shift to the fourth stage (*commercialising the outcomes of internationalisation*) as it undertakes attempts to start joint ventures and sell the research products abroad. The articulated level of internationalisation is disputable but it produces an interesting observation: the managers involved in internationalisation tend to overestimate the achievements of their universities.

According to Knight’s cycle model, KSU is on the stage of *operationalisation* characterised by a wide range of academic activities and services, organisational factors and guiding principles, but functioning without a clear strategy.

In conclusion, it can be said that KSU views international cooperation as an explicit but not a top priority used as the tool of income generation for further internationalisation and enhancement of education and research quality. The overview showed the dominance of international cooperation activities, whereas the structural reforms of the Bologna process are less important for the university. KSU is very entrepreneurial in the approach to internationalisation which is proved by the revealed combination of elements and features of different stages or polarities in the models. Nevertheless, planned internationalisation through a clearly explicit strategy is still a task for the future.

5.2.2 Internationalisation at the Black Sea State University

A brief university overview

The Black Sea State University is a branch of the National University “Kyiv Mohyla Academy” (NaUKMA). The “Kyiv Mohyla Academy” was founded in Ukraine in 1992 as the first example of a western-type liberal arts college providing education of the highest calibre which conforms to international standards. Within a few years the institution gained the title of National University (the highest range of universities in public higher education system of Ukraine) and entered the Ivy League of Ukrainian universities.

After the country became independent, the Black Sea region lost a major economic specialisation in shipbuilding. Therefore, the idea of creation of Mykolaiv branch of “Kyiv Mohyla Academy” to train a wide range of professionals for the regional needs began in summer 1995 with teachers from the Ukrainian State Sea Technical University and was supported by the local government and the administration of NauKMA.

The Black Sea State University (BSSU) was founded in 1996 to respond to the need “in specialists with higher education, especially in humanitarian direction”, including social and natural sciences (<http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=istorijavstanovlenja&hl=usa>). At that time it enrolled a modest number of students. Comprehensive operations began in 2000 after the infrastructure was in place.

Despite its young age, the university has become one of the most respected institutions in the Southern region and in the national research community. For example, in 2009 it placed 24th out of 200 in international recognition and 40th in the overall UNESCO ranking of Ukrainian universities, a good indicator for a young institution (http://www.abiturient.in.ua/ru/rating/rating_unesco_2009_1). It employs 310 teaching staff and enrolls about 4000 students (http://grani.zymichost.com/files/vagant/vagant_apr2010_spec.pdf). The teaching is provided in 15 specialties at eight colleges, schools and institutes (equal to a typical Ukrainian “faculty”) – College of Computer Science, School of Economics, College of Environmental and Medical Sciences, School of Political Science, Institute of Foreign Languages, School of Sociology, School of Law, Institute of Public Administration, Institute of Postgraduate Education. International cooperation is very important for the University as part of the formation and maintenance of the quality of educational standards. The webpage of the university states: “For securing of level of education equal to international standards, the university has strong links with different international organisations and foreign universities” (<http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=istorijavstanovlenja&hl=usa>).

The interview on internationalisation of BSSU was conducted with the Head of International Cooperation Office Mr. Volodynyr Romakin who has served in this position for eleven years. Mr. Romakin confirmed that international cooperation belongs to the priorities of the university and is undertaken in accordance with the “Concept of international cooperation development”. The University has no strategic plan of internationalisation.

Influencing factors and rationales

International cooperation of BSSU is influenced by a set of factors. First, BSSU is orientated toward local, national and international leadership among classical universities and toward pursuing Western academic standards. This conditions the composition of student population marked by ambitious internationally oriented talents. Certainly, influence is exerted by the funding sources and national legislation related to international academic cooperation.

The mission of international cooperation is formulated at the university’s website: “BSSU’s international activity is aimed not at getting profits, but at improvement of the quality of future specialists. We provide opportunities for students to obtain additional knowledge and promote the main achievements of the University – experience and qualifications of teachers. The way to solve the issue is participation in international exchange programs” (<http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=miznarodnaspivpracja&hl=usa>).

The most important rationales of internationalisation (graded 5) are the social rationale (gain international recognition), academic rationale (attract more talented teachers and students, improve research potential and enhance international and intercultural awareness of the teaching staff and students), economic rationale (attract additional funding sources). Of less importance (4) are the social rationale (enhance national competitiveness and image), the academic rationale (upgrade curricula and stimulate design of innovative curricula (3).

Activities and results of internationalisation

“Internationalisation at home” activities are versatile and similar to those of previously described in the case study of KSU. The geography of 12 international cooperation agreements includes universities of Germany, Switzerland, Russia, USA, Sweden, Canada, China and Poland. The teaching at the university incorporates international or intercultural aspects of the curricula, thematic courses with international orientation, the use of international case studies and studies of 4 foreign languages (English, German, French and Polish). A joint degree programme with Tbilisi University in the country of Georgia is being elaborated at present.

BSSU concentrates on cooperation with multiple international organisations, foundations, libraries (Peace Corps, International Renaissance Foundation, Goethe Institute, Union of Education and Science of Poland, etc.) (<http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=contactizmiznarodnimiorg&hl=usa>), cooperation for funding purpose with the branches of foreign businesses in Ukraine (e.g., Siemens from Germany and American-Polish ALDEC) and participation in international research and academic projects (e.g., TEMPUS). The university maintains contacts with 10 embassies of foreign countries, nine of which are European ones (<http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=contactizposolstavmi&hl=usa>).

Intercultural activities are similar to those of KSU: contacts with local cultural and international groups (e.g. Euroclub – Mykolaiv), establishment of international and bilateral centres (the Centre of International Student Internships). Recruitment of foreign students is not a priority for the university. The core of international research activities “at home” is made by organisation of international conferences at the university.

“Internationalisation abroad” is reflected in the outgoing mobility of staff and students (mobility in the framework of the Erasmus Mundus, scholarships for studies, research and teaching abroad), in publications in international research periodicals, in growing teaching at foreign universities (mostly American ones) and in the participation of BSSU staff and students in research conferences abroad. The university is working towards opening a university branch in Georgia.

