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Recognizing the importance of international learning in the context of the political, social, economic, and educational landscape of the early 21st century, the American Council on Education has included internationalization as one of the areas of program focus in our strategic plan.

ACE has a history of international engagement that dates back to the 1960s. With the new strategic plan, ACE reaffirms its commitment to internationalization. ACE will continue its advocacy with the federal government to promote policies and programs that will help advance the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities and enhance their capacity to collaborate with partners around the world. We are strengthening our capacity to offer useful information to higher education leaders on a variety of issues related to international education and global issues, and to offer programs to help colleges and universities prepare students to work and live in a globally interdependent world.

This practical guide for campus leaders draws upon lessons learned through a variety of ACE programs involving diverse institutions throughout the country. We offer it as a resource to administrators and faculty who are engaged in the important work of internationalization.

David Ward
President, American Council on Education
Executive Summary

This publication is a practical guide for higher education administrators and faculty engaged in internationalizing their institution. Drawing upon existing literature, as well as ACE’s experience in working with diverse institutions around the country, it outlines a process for clarifying goals, conducting an internationalization review, and crafting a strategic internationalization action plan. Every chapter includes practical campus illustrations, resources, and discussion questions.

Part One, “Framing Internationalization,” provides campus leaders with an overview of the terminology and rationales in the field. Familiarity with these debates can assist leaders in identifying stakeholders’ points of view and enable them to create a vision appropriate for their campus and community. Making the case for internationalization is an ongoing process that requires leaders to engage stakeholders and tap into their interests and expertise. Comprehensive internationalization—our shorthand for the broad, deep, and integrative practice that enables campuses to become fully internationalized—requires leadership, strategy, and sustained effort.

Part Two, “The Journey,” offers campus teams charged with internationalization a roadmap for addressing the process (the “how”) and the content (the “what”) of internationalization. Internationalization requires strong champions. A carefully composed team, with broad representation from the faculty and administration, is critical for conducting a productive review of current international programs and policies and crafting an action plan. An effective plan should build upon a clear understanding of what is in place and the institution’s strengths and weaknesses. Chapter 5 outlines a framework and a process for undertaking an internationalization review—an undertaking that can be more or less elaborate, depending on the size and decentralization of the institution. Chapter 6 distinguishes between institutional and student learning goals, challenges readers to formulate measurable goals, and underscores the principles of integration and cross-campus collaboration when developing an internationalization action plan.

Of all the elements of an internationalized campus, the curriculum stands out as key to ensuring that all students experience international learning. Internationalizing the curriculum is not simply an adjustment of the curriculum, but rather a transformation. Chapter 7 poses questions about what constitutes an internationalized curriculum and offers strategies for developing more coherence. If the curriculum is the centerpiece of internationalization, faculty engagement is its cornerstone. Chapter 8 focuses on widening the circle of faculty participation in internationalization. Identifying institutional
and individual barriers is a critical early step when developing a well-crafted faculty
development plan that is sufficiently attentive to principles of faculty ownership, choice, and
support. Four key elements of a successful institutional strategy—leadership, resources, orga-
nizational structures, and partnerships—are discussed in Chapter 9.

The appendices include ACE’s guidelines for carrying out an internationalization review, survey instruments created by practitioners, a summary of the literature on interna-
tional and intercultural competencies, and a list of funding sources.
Introduction

Most higher education leaders agree that an undergraduate education should prepare students to live and work in a world in which national borders are highly permeable, information travels rapidly, and communities and workplaces are increasingly multicultural and diverse. Far less clarity exists, however, on precisely what that preparation should entail in terms of curriculum content or on the learning outcomes that such “globally prepared graduates” should achieve. The result is a gap between lofty aspirations and clear educational objectives. A similar gap lies between the value of internationalization asserted in many institutional mission statements and the reality of actual institutional practices and priorities as revealed by strategic plans, policies, and resource allocations.

Closing these gaps is not a trivial task, nor does it involve simply adding a few internationally focused programs or strengthening those existing ones. Although many institutions offer a diverse mix of international learning opportunities, few do so with much intentionality. The result becomes a hodgepodge of programs and activities that are not sufficiently integrated to create maximum institutional impact or to advance learning. Without a clear set of goals and a strategy to connect the disparate activities and create synergy among them, internationalization will likely be confined to a marginal set of activities affecting a self-selected group of students and faculty. Internationalizing an institution requires widely understood goals and objectives, an assessment of existing efforts and capacity, recognition of the leverage points for creating change on campus, plans for measuring progress, and the capacity to make continuous adjustments along the way.

Origins of the User’s Guide

This publication aims to help campus leaders address these gaps. It draws on literature in the fields of organizational change and international education and is informed by our experience working with institutions on a number of ACE projects, most notably the Carnegie Corporation-funded initiative, “Promising Practices: Spotlighting Excellence in Comprehensive Internationalization” (http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international) and two Kellogg Foundation initiatives that examined campus change (http://www.acenet.edu/programs/change). Another project that has informed this publication has been our work with the ACE Internationalization Collaborative, a group of 45 institutions engaged in serious efforts to advance internationalization on their campuses (http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international).
These projects demonstrated the significant challenges of internationalization. We have learned that because each institution has different starting points, objectives, and campus cultures, there is no one best way to internationalize an institution. Nor is there a final point at which an institution can declare itself fully internationalized. We also have learned that although every institution’s journey is unique, there are many commonalities and rich opportunities that allow institutions—even markedly different ones—to learn from one another.


This familiar framework provides a helpful shorthand to organize institutional thinking and strategy. It also helped us organize this guidebook, framing the central questions we address:

- **Why internationalize?** This question provides a point of departure. Why is it important? Is it necessary? Will it really improve this campus, and if so, how? What do we hope to accomplish through internationalization?
- **Who should be involved?** Internationalization, similar to other important campus changes, cannot be decreed or accomplished by a few individuals. Internationalization leaders should carefully consider whom to involve, how, and at what point in the process. These questions are crucial toward ensuring that various stakeholders own the international agenda and have a say in its development and implementation.
- **How shall we proceed?** Change is often thwarted by insufficient attention to process, rather than by a lack of good ideas. Although campus discussion focuses, rightfully, on the substance of internationalization (the “what”), such discussion must be accompanied by a thoughtful process that addresses individual and institutional barriers and is compatible with the campus culture. A consultation plan and communications strategy are two important—albeit troublesome—elements of the process. Crafting an inclusive, intentional process can serve as a decisive factor in successful internationalization.
- **What do we need to do?** At the heart of the matter is the substance of internationalization: the curriculum, campus life, and opportunities for students and faculty to engage in learning. Different stakeholders will express different interests, and internationalization requires making choices, resolving conflicts about values and priorities, and fitting the pieces together into a coherent whole.

Organization of the Guide

Although many users will not read this handbook in its entirety or the chapters sequentially, each chapter does build on earlier ones. We have divided the guide into two parts. Part One, “Framing Internationalization,” highlights underlying questions and debates and discusses the context and rationale for internationalization (the “why”). It also introduces the concept of comprehensive internationalization—our shorthand for the broad, deep, and integrative international practices that enable campuses to become fully internationalized. We have crafted Part One so that it reaches as broad a spectrum of readers as possible, including those individuals currently charged with the direct oversight and advancement of internationalization (faculty, staff, international education professionals, and others) and persons with authority over the levers of institutional policy and change (senior administrators and governing board members).
Part Two, “The Journey,” addresses the content (the “what”) and the process (the “how”) of internationalization, introducing its major elements and framing questions that guide faculty and administrators to think about the curriculum, the co-curriculum, and programmatic elements of internationalization. In focusing on the internationalization process, we highlight strategies to achieve comprehensive internationalization, including taking stock of existing international practice (an “internationalization review”), developing goals and strategies for integrating international learning into essential institutional functions, and measuring progress. Our focus on process also includes consideration of how to continually widen the circle of involvement (the “who”). This section targets campus teams charged with internationalization.

Several of the most important lessons that we present spring from key assumptions about the nature of comprehensive institutional change and our observations of institutions working to integrate international learning into the fabric of the educational experience. First is the simple but compelling truth that all institutions are different; each has its own history, culture, structure, and practices. Although this guidebook presents general principles and frameworks, readers will necessarily interpret these principles according to their institution’s distinctive nature. The second lesson is that internationalization, similar to other major changes, is not a linear process. Successes are accompanied by setbacks, interruptions, and distractions. The work is difficult, exasperating, and frustrating, and at the same time exciting, exhilarating, and energizing. It takes a long time and requires patience and stamina. Wrong turns are opportunities for learning and readjustment, rather than signs of failure.

The third lesson involves the importance of coherence. Even the smallest campuses suffer from inadequate communication and fragmentation among related efforts. An internationalized campus is more than a set of disconnected programs; it is characterized by a sense of shared purpose and the cross-fertilization of different elements such as education abroad, language teaching, international students and scholars, service learning, the curriculum, campus life, and community involvement. Coherence does not mean centralized control or uniformity. Complex institutions, and especially research universities, are highly decentralized; their schools and colleges cherish autonomy. But adhering to a broad set of goals, and pointing all the boats in the same direction, as one administrator at a research university put it, can promote synergy and connections that are helpful to all.

And finally, the fourth lesson is that internationalization is a shared responsibility across campus. Even the most visionary president and the most energetic, creative chief international officer cannot make internationalization happen without the participation—indeed, the enthusiasm—of faculty, staff, and students. Internationalizing the campus is a leadership challenge: to identify other leaders and champions, to generate widespread enthusiasm, and to harness it.

We offer this volume as a resource for campus leaders to deepen their understanding of internationalization and help them address the challenges associated with its advancement.
Some of the most difficult conversations are those in which people use the same words to mean different things—or, conversely, use different words to denote the same concept. These very conversations are happening on many campuses, as well as in many national and international discussions of internationalization. People frequently use key terms such as international education, international studies, internationalization, global education, intercultural education, and multicultural education interchangeably, and sometimes with quite different meanings, depending on the context and the speaker. These different terms convey diverse philosophies and approaches and can create confusion and distractions to advancing internationalization; therefore, campuses need to develop a shared language in order to create a common understanding of internationalization and to craft a shared vision. The following discussion of terms is intended to help internationalization leaders identify stakeholders’ diverse points of view and negotiate the language appropriate for their campus and community.

**International Education and Internationalization**

Historically, international education has been the term of choice to describe the international dimensions of higher education in the United States. Although internationalization is also widely used today, international education remains a standard in the higher education lexicon. It generally functions as an umbrella term for institutional programs and activities that have a recognizable international dimension, such as student and faculty exchange, study and work abroad, international development activities, foreign language studies, international studies, area studies, joint degree programs, and comparative studies.

The term international education suggests that it is separate from the rest of education and that it exists as a parallel or different undertaking. In practice, the result of this parallel concept is that international learning and experiences are not only disconnected from other aspects of the educational process, but also marginalized and poorly integrated into the institution’s mission, strategic plan, structure, or funding priorities.

Framing international education as a separate part of the educational experience, occurring through a series of discrete activities, invites a fragmented approach. The whole is unlikely to be greater than the sum of its parts, and the parts are likely to be poorly integrated with each other. On many campuses, faculty and staff involved
in international teaching and programs constitute separate domains and act as distinct clans. Those who conduct research and teach students about other parts of the world (in area studies, transnational studies, foreign languages, or the disciplines) are usually very disconnected from each other. Compounding the problem is the fact that faculty are frequently disconnected from the professional staff who deal with the international mobility of students and faculty.

Another problem associated with the term international education is the tendency to substitute one component activity for the whole. Thus, according to one individual or group, study abroad is international education; according to others, it might be defined solely as international studies or language study. This substitution reduces a complex multifaceted phenomenon to a single dimension.

Despite the continuing popularity of the term international education in the United States, this guide uses internationalization instead, a term that suggests an integrative process with multiple approaches. The term internationalization is widely used in other countries and has gained currency in the United States. The use of the verb form to internationalize suggests a move from description to action, a process rather than a set of activities. Knight (1994) defines internationalization as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution.”

Because internationalization is a more recent addition to the U.S. lexicon and it has accumulated less baggage, it may help open new avenues of thinking and new debates.

