I. Introduction

This report is based on a visit to University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) by an American Council on Education (ACE) peer review team on February 10-12, 2014. This report also draws upon several documents, which the university provided to the peer review team: UMD Global 2020 (1/31/2014); the 2011 University of Minnesota Duluth Strategic Plan; a general fact sheet; the charge to the Internationalization Leadership Team from the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; a chart of the UMD organizational structure related to international activities; a copy of the Fall 2013 alumni magazine Bridges; and miscellaneous documents from the study abroad office.

The visit included meetings with Chancellor Lendley Black; Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Andrea Schokker; the Vice Chancellors (Lisa Erwin, Vice Chancellor of Student Life; and Mike Seymour, Vice Chancellor of Finance Operations); the Academic Deans (James Riehl, Swenson College of Science and Engineering; Jill Pinkney Pastrana, College of Education and Human Services Professions; Amy Hietapelto, Labovitz School of Business and Economics; William Payne, School of Fine Arts; Susan Maher, College of Liberal Arts); and the International Leadership Team (Dennis Falk [Co-Chair], Professor, Department of Social Work; Leigh Neys [Co-Chair], Director, International Education Office; Cindy Christian, Director, Royal D. Alworth Jr. Institute for International Studies; Chris Haidos, Associate Director, International Student Admissions; Tim Holst, Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Education and Research; Penny Morton, Associate Dean, Swenson College of Science and Engineering; Michael Mullins, Instructor, Foreign Languages and Literature; Trisha O’Keefe, International Student Advisor, Office of Cultural Diversity; Bill Payne, Dean, School of Fine Arts; Paula J. Pedersen, Faculty Fellow for Intercultural Initiatives; Susana Pelayo-Woodward, Director, Office of Cultural Diversity; Kim Riordan, Associate Vice Chancellor for Outreach and Online Delivery; Rajiv Vaidyanathan, Professor, Department of Marketing; Jennifer Webb, Associate Professor, Department of Art & Design; and Catherine Caine [Project Assistant], Program Project Specialist, International Education Office).
The visit is part of the ACE Internationalization Laboratory (Lab), a project that builds upon the learning from several earlier ACE multi-campus initiatives, including Promising Practices in International Education, Global Learning for All, and the previous nine cohorts of the Lab itself. In addition to University of Minnesota Duluth, other institutions participating in the 2012–2014 Laboratory are Becker College (MA), Grand Valley State University (MI), Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis; Merrimack College (MA); Samford University (AL); Texas Christian University; Villanova University (PA), and Virginia Commonwealth University.

This confidential report to University of Minnesota Duluth is designed to assist the institution with its comprehensive internationalization efforts. In spite of the ample reading material provided to the peer review team, we want to emphasize that this report can only be a snapshot of the university, not a full portrait, because the peer review lasted only 24 hours over 2 days and UMD is an intrinsically complex and decentralized institution. We do not completely understand the Minnesota system restrictions and guidelines, so some of our suggestions must be translated into your context. Nonetheless, we encourage wide internal distribution of the report so that it can assist the university community in the tasks of comprehensive internationalization. The contents will not be published or made public unless the institution chooses to do so or gives ACE permission to do so.

II. Peer Review Team

Dr. Barbara Hill, Senior Associate for Internationalization and Director of the Internationalization Laboratory, Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, American Council on Education, Washington, DC (team leader).

Dr. Susan Marie Kalina, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs and Professor of Russian, University of Alaska Anchorage.

Dr. Penelope J. Pynes, Associate Provost for International Programs, International Programs Center, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

III. Overall Strengths

Timing of the Task Force on Comprehensive Internationalization

UMD is at a propitious moment in time to broaden and deepen its internationalization efforts. The institution already has high levels of international activity, and this is a good foundation on which to build. Internationalization has received strong and engaged support from the current chancellor, executive vice chancellor, and the deans—a fact widely acknowledged
and appreciated on campus, especially by the Internationalization Leadership Team (ILT). This support is critical to the task of implementing the university’s global vision.

The Design of the Comprehensive Internationalization Process

The ILT was designed with a diversity of membership across the schools to ensure broad faculty and administrative buy-in, and the group has produced strong recommendations with clear, focused goals. The subcommittee chairs gave balanced and sensitive direction to the thorough process. The ILT was given an ambitious charge, and it was very well executed because of the excellent leadership of Dennis Falk and Leigh Neys, and seems to have engendered a lot of discussion on the campus.

The team organized itself to deal with the various aspects of internationalization, gathering information, studying it in depth, analyzing current opportunities and challenges, and giving ample opportunity for people to participate in the process. We were impressed by the depth and breadth of information collected, and we commend the team for visiting departments, as this is a very solid way to get faculty buy-in.

Furthermore, it held appropriate meetings to disseminate draft materials and to receive campus feedback. A side benefit of the process was that committee members from different schools learned more about each other.