The results of international cooperation are normally described in the reports to MESU. Major achievements of BSSU international activities are presented further. Sixteen teachers (5%) participated in the professional development programs abroad and this indicator is higher than that of KSU. Twenty nine students studied in the USA, which shows the preference of cooperation with this country. Seventy foreign teachers from USA, France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Romania, Poland and South Korea researched, lectured and provided consultancy at BSSU (<http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=inozemniprofessoriunas&hl=usa>) which is impressive for only ten years of university’s life.

The International Office actively disseminates information about international opportunities. Annually 30 different exchange programs are offered to students and this activity is rewarding, as the results show.

Internationalisation policy and strategies

BSSU expresses its commitment to internationalisation in the “Concept of international cooperation development”. This document formulates vision, strategy and plans for university

internationalisation as well as describes the policy of the process. The declared policy does not have any hidden agenda or contradictions and can be identified as encouraging and supportive. The university culture stimulates teachers and students to seek opportunities for international change and research and supports the seekers with resources available at the university. Accordingly, internationalisation is regarded as a positive phenomenon and enjoys the support and involvement of a critical mass of teachers, staff and students, though no specific incentives and rewards are assured. Internationalisation is regarded at BSSU as a strong competitive advantage at the regional level but it also contributes to the growing appreciation nationally.

International cooperation management structure is typical for a middle-size Ukrainian university. International cooperation at BSSU is coordinated by the International Office which was founded in 2000, simultaneously with the start of university operations with the mission “to expand and deepen its international contacts to raise the authority of BSSU in the world”. The activities of the Office are regulated by the “Statements about International Office”. The functions embrace representation, support service for local and foreign scholars, staff and students, coordination, information dissemination, supervising. They cover (http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=intdep_polog&hl=usa): a) Coordination of scientific and educational contacts with similar institutions abroad, attraction of the best foreign experts for teaching and foreign students for studies; b) Search and expansion of international educational, scientific and administrative contacts; c) Support and supervision of foreigners staying at the University for learning, teaching and research; d) Informing foreigners of study opportunities at BSSU; e) Reporting and visa support.

The International Office reports to the first Vice-Rector. The departments and faculties of BSSU report to the International Office on the planned and completed international activities and can approach the office for methodological, informational, regulatory and visa consultancy in this relation.

Though the “Concept of international cooperation development” is a policy document, it does not envisage any specific programmes in international cooperation promotion. Annual planning and budgeting is not possible due to non-predictability of funding, whereas the review and analysis at the Rector Council’s and Scientific Council’s meetings are undertaken to trace the trends and analyse strong and weak aspects of international cooperation. The interviewee states that a long-term strategy is not possible due to limitations in funding and legislation.

The elements of all Program Strategies by Knight are traced at his university. Academic Programs, Research and Scholarly Collaboration (all constituent elements), External Relations (especially collaboration with funding organisations and embassies of foreign countries in Ukraine) and Extracurricular Activities are considered equally important to make staff and students more internationalised. These strategies prevail as compared with Organisation strategies. In Organisation strategies, like in KSU, are evident three categories of elements. Operations are represented by appropriate organisational structures, balance between centralised and de-centralised promotion and management of internationalisation. Services are reflected in student support service for incoming and outgoing students. Human Resources strategy is revealed in the support of international assignments and sabbaticals.

Obstacles to internationalisation

The most influential the obstacles to internationalisation at BSSU rated higher than others (4) are: a) limited international experience and knowledge of the teaching and support staff; b) problems with regulatory framework. The regulatory framework is very impeding. For example, the interviewee states that BSSU for two years has not been able to pay member fees in international organisations (in particular, the European Association of Universities) because in accordance with the Ukrainian legislation on the state budget this requires a special permission of the Cabinet of Ministry of Ukraine to be obtained through MESYSU. Therefore, the chances to obtain this permission are minimal because the process might take a long time but still the permission might not be received.

Another problem concerns the formalities of international technical assistance to Ukrainian universities. A university should pay about 50% of the values of study materials and books as a customs fee and have a special license for obtaining them. For example, in January 2011, sets of German language manuals and CDs were sent back to the publishing house in Germany from customs.

Of less impact (3) are: a) administrative inertia and bureaucracy at the level of MESYSU; b) the absence of financial support at the sector level; a low level of knowledge and skills on the management of international activities; a lack of professional training for managers and staff involved in the process; c) a lack of funds and physical resources at the university, and a lack of interest on the staff side. Competition for resources within the university and the absence of a clear strategy were ranged in the group of the lowest effect. The lack of interest on the side of the university administration is minimal (1).

In general, the obstacles at the institutional level can be overcome quite quickly, whereas the national legislation and the inertia of the sector management produce a long-term restraining effect.

Internationalisation models

The conducted interview showed that only signs of different stages can be traced at BSSU because, the classifications are based on the long-term development strategy whereas at BSSU “it looks more like a hunting: shoot whenever you see the target” (personal interview, December 20, 2010). This statement proves the prevalence of ad-hoc and non-systemic approaches, but high zeal and activeness.

According to Neave’s model, BSSU might be characterised by the combination of *unit-driven in initiation but centralised in management* with the dominance of the latter one. This is typical for Ukrainian middle-size universities, whereas big universities have a less centralised operational system of international cooperation. Also, there is a symbiosis of the *proactive approach*, expressed in an active search for opportunities and procedure initiating, and the *reactive approach, reflected by controlling, coordination and controlling functions*.

In Rudzki’s model, the university combines the *stages of contact* (limited mobility, engagement of academic staff in international contacts, curriculum development), *central control* (expansion of activities and gaining of control over international contacts by administration) and *formalisation* (formalisation of links in institutional agreements) of the reactive model with the characteristics of the analysis expressed in the awareness of the importance of internationalisation and understanding of its meaning and taking decision to internationalise.

If the internationalisation of BSSU is viewed through the prism of Davies’s quadrant, the international mission implemented in intensive and well-coordinated activities, explicit policies and supporting procedure is characteristic of the *central-systematic strategy*. At the same time combined with the off-hand activities undertaken without any long-term strategy is typical for the *ad-hoc strategy*.