Globalization and Global Education
Thus far, our discussion of definitions has been restricted to terms using the word or stem international. Globalization is an increasingly popular term as well, sometimes used synonymously with internationalization, at other times clearly used to convey a different meaning. Historically, international describes relationships between and among nation states. In an educational context, international courses deal with other countries and regions, other peoples, and their languages and cultures. French literature, Asian studies, or Russian history are classic examples. Globalization is also a term that carries multiple meanings and growing cultural and political baggage. A fairly neutral definition points to the flow of ideas, capital, people, and goods around the world in the

**Definitions from the Literature**

**International Education**

“International education is an all-inclusive term encompassing three major strands: (a) international content of the curricula, (b) international movement of scholars and students concerned with training and research, and (c) arrangements engaging U.S. education abroad in technical assistance and educational programs.” (Harari, 1972)

“[International education embraces] the programs of activity which identifiable educational organizations deliberately plan and carry out for their members (students, teachers, and closely related clientele), with one of (possibly both) two major purposes in mind: (a) the study of the thought, institutions, techniques, or ways of life of other peoples and of their interrelationships, and (b) the transfer of educational institutions, ideas, or materials from [one] society to another.” (Butts, 1969)

“International education addresses both approach and content. In terms of content, it assumes that a subject or discipline can no longer be understood if it focuses only on the U.S. experience. Almost no discipline is culture free; therefore, excluding the experience of other cultures from the teaching of a discipline that has a cultural context shortchanges the students and reflects an ill-advised chauvinism. In terms of approach, international education calls for presenting a subject in an international framework so that students are aware of the interrelatedness of all nations and the commonality of such problems as poverty and discrimination.” (Burn, 1980)
context of diminishing importance of national borders. For some, globalization is simply the description of an unstoppable reality. For others, it is a loaded term; it implies the hegemony of the capitalist system, the domination of the rich nations over the poor, and the loss of national identity and culture.

In the institutional context, globalization can also refer to the reach of a campus, through distance learning, partnerships with institutions in other countries, or the implementation of academic programs, and even campuses, outside the United States. When applied more specifically to a course or program, the term global frequently denotes supranational or transnational concerns, such as health and environmental issues that are worldwide in their reach and implications and that cannot be studied solely in the context of any single nation or region. One current academic debate pits those who emphasize the need for in-depth learning about nations and regions against those who argue that greater rigor comes from applying a disciplinary-based perspective to a global issue (such as food supply, labor force, population, and environmental issues).

Globalization and internationalization are clearly linked—but not synonymous—concepts. Some contend that globalization has provided greater impetus for internationalization: As increased technology and travel, economic integration, and environmental interdependence diminish the barriers among nation-states, the imperative to know about other societies and cultures increases. Others see globalization and internationalization as distinct—with the former primarily an economic phenomenon and the latter tied to more traditional concepts of national culture, politics, and history.

### Definitions from the Literature

**Internationalization**

“Internationalisation of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution.” (Knight, 1994)

“[Internationalization is]…the complex of processes whose combined effect, whether planned or not, is to enhance the international dimension of the experience of higher education in universities and similar educational institutions.” (OECD, 1994)

**Globalization**

“Fundamentally, it is the closer integration of the countries and peoples of the world which has been brought about by the enormous reduction of costs of transportation and communication, and the breaking down of artificial barriers to the flows of goods, services, capital, knowledge, and (to a lesser extent) people, across borders.” (Steiglitz, 2003)

“[W]e use the term globalization to represent neo-liberal economic ideology and its material strategies that aim to increase profits and power for transnational corporations, and similar strategies enabling government agencies to gain economic advantages and be competitive.” (Currie et al., 2003)

“Whatever specific characteristics we tend to associate with the concept of ‘globalization,’ it is an expression of ‘new geopolitics’ in which the control over territory is of lesser importance than the control of and access to all kinds of markets, the ability to generate and use knowledge, and the capacity to develop new technology and human resources….” (Sadlak, 1998)

### Multicultural and International: The Same or Different?

By using the term intercultural/international, Knight and others left their readers to interpret the connection. Intercultural most commonly refers to the encounter between people of different nation-states or diaspora cultures. Multicultural, yet another term that describes the interactions between people of diverse cultures, most frequently refers to the diversity within a nation or community. In the United States, the term generally describes ethnic and racial diversity within our borders.
Some observers believe that the concepts of multicultural and intercultural are so closely related that they are synonymous: The encounter of other cultures, whether they exist in one’s own city or in another country, is considered the same phenomenon. For example, the differences that one experiences in encountering Native American culture or a Hmong immigrant population require a set of skills that allow them to understand and communicate—the same skills as those needed to understand the ways of Russian farmers or Japanese businessmen.

Others maintain that the degree of difference between multicultural and intercultural/international is so significant that it is impossible to equate the experience of learning about diverse cultures in one’s own cultural setting with the effort required to do the same in a totally different linguistic and cultural context abroad. According to this logic, a service-learning experience in the inner city or with an immigrant population is not a substitute for study or service-learning abroad. The debate may be one of degree. Both multicultural and intercultural/international learning require stepping out of one’s own cultural assumptions and views. The question is whether they require an equal stretch for the learner. Another issue surfaces, as well: skill transferability. If learners develop intercultural skills abroad, will they draw upon these skills in a multicultural context when they return home?

A related issue deals with the Eurocentric nature of internationalization in the United States. Study abroad provides a clear example. Most students going abroad are white, female, and middle class. Additionally, their destination is likely to be an English-speaking country such as the United Kingdom (19.6 percent) and Australia (5.2 percent), or Western Europe.
If an important goal of study abroad is to develop intercultural sensitivity, the limited contact with people from the “non-Western” world or from different language groups would suggest that many study-abroad efforts provide a limited cultural stretch for students.

Multicultural education can be defined as “teaching to an ethnically diverse student population...as well as teaching about diverse populations” (Alexandre, 1991). In addition to encouraging students to learn about and develop an appreciation of diverse cultures, multicultural education emphasizes the importance of making students aware of identity issues (gender, race, class), issues of access and equity, and the consequences of power and privilege. Ethnic studies—the in-depth examination of a particular ethnic group—can reside under the larger rubric of multicultural education. Situated in a course, program, or department, these studies constitute one academic component of multicultural education. The relationship among ethnic studies, multicultural education, area studies, and internationalization ranges from nonexistent to tense and hostile to a concerted effort at integration.

Many multiculturalists take issue with the focus that internationalists place on problems in other countries or regions, and their corresponding neglect of racism, sexism, and social inequities in the United States. Multiculturalists often perceive internationalists as skirting the issues of power and privilege, because they have benefited from the system, however flawed. In turn, internationalists often perceive multiculturalists as focusing excessively on victimization and as having a uni-dimensional or provincial perspective. Internationalists raise the concern that many programs designed for and about people of color do not include enough treatment of intercultural education.

Definitions from the Literature

**Intercultural Education**

“Intercultural sensitivity is not natural. It is not part of our primate past, nor has it characterized most of human history. Cross-cultural contact usually has been accompanied by bloodshed, oppression, or genocide…. Education and training in intercultural communication is an approach to changing our ‘natural’ behavior. With the concepts and skills developed in this field, we ask learners to transcend traditional ethnocentrism and to explore new relationships across cultural boundaries.” (Bennett, 1993)

“Intercultural education is intense for a number of reasons. Its content can be difficult to grasp; its process demanding. First, it requires learners to reflect upon matters with which they have had little firsthand experience. Second, unlike more conventional approaches to education, which tend to emphasize depersonalized forms of cognitive learning and knowledge acquisition, it includes highly personalized behavioral and affective learning, self-reflection, and direct experience with cultural difference. Third, ‘learning-how-to-learn’ a process oriented pedagogy…replaces learning facts, a product oriented pedagogy, as a major goal. Fourth, intercultural education involves epistemological explorations regarding alternative ways of knowing and validating what we know, i.e., the meaning of trust and reality.” (Paige, 1993)

**Multicultural and Intercultural Compared**

“Differentiating the labels multicultural education and intercultural education, the two most commonly used terms…is sometimes difficult and the boundaries are blurred…. For many, intercultural education has a somewhat different orientation than multicultural education. Multicultural education, according to Khoi (1994), refers to unrelated juxtapositions of knowledge about particular groups without any apparent interconnection between them. Intercultural, however, implies comparison, exchanges, cooperation, and confrontation between groups. Problems and situations are seen as so complex that they can be dealt with only through the convergence and combination of different viewpoints. From this perspective, intercultural education is more proactive and action oriented than multicultural education, and rather than focusing on specific problems such as learning style differences or language development, recognizes that a genuine understanding of cultural differences and similarities is necessary in order to build a foundation for working collaboratively with others.” (Cushner, 1998)
intercultural/international information and consequently do not adequately prepare these students for careers in today’s global market. Consequently, international careers are accessible only to a small group of majority and/or privileged students. The irony here is that the multicultural programs, which aim to address social injustice, may be actually perpetuating social inequities if they fail to provide all students with international perspectives and skills.

The discussion within this chapter clearly shows that the various terms used in the field of internationalization can carry quite emotional and distinct meanings. Although the intellectual movements associated with these terms have evolved along different paths, they are not irreconcilable, as suggested by Alexandre (1991), Bennett and Bennett (1994), and Cornwell and Stoddards (1999). Increasingly, institutions are exploring the areas where multiculturalism and internationalization intersect and mutually reinforce, rather than conflict with, one another. This intersection carries important implications for campus policies and programs. By exploring the points of convergence, and divergence between multiculturalism and internationalization, for example, campus leaders can provide a basis for advancing both agendas effectively.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, we emphasize that many institutional change efforts are slowed by the lack of a common language. Developing a shared lexicon is an essential step in ensuring a shared understanding and vision of internationalization. An open discussion of terminology should help a campus grapple with the key issues of goals, objectives, and institutional strategy.

---

### Conversation Starters

**What’s in a Word?**

1. What terms are most commonly used on campus? In which documents?
2. Is there an explicit common definition of those terms? What is it?
3. If there is not yet common terminology, which terms seem most appropriate and useful? Why?
4. To what extent does the campus view “multiculturalism” and “internationalization” as related? Who holds different views on this question? Where they exist, what are the points of convergence? divergence? complementarity?
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Chapter 2
Why Internationalize?

Making the Case
Although the enthusiasts and supporters of internationalization may see the need to internationalize as self-evident, they run a significant risk if they assume that others see things as they do. Change cannot simply be decreed in an academic setting. Rather, internationalization requires extensive discussion of why it is necessary or beneficial. Thus, leaders must take on the central task of addressing the question “Why internationalize?”

“Making the case” is not a question of simply selling internationalization to the campus community: It requires guiding stakeholders as they explore the changing external environment, define excellence in today’s world, and clarify learning goals for students. Accomplishing these tasks is an ongoing process, not a one-time effort. The institution constantly needs to bring new people into the dialogue and conduct new conversations as internationalization progresses. Making the case to multiple stakeholders over time is a key leadership challenge. Effective leaders tell a compelling story that engages stakeholders and inspires them to take action.

Multiple Stakeholders, Different Goals
Further complicating matters is the fact that internationalization may have several different rationales, often complementary, but sometimes conflicting. A Canadian study revealed that government, business, and educational leaders agreed on the general goal of preparing graduates who are “internationally knowledgeable and globally competent,” but they disagreed on why this goal was important (Knight, 1996). In rating different reasons to internationalize learning, government and business respondents assigned higher ranks to national competitiveness, while educators placed a higher priority on scholarly and social change rationales.

If not addressed, these diverse rationales (often, but not always, associated with different stakeholders) will express themselves in different priorities and may lead to conflict. For example, advancing liberal education is more likely to be an important rationale for faculty, leading them to focus on the curriculum. Local economic development is often the dominant preoccupation of trustees; they will want to focus on assistance to local business and community outreach.

Consider the example of how different rationales for recruiting international students will lead to different mindsets and strategies. If the presence of international students on campus is largely a question of
generating revenue (a likely priority of governing boards and state legislatures), the academic issues associated with integrating international students into campus life and capitalizing on their ability to serve as a learning resource will receive short shrift. It is unlikely that these students will be eligible for institutional aid unless the tuition they do pay is a net benefit to the institution. If, however, the rationale for their presence is academic, and administrators see international students as a way to enhance the intercultural learning of all students, the result is likely to lead to an investment in programming that helps integrate these students into campus life. Budget allocations—including financial aid—will be aligned with this goal to encourage the presence of international students and their contributions to the campus.