UMD Global 2020

The ILT’s strategic plan, UMD Global 2020, is clear, with an array of suggestions, and it provides a comprehensive view of what the university needs to do over a period of years. It is well aligned with UMD’s strategic plan. The relationship of international, intercultural, and multicultural terminology at UMD was explored and clarified, and was a good feature of the materials that were sent to us. The terms can be mutually supportive, but they are not synonymous, and many features of organizational structure and relationships depend on widespread agreement of this.

UMD’s mission to educate globally engaged students is a clear north star for your plan.

UMD is not starting from scratch: the institution already has international majors; various language offerings; individual schools with significant activity; the honors college scholarship funding for study abroad; indigenous studies; strong programming both from Multicultural Center and the Alworth Institute; study abroad opportunities; international students; and a model cultural diversity office.
Collaboration between Diversity and International Initiatives

UMD wisely understands that cultural diversity and internationalization need to work hand in hand. The UMD Organizational Structure Related to International Activities (2/6/14) suggests such a collaborative model, including a chief international officer, faculty fellows, and the Office of International Affairs.

IV. Observations and Recommendations

Next Steps

UMD Global 2020 sets out a list of goals, which need to be prioritized and put into an implementation plan. This is critical given the dynamic financial environment the institution faces, which encouraged the institution to undergo program prioritization. It is important to note that the recommendations we make involve transformation of current activities rather than new ones.

Student Learning Outcomes and the Curriculum

UMD Global 2020 included a list of student global learning outcomes. This list needs further discussion and perhaps recasting to be useful in the necessary but unfinished business of curriculum enhancement to align with the global engagement mission, vision, and goals.

Internationalizing the curriculum is a necessary part of comprehensive internationalization. Because not all students will be able to study abroad, the university must consider ways to internationalize at home by internationalizing the curriculum. We recommend that UMD begin the process of internationalizing the curriculum and pedagogy as soon as possible. This is a long-term process, involving a discussion of the desired student learning, creating opportunities in all programs for students to acquire and demonstrate this learning, and integrating student study abroad experiences into the curriculum (both prior to departure and once they return). But internationalization of the curriculum must go beyond general education.

The chief resource needed to accomplish this is the faculty, both the ones currently at the institution and those who will be hired in the future. They need to be incentivized to do this work. Internationalization cannot be accidental—it must be intentional. Advertisements of new positions can emphasize that international experience or background is preferred so that the institution can augment its internationalization. Professional development at various levels will be necessary to help faculty members, department chairs, and deans identify international and/or intercultural learning outcomes, enhance the international/intercultural content of current programs and perhaps create study abroad opportunities that will give global perspectives to the majors. This is not new work, but a means to give the faculty new ways to think about their current teaching and research in a more nuanced way. As the university’s international agenda continues to develop and incorporate graduate education as well as faculty research, the
possibilities for productive linkages between undergraduate and graduate training as well as research should be enhanced as much as possible.

Internationalizing the curriculum is not just a responsibility of the language departments; a global dimension can be infused in all courses, general education requirements, and majors and minors, and some programs at the university already do this. Given the nature of UMD, the STEM disciplines need to be on board in the curriculum discussions. For example, it is helpful to have engineers talking to engineers about the value of internationalization.

All disciplines need to understand the major in terms of local, national, and global dimensions. A good example is the University of Rhode Island’s classic engineering abroad program. Encouraging interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary as well as cross-unit collaboration in curriculum development will be especially important in a university such as UMD with its strong constituent schools and units. Many resources are available to assist the faculty in internationalizing the curriculum. ACE has posted or published successful programs from several projects: “Where Faculty Live”—disciplinary associations (American Political Science Association, American Psychological Association, American Historical Association, and the Association of American Geographers) describing what an internationalized major would look like in their discipline.

In addition, ACE has sponsored three technology awards about bringing the world into the classroom, and these models are available on the ACE website. A technique to boost faculty involvement in international education efforts is to use technology to greater advantage. At a much lower cost than faculty travel, technology offers faculty and their students the opportunity to engage with colleagues overseas. Co-teaching courses with faculty from abroad using video/Internet technology, for example, can help fill gaps in international expertise at an institution and enhance the internationalization of the curriculum. This will require having technical capacities in areas of the two campuses that are convenient for faculty and students. It will also require support for developing the relationships that can lead to such cooperation, and the university will need to recognize that this will require face-to-face contact for cooperating faculty (and possibly administrators) at some points. Yet, to be successful, technology must serve specific objectives of the international education, and not simply “build it and they will come.” Technology, at its best, needs to be used to integrate classroom and educational experience across the disciplines. Technology can prove to be very costly, and if it is not designed to clearly support the international program, UMD may find that these scarce funds have not been most effectively utilized.