Following Van Dijk and Meijer’s model, the policy of international cooperation at BSSU can be identified as *central for the management of the institution*, with interactive support and systemic implementation. According to de Wit, BSSU can be also classified simultaneously as a quick starter and an organised leader that has been rapidly progressing.

The stages of *recognising the need for change, and formulating a solution, initiating and implementing it* in Van der Wende’s model of innovative process are identified by the interviewee as the current standing of BSSU.

Following the interviewee, BSSU combines the features of the *first stage characterised by the student mobility* and the *second stage emphasising curriculum and research internationalisation* of Söderqvist's classification.

According to Knight's cycle model, BSSU is combining the features of the *phase of awareness of needs and benefits of internationalisation for all groups at a university with the features of the stage of commitment by all groups*.

It can be concluded that BSSU views international cooperation as one of the major tools to gain national and international recognition. Still, due to financial and legislative constraints, the university is able to develop and complete only tactical tasks but not long-term strategies.

5.3 Chapter conclusions

The compared case studies of the universities prove the increasing national trend to consider institutional internationalisation as an important tool in enhancing the regional and the national status. The reason for that is the need to accelerate the pace of development for both recently formed (BSSU) or re-shaped (KSU) institutions, but BSSU has more ambitious plans to gain international recognition. Both universities use international activities to improve the quality of teaching and research, but for KSU the financial rationale is equally important to the latter mentioned.

The prioritised international cooperation activities at the analysed two universities are similar to each other and to those of the benchmarking Ukrainian trend. It can be argued that universities do what they are offered and what they are allowed to do in the environment of financial and legal limitations. Both institutions, like majority of Ukrainian universities, have to be entrepreneurial in searching for and implementing opportunities of international cooperation. Therefore, the generalised approach can be characterised as reactive and ad-hoc one due to financial and legal constraints, though BSSU more accentuates legal constraints as a restraining factor. The same constraints prevent KSU and BSSU from an active management process that envisages planning, monitoring, analysis and reviewing. In both universities internationalisation is centrally managed with the high level of senior management commitment. The level of involvement of the staff and students into international activities looks to be higher at BSSU and this is explained by the higher emphasis on pervasive devotion to internationalisation at the institution. That is why KSU names itself an "entrepreneurial university" whereas BSSU – an "organised leader".

At both KSU and BSSU, similar to the national trend, Academic Programs, Research and Scholarly Collaboration strategies are dominant because they are more concentrated on activities and are typical for mid-stages of internationalisation. At these stages the minimal set of Organisation strategies (appropriate organisational structures, balance between centralised and de-centralised promotion and management of internationalisation), Operations Services (student support service for incoming and outgoing students) and Human Resources (support for international assignments and sabbaticals) are combined.

Both universities report that internationalisation of the university combines the features of different stages. KSU identifies the features of the third and of the fourth stages, BSSU is combining the features of the first and second stages in the classification of Söderqvist. The difference is also observed in the stage identification by Van der Wende's classification: the *phase of institutionalisation* at KSU and the *phases of recognising the need for change, and formulating a solution, initiating and implementing it* in BSSU. In Knight's combination KSU places itself at the *stage of institutionalisation* and BSSU sees itself at the *phase of awareness of needs and benefits of internationalisation for all groups at a university* with the features of the *stage of commitment by all groups*.

The same phenomenon was traced with the models: it is difficult to identify a prevailing model. This can be explained by the quick progress of institutional internationalisation in Ukraine and by impossibility to shift to the commercialised or pervasive stages due to legal and financial limitations and political non-popularity of Ukrainian universities as a study abroad location among foreigners.

The remark should be made that the identification of models and internationalisation stages was made subjectively by the heads of the international offices and, therefore, reflects the level of ambitions of the particular administrator either to provide a reasonable evaluation or embellish the situation of the university.

Unfortunately, since no statistics or calculated national indicators of internationalisation (e.g., percentage of foreign students at the university, percentage of students participating in mobility to the overall student body of the university, percentage of the teaching-research staff in the overall staff, the growth dynamics) exist and the dynamics of university internationalisation is not tracked, no statistical comparisons of the case study universities can be done. The universities, like most universities in Ukraine, are not willing to share the detailed statistical data. Consequently, they only can be compared in their policies, strategies and models. Alternatively the calculations can be made independently, using the data provided by the universities but the parameters measured by absolute figures are arbitrary

and very often embellished because universities wish to present the activities as more productive than they are in reality. For example, the number of foreign visitors in institutional reports typically includes all visitors with purposes different from research and teaching (representative visits, negotiations, etc.). This happens because no clear indicators and their definitions have been elaborated at the sector level, but the ambiguity is used both by MESYSU and by universities to make the “internationalisation picture” more attractive.

6 Effects of internationalisation on the higher education system of Ukraine

The benefits of higher education internationalisation, according to Lajos (1996) in Bremer (1997, p. 206) can be traced in three ways. It can 1) facilitate the restructuring and development of universities, 2) upgrade the services that universities provide to the society and 3) strengthen links with other more developed societies. Is this applicable to Ukraine?

In the years 2003-2004 major discussions in Ukraine focused on the “pros” of joining Bologna, whereas the publications of later years concentrated on the issues of implementation and weighting the risks and “cons” of the process. To date the effects of this reforming initiative on the development of higher education in Ukraine have not been examined. The Bologna Process became the first initiative in the higher education of Ukraine based on and further stimulating the internationalised background per the definition of internationalisation by Knight. As a result of the Bologna process, internationalisation was put “more strongly into an overall perspective of higher education” (Hahn and Teichler, 2005, p. 50). This is more applicable to structural reforms than to internationalisation in the meaning of international cooperation activities and mobility.

Without any doubt, internationalisation produced a great positive reforming effect on the higher education system of Ukraine due to its innovative potential, considered by many researchers as strength (Grünzweig & Rinehart, 2002, p.147 in Bostrom, 2010, p.147; Söderqvist, <http://www.eaie.org/pdf/F41art2.pdf>). Today, in Ukraine innovations are needed so that the system could respond to the challenges of the time.

First, as Bremer (1997, p.220) notes, the changes owe to the opening of the formerly closed society, and this happened to a great extent due to internationalisation.