Different goals for internationalization can, however, mutually reinforce rather than conflict with one another. For example, efforts to internationalize career-oriented fields can also result in students’ developing intercultural communication skills that are useful in working with people of different cultures within the United States. Likewise, agreements designed to assist universities outside the United States in developing their international capacity can provide valuable learning opportunities for U.S. faculty and students as well as create goodwill and increase the number of U.S. supporters in other countries.

The following sections review the commonly articulated goals of internationalization (Knight, 1996 and 1999; American Council on Education, 1997), noting their most important audience and discussing their implications for action.

**Academic Goals**

The following set of rationales for internationalization addresses the quality of the academic enterprise and are usually the most important ones for faculty members. To the extent that academic quality is a concern to all stakeholders, these rationales are important and enduring reasons for internationalization.

**Strengthening liberal education.** Liberal learning prepares students for a life of productive citizenship, continued learning, and many careers over a lifetime. Because college graduates will live in a multicultural society within the United States, as well as in a world of diminishing geographical distance and permeable national borders, the international and global dimensions of liberal learning will prove essential.

Many outcomes of a liberal education that are not specifically “international” in nature equip students to live and work in the global environment: critical thinking, oral and written communication skills, and understanding different modes of inquiry. At the same time, a high-quality liberal education should impart the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that equip students to function in the global context—such as knowledge of world geography and interdependence of world events and issues; foreign language proficiency; openness to new opportunities; and the ability to tolerate ambiguity and appreciate multiple perspectives.

---

**Insights from the Literature**

**International Learning as Liberal Education**

“Future-oriented liberal education must prepare students to function effectively in a multicultural society and in a world where national borders may sometimes blur. The capacity to understand and communicate with people of other cultures begins with an understanding of one’s own culture and its relationship to others.” (Barker, 2000)
**Enhancing the quality of teaching and research.** A high-quality education opens the mind to new ideas, new ways of thinking, and new experiences. Every field involves scholars and teachers around the world. By definition, keeping current in one’s field should mean that faculty members are knowledgeable about scholarship from other countries. Through such knowledge, faculty members encounter diverse theories, research approaches, and cultural perspectives.

Faculty who teach about business or sociology in a larger global context, for example, challenge students to broaden their frames of reference and address sometimes contradictory perspectives. Likewise, when faculty members introduce culturally diverse teaching and learning practices, the educational experience can become more vibrant and relevant for an increasingly diverse student population.

These academic goals for internationalization challenge faculty to evaluate carefully the content, structure, and outcomes of general education programs, as well as the priorities of the majors and graduate programs. Are students acquiring the global competencies—the knowledge, attitudes, and skills—that they will need in the future? Are graduate programs providing a methodological foundation conducive to international research, scholarship, and teaching? How do we assess the effectiveness of these programs?

**Economic and Entrepreneurial Goals**

Given the dominance of market forces and competition in the United States, it is no surprise that governments, businesses, and institutions value the economic benefits of internationalization. Each sector approaches the question differently, but the underlying motivation remains the same.

**Preparing students for careers.** Many careers are potentially international, and every institution is preparing the next generation of professionals and leaders. All sectors need employees who are prepared to work in a world in which information travels rapidly and diversity within borders is increasing. Communities across the nation are becoming more globally connected, and the need for global competencies is surfacing in unexpected places. The public understands this reality; a recent ACE survey found that more than 90 percent of the public agreed that knowledge about international issues would be important to the careers of younger generations (Siaya, Porcelli, and Green, 2002). Colleges and universities need to find ways to respond to this clear public demand and to the realities of the global market.

Student interest in career success directly affects their choice of majors and courses. Not all students see global competencies as a plus in the job market, but nor do many envision a specifically international career. The challenge that both employers and colleges and universities face is making these opportunities clear to students and crafting programs that students perceive as useful preparation for the world of work.
Generating income for the institution.
Ongoing financial pressures lead colleges and universities to see internationalization as a potential source of revenue. For some, the presence of international students represents a financial benefit; thus, their contribution to academic quality and student learning assume a greater rhetorical importance than actual importance. This does not mean that an international activity with clear economic returns—such as the delivery of distance learning courses to students in other countries, the presence of international students on campus, or contracts to provide special training programs for managers from other countries—may not also yield academic benefits for faculty and students. However, the academic returns of such entrepreneurial endeavors are not automatic; administrators and faculty need to build them intentionally into the initiative’s design. Entrepreneurial activities may result in certain social benefits—such as expanding educational opportunities for the underserved in other countries or developing English as a Second Language (ESL) programs on campus—but once again, program developers must articulate clear goals to guide these efforts in order for them to accrue multiple returns.

Contributing to local economic development and competitiveness. Depending on the state and the community, this rationale will assume different levels of importance in crafting institutional strategies. In Wisconsin, for example, in 1997 Governor Tommy Thompson called on the Wisconsin International Trade Council (WITCO) to review the status of international education in the state and to determine necessary expansions and improvements (WITCO Task Force, n.d). In the case of the Wisconsin task force, there was a high degree of confluence between the academic and economic rationales, creating a potentially win-win approach.

The economic goals for internationalization challenge higher education leaders to develop effective partnerships with community, business, and government leaders (see Chapter 9). Through such partnerships, higher education leaders can forge programs that enable institutions to be more responsive to the global market and more flexible in serving student and community needs. Such outreach efforts can complement the institution’s academic and social goals, providing experiences, networks, and resources that would otherwise be unavailable. By working closely together, leaders in each sector can understand one another’s goals and more effectively implement approaches that support diverse goals and needs.

Social Goals
The following social goals relate to the loftier aims of colleges and universities and to their contributions to the public good. These social rationales may not represent the highest priority for some stakeholders on campus, in business, or in government. Awareness of this reality can help internationalization leaders draw upon these rationales when appropriate, but not rely on them exclusively when interacting with others who have different priorities.

Enhancing students’ ability to live in an increasingly multicultural environment in the United States. Higher education’s mission includes preparing students for active lives as voters, informed citizens, and contributors to the public good. As U.S. society becomes increasingly diverse through immigration and population shifts, we will see more and more “majority minority” cities and states. Already, the majority of
Californians are members of minority groups, and some other states are not far behind. While demography remains a powerful determinant, a pluralistic society is also a democratic value. Education at all levels plays a central role in providing the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the students who will serve as the leaders and citizens of that society.

Enhancing the development, excellence, and relevance of institutions in other countries. The benefits of internationalization accrue to all partners, not only U.S. students or institutions. U.S. colleges and universities have much to offer their counterparts in other countries—and much to gain, as well. Institutions in other countries are increasingly turning to the community college model and the land-grant tradition, with their emphasis on strong ties to the local and regional community, to learn new strategies for national economic and social development. Many U.S. campuses use their laboratories and equipment to help partner institutions with fewer resources advance their scientific agendas. Other countries also have traditionally turned to the United States to educate their Ph.D. students, especially in the sciences and engineering.

The concept of technical assistance as the major way of relating to institutions in developing countries has been largely superseded by the idea of development cooperation—a term that emphasizes reciprocal benefit and shared decision making rather than a traditional teacher/learner relationship between the institutions. Such collaborations benefit not only the international partner in the developing country, but also the U.S. partner, through opportunities for faculty and students to expand their academic and cultural horizons.

Contributing to international and intercultural understanding. Knowledge and first-hand experience of those who are culturally different can be a powerful antidote to prejudice and intolerance. Intercultural awareness should be an integral part of the educational process from childhood. Young children from diverse backgrounds and cultures who grow up together tend to see the “other” on a personal level rather than in purely political and ideological terms. The same is true, although perhaps less powerfully so, for college students, who continue to form opinions and perspectives during their college years. Programs that bring together Jewish and Arab students in the Middle East, Catholic and Protestant students in Ireland, or Asian Americans and African Americans in Los Angeles are examples of such educational strategies.

Whether institutions achieve this exposure through study or work abroad, service learning, or inclusion in the curriculum and co-curriculum, it can help people of all ages understand the common bonds of being human.

National Security and Foreign Policy
Government stakeholders are likely to view national security and foreign policy as the most important rationale for internationalization. As U.S. trade and foreign policy changes over time, so will the needs for expertise in particular countries or geographical regions. And the unpredictability of political hot spots in the world makes it difficult for anyone to predict future national needs: Will the United States need experts in Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, or African studies in five or 10 years? Language and regional expertise cannot be produced overnight; thus, these are questions that must be answered with long-term investments.
Producing experts required to support U.S. foreign policy and diplomacy. The U.S. government needs more employees who have mastered other languages and cultures. A recent policy paper developed by ACE notes:

Lack of expertise in national systems, languages, cultures, and global problems will carry serious costs in terms of potential foreign policy failures, military blunders, terrorism, and a decline in U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace (American Council on Education, 2002).

The federal government is a frequent and important consumer of international linguists and experts. The events of September 11 focused sharp attention on the serious shortage of American experts in less commonly taught languages and in area studies that focus on countries and regions of strategic importance. More than 80 federal agencies and offices now rely on personnel with foreign language proficiency and international knowledge and experience. In a 2002 report, the General Accounting Office reviewed operations at four government agencies in which language skills are critical—the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Army, and the Foreign Commercial Service (which is a component of the Commerce Department). The Army reported a 44 percent shortfall in translators and interpreters in five critical languages, the State Department revealed a 26 percent shortfall, and the FBI reported a 13 percent shortfall (U.S. General Accounting Office, 2002).

Higher education institutions represent a major source of language and area studies experts. They provide essential knowledge for all types of government agencies and businesses as they establish relationships and operations in different parts of the world. These experts also serve as important intellectual resources within their institutions, offering tremendous potential to work with other faculty to enrich teaching and research in areas such as health, law, agriculture, or the environment.

Creating goodwill and support for the United States in other countries. International students have historically played an important role in cultivating positive relationships with other countries. Those international students who eventually return to their home countries and assume posts of prominence in business, government, or nongovernmental organizations possess firsthand knowledge of, and potential sympathy for, the United States. The State Department recently highlighted the world leaders who once attended U.S. campuses (to access the full list of more than 200 such world leaders, visit http://exchanges.state.gov/education/educationusa). Institutions conducting “friend-raising” activities in other countries also have seen much success, as a result of the contacts established and foreign alumni’s fund-raising potential.

Conversation Starters

Why Internationalize?

1. What are the most commonly articulated rationales for internationalization on campus?
2. To what extent are there conspicuous differences in rationale held by different stakeholders? What are the consequences of the alignment of rationales or lack thereof?
3. In what forums are the rationales for internationalization discussed? Who is involved in these discussions? Who else might/should be?
External Sources of Support for Internationalization

Institutions need to secure internal support for internationalization before moving forward. Chapter 4 identifies potential champions and advocates on campus and recommends ways to enlist their support. However, external pressure exerts an even more powerful lever for change. Often, institutions need such pressure to encourage the efforts of champions and advocates, or to provide a counterforce to an institution’s natural inertia. The assessment movement provides a case in point. State policy makers and accrediting groups have pushed institutions to establish assessment processes that they would have been unlikely to develop on their own. In many states, policies to improve articulation practices have resulted in course-by-course evaluation and curricular restructuring. It is doubtful that such activities would have happened without an external mandate. In the case of internationalization, no similar pressure exists. But internationalization leaders can identify external supporters and engage them in advancing internationalization efforts on campus.

The public. Although the public supports international learning, this enthusiasm has not translated into a demand for it. The public thinks that learning about other countries and learning foreign languages is very important for college students, according to a 2002 ACE national public opinion survey. The survey report revealed that 77 percent of respondents favored college and university course requirements on international topics, 74 percent believed that institutions should require foreign languages for students that do not already know one, and 79 percent stated that students should have a study-abroad experience during college (Siaya, Porcelli, and Green, 2002). Although this generally positive attitude has not translated into public pressure, it remains an untapped source of support and leverage.

The business community. Perhaps the most important relationship between the corporate world and higher education institutions lies in the role of business as a major employer of college graduates. While businesses benefit from the availability of graduates with international expertise, they represent a curious paradox. Businesses (especially their CEOs) say that they seek to employ graduates who are prepared for the global workforce—individuals who not only possess the communications, reasoning, critical thinking, and writing skills that a solid liberal education produces, but who also can function in multicultural settings and speak other languages.