In addition, other curricular resources are available at www.campusinternationalization.org, which is a collaboration of 12 higher education associations dealing with internationalization. Some of the curricular postings include: Campus-
Based Curricular Development (AAC&U)—links to 10 award-winning institutional projects; Global Citizenship (AAC&U)—internationalizing undergraduate majors at 11 institutions; Integrating Global Learning in Science Courses (AAC&U); and Internationalization of Teacher Education (NAFSA)—three case studies. Another potential resource is Global Learning for the 21st Century (the LEAP Report from AAC&U). Also, the university should intentionally expand its culture of faculty development grants to include internationalization of the curriculum.

**Internationalizing the Co-curriculum**
This follows from internationalizing the curriculum. UMD has an array of student organizations that provides opportunities for domestic and international students to engage with each other. We recommend that the student affairs office and the international office work together to continue to develop the co-curriculum that can support the work of the academic curriculum.

**Ongoing Structure for the Growth of Comprehensive Internationalization**
We think you are going in the right direction to have a point person as a chief international officer (CIO). Not all international units have to report to that person; more important is fostering collaboration among different units and creating synergies. We think that the 2/6/14 organizational chart captures this direction well. Instituting the two faculty fellows will be a good way to continue integrating activities into the academic fabric of the institution, to facilitate communication, and to clarify campus actions. The thorough data collected for the Lab can be used as a spring board for conversations about setting priorities and highlighting successes.

**International Student Recruitment as a Feature of Comprehensive Internationalization**
While Goal 2.2 of the Action Plan of UMD Global 2020 seeks to “expand and diversify the international student, faculty, and staff population, is there an international recruitment and retention plan, at least at the student level? Is there the right mix of international students being recruited to UMD? If the university wants to increase the number of undergraduate degree-seeking international students as one of its internationalization strategies, to do this successfully requires a clear and well-articulated international student enrollment management plan that specifies the countries and regions from which international students will be recruited and how they will be engaged in the classroom and integrated into the community so that they persevere to degree completion. We caution that the university recruit from a variety of countries and regions because no U.S. institution of higher education can influence or control the politics of other countries and reliance on only one or two countries is unhealthy given the volatility of international relations.

Because of these factors, we think that a robust enrollment management plan should have the following features. First, it needs to set intentional numerical goals for both domestic and international students. Second, it needs to address issues of the quality of entering students, ensuring that there is equal attention to this issue for both domestic and international students.
Third, it needs to address the diversity of both domestic and international students and to be intentional about ensuring that diversity. Fourth, and equally important, steps must be taken to ensure that international students be distributed widely across the schools so there is no disproportionate impact on any one of them. Considering the life cycle of the international student from recruitment through OPT (from the perspective of the student) will help in determining appropriate operational and support mechanisms needed as an institution for student success. One example that needs immediate consideration is the production and handling of I-20s and DS-2019s at the institution.

**International Alumni**

UMD should give considerable thought to how international alumni can be engaged to further the university’s internationalization. UMD should develop a process for tracking all international alumni. Alums are valuable to institutions for recruitment, the development of exchange programs, providing international internships, and potentially for funding. As a first step, the university should get names of recent graduates and hire a graduate assistant to search for the international graduates on the Internet as professionals are relatively easy to track. This can form the basis for building a more comprehensive data base.

**V. Conclusion**

During the peer review visit, the scheduled meetings involved a wide spectrum of the campus community, including high-level academic officers and representatives of important administrative offices. The conversations we had during the visit suggested that internationalization has strong buy-in on campus, but conversations about why internationalization is important must continue. They can shape everything the university does, and clearly a committed core of faculty and staff members are willing to work to achieve that vision.

A challenge we anticipate is the finding of faculty champions to carry on and expand the conversations and commitments. UMD has had great faculty leadership with Dennis Falk; while he cannot be replaced, his work needs to be magnified through additional people. Perhaps some new kind of council on comprehensive internationalization may be a solution.

We encourage you to have the patience to know that comprehensive internationalization is a long road; getting a few short-term goals accomplished, and there are many in UMD Global 2020, will help keep the momentum.

While UMD has made remarkable progress over the course of its participation in the ACE Internationalization Lab on developing a clear set of recommendations for supporting comprehensive internationalization, the academic content to these efforts – whether curricular, research or programmatic – needs to follow closely behind.
The institution is well positioned to continue its work in internationalization because it has all the key ingredients: leadership, energy, and a sense of direction. Internationalization is a long-term project that requires commitment from the top administrators who regularly provide reasons why the campus and its programs (like all of higher education) must become more fully internationalized. This requires adequate resources, accountability, and regular evaluation and assessment. By developing and continuing an intentional process, UMD will make balanced internationalization goals part of its everyday operations, continuing to reinforce its status as a distinguished and distinctive institution.
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