Second, after the opening of the Bologna period, internationalisation started influencing the formation of the national policy in the field: it modified the structure of university administration, changed the structure of degrees in terms of increasing compatibility with the European and world degree structure, modified content and

methodology, introduced subjects and credit system, increased the number of foreign languages taught, introduced new forms of delivery that are in required to facilitate life-long learning. This was the only possible way of advancement in the still centrally administered higher education system, and this path significantly differs from the path taken by the majority countries in the Central and Eastern Europe, where “this structural reform is..... laid down in legislation only in reaction to reform measures already being accomplished in the institutions” (Bremer, 1997, p.220). The lack of autonomy of Ukrainian universities as well as the low role of professional associations is still the challenge. But internationalisation increased the role of universities in the Clark’s triangle proportionally to the influence of the western standards (concerns mostly the freedom of universities, not the personal academic freedom) and made them more entrepreneurial. This means that internationalisation touched greatly the institutional level, but did not change the foundation of the system administration at the national level. Also, internationalisation was promoted by international organisations and increased their role in the policy formation at the sector level.

Third, similar to the situation with the Central and Eastern European countries, internationalisation in Ukraine brought reforms that, in their turn, target to further internationalisation (Bremer, 1997, p. 206), in particular growing mobility, activation of communication and cooperation with the international community of scholars and academics, creating international strategic alliances that enrich universities and, in the long-run prospect, serve as the international social and business investment in Ukraine.

Internationalisation and its culture introduced by the staff and students who have been abroad on different missions brought more international and intercultural awareness and tolerance, more westernised academic culture aiming at increasing student independence and responsibility. At many universities internationalisation started to play the role of the instrument that improves institutional standing and reputation.

Internationalisation contributes positively to the issues brought forward by globalisation which found expression in Ukraine in the changing employment expectations and the vital need to be competitive internationally. Internationalisation of higher education, through reformation of teaching, is helpful in bringing the provided educational services to the requirements of businesses and local communities which are rapidly changing under the influence of economic globalisation. This allows progress towards accomplishing of goals stated in the policy documents at the national level and enriches the activities of universities in their target to become competitive so far nationally, but later on internationally.

At the same time, the issue of duplicating the western standards of higher education in a completely different culture led to active discussions about benefits and threats of the implementation of international standards. The discussions about whether the reforms are justified and beneficial for the system or only a tribute to politics and economic globalisation never stop. One can even argue that globalisation came to Ukraine in the form of Bolonisation and the need to adopt externally set standards, ironically, promoted internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine, not vice versa. This active intrusion and following discussions agitated a conservative and static world of national higher education and showed the interest and liveliness of experts, researchers and professionals.

Therefore, having answered positively to the three questions of Lajos, it is possible to say that internationalisation, as “a pervasive force, shaping and challenging the higher education sector” (Ninomiya et al., 2009, p. 117) and contributing to the system development, is very beneficial for contemporary higher education of Ukraine.

7 Conclusions

It is time to summarise the conclusions of the completed research.

Internationalisation of the higher education system in Ukraine started with the independence of Ukraine as a result of the breakdown of the Soviet Union in 1991. To date two periods of the internationalisation process can be reported: a) international cooperation initiated by universities and then streamlined by the Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine between 1991 and 2005; and b) top-down introduction and implementation of the provisions of the Bologna Declaration after 2005.

Ukraine is characterised at present by co-existence of a traditional complex internationalisation model and a regional type of internationalisation – Bolonisation. The first type is characterised by a bottom-up model with a prevalence of the activity-approach, the enhancing management of the process and the strengthening appreciation of internationalisation as being instrumental in upgrading functions and services of a university. Bolonisation is a top-down model with a prevalence of structural reforms concerning the structure of degrees, quality insurance, recognition issues in the whole system. These two lines of internationalisation are characterised by different levels of interest from national internationalisation actors. MESYSU reveals more devotion to Bolonisation in the part of supporting regulatory frameworks, planning and funding following its political motivation to improve the reputation of the national higher education system as a part of the EU joining strategy. For universities international project activities, mobility and curricula modernisation

are priorities in improving their local, national and international statuses through upgrading the quality of educational services and research as well as securing funding of international and foreign donors for this purpose.

Internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine is characterised by an ad-hoc reactive approach both at the sector and at the institutional level; it is rationale and policy driven regarding Bologna reforms and activity driven regarding traditional international academic cooperation.

At the sector level no general internationalisation strategy exists, but the strategy of Bolonisation has been elaborated and is being implemented by MESYSU with the increasing role of supranational and bilateral organisations. The role of the institution management, the academic oligarchy and market force in internationalisation coordination is limited at the sector level. State funding of internationalisation is poor and is not spent in the form of the open transparent programs but is distributed following hidden criteria and non-transparent policy of MESYSU. The steering mode regarding internationalisation at the sector level can be identified as regulative and controlling through legal frameworks and detailed supervision. In respect to the Bologna process, the earlier enumerated functions are revealed, but additionally the planning function is observed. In general, the higher education system lacks national leadership in promoting internationalisation. The process is not understood as a mainstream strategy in the system reforms. This does not allow for more dynamic advancement of universities obliged to follow national policy guidelines. This “situation is likely to be attributed to a lack of conceptualisation on the part of educational policy makers” (van der Wende, 1997, in Avila, 2007, p. 406). The words of Rouhani (2007, p.473) are also true for Ukraine: “Internationalisation remains a peripheral issue on the agenda of government policymakers and is handled on an ad hoc basis, with no long-term vision or strategic considerations”. Similarity with the internationalisation specifics described by Rouhani (2007) for South Africa and Avila for Latin America (2007) brings to the opinion in Ukraine the model partly similar to the one in the developing countries. A deplorable situation with research and analysis on the national situation with internationalisation aggravates the situation.