What the Public Thinks: Data from the 2002 ACE Survey

A recent ACE report, One Year Later: Attitudes About International Education Since September 11, examines the public’s attitudes toward international education. Comparing results from a survey conducted before September 11, 2001, with three polls conducted after, the report notes generally high support for international education and foreign language training.

Findings include:

- 80 percent of the respondents supported a high school foreign language requirement; 74 percent supported a college requirement.
- 77 percent of the respondents supported internationally focused course requirements.
- 75 percent of the respondents agreed that students should have a study-abroad experience during college; more than one-third strongly agreed.
- 80 percent agreed that the presence of international students on U.S. campuses enriches the learning experience for American students; people under age 30 were the strongest supporters of the presence of international students. (Siaya, Porcelli, and Green, 2002)

For more information, see ACE’s online bookstore at http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore.
However, one hears all too often of corporate hiring officials who possess much narrower visions of “qualified” graduates and who value technical skills more than the broader intellectual capacities associated with liberal and internationalized education. There is no quick fix for this contradiction; but the cultivation of solid relationships and the demonstrated skills of graduates over time remain important steps in resolving it.

**Government.** Local and state governments possess a keen interest in economic development and international trade. As with the corporate sector, colleges and universities can provide expertise, participate in sister city activities and trade missions, and find appropriate ways to participate in the international outreach conducted at the state and local levels. As noted above, the government needs linguists, area studies specialists, and internationally competent employees.

**The local community.** Other potential resources and advocates for international learning are local ethnic communities, which can serve as a tremendous resource if incorporated into a campus’s international activities through cultural events and academic programs (especially language courses), or in an advisory capacity. Their involvement can generate much energy and passion for international learning. Such interactions between the campus community and the surrounding community can produce a fruitful relationship between multicultural and international learning on campus and in local communities.

**Conclusion**

Successfully internationalizing a campus requires making the case to multiple stakeholders and tapping external interest and support. Because internationalization is a slow, cumulative process and must compete with many other campus priorities and demands for attention, a major leadership task is to catalyze conversations about international learning and link them to real-world interests and concerns.

Many campuses have relied on external councils or advisory groups as sources of support. These groups may vary in their representation and purpose, but they frequently consist of a cross-section of community activists, business leaders, government officials, policy makers, and association representatives. To achieve maximum effectiveness, they need a clear agenda, staff support, and recognition of
As the team compiles information, it should continuously ask whether the analysis is moving beyond a purely descriptive mode. One of the dangers when embarking on a review—especially if an institution has not yet assessed its international work—is that efforts will become bogged down with describing or enumerating existing programs and processes. Teams should allow enough time to analyze and discuss the information that it has gathered. Moving to an analytical mode will enable the team to create a strategic action plan that is grounded in the institution’s strengths and addresses its weaknesses.

The team may want to create subgroups and divide the work of answering some questions among them. Responsibility charting may help coordinate the groups’ efforts (see Chapter 4). The least useful approach is to charge a single person or small subgroup to do all the work; this represents a lost opportunity for collective reflection and analysis. A broader group effort can help address the sometimes contentious politics of collecting information.

Preparing the Report
The review should result in a written report, highlighting current practices, focusing on those successes and challenges unique to the context of the institution, and including recommendations for the future. The report should not be an end in itself, but rather a vehicle for engaging the broader campus community in setting an agenda for enhancing internationalization. As noted previously, the report might follow the major categories of the framework, or take a different format, such as an analysis of institutional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges.

If the institution chooses to invite an external review team, the team should add background information on the institution to the report.

Because the goal of the review is improvement, the report is best treated as an internal document intended for institutional use and for the confidential use of the external peer review team, if the institution chooses to have one. The internationalization team’s efforts will be most successful if participants do not see the review as either a comparative exercise or one designed to produce information for recognition or publicity. The utility of a review will be limited unless it frankly addresses serious issues and is appropriately complimentary and critical about successes and shortcomings.

Analyzing Information as a Basis for Action
By conducting an analysis that looks at an institution’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT), an internationalization team can develop a useful way to conclude a review and/or organize a report. Many institutions are surprised to see the strengths already in place—strengths that are made visible through the review. For example, the presence of a significant number of international students is a rich resource, often underused to advance the goals of internationalization. One campus team realized that its institution contained a critical mass of faculty and staff who were born or educated in other countries, or who had significant international experience.
Table 1 suggests one way to organize a SWOT analysis. The team can use it as a tracking tool by checking off those areas that the team wants to comment upon in its report. The SWOT analysis also can be a poster-sized chart on which the team records specific information it has gathered. The advantage of the latter approach is that it clusters strengths and opportunities and points to possibilities for greater integration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Suggested Structure for SWOT Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty opportunities and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student opportunities and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum – General education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum – Majors, minors, and certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages with institutions abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/staff expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration among different components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using External Consultants

When embarking on a major initiative, it is useful to receive external input at various points in the process. This input can range from having a paid external consultant who works closely with campus leaders over an extended period of time, to sporadic conversations with colleagues at international education conferences. An institution can hire a consultant at the early stages of internationalization to help define key questions and issues, clarify tasks, and build support for the process across the campus. The same consultant also can stay in touch with the team leaders throughout the process and offer advice on analyzing information, presenting recommendations, and formulating action plans. An external perspective is also useful when finalizing the report and reflecting about a strategic plan for the future.

Another way to use external consultants is to invite an outside group to review the team’s report, visit the campus, meet with leaders, and prepare its own report offering feedback and recommendations, much like the traditional program review. The peer review motivates the internationalization team to keep the process moving forward toward the goal of presenting the end result to the external reviewers. Inviting others to review the team’s efforts also helps spread the word and lends further credibility to the institution’s internationalization agenda.

To make the most of a peer review visit, the leadership team should send the completed report to the visiting team members several weeks before the visit, indicating any particular activities or issues on which the visiting reviewers should focus more carefully.

A schedule for the visiting team might include the following activities:

- Two meetings with the leadership team, one at the beginning and one at the end of the visit.
- Meetings with a representative sample (six to 12 individuals) from each of the following groups: students, faculty, department chairs, and administrators/staff.
- A meeting with as many of the following individuals as possible, individually or together: president, board members, and chief academic officer.
- Designated amount of free time each day for the peer review team to meet alone.

It is important that the reviewers tap into the full range of opinions and knowledge about internationalization on campus, and not just hear from the champions and advocates. To ensure a frank conversation, members of the leadership team should not attend the group meetings. A workable length for most such meetings is 30 to 90 minutes, depending on the size of the group.

The site visit reports might cover the following areas:

- A general review and analysis of the institution’s self-assessment report relative to site visit observations and conversations.
- A more in-depth review and analysis of those internationalization dimensions chosen in advance by the institution to receive special appraisal.
- An assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for integration.
- Suggestions for improvement.
Conclusion

All too frequently, action-oriented teams proceed quickly toward implementing a new idea without taking the time to craft a common vision, review existing programs and policies, and formulate a strategic plan. This is particularly problematic in the area of international learning, which has a history of fragmented efforts and will likely remain marginalized unless institutions make more intentional and strategic efforts toward internationalization.

This chapter presents a framework and process for undertaking an institutional internationalization review. Although this entire process can take several months to complete, those institutions that have engaged in such a process have found that it can serve as a powerful force for effecting significant campus change. The following chapter addresses how institutions can build upon the information from the internationalization review to develop effective institutional plans for internationalization.
Chapter 6
Developing an Internationalization Plan

Developing Institutional Goals and Objectives

The knowledge gained from an internationalization review provides a foundation for the development or revision of an institution’s internationalization plan. The extent to which the campus has already established a culture of planning and assessment will shape the process of articulating measurable goals and developing plans. If the campus has historically engaged in strategic planning and allocating resources according to the plan, it can use that plan as a touchstone for enhancing internationalization. Typically, plans include a vision and/or a mission statement, goals, specific objectives for each goal, strategies to achieve the objectives, designation of the person or group responsible for implementing the strategies, a timetable, and quantifiable measures of success. It is important to build assessment methods into the plan from the beginning, so that they are integral to the implementation process rather than an afterthought. In large institutions, the constituent colleges, schools, and units generally devise their own plans, aligning them with the institutional plan.

Institutions using this guidebook will undoubtedly have varying degrees of experience with internationalization. If an institution is in the early stages of internationalization, it should develop a clear set of goals and measurement of progress along the way. Even institutions that are experienced in internationalization will want to clarify and re-affirm their goals, or adjust them in light of knowledge they have gained through the review process.

Institutions can use two important and different units of analysis in developing goals and measuring progress. The first and most commonly used is the institution itself. Most indicators of institutional performance and the accompanying evaluation measures use the institution as the unit of analysis. Similarly, both goals and measures of internationalization are usually institutional in nature and do not address their effect on students—that is, what students are learning. Examples of commonly articulated institutional goals regarding internationalization include:

- Expand education-abroad opportunities outside Western Europe; increase the percentage of students participating in these experiences to 25 percent of all education-abroad students within five years.
- Expand the representation of international students on campus and ensure their integration into campus life.
- Ensure that the general education curriculum incorporates global perspectives.

The extent to which the campus has already established a culture of planning and assessment will shape the process of articulating measurable goals and developing plans.
The measures follow suit: How many new education abroad programs has the institution developed? To what extent has participation in education abroad increased? To what extent has the number of international students increased? What do we know about their integration into campus life? How has the general education curriculum changed? What courses focus on international and intercultural subjects or include significant content in this area? Institutional behavior and outcomes define the focus of the vast majority of institutional plans and most external accountability, including accreditation and state performance indicators. And indeed, most internationalization plans focus on institutional approaches, either at the level of the entire institution or through its constituent colleges, schools, and departments. Questions that the team may find helpful for clarifying internationalization goals include:

- What are the important institutional internationalization goals?
- How do the stated goals fit together? Do they amount to an integrated vision for internationalization?
- Do different schools and colleges within the institution have their own specific internationalization goals? If so, are these specific goals consistent with the institution’s overall internationalization goals?

**Articulating and Assessing Student Learning Outcome**

Another important dimension of an internationalization plan considers the student as the unit of analysis—therefore looking at learning outcomes rather than institutional performance. External agencies and accrediting bodies are focusing increased attention on student learning assessment as the true test of educational effectiveness. A new effort to assess the outcomes of liberal education—the Value-added Assessment Initiative (VAII)—attempts to assess the difference that institutions make for their students. The VAI centers around the premise that “[e]xcellence and quality should be determined by the degree to which an institution develops the abilities of its students” (Benjamin and Hersh, 2002). Assessing student learning—whether it be liberal education, learning in the major, or international learning—requires consensus on desired outcomes as well as on how to measure the achievement of these outcomes.

At the heart of the matter is the following question: What knowledge, attitudes, and skills do students need to be world citizens and to succeed in today’s global workforce? Educators often refer to these three attributes as “global competencies.” Although many scholars and practitioners have attempted to answer these questions, they have not reached a consensus. Part of the challenge lies in the interdisciplinary nature of international learning and its associated competencies. Each field brings to the debate its own perspectives, and little discussion has taken place among the disciplines. The following list illustrates a range of global competencies; it is not exhaustive. (See Appendix C for more information.)
Knowledge

- Knowledge of world geography, conditions, issues, and events.
- Awareness of the complexity and interdependency of world issues and events.
- Understanding of historical forces that have shaped the current world system.
- Knowledge of one’s own culture and history.
- Knowledge of effective communication, including knowledge of a foreign language, intercultural communication concepts, and international professional etiquette.
- Understanding of the diversity of values, beliefs, ideas, and world views.

Attitudes (or Affective Characteristics)

- Openness to learning and a positive orientation to new opportunities, ideas, and ways of thinking.
- Tolerance for ambiguity and unfamiliarity.
- Sensitivity and respect for personal and cultural differences.
- Empathy or the ability to see multiple perspectives.
- Self-awareness and self-esteem about one’s own identity and culture.

Skills

- Technical skills to enhance students’ ability to learn about the world (for example, research skills).
- Critical and comparative thinking skills, including the ability to think creatively and integrate knowledge, rather than accepting knowledge in a noncritical way.

Communication skills, including the ability to use another language effectively and interact with people from other cultures.

Coping and resiliency skills in unfamiliar and challenging situations.