At the institutional level internationalisation is regarded as an instrument of different degree of importance depending on the overall university mission and strategy. A typical situation consists of the discrepancies in the declared plans and their implementation due to multiple subjective and objective barriers. This situation is described by Kishun (2007, p.465) regarding South Africa but is true for Ukraine as well: “As in many other countries, there is a

gap between what higher education leaders say about international education and actual practice”. This gap is noticeable in the differences between institutional mission statements and the reality of institution practices as revealed by their strategic plans, policies, and resource allocations. The barriers can be partly or completely overcome if the commitment of the senior leadership is assured, because bottom-up initiatives without a due support from the management have few chances to grow into an institutional strategy at Ukrainian universities which are characterised by still strong hierarchical structure and bureaucratic-political governance model typical for post-Soviet education systems. At the same time internationalisation has not yet become “a shared responsibility across campus” (Kishun, 2007, p. 466) and international activities are regarded as an activity for selected committed volunteers. Institutional internationalisation in Ukraine is characterised by a lack of internationalisation policies and organisational strategies. Therefore, the process is not systematic and central to the institutional development. It is still regarded as peripheral or in a better case to a different degree instrumental to modernisation of the university. Internationalisation strategies, if exist, are not comprehensive (especially in regard to institutionalisation) but they are becoming increasingly goal-driven. The national internationalisation environment with strict regulation and a lack of financial support from the Government stimulates entrepreneurialism of universities stronger than in any other activity domain. The universities described in the case studies of the research prove the trend.

Internationalisation brought an enormous positive effect into the development of the higher education in Ukraine. In the overall perspective it stimulated modernisation of priorities, goals, models and instruments of the system development as well as involved new stakeholders and players. It can be stated that its effects are more visible at the institutional level. At the same time internationalisation provoked discussions about the threats of duplicating the Western educational standards in Ukraine and the necessity to balance the best national achievements of higher education with the progressive innovations that increase its social relevance.

To sum up, though internationalisation effected magnificent positive contribution in shaking the statics of the Ukrainian higher education system, it is not yet in the mainstream of the academic development. Therefore, the stages of its progress according to different classifications are in the middle and below, showing a great potential and the need for efforts to achieve institutionalisation of internationalisation and enjoy its benefits.

Implications for future action

Challenges and threats can be turned on its head to become a rich source of opportunities, if future research and actions show they are realistic and obtainable. One of the most important implications regarding internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine is linked to policy and funding, both at the national and institutional levels, a typical feature for developing countries. Internationalisation should gain attention of all stakeholders and stimulate commitment to agreed, planned and well-coordinated actions.

Ukraine needs a comprehensive national policy regarding internationalisation of higher education that will produce the readiness to understand and articulate the benefits available from these efforts, to formulate clear goals and strategies, to identify appropriate and fiscally realistic budgets, to integrate policy objectives and strategies in all higher education institution sectors and to develop criteria for assessment of results.

Thus, it is paramount to conduct more research in the field of internationalisation to be able to analyse its advantages and shortcomings for the development of the national higher education system. The tasks are still large-scale and call for commitment, solid funding and well-trained researchers and professionals.

Reference list

About the university (in Ukrainian). In *Vagant* # 118, April 2010, p. 4

URL: http://grani.zymichost.com/files/vagant/vagant_apr2010_spec.pdf

Academy of Pedagogical Science of Ukraine. Institute of Higher Education (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.apsu.org.ua/ua/structure/institution/Invysh>

Action programme regarding the implementation of the provisions of Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education of Ukraine (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>

Agreement between the European Community and Ukraine on the facilitation of the issuance of visas

URL: <http://www.ukraine-eu.mfa.gov.ua/eu/en/publication/content/11576.htm>

Altbach, P. (2004) Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary education and management*. Vol. 10(1), pp. 3-25

Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Realities in an unequal world. In *J. Forest and P. Altbach (Eds). International handbook of higher education*. Vol.1. Dordrecht: Springer, pp.121-140

Altbach, P. and Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 11, no. 3-4 pp. 290 – 305

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/11/3-4/290>

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. A report prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education. Paris: UNESCO

Andreichuk, S. (2007). State governance in reforming the higher education of Ukraine in the context of the Bologna Process (in Ukrainian). Candidate of Nauk thesis. Lviv: Lviv Regional Institute of State Governance of the Presidential National Academy of State Governance

Avila, J. G. (2007). The process of internationalization of Latin American higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 11, no. 3-4, pp. 400-409

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/11/3-4/400>

Black Sea State University. History of foundation

URL: <http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=istorijavstanovljenja&hl=usa>

Black Sea State University. International cooperation.

URL: <http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=miznarodnaspivpracja&hl=usa>

Black Sea State University. International cooperation. Contacts with foreign embassies.

URL: <http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=contactizposolstavmi&hl=usa>

Black Sea State University. International cooperation. Foreign professors at our university.

URL: <http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=inozemniprofessoriunas&hl=usa>

Black Sea State University. International cooperation. International Department. The Statements about International Department

URL: http://www.kma.mk.ua/index.php?page=intdep_polog&hl=usa

Block, P. (1995). Policy and policy implementation in internationalisation of higher education. EAIE Occasional paper # 8. Amsterdam: EAIE

Böhm, A. et al. (2002). Global student mobility 2025: forecasts of the global demand for international higher education. New South Wales: IDP Education Australia

Borisova, M. (2009). Globalisation and internationalisation of university education in Canada (in Russian). URL: www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Pfto/2009.../ped_02_09_Borisova.pdf

Bostrom, C. (2010). Diffusion of internationalization in Turkish higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, # 14, pp.143-160

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/14/2/143>

Bremer, L. (1997). Central and Eastern Europe and Russia. In T. Källemark and M. van der Wende (Eds.). *National policies for internationalisation of higher education in Europe*. Stockholm: SNAHE, pp. 202-224

Budget 2009 of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (in Ukrainian)

URL: http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=budget/vik_derzh

Changing rules. The review of the projects of the TEMPUS program in administration (March 2010). URL: <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus>

Childress, L.K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education* # 13, pp. 289-309

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/3/289>

Clark, B. (1986). The higher education system. Academic organisation in cross-national perspective. Berkley: University of California Press

Davies, J. (1995). University strategies for internationalization in different institutional and cultural settings. In P. Block (Ed.). *Policy and policy implementation in internationalization of higher education*. Amsterdam: EAIE, pp.3-18

De Jong, H. and Teekens, H. (2003). The case of the University of Twente: Internationalisation as education policy. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 7, #1; pp. 41-51. URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/7/1/41>

Education of Ukraine (2001). Informational-analytical review completed for the II All-Ukrainian congress of educationalists. Kyiv: Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Haddad, W. D. (1995). Education policy-planning process: an applied framework. Paris: UNESCO

Hahn, K. and Teichler, U. (2005). Internationalisation mainstreaming in higher education. In *Globalization and higher education*. RIHE International Publication Series, # 69, pp.39-66

Higher education of Ukraine – a European dimension: conditions, problems, perspectives. Decision of Ministry of education and Science of Ukraine dated 02.04.2009 (in Ukrainian)
URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>

Huang, F. (2007). Internationalisation of higher education in the developing and emerging countries: A focus on transnational higher education in Asia. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, # 11
URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/11/3-4/421>

Huisman, J. and Wende, van der, M. (Eds) (2005). On competition and cooperation II. Bonn: Lemmens

Groof, de, J., Neave, G. and Svec, J. (1998). Democracy and governance in higher education. Boston: Kluwer Law International

Grünzweig, W. & Rinehart, N. (Eds.). (2002). Rockin' in Red Square: Critical approaches to international education in the age of cyberculture. Munster: LIT

Guliajeva, N. (2005). Mobility of teachers and students: problems and guidelines. In *Materials of the VI annual international conference "Development of business education in Ukraine" (17-19 February, 2005, Dnipropetrovs'k (In Ukrainian))*. Kyiv: Consortium on the Enhancement of Management Education in Ukraine, pp. 76-81

Gurova, K. (2008). Internationalisation of higher education as the factor of the formation of professional quality of a manager (in Russian). In *MSU Visnyk*, # 11, pp.58-61
URL: <http://msu.kharkov.ua/files/vestnik/2008/ekonomika-08-1.pdf>

Kehm, B. M. (2003). Internationalisation in higher education: from regional to global. In *R. Begg (Ed.). The dialogue between higher education research and practice*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 109-119

Kehm, B. M. and Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation of higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 11, # 3-4, pp.260-273

Kherson State University. International relations (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.university.kherson.ua/About/InternationRelation.aspx>

Kherson State University website. International relations. KSU partners (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.university.kherson.ua/About/InternationRelation/Internationalpartners.aspx>

Kherson State University. International relations. International projects (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.university.kherson.ua/About/InternationRelation/Internationalprojects.aspx>

Kherson State University. Main page. About us (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.ksu.ks.ua/About.aspx>

Kishun, R. (2007). The Internationalisation of higher education in South Africa: Progress and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 11, # 3-4, pp. 455-469

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/11/3-4/455>

Knight, J. (2001). Monitoring the quality and progress of internationalization

Journal of Studies in International Education, vol. 5, # 3, pp. 228-243

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/5/3/228>

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, #33, pp. 2-3

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 8; # 1, pp.5-31

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/8/1/5>

Knight, J. (2006). Internationalisation of higher education: new directions, new challenges. 2005 IAU Global Survey Report. Paris: International Association of Universities

Kremin', V. (Ed.), (2004). Major principles of development of higher education in Ukraine in the context of the Bologna Process. Documents and materials 2003-2004 (in Ukrainian). Ternopil': Ternopil' state pedagogical university named after Volodymyr Gnatiuk

Kremin', V. (Ed.), (2004). Higher education of Ukraine and Bologna process (in Ukrainian). Kyiv, Ternopil': Bohdan

Kremen, V. and Nikolajenko, S. (2006). Higher education in Ukraine. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES

Lajos, T. (1996). The Hungarian experience of academic cooperation with North America and the European Community. In P. Blumentahl et al. (Eds.). *Academic mobility in a changing world*. Higher Education Policy Series, # 29, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers

Law of Ukraine on education (1996) (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?page=1&nreg=1060-12>

Law of Ukraine on higher education (2002) (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=2984-14>

Law of Ukraine on scientific research and scientific research-technical activities (1992) (in Ukrainian). URL: <http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=1977-12>

Lisbon Recognition Convention.

URL: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lisbon_Recognition_Convention

Main developments in the higher education system of Ukraine 2005-2007. Ukraine's national report. URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>

McLellan, C. E. (2006). Internationalisation as a national policy issue in South African higher education: A look at the policy context and a way forward. In R. Kishun (Ed.). *The internationalisation of higher education in South Africa*. Durban, South Africa: IEASA, pp. 179-190

Meek, V. Lynn (2002). Changing patterns in modes of co-ordination of higher education. *In J. Enders and O. Fulton (Ed.) Higher education in a globalizing world. International trends and mutual observations. A festschrift in Honour of Ulrich Teichler.* Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 53-69

MESU ranking 2007: ranking of higher educational institutions within groups (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.osvita.org.ua/abitur/entrance/ratings/20.html>

MESU ranking 2007: ranking of universities – a step towards the openness and transparency of higher education (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.osvita.org.ua/abitur/entrance/ratings/19.html>

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (2005). Higher education and science – the most important spheres of responsibility of the civil society and the basis for innovative development. Informational-analytical materials of the final Board of the Ministry of Education and Science (in Ukrainian). Kyiv: MESU

Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine. Higher education (in Ukrainian). URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>

Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine. Higher education. Bologna process (in Ukrainian).

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher/bolpr>

Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine. International cooperation (in Ukrainian). URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=international>

Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine. Normative acts. International cooperation (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=laws/education/prof-tech/7/0001>

Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine. Nostrification (in Ukrainian). URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=nostr>

National Doctrine of Education Development (in Ukrainian)

URL: http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/category?cat_id=825538

National Programme “Osvita” (in Ukrainian)

URL: http://uazakon.com/documents/date_5x/pg_irwjios/index.htm

Ninomiya, A., Knight, J., Watanabe, A. (2009). The past, present, and future of internationalisation in Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, # 13, pp.117-124

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/13/2/117>

NG, Shun Wing. What should internationalisation of higher education aim at?