Good Practice

A Technique for Launching the Campus Discussion on Global Competencies

An effective way to launch a constructive campus dialogue on global competencies is to conduct an all-faculty retreat focused on identifying the global competencies that are the most relevant for their institution’s student population. The following technique has worked in promoting discussion and building consensus around the most important competencies:

Length of the session: From 45 minutes to two hours, depending on the number and breadth of people involved in the discussion.

Procedures: First, provide participants with a sample list of competencies. The list in Appendix C—gathered from the literature on international and intercultural competencies—is organized under the headings of Knowledge, Attitudes, and Skills. Distribute six index cards to each participant. Ask each participant to choose from each heading the two most important competencies for a student at their institution, and write each choice on a separate index card.

Then ask the group to break into subgroups of three to seven people (depending on the size of the full group) and to designate a reporter, who will gather and organize the index cards to see which competencies were listed the most frequently. Then, ask each group to discuss the most frequently listed competencies. The group should also discuss those competencies that were listed only once and invite the person who made that choice to try to convince the other group members of its importance. The goal is to reach consensus concerning two or three competencies in each category.

After 15 to 30 minutes of discussion, ask the recorders to note on a flipchart those competencies for which they have reached consensus. Cluster those competencies that occur the most frequently and those that are less frequently cited. Finally, try to assemble a composite list for the group.
**Good Practice**

**Missouri Southern’s Goals for Student Learning**

According to Missouri Southern College’s mission statement, “Inherent to our international approach to undergraduate education is the college’s desire to prepare its students to understand world affairs, international issues, and other cultures, as seen through their history, geography, language, literature, philosophy, economics, and politics. Knowledge and understanding of other cultures of the world also promote better understanding of our own valuable cultural diversity.”

Missouri Southern aims to enhance all academic programs “through an emphasis on international education.” To that end, the college has identified five learner-centered objectives:

- Graduates will have an understanding of how cultures and societies around the world are formed, sustained, and evolve.
- Graduates will have empathy for the values and perspectives of cultures other than their own and an awareness of international and multicultural influences in their own lives.
- Graduates will be able to identify and discuss international issues and cultures other than their own.
- Graduates will have communicative competence in a second or third language.
- Graduates will have experienced, or desire to experience, a culture other than their own.

Engaging people across the campus in conversations will help build consensus around critical international learning outcomes and develop broad ownership for the internationalization agenda. (For more details on leadership strategies, see Chapter 9). The following questions can help shape that process:

- What methods has the institution used in the past to launch campus-wide discussion?
- What forums have been most effective for engaging faculty in discussion?
- Which campus leaders should be engaged in leading and broadening the conversation?

- What campus committees should the institution bring into the process, and at what point?
- How should the institution synthesize the information generated through these conversations, and how should it communicate the resulting message to the community?
- What mechanism(s) should the institution use to bring closure to the conversation and reach a decision?

The extent to which institutions can reach consensus concerning the most important global competencies for their students will inevitably vary with institutional size and the breadth of the institutional mission. At large research universities with multiple missions, for example, the institution may decide to articulate one or two overarching international learning outcomes for all students and encourage individual colleges and departments to craft more specific global competencies for its students. A small liberal arts institution may convene faculty at an all-college retreat and identify the most important global competencies for all students. In both cases, it is helpful to note that not all competencies will need to be addressed by every curricular or co-curricular activity—rather, students will acquire these competencies by participating in a well-integrated combination of activities. (See Chapter 7 for more detailed information.)
Another challenge that institutions need to address when articulating student learning outcomes is the expected achievement level of a particular competency. The task is to respond to the question: What do we want students to know about the world and be able to do as a result of being educated at this institution? Institutions can articulate a full range of desired global competencies—from simple to more complex competencies—describing what a student will know or be able to do as a result of a learning experience, rather than what content the instructor provides in the class. Consider the following example of a learning outcome statement: “Students will be able to describe the historical forces that contribute to the current world economic order.” Contrast that statement with the following sample course objective statement: “Students will study the historical forces that contribute to the current world economic order.” This statement addresses course content versus what students will know or be able to do. Although the change in language is slight, the shift in perspective toward a learner-centered approach is significant. The less complex outcome statements would be introduced by verbs such as describe, identify, define, or recite. Higher-order outcome statements would include verbs such as analyze, synthesize, and apply. The same competency, articulated as a higher-order outcome, would state: “Students will be able to apply their knowledge of the historical forces that contribute to the current world economic order in preparing an economic development plan.”

### Insights from the Literature

#### Useful Language for Developing Outcome Statements

“Student learning outcomes are defined in terms of the particular levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities that a student attains as a result of his or her engagement in particular set of collegiate experiences” (Ewell, 2001). An outcome statement describes what students should know, understand, or be able to do based on what or how they have learned.

“The key to composing an outcome statement is to select an active verb that effectively captures this knowledge, understanding, or ability” (Maki, 2003). Student learning researchers have developed taxonomies that address lower to higher orders of learning (Anderson, 2001). The following verbs are clustered from simple to more complex levels of learning:

- **Remembering:** recognize, list, describe, identify, retrieve, name.
- **Understanding:** interpret, exemplify, summarize, infer, paraphrase.
- **Applying:** implement, carry out, use.
- **Analyzing:** compare, attribute, organize, deconstruct.
- **Evaluating:** check, critique, judge, hypothesize.
- **Creating:** design, construct, plan, produce.

#### Assessing International Learning

Although many institutions are working on identifying international learning outcomes, few have tackled the issue of assessing students’ achievement of these outcomes. Formulating international student learning outcomes is a crucial first step in assessing international learning. Foreign language learning is one area in which educators have paid considerable attention to measuring competency or proficiency. Efforts that measure the impact of study abroad also have received considerable attention. But the practice of measuring the competencies that students acquire as a result of their full international educational experiences remains in its infancy.
Insights from the Literature

Learning as Attainment and as Development
Peter Ewell draws a distinction between the “good effects” that students may experience as a result of participating in postsecondary education (employment, enhanced career mobility, access to additional education, or a more fulfilled life) and the actual learning that takes place. He further distinguishes between “learning” in terms of student growth, development, or value-added, and “learning” in terms of the levels of student attainment of knowledge (disciplinary or professional content), skills (the capacity to do something), and attitudinal or affective outcomes (changes in belief or development of particular values). Finally, he defines learned abilities as involving the “integration of knowledge, skills, and attitudes in complex ways that required multiple elements of learning. Examples embrace leadership, teamwork, effective problem solving, and reflective practice.” (Ewell, 2001)

The institutional team may find the following questions helpful when approaching the challenge of assessing international learning:

• How will we know if students are achieving the student learning outcomes we have articulated? What will constitute evidence?
• What process can we use to gather evidence that students are achieving these outcomes at the individual course level, the program level, and the institutional level?
• What campus expertise might we draw upon in formulating assessment strategies?

The ease in addressing the first question—how will we know?—depends upon how well the team has expressed the learning outcomes. Many teams find the global competencies challenging to articulate as outcome statements with active verbs that are easily measurable. For example, one common outcome is that students will be able to empathize with individuals of different cultural backgrounds. Without stating what constitutes evidence of such empathy, it would be difficult to ascertain whether a student has achieved this outcome. Establishing performance criteria will render this goal measurable. Performance criteria, or rubrics, indicate concrete actions that the student should be able to perform as a result of engaging in the learning activity. These criteria explain the behaviors, characteristics, or attributes expected from the student who has accomplished the learning goal. To continue with the existing example, a student who has developed the ability to empathize with individuals from a different culture would listen attentively to others and would demonstrate willingness to adapt to other individuals’ communication styles. A possible performance measure is the ability of the student to present an argument or describe an event relevant to the course content from a different cultural perspective.

Any internationalization team will be enriched by the presence of faculty and institutional research staff experienced in outcomes assessment and diverse measurement methods. Their expertise will be critical as the team determines the most effective ways to assess the cognitive, behavioral, and attitudinal outcomes of internationalization—that is, what students learn and know about the rest of the world, what kinds of jobs they secure that relate to international subjects, and their level of satisfaction with their preparation as national and global citizens. As Peter Ewell notes, several kinds of outcomes merit attention, including cognitive learning, career success, satisfaction, attainment levels after graduation, and the “value-added” during the time of enrollment (the latter requiring time-series data). Ewell cautions that assessment strategies need to
“go beyond such things as surveys, interviews, and job placements to include the actual examination of student work or performance” (Ewell, 2001).

The team’s approach to assessment will be shaped by existing initiatives and by campus attitudes toward assessment. It will want to consider how the institution has used assessment data in the past. If a campus has a history of using assessment data in a constructive feedback loop to improve programs, the internationalization team will likely have better results. Student learning assessment has reached only its beginning stages on most campuses. Many faculty view assessment as a bureaucratic, externally imposed requirement whose costs far outweigh the benefits. Some faculty and administrators may hesitate to share information, fearing how this information may reflect upon their individual performance or how it may be used. And some may resent and resist what they perceive to be an intrusion into their domain of expertise—the content and process of instruction. Therefore, before proceeding, internationalization team should consider the following questions:

- What is this institution’s history with student learning assessment? What can we learn from this history?
- In what ways has the institution used the assessment data it has gathered?
- Who has the necessary information? How willing will these individuals be to share that information?
- How will we work with those people who will likely resist student learning assessment? What incentives or assurances might the institution offer them?

The team may wish to refer to the general guidelines for learning assessment that the institution’s accrediting agency has developed. For example, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education has prepared a report titled *Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources.* The report highlights important methodological considerations and includes examples of direct and indirect measures of student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels. Direct evaluation methods should respond to the following questions: What did students learn as a result of an educational experience? To what degree did student learning occur? What did students not learn? Direct methods of assessment do not, however, provide evidence concerning “why” the student has learned. In contrast, indirect methods such as self-report forms, surveys, questionnaires, and interviews involve gathering evidence related “to the act of learning.” But their limitation lies in the fact that they do not actually evaluate the learning. A strong assessment plan will include both direct and indirect measures.

Every assessment method has strengths and weaknesses, which is why it is important to use a combination of methods such as surveys, focus groups, and portfolios. (See “A Sampling of Assessment Methods,” on page 52.)
Insights from the Literature

A Sampling of Assessment Methods

- **Written surveys and questionnaires**: asking individuals to share their perceptions about the study target—their own or others’ skills/attitudes/behavior, or program/course qualities and attributes.
- **Exit and other interviews**: asking individuals to share their perceptions about the target of study—e.g., their own skills/attitudes, skills/attitudes of others, or program qualities—in face-to-face dialogue with an interviewer.
- **Commercial, norm-referenced, standardized examinations**: commercially developed examinations, generally group administered, mostly multiple choice, “objective” tests, usually purchased from a private vendor.
- **Locally developed examinations**: objective or subjective and designed by local staff/faculty.
- **Archival records**: biographical, academic, or other file data available from the college or other agencies and institutions.
- **Focus groups**: guided discussion—conducted by a trained moderator—by a group of people who share certain characteristics related to the research or evaluation questions.
- **Portfolios**: collections of work samples, usually compiled over time and rated using rubrics.
- **Simulations**: a competency-based measure in which a person’s abilities are measured in a situation that approximates a real-world setting. Simulation is primarily used when it is impractical to observe a person performing a task in a real-world situation (e.g., on the job).
- **Performance appraisals**: systematic measurement of overt demonstration of acquired skills, generally through direct observation in a real-world situation—e.g., while the student is working on an internship or on a client project.
- **External examiner**: using an expert in the field from outside your program—usually from a similar program at another institution—to conduct, evaluate, or supplement the assessment of your students.
- **Oral examinations**: evaluation of student knowledge levels through a face-to-face dialogue between the student and the examiner, usually faculty.
- **Behavioral observations**: measuring the frequency, duration, and context of a subject’s actions, usually in a natural setting with noninteractive methods. (adapted from Rogers, 2003)

Finally, in crafting the plan, the team will want to be conservative in the number of international learning outcomes that it decides to assess for a given period of time. Some institutions alternate from one year to the next two or three overarching outcomes they elect to assess across the campus.

Aligning Activities with Institutional Goals and Learning Outcomes

Clearly articulated institutional goals and learning outcomes guide institutions in making strategic choices about where to invest time, energy, and resources. Many institutions focus on what they plan to do without fully considering what they would like to achieve and why. This approach is shaped by a historic tendency to view internationalization in terms of its discrete component activities rather than the purposes that those activities are fulfilling.