URL: <http://www.docin.com/p-72331117.html>

OECD (2004). Internationalisation and trade in higher education. Opportunities and challenges. Paris: OECD Publishing, pp.91-100

On approval of the Action Programme aimed at implementation of the conventions of Bologna Declaration in the system of higher education and science of Ukraine for years 2004-2005. Order of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 49 dated 23.01.2004 (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher/bolpr>

On approval of the Plan of actions to assure quality of higher education of Ukraine and its integration into the European and world community for the period till 2010. Order of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 612 dated 13.07.2007 (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher/bolpr>

On approval of the Regulation on recognition of the foreign education certificates. Order of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 563 dated 20.08.2003 (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=laws/education/prof-tech/7/0001>

On celebrating the day of Europe in Ukraine. Letter of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine dated 10.05.2006 (in Ukrainian)

On conducting the pedagogical experiment on the credit module system of organisation of educational process. Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 48 dated 23.01.2004 (in Ukrainian). In *Osvita*, # 8, 2004, p. 4

On Europe Day. Order of the President of Ukraine № 339/2003 dated 19.04.2000

URL: http://search.ligazakon.ua/l_doc2.nsf/link1/U339_03.html

On implementation of international projects in the sphere of education. Order of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 648 dated 12.11.2002 (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=laws/education/prof-tech/7/0001>

On international cooperation. Letter of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine dated 05.12. 2008 (in Ukrainian)

On introduction of credit-module system of educational process organisation. Order of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 774 dated 30.12.2004 (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher/bolpr>

On the plan of events to implement the State Programme on informing the public regarding Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine for years 2004-2007. Order of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine dated 16.03.2006 (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/integration>

Principal trends of modernisation of higher education structure in Ukraine

URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/main.php?query=education/higher>

Reichert, S. and Wächter, B. (2000). The globalisation of education and training: recommendations for coherent response of the European Union, Academic Co-operation Association. Study commissioned by the Directorate-General for Education and Culture, European Commission. Brussels: ACA

URL: http://www.aca-secretariat.be/fileadmin/aca_docs/documents/reports/globalisation-oth-enl-t07.pdf

Rouhani, S. (2007). Internationalisation of South African higher education in the postapartheid era. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol.11, # 3-4, pp. 470-485

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/11/3-4/470>

Rudzki, R. (1995). The application of a strategic management model to the internationalization of higher education institutions. *Higher Education*, 29(4), pp. 421-441.

Rudzki, R. (1998). The strategic management of internationalization. Towards a model of theory and practice. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Saginova, O. (2010, a). Internationalisation of higher education as a factor of competitiveness (in Russian). URL: http://www.marketologi.ru/lib/saginova/inter_vuz2.html

Saginova, O. (2010, b). Internationalization as applied to the area of higher education (in Russian). URL: <http://lib.kture.kharkov.ua/ua/elehx28/4.php>

Sandrygailo, I. (2009). Dialogue of cultures in the context of globalisation and internationalisation of higher education (in Russian)

URL: www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/pednauk/2009_2/99.pdf

Scott, P. (1992). Mass higher education in Europe – implications for student mobility and international education. EAIE: Amsterdam

Scott, P. (1998). Massification, internationalisation and globalisation. In P. Scott (Ed.). *The society for research in higher education*. Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk: St. Edmundsbury Press, pp. 108-129

Sikors'ka, I. (2006). Enhancement of state administration of higher education in the context of European integration (in Ukrainian). Kandidat Nauk thesis. Donetsk: Donetsk State University of Management

Söderqvist, M. (2002). The internationalisation of higher education institutions

URL: <http://www.eaie.org/pdf/F41art2.pdf>

Söderqvist, M. (2007). *Internationalization and its management at higher education institutions: applying conceptual, context and discourse analysis*. Helsinki: Helsinki School of Economics

Smith, A. (1993). *International education – a question of quality*. EAIE occasional paper # 7. Amsterdam: EAIE

State Statistics Committee of Ukraine. Higher education institutions (in Ukrainian)

URL: <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua>

Taylor, J. (2004). *Toward a Strategy for Internationalisation: Lessons and Practice from Four Universities*. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, # 8, pp. 149-168

URL: <http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/8/2/149>

Teichler, U. (2002). *Internationalisation of higher education in Europe*. Unpublished conference paper

Teichler, U. (2003). *The future of higher education and the future of higher education Research*. *Tertiary Education and Management* vol. 9, # 3, pp.171-185

Teichler, U. (2004). *The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education*. *Higher Education* # 48. Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 5-26

Teichler, U. (2005). *Research on higher education in Europe*. *European Journal of Education*, # 40(4), pp. 447-469

TEMPUS in Ukraine. Webpage of TEMPUS office in Ukraine.

URL: <http://www.tempus.org.ua/en/tempus.html>

TEMPUS in Ukraine outlines. Webpage of TEMPUS office in Ukraine

URL: <http://www.tempus.org.ua/en/tempus/tempus-v-ukraini.html>

The Cabinet of Ministers will fund sending abroad of 3000 students (October 26, 2010) (in Russian). *Finance news* website. URL: <http://news.finance.ua/ru/~1/0/all/2010/10/26/214502>

The system of education in Ukraine: the state and prospects of development (in Ukrainian). *National Security and Defence*, #4 (28), 2002. pp.2-35

Titarchuk, V. (2005). Socio-cultural globalisation of higher education: trends and consequences (in Ukrainian)

URL: www.viche.info/journal/391/

Trohymets, O. (2009). Development of higher education under globalization conditions (in Ukrainian)

URL: http://sites.zhu.edu.ua/news_details.php?news_id=4227&lang=ukr

Ukraine's national higher education system. URL: http://www.ednu.kiev.ua/edu_h_e.htm

Ukraine's national report 2007-2009. URL: <http://www.mon.gov.ua/education/higher/bolpr>

UNESCO ranking of Ukrainian universities “Top 200”, year 2009 (in Ukrainian)

URL: http://www.dt.ua/img/st_img/2009/747/12_vo_send_ukr.gif

Vakarchuk, I. (2008). Higher education of Ukraine – European dimension: state, problems, perspectives (in Ukrainian). *Higher education of Ukraine*, # 4, pp.106-108

Veld, R. in't, Füssel, H.-P., Neave, G. (1996). Relations between state and higher education. The Hague/London/Boston: Kluwer Law International

Verbyts'ka, S. (2008). Trends of development of internal internationalization of higher education (in Ukrainian)

URL: www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/pednauk/2008_3/10.pdf