Consider the following examples of the failure to link activities and purposes: Some institutions focus almost entirely on study abroad, without clearly connecting it to the overall goals of the curriculum or paying sufficient attention to its integration into the rest of the undergraduate experience. Other institutions cite recruiting international students as a key strategy for internationalization, but they miss important opportunities to ensure that international students are integrated into campus life and contribute to the international learning of all students through such strategies as arranging conversation partners, facilitating presentations by international students, and establishing special meeting places. A final example concerns contracts for development cooperation. These contracts provide important international experience for the faculty and staff involved, but unless graduate and undergraduate students are intentionally involved in the initiative, and these efforts
explicitly tied to curriculum development, the effect of development cooperation on students will be uneven and haphazard.

Another important outcome of linking activities to goals and desired outcomes is to create synergy among the discrete international activities and with other academic initiatives. For example, if an institutional goal is to help students develop a conversational mastery of a second language, that goal will shape the curriculum, education abroad, engagement of international students, campus life activities and the connections among them in ways that help students achieve that goal.

Consider the example of a college that emphasizes the development of civic responsibility through service learning. This college would want to support that goal by instituting international service learning programs, infusing service learning into appropriate courses, working with local immigrant communities, and developing relationships with institutions in developing countries.

Clear institutional goals and explicit learning outcomes are the foundation of any internationalization effort. A focus on activities rather than goals leads to an ad hoc approach to internationalization and the risk of dissipating limited resources by creating a series of efforts that remain disconnected—not only from one another, but from the larger campus goals as well.

**Insights from the Literature**

**Middle States Report on Student Learning**

A comprehensive report from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, *Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources*, includes the following key questions that should be considered when choosing, developing, applying, and interpreting assessment instruments:

- Is the evidence provided by the evaluation method linked to important learning outcomes?
- Is a standardized instrument appropriate for the learning goals of the institution?
- Is the evaluation method appropriately comprehensive?
- Are important learning outcomes evaluated by multiple means?
- Are the questions clear and interpreted consistently?
- Do questions elicit information that will be useful for making improvements?
- Does everyone interpret the response the same way?
- Do the results make sense?
- Are the results corroborated by other evidence?
- Are efforts to use “perfect” research tools balanced with timeliness and practicality?
- Is evidence gathered over time and across situations?
- How much should be assessed?
- Are faculty and staff members who are knowledgeable about measurement seeing as resources for developing assessment instruments?


**Conversation Starters**

**Linking Activities and Strategies to Institutional Goals**

- What are the institution’s most important internationalization strategies and activities? In what ways do they contribute to the student learning goals of this institution?
- To what extent are the various international activities at this institution connected? How?
- How do they reinforce or support each other? How might these connections be improved?
Connecting and Aligning the Elements of an Internationalization Agenda

Activities and strategies based on institutional goals and desired learning outcomes form the core of a plan. If an institution engages in an internationalization review, as presented in Chapter 5, it will have evaluated the major internationalization dimensions on campus and formulated recommendations for improvement. It also will have completed a SWOT analysis that highlights clusters of strengths and opportunities—and guides the team in determining where the institution could bring about further alignment of its efforts.

A key task in developing a strategic plan is to ensure the alignment of desired student learning outcomes, institutional goals, and activities or strategies. For example, a student learning outcome may be “All students will be able to analyze an issue from at least two cultural perspectives.” An institutional goal that aligns with that learning outcome may be “Ensure that all students have opportunities for substantive interaction with people of other cultures.” Strategies that might help students achieve this competency and help the institution achieve this goal could include study and work abroad, projects with the local ethnic community, increasing the number and diversity of international students, or recruiting visiting scholars from other countries for those departments with little cultural diversity among their faculty.

Another example is the following student learning outcome: “All students can demonstrate knowledge of a non-Western culture.” Institutional goals that align with that learning outcome might be “Expand opportunities for faculty and staff to develop their expertise of non-Western cultures so that they can incorporate content from these cultures into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution.” Strategies that would support this goal include faculty and staff exchange opportunities, curriculum development workshops, and mentor programs between faculty or staff and international students from non-Western cultures.

Implementation Considerations

Internationalization efforts—especially those with ambitious agendas—are a messy and long-term undertaking. The team will inevitably use an iterative process, revising institutional goals or desired student outcomes as the process unfolds and what began as an abstraction becomes real and concrete. Weaving together the interrelated parts requires shining the spotlight on different tasks at different times; it is not possible to tackle every dimension of internationalization simultaneously and with equal vigor. Building a campus ethos of internationalization requires patience, well-conceived strategy, and focused attention (the latter being perhaps the scarcest commodity on campus). Accordingly, the leadership team should develop a timetable and measures for success that are realistic for the campus, given its culture and progress to date.

Conclusion

All too frequently, international activities are ends in themselves, rather than a means to achieve academic goals. A focus on learning outcomes is difficult but useful, enabling institutions to prioritize internationalization efforts and assess student learning. The principles of synergy and cross-campus collaboration remain equally important as the team develops a strategic plan to advance internationalization throughout the institution.
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Chapter 7
The Curriculum: The Heart of the Matter

The Curriculum: The Centerpiece of Internationalization
Among all the elements of an internationalized campus, the curriculum stands out as the key part of any internationalization effort if all students are to experience international learning in college. Despite the tremendous value of study-abroad programs to promote international and intercultural learning, recent ACE data indicate that only 10 percent of students will participate in some academic experience abroad during their college career, and most will do so for a month or less (Siya and Hayward, 2003).

Current scholarship leads to the conclusion that internationalizing the curriculum is not simply an adjustment, but rather a transformation of the curriculum (see Chapter 3). As such, internationalization affects all faculty, not just those who teach internationally focused courses in the general education curriculum or in a few majors. Nor is it additive—true internationalization does not involve sandwiching a few readings or assignments into existing courses, or creating a new major. Internationalization provides a unique world perspective that affects academics’ view of their discipline, scholarship, curriculum, and campus life. It is interdisciplinary, integrative, and built on the recognition that knowledge is culture based. Internationalization requires new pedagogies and ways of learning (for example, experiential, service, and collaborative learning), which enable students to fully experience how other cultures and belief systems work. The rich, complex conversations about curriculum are best discussed in specific disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and programmatic contexts and surpass the scope of this guidebook. Instead, it provides a general approach to internationalization and frames questions to guide a deeper discussion.

Insights from the Literature

The Heart of Internationalization
“At the heart of the internationalization of an institution is and will always remain its curriculum, precisely because the acquisition of knowledge, plus analytical and other skills, as well as the conduct of research, is what a university is primarily about.” (Harari, 1989)
Insights from the Literature

Dimensions of Internationalization
Paige and Mestenhauser have developed the following descriptors for an internationalized field of study:

"Integrative dimension: The field incorporates knowledge from diverse settings, cultures, and languages into the curriculum and integrates (i.e., translates, synthesizes, and connects) knowledge produced within as well as outside any given national boundary.

Intercultural dimension: The field reflects a profound understanding of culture and cultural variables; studies how they influence educational policy, practice, and scholarly inquiry; and understands the role of culture in identity formation, intergroup and interpersonal relations, and institutional life. These are especially important to larger issues of democracy, inclusion, and human rights.

Interdisciplinary dimension: The field draws on knowledge found within other disciplines to construct new and more holistic ways of understanding social phenomena and has complex intellectual tools to identify factors that make disciplines culture bound, including itself.

Comparative dimension: The field demonstrates the ability to compare and contrast education in diverse cultural contexts using educational ideas and practices in one setting as points of reference for arriving at a better understanding of them in another.

Transfer of knowledge-technology dimension: Professionals in the field take the knowledge from one setting and apply it to another in a manner that respects both the origins of the idea and the setting into which it is being transferred. Ideally this should not be simple borrowing, but the transferred knowledge should be used to create new knowledge.

Contextual dimension: Professionals in the field know how to analyze context, that is, identify the salient historical, political, economic, sociocultural, and other factors associated with educational theory, research, and, especially, practice.

Global dimension: Professionals in the field are aware of how global trends influence educational practice and seek to use knowledge of worldwide economic, political, and sociocultural trends in the development of educational programs."

"These all combine to form what we refer to as an international mindset. In an internationalized field of study, these perspectives find expression in the education that graduate students receive, the research being conducted by scholars, and the policies being developed and implemented by educational planners and administrators." (Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999)

What is an Internationalized Curriculum?
The complexity of internationalization, the diversity of U.S. institutions, and the strength of disciplinary traditions permit no simple answer to this question. Ultimately, each institution—and each of its programs—will have to arrive at its own response and shape its strategies accordingly.

Many U.S. scholars have addressed this question (Lambert, 1989; Groennings and Wiley, 1990; Hari, 1992; Pickert and Turlington, 1992; Mestenhauser, 1998; Paige and Mestenhauser, 1999); there is also a considerable body of work by European and Canadian scholars on the topic. Despite the differences in the U.S., Canadian, and European contexts, the European and Canadian experiences and research are instructive. The Center for Educational Research and Innovations (CERI) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) framed a recent study around the following questions:

- What are the characteristics of an internationalized curriculum?
- Which factors contribute to the effective implementation of an internationalized curriculum?
- What are the outcomes and effects of an internationalized curriculum (Bremer and van der Wende, 1995)?

Internationalizing the curriculum requires conceiving of the curriculum not as a collection of disconnected pieces, but rather as an integrated and learner-centered system that fosters intercultural, interdisciplinary, comparative, and global learning. Beginning the curriculum development process with a focus on desired competencies is a first step in making this shift.
What Is Already in Place? What Opportunities Exist for More Coherence and Connections?

As noted earlier in this chapter, reviewing the existing curriculum is the first step in developing an internationalization plan. The review should help the institution determine the extent to which the curriculum is already internationalized and generate ideas about how to broaden and deepen that level of internationalization.

After the institution has articulated desired student learning outcomes, the team will want to review how the current curriculum helps students achieve them. Different students will achieve these learning outcomes through different modes of study (on-campus coursework, education abroad), pedagogies (interactive student-teacher discussions, collaborative group work, experiential and service learning, or internships) and parts of the curriculum (general education, the academic major, interdisciplinary minors, or capstone courses). Students cannot achieve complex competencies with merely one or two introductory courses or through a study-abroad experience that is not intentional about the learning it seeks to promote. An internationalized curriculum is an interconnected system, including general education and education related to the major, offering international learning opportunities broadly across the curriculum. A successful internationalization process considers the different modes of study, curricular interests, and learning styles of diverse students. Institutions can use the following questions to guide their review of different parts of the curriculum:

- How does this set of courses contribute to the articulated international learning outcomes?

• What global competencies do these courses develop? What level of complexity do students attain—low, medium, or high? How well are these courses connected with others that address the international learning goals? Are there opportunities for greater connection?

• How does this part of the curriculum fit into the larger curriculum? Does it function as a common experience for all students, an introductory experience for students of a particular major, or an advanced capstone experience?

Insights from the Literature

Elements of an Internationalized Curriculum

“[An internationalized curriculum is] a curriculum with an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students for performing (professional/socially) in an international and multicultural context, and designed for domestic students and/or foreign students.”

Elements would include:

• Curricula with an international subject.
• Curricula in which the traditional area/original subject area is broadened by an internationally comparative approach.
• Curricula which prepare students for defined international professions.
• Curricula in foreign languages or linguistics that explicitly address cross-communication issues and provide training in intercultural skills.
• Interdisciplinary programs such as region and area studies, covering more than one country.
• Curricula leading to internationally recognized professional qualifications.
• Curricula leading to joint or double degrees.
• Curricula of which compulsory parts are offered at institutions abroad, staffed by local lecturers.
• Curricula in which the content is especially designed for foreign students. (Bremer and van der Wende, 1995)
For instance, the institution may have identified the following international learning outcome for all students:

“Students can apply knowledge about the historical forces that have shaped the current world system.” This is a relatively complex, or “high-order,” competency that requires students not only to understand the historical forces that have shaped the present, but also to analyze these forces and develop an informed recommendation for action on a particular issue. A review and analysis of the core or general education curriculum will reveal which courses accomplish this learning goal and to what extent. One of these courses might be a survey of Western civilization that includes as one of its objectives, “Students will be able to describe the rise and decline of the industrial era in Western societies.”

Achieving this individual course objective would require students to develop a fairly simple level of the desired knowledge competency. To achieve the more complex ability to analyze and apply this knowledge, students would need to take additional courses or do further work that develops these skills. In order to build a coherent internationalized curriculum that enables students to achieve these complex learning goals, it is important to understand which portions of the curriculum develop a particular competency and at what level of complexity. This is no small challenge, given the fragmentation of the curriculum at most institutions.

Institutions with high numbers of students face an additional challenge in reviewing the curriculum, since these students are likely to take all or most of their general education courses at another institution. The leadership team may need to consider the articulation arrangements that the institution has established with partner institutions and seek ways to encourage the internationalization of courses commonly transferred from the partners. If there are one or two primary feeder institutions, the team may want to include a representative from these partner institutions on a curriculum subgroup charged with considering the international content of courses that are being awarded transfer credit.

The following sections provide a series of questions to assess the contribution of different parts of the curriculum to internationalization.

*General education.* General education may consist of core courses that all students must take (English, math, history of Western civilization) or distribution courses (that is, groupings of discipline-based courses from which students select individual classes).

- Has the institution articulated international learning outcomes for general education? If so, how does the curriculum enable students to achieve these outcomes? What is the evidence that they do?
- Are courses with an international/global/intercultural focus required? Or are they simply listed as one among many options?
- Does the general education curriculum include opportunities or requirements for learning about non-Westem cultures?
- Does the institution have a language requirement? Why or why not? If yes, is it a proficiency requirement or a seat-time requirement?
The majors, minors, and professional certificates. This grouping may include introductory courses (commonly cross-listed as general education courses); intermediate, advanced, and specialized courses in the disciplines; or international, regional, or comparative tracks or subspecialties in the disciplines (for example, a certificate in international or global studies, or a concentration in area studies).

- To what extent does this discipline lend itself to international/global perspectives and content?
- What proportion of the courses in this department has an international focus? What proportion has some international content?
- Does this program of study articulate international learning outcomes? What are they?
- How do the courses in this program or department enable students to achieve these outcomes? What is the evidence?
- How do the courses enable students to develop progressively higher-level competencies? How are they assessed?
- To what extent are the dominant models or paradigms of this discipline culturally bound? What do faculty members know about how colleagues in other countries approach the discipline?
- How does this department facilitate or impede study abroad? What percentage of the graduates study abroad? Can students fulfill requirements in the major when studying abroad?

Interdisciplinary programs. The internationally oriented interdisciplinary programs generally include Language Across the Curriculum (LAC), area studies, international studies, and global studies. Other interdisciplinary programs, such as environmental studies or women’s studies, are often internationally oriented, as well.

- Do these programs benefit fully from the international expertise available across the disciplines?
- How might these programs contribute to internationalizing the disciplines?
- How might these programs benefit from national Title VI centers and/or collaboration with other institutions?
- How might these programs complement each other?

First-year seminars or senior capstone experiences.

- Do these introductory and capstone learning experiences include international dimensions and/or learning objectives?
- How do these experiences relate to other parts of the curriculum?

Education abroad. Education abroad includes long- and short-term study, internships, and service learning opportunities.

- Are the experiential and academic goals of these programs well integrated?
- How well are these programs connected to the home institution’s academic programs?
- Are there problems surrounding recognition of credit for education abroad?

In order to build a coherent internationalized curriculum that enables students to achieve these complex learning goals, it is important to understand which portions of the curriculum develop a particular competency and at what level of complexity.
**Joint degree development.**
- Has the institution established joint degree programs with institutions in other countries?
- Do these programs have explicit international learning goals (in addition to the discipline-specific content learning goals)?
- How do these programs relate to other academic units on the partner campuses?

**Graduate and professional training.**
- How well do these programs promote opportunities for international research for faculty and graduate students?
- Does the institution assist graduate students in pursuing internationally focused scholarship? In integrating it into their teaching?

This analysis is a critical step because it covers the breadth of the curriculum and assists faculty leaders—the stewards of the curriculum—in shifting from a focus on inputs (what courses are being offered) to a focus on outputs (the concepts that students are learning). The question becomes: Is a broad range of students developing a high level of global competency?

---

**Strategies for Internationalizing the Curriculum: New Offerings, Infusion, or Both?**

Given the diversity of institutional missions and curricular offerings, each institution will have to find its own path to internationalizing the curriculum. Nonetheless, it is helpful to know how other institutions went about doing it. Undoubtedly, institutions will want to use a combination of approaches to develop an internationalization strategy.

For the most part, these approaches fall into two categories: the creation of new courses and programs with an international focus and the infusion of existing curriculum with international content and perspectives.

Consider the approach of creating new courses and programs. This time-honored approach to curriculum revision is a comfortable one for faculty. A general education review may result in the creation of a new required course or series of courses with international content. Or a department may create a new international track or subspecialization that calls for developing one or more new courses to support such a program. In other cases, faculty may decide that the only way to ensure that students develop the advanced competencies required for international work is through creating new majors in international, global, or area studies. Adding new academic offerings provides new opportunities for international learning on the part of both faculty and students. But the add-on approach also has disadvantages. Creating new courses and programs requires attendant costs, which the institution must factor into the implementation of these initiatives. Additionally, relatively few students benefit from the in-depth learning offered through the newly created majors or minors. Finally, new programs generally require faculty expertise in international,
global, or area studies that may not be present on campus and create new competitors for coveted faculty lines.

After considering the challenges and limitations associated with creating new programs, the infusion method may seem to be a better approach. If the curriculum is broadly infused with international content, it provides more students with a greater number of international learning opportunities. The infusion method also serves as an efficient way to engage a wider group of faculty in internationalization. If the institution supports its faculty with appropriate incentives and professional development opportunities, many will be receptive to this approach (see Chapter 8).

However, the infusion method raises some potential difficulties as well. If infusion is to be an effective way to advance international learning, it must involve more than the addition of international content here and there. If faculty are simply inserting such content into existing courses—such as highlighting an example from another country or culture, or presenting a short course module with an international focus—it is likely that students will see this information as the exceptional or the exotic. To be fully understood, international content requires cultural context or translation and likely will call for changes in the overall structure, content, and pedagogy of the course.

Faculty may overlook the following issues when developing and delivering an infused curriculum: the rationale for selecting and sequencing material, the depth to which the course will probe the international area, the ways in which the international content connects with the rest of the course, the skills required to use the course content in another international context, and explicit recognition of the cognitive competencies being taught (Mestenhauser and Ellingboe, 1998). It is also important to remember that culture defines knowledge. The content being infused into the curriculum is also culturally bound and thus may not fit with the unarticulated assumptions or principles underlying the course. For example, when Caribbean literature is infused into traditional English or French literature courses, these texts will likely include different vocabulary and syntax from texts written in English from England and the United States, or texts written in French from France. The oral traditions of the Caribbean cultures also are likely to be interwoven throughout the texts, sometimes in subtle ways. In reviewing these texts, teachers and students may

**Good Practice**

**Approaches to Internationalizing the Curriculum**

- Incorporate international learning into the general education curriculum.
- Infuse the disciplines with international perspectives and content.
- Use comparative educational approaches.
- Discuss international issues in courses and through interdisciplinary studies.
- Encourage students to take area studies courses on various world regions and geographic, historic, political, and economic systems.
- Offer international majors and international minors within several colleges as options at undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Weave a practical or theoretical intercultural communication element within courses.
- Make international development topics part of various majors.
- Strengthen the role of foreign languages as an integral part of internationalizing undergraduate education.
- Create internationalized curricula and programs in pre-professional studies and the professional schools.
- Foster faculty and staff development and research in the international arena.
- Create institutional linkages and global networking of scholars, involving both international students and U.S. students who have studied abroad in the international enrichment of the curriculum and campus.
- Involve students and faculty in internships, research projects, and other opportunities in internationally oriented businesses and agencies at home and abroad.

(Ellingboe, 1997)
inadvertently dismiss the texts’ esthetic and literary value and focus instead on their rich sociopolitical content. Such treatment sidesteps the challenge to literacy and to “standard English” or “standard French” purposefully embedded in many of these texts. To address these challenges means to begin to question fundamental assumptions about what is literature and who owns standard English or French.

Or consider the example of introducing traditional healing practices of the medicine women from Africa or acupuncturists from China into a pre-med or nursing course; these practices may elicit questions concerning the preeminence of Western medicine. Many Western medical practitioners and health science students assume that the Western concept of the human body and medical practice is universal. This conception excludes from the mental model a different conception of the body and human systems, and therefore a different approach to the practice of medicine. Once one admits another model, the possibilities unfold and it is impossible to accept the presumed universality of the Western conception. The more faculty and students become conversant with the international content and the cultures from which this content is drawn, the more likely that questions will surface concerning the universality of Western knowledge systems.

Infusing the curriculum is a more complex undertaking than most people initially realize. Although this approach does not require the same level of new resources as creating new courses or programs—from the standpoint of new faculty hires, facilities, and administrative infrastructure—it still requires a substantial investment. Leaders need to recognize the complexity of this undertaking and try to create an environment in which faculty efforts to infuse international content into the curriculum are recognized and supported. Institutions can consider several potential questions:

- Is the institution setting the bar too high when encouraging novice faculty to internationalize their curriculum?
- Are efforts to infuse the curriculum with international dimensions rewarded and supported?
- Is an “either/or” approach developing—that is, a course is either international or it is not? How can this be avoided?
- Are efforts being made to recognize that there are varying degrees of internationalization, and different curricula may lend themselves to different degrees of infusion?

Internationalization is a process that happens over time. Likewise, infusing the curriculum is a skill that faculty develop over time and through experimentation. Opportunities for contact with foreign colleagues and cultures, team-teaching, faculty seminars, and professional development workshops provide invaluable support for these endeavors. (See Chapter 8 for a more in-depth discussion of the important role of faculty development.)

Whether an institution elects to pursue program creation, curricular infusion, or a combination of these two methods, the issue of pedagogy remains. An internationalized curriculum, by most standards, is international in content and varied in pedagogy. Pedagogical issues will vary across disciplines, but the following questions may
help advance the conversation on internationalizing instructional delivery practices:

- What teaching/learning strategies can institutions adopt that are appropriate to the cultures represented in the course content (storytelling? oral histories? apprenticeships? service-learning)?
- What assessment strategies would most effectively capture the global competencies that this course seeks to develop (interviews? portfolios)?
- What activities could be structured outside the classroom to reinforce the international learning in the course, possibly drawing upon international students or members of the community?
- How might students and faculty engage with peers abroad in studying or conducting research on similar content? Possibly through a distance education component? Or a short-term exchange component?

**What About General Education?**

The general education program—the universal experience for most students at an institution—should represent an important starting point for internationalizing the curriculum. According to a recent ACE survey, only two in five institutions require undergraduates to take courses focusing on issues, events, or perspectives outside the United States. Of those, 60 percent require one course and 21 percent require two. In other words, less than one-quarter of all U.S. undergraduates are required to take one course with an international focus in order to graduate. Similarly, of those institutions that do require an internationally focused course, 60 percent require a course with a non-Western perspective (Siaya and Hayward, 2003). Although one course is surely insufficient to produce a “globally competent” graduate, it does signify a start—one important opportunity to introduce students to international and global learning.

---

**Good Practice**

**Internationalizing the Curriculum: A Canadian Perspective**

Canadian scholars Whalley, Langley, and Villereal provide guidelines for internationalizing the curriculum that include goal statements for each of the following curricular areas: global skills objectives, course content, instructional resources, teaching/learning strategies, assessment strategies, extension activities, and extracurricular activities. For example, the goal statement for course content is:

“An successfully internationalized curriculum provides students with course content that reflects diverse perspectives on economic, political, environmental, and social issues of global importance. It promotes knowledge of the diversity of Canadian perspectives. Course content also provides students with knowledge of the differences in professional practices…across cultures.”

This goal statement is followed by a list of best practices in achieving this goal including:

- Course content is described in terms that include explicit reference to both the international and Canadian content of the course.
- Course content is carefully reviewed to ensure that it does not promote monolithic descriptions of other countries or cultures.
- Course content includes an exploration of how knowledge may be constructed differently from culture to culture in the subject area concerned.