Wende, van der, M. (1997). Missing links: The relationship between national policies for internationalisation and those for higher education in general. In T. Kälvermark and M. van der Wende (Eds.). *National policies for the internationalization of higher education in Europe* Stockholm: SNAHE, pp. 10-38

Wende, van der, M. (1999). An innovation perspective on internationalisation of higher education institutionalisation: The Critical Phase. *Journal of Studies in International Education* # 3, pp. 1-14

Wit, de, H. (Ed.) (1995). Strategies for internationalization of higher education. A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America. Amsterdam: EAIE

Wit, de, H. (2002). Internationalization of higher education in the United States: a historical, comparative, and contextual analysis. Westport: Greenwood Press

Yandul'ski, O. (2008). Implementation of principles and requirements of Bologna process in Ukraine as the basis for the mobility development (on the example of electrical engineering). Power Point presentation (in Ukrainian)
URL: <http://kpi.ua/SCM-T076A04/Yandulski.ppt>

INTERVIEWS

Personal communication with Hrygoriy Baran on June 30, 2010. Kyiv

Personal communication with Volodymyr Romakin on December 20, 2010. Kyiv

Appendix 1

List of charts

Chart 1. Main indicators of higher education development in Ukraine	18
Chart 2. Dynamics of higher education development in Ukraine	19
Chart 3. Indicators of higher education internationalisation in Ukraine	42

Appendix 2

List of abbreviations

- ACTR/ACCELS – the American Councils for International Education
- BSSU – the Black Sea State University
- CIDA – the Canadian Agency for International Development
- DAAD – the German Academic Exchanges Service
- ECTS – the European Credit Transfer System
- EHEA – the European Higher Education Area
- EPP – an educational-professional programme
- EQAR – European Quality Assurance Register
- EU – the European Union
- FSA – the Freedom Support Act
- IAU – the International Association of Universities
- ICT – Informational communications and technologies
- KSU – the Kherson State University
- MESU – the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (the official title till December 2010)
- MESYSU – the Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine (the official title since December 2010)
- NATO – the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
- NGO – a non-governmental organisation
- NQF – the National Qualifications Framework
- NaUKMA – the National University “Kyiv Mohyla Academy”
- NTUU “KPI” – the National Technical University of Ukraine “KPI”
- OECD – the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
- SIDA – the Swedish Agency for International Development
- SWOT – Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
- TEMPUS – the Trans-European Mobility Partnership Scheme
- UNESCO – the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation
- USAID – the United States Agency for International Development
- USSR – the United Soviet Socialist Republics

Appendix 3

Preparatory questionnaire for the interview “University internationalisation”

Dear _____!

Thank you for your agreement to describe the internationalisation strategy of your university. This activity will constitute a part of the thesis research “Internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine” undertaken in the framework of the International Master Programme “Higher Education Research and Development” administered by the International Higher Education Research Centre, University of Kassel, Germany.

1. Is there a strategic development plan at the university? If such plan exists, does international cooperation development belong to priorities?
2. Which department is responsible for international cooperation?
3. What are rationales and goals of international cooperation? (rank, please, by the level importance from 0 till 5, where “0” – “not important at all” , a “5” - “very important”).

<i>Goal</i>	<i>Importance</i>
Gain international recognition	
Enhance national competitiveness and image	
Attract more talented teachers and students	
Improve research potential	
Upgrade curricula	
Improve international and intercultural awareness of the teaching staff and students	
Stimulate design of innovative curricula	
Attract additional funding sources	

4. Which internationalisation activities out of below enumerated ones are undertaken at the university?

Agreements with foreign universities
Visits and stays of foreign scholars for teaching and research
Outgoing mobility of staff and students (conferences, professional development, studies, internships)

Double or joint degrees
International or intercultural aspects of the curricula
Thematic courses with international orientation
Foreign language studies
Integration of international case studies
Participation in international research projects
Publications in the international periodicals
Recruitment of foreign students
Contacts with local cultural and international groups
Export of study programs abroad
Branches of the university abroad
Teaching at foreign universities
International conferences at the university
International and bilateral centres at the university
International publications in the university periodicals
Contacts with local cultural and international groups

5. Which strategies are used for internationalisation?

Commitment of the senior administration
Support and involvement of critical mass of teachers, staff and students?
Policy
International office
Adequate funding
Incentives and rewards
Annual planning, budgeting and review process

6. Do the Organisations strategies or Programs strategies prevail?
7. Which documents describe the results of international cooperation?
8. Which factors, to your mind, impede internationalisation (please range the degree of influence of the factors below from 0 till 5 where 0 – “no influence” and 5 – “very strong influence”)?

<i>Influencing factor</i>	<i>Degree of influence</i>
Lack of interest of the teaching staff	
Administrative inertia or bureaucratic barriers at the level of the Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sports	
Limited experience and knowledge of the teaching staff in international cooperation	
Absence of a policy/ strategy to manage the process	
Lack of interest and recognition of internationalisation by the university administration	
Shortage of funding and physical resources at the university	
Competition of priorities (time and resources) at the university	
Absence of financial support at the national level	
Regulatory framework issues	
Insufficient theoretical and practical knowledge on internationalisation and management of international cooperation.	
Other issues	

9. Please define the model of internationalisation at your university following the provided theoretical frameworks (the description of internationalisation models at the institutional level is provided to the interviewee).
10. Which incentives for international activities of the teaching staff exist at the university?
11. What are funding sources of international activities at the university?
12. Does the funding level of internationalisation cover existing needs?
13. What is the percentage of teachers and students participating in international activities?
14. Is international cooperation planned, budgeted and reviewed annually?

Your cooperation is highly appreciated!

The present research undertakes the first attempt to systematically describe internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine with reference to the international theory in the field by exploring:

1. The current state of internationalisation of higher education in Ukraine at the sector and at the institutional levels including context, rationales, meaning, actors and stakeholders, policy formation and implementation, achievements and failures, stage of development in the view of existing classifications;
2. Similarities with international trends and specifics;
3. Contribution of internationalisation into the development of higher education in Ukraine.

The analysis of national higher education internationalisation policy bases on the policy documents and reports, whereas the analysis of internationalisation at the institutional level grounds on empirical observations, interviewing and is furnished by two case studies that illustrate national trends.