The report also outlines goals and best practices for the following programmatic areas: philosophy and mission statements, administrative support, support services, professional development practices, awareness activities, community linkages, international linkages, and program review. (Whalley, Langley, and Villereal, 1997)

---

An alternative approach to identifying specific required courses is to pinpoint a few critical low- to mid-level global competencies that all general education courses should address. This approach would require that the internationalization team work closely with the general education committee to develop a plan that is mindful of the required level of faculty and administrative support and that includes an appropriate timeline.
Internationalizing the Major

The role of the department or division.

The academic department—the major unit of organization at most colleges and universities—is an important focus for internationalization. The department or division head can play a crucial leadership role in providing energy for internationalization and facilitating the work of the faculty. Department chairs can take several important steps to promote internationalization at the department level or division:

- Recognize and reward international competence and activity in the hiring, tenure and promotion, and merit processes.
- Recruit international visiting faculty.
- Encourage and support faculty in internationalizing their courses.
- Support collaboration between departments in the development of interdisciplinary team-teaching and research.
- Through the advising process, encourage students to take courses that are part of the international curriculum, either in the department, in other programs, or through an education-abroad program.
- Ensure that interdisciplinary curriculum and education abroad do not constitute a perceived or real obstacle to fulfilling the requirements of the major.
- Create linkages with departments in other countries that will provide opportunities for faculty and student mobility and collaboration.
- Form a standing committee that can chart new department-based international initiatives.

(Adapted from Godwin, 2001.)

The role of interdisciplinary programs.

Many U.S. campuses have established interdisciplinary area studies, international studies, or global studies programs during the past few decades. In most cases, faculty members who teach in these programs hold appointments in the traditional academic departments and offer courses in their disciplinary expertise. In some cases, the interdisciplinary programs have faculty lines, and faculty members from these programs are available to offer their regional or comparative expertise to other departments. These interdisciplinary programs provide important focal points for the international, intercultural, and comparative expertise on campus. Furthermore, they can draw upon U.S. Department of Education Title VI resource centers and international professional associations for additional expertise and support in advancing the internationalization agenda on campus. Interdisciplinary programs and the faculty connected with them can serve as powerful resources for internationalizing other programs on campus.

The role of modern language programs.

Most campuses also offer modern language and literature programs. In addition to the more widely known fields of literature, these programs frequently also include language and cultural studies. These faculty can contribute in several ways to the internationalization of other disciplines. For example, they can be instrumental in developing and delivering language across the curriculum courses. Or they can be invited to team-teach or guest lecture in their areas of expertise. Also, if the institution decides to select certain regions of the world to focus upon in its strategic plan, modern
language departments can develop language and cultural studies courses relevant to specific areas of the world. These new initiatives will require funding for faculty lines and support services for students (for example, tutoring programs, technicians and resources for the computer laboratories, and print and multimedia resources in the target language).

The role of the disciplinary and professional associations. Faculty members, especially those at large research institutions, tend to be more closely aligned with their departments or disciplinary associations than they are with the institution in general. This phenomenon points to the important role that disciplinary and professional associations can play. An ambitious project undertaken nearly 20 years ago attempted to engage a number of disciplinary associations in thinking about internationalization of the disciplines. The questions that the study directors presented to the associations included:

- What should undergraduate student majors learn about the outside world in our discipline?
- What is an attainable global perspective for undergraduates within our discipline?
- What is the minimum acceptable level of global education that our discipline should provide to its undergraduate majors (Groennings and Wiley, 1990)?

Professional and disciplinary associations can play an important role in providing guidelines, resources, and encouragement to academic departments and to individual faculty members. In turn, those who are champions on their campuses can help encourage associations to feature internationalization more prominently on their agendas.

Conclusion

Internationalization of the curriculum is indeed “the heart of the matter.” It is the principal mechanism that institutions can use to shape student learning and, ideally, to provide a series of mutually reinforcing learning opportunities. Such opportunities will allow students to develop a nuanced understanding of the place that their own cultures and assumptions occupy in the larger global context. Internationalizing the curriculum is a complex task, requiring attention to general education, the major, and pedagogy. As illustrated in the next chapter, the faculty’s ability to lead this important work requires sustained attention to their own international learning, as well.
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Chapter 8
Engaging Faculty in Internationalization

Faculty Involvement: The Critical Piece
Faculty engagement drives successful internationalization. Although vigorous leadership by the president, provost, and chief international educator is essential to envisioning, financing, and steering internationalization, a core of committed faculty is essential to create and sustain this transformation. Only when a substantial number of faculty members actively participate can the institution provide students with diverse international learning opportunities that are fully integrated into the educational process.

Such involvement encompasses teaching, research, service, and advising. Only faculty members can internationalize the general education program, their academic disciplines, and their courses. They encourage students to attend international events, support junior faculty, approve transfer credit from a study-abroad experience, draft grant proposals, facilitate classroom interaction between international and domestic students, and generally shape an internationalized campus culture.

Because the faculty role is so central, an institutional commitment to engaging faculty in expanding their international work and developing their interest and capacity should be a central focus of an internationalization strategy. Institutions should ideally aim to involve a critical mass of the faculty in internationalization, but it is unrealistic to expect that everyone will be equally engaged—nor is universal engagement a prerequisite for success. When assessing faculty support for internationalization and attempting to widen their involvement, institutions will want to honor diverse levels of faculty interest and draw upon individual skills and strengths. Some faculty champions will be prepared to step forward and lead internationalization efforts on campus. Other less committed faculty members may advocate internationalization in more limited ways, such as connecting to a specific aspect of the internationalization agenda. They might develop a new language offering, internationalize a particular program, conduct joint research on a specific project, serve on a study-abroad committee, or create an international outreach program for K-12 students. Still other faculty members may serve as the quietest of champions, teaching an internationalized course or working closely with international students to improve their language skills. In addition, there may be latent supporters who, with the right kinds of international experience or incentives, could become strong advocates for internationalization.
Some faculty members inevitably will express skepticism or oppose internationalization, as noted in Chapter 4. Such opposition may stem from fundamental philosophical differences or the concern that internationalization threatens one’s area of expertise. It is important to resist the temptation to ignore these dissident voices. Opponents often provide useful points of view, raising legitimate questions that may not be evident to enthusiasts. Striving to understand and address critics can result in a stronger internationalization agenda.

Barriers to Faculty Engagement
Advancing internationalization requires identifying and addressing institutional barriers to faculty engagement in internationalization. Only the most committed faculty will engage in internationalization in the face of significant institutional barriers; without sufficient support, even the enthusiasts may conclude that their energy might best be directed elsewhere. When reviewing barriers, internationalization leaders will want to consider whether such barriers are institutional or individual in nature. If a particular barrier is largely institutional, changes in the relevant policies and practices will help stimulate additional faculty engagement. Individual barriers, on the other hand, present a potentially greater challenge because they stem from personal attitudes and capacities, rather than the more impersonal forces of policies and structures.

Institutional barriers to internationalization. Through a series of interviews with administrators and faculty from across the campus, a researcher at the University of Minnesota identified nine “resistance factors”: cognitive competence, incentives, finances, institutional tenure and promotion policies, discipline limitations, public perceptions, fear of the future, hesitancy to collaborate, and graduate school preparation (Ellingboe, 1998; see “Institutional Barriers to Internationalization,” page 71). Of these, the three most frequent barriers were lack of financial resources, disciplinary structures and standards, and restrictive promotion and tenure policies.

Lack of financial resources. Every campus faces the challenge of insufficient funding, and every academic innovation hinges on its availability as a major determining factor. Insufficient funding for faculty engagement in internationalization is further exacerbated by the marginal status of international activities and programs on most campuses. Budget cuts often hit travel funding first, and international travel is especially vulnerable. But even small investments can result in a significant impact. Grants for course development, partial funding for faculty travel, and release time for project and curriculum development can be relatively low cost. External funding also can provide essential discretionary dollars.

Disciplinary structures and standards. The disciplines, which serve as the organizing principle for the institution as well as for scholarship, also can serve as an institutional barrier to international-
ization. Academic departments are the keepers of curriculum, faculty lines, teaching assignments, and resources. This discipline-based structure prevents many faculty members from working across disciplines—one of the critical intellectual dimensions of an internationalized curriculum. Most faculty are committed first and foremost to their disciplines and departments, which determine their teaching assignments, and to the professional associations that shape their scholarly lives. These commitments can severely limit even the most enthusiastic faculty member’s ability to work collaboratively in developing internationalized courses, engaging in interdisciplinary research, or devising experiential learning opportunities for students (for example, study, internships, or community service projects abroad). In addition, internationalization challenges many fundamental assumptions of the knowledge systems that the disciplines have painstakingly constructed, such as the assumption that knowledge is universal (Mestenhauser, 1998).

Restrictive promotion and tenure policies. Institutional policies and practices—such as tenure and promotion policies—serve as yet another obstacle to successful internationalization. The practice of overlooking international scholarship, teaching, and service, or worse yet, considering such activities distractions from “more important” work, will serve as a powerful disincentive to faculty in general, and especially to untenured faculty. According to ACE research, only 4 percent of institutions across the nation formally recognize international work in their tenure and promotion guidelines (Siya and Hayward, 2003).

Insights from the Literature

Institutional Barriers to Internationalization

Brenda Ellingboe conducted a series of interviews with administrators and faculty at the University of Minnesota which revealed the following sources of resistance to internationalization:

Cognitive Competence: “Some faculty have not made the cognitive shift to internationalize their curriculum. Those who have had international experiences have not connected them with their teaching, and ways of infusing their disciplines with international perspectives were unknown to them.”

Incentive Ingredient: “Many...leaders of departmental sub-units do not give their faculty incentives or encouragement to internationalize their courses...[to] apply for travel grants/fellowships to teach overseas, partake in international faculty development opportunities, or share their international experiences upon return home.”

Financial Factor: “Colleges are financially constrained and cannot offer their faculty members financial assistance that would enable them to go overseas for a meaningful period of time to do research, teach, or do consultation work...”

Institutional Dilemma: There are “institutional roadblocks for junior, untenured faculty who may want to go overseas to research, teach, or consult but have been restricted by their own departments' promotion and tenure codes and criteria for performance evaluation.”

Disciplinary Direction: “Disciplinary walls are often high, hard to scale, and difficult to tear down to create bridges across disciplines in interdisciplinary courses, programs, team-teaching, and faculty collaboration.”

Public Perception Syndrome: “Conducting research internationally, taking a group of students abroad, or teaching for a year in another university overseas may not be perceived favorably, particularly among administrators, who wonder who will teach those courses while that faculty members is away. Some view it as a luxury or a perk. Faculty who cannot be categorized neatly into one box may be viewed as ‘different.’”

Future Orientation Fear: “Many resist internationalization, fear change, and are more content to be present-oriented and solidly grounded in their own disciplines, which may be U.S. centered. Future-oriented, high-technological changes such as distance learning or teleconferencing with students in other countries, is also met with resistance.”

Collaborative Component: There is “resistance to collaborative teaching and research.”

Graduate School Preparation: “[G]raduate school preparation did not adequately address international education.”

(Ellingboe, 1998)
Good Practice

Addressing Institutional Barriers to Faculty Engagement
Members of the ACE Internationalization Collaborative, a group of approximately 45 diverse U.S. institutions committed to advancing internationalization on their campuses, recently developed a web resource dedicated to successful faculty engagement strategies. This site (http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international/collaborative/engagement.cfm), excerpted below, includes brief descriptions of strategies used in diverse institutional contexts:

Hiring, Tenure, and Promotion Policies
• Arcadia University applicants for faculty and administrative staff positions are asked to identify their international experience and expertise.
• Binghamton University’s Harpur College explicitly states that new candidates for faculty positions must include evidence of a global perspective in their area of expertise.
• Missouri Southern State College has approved a new policy that reads: “Faculty members who have spent significant time and work developing and expanding Missouri Southern’s International Mission Statement are allowed to list these activities under either Scholarship or College Service.”

Faculty Travel Abroad
• Grinnell College and the University of Richmond have organized short-term seminar-abroad programs for their faculty. The Grinnell College seminars enable faculty to pursue individual research projects and explore ways to internationalize their teaching. The University of Richmond seminars provide faculty with the opportunity to meet with academic counterparts and political and business figures. Upon return, the participants write plans for using the outcomes of the seminar in teaching, advising, and research.
• Several institutions connect funding for a conference or research abroad with a site visit to one of the institution’s study-abroad sites. Kalamazoo College provides study-abroad grants ranging from $1,500 to $2,500 to faculty who spend three or more days at the partner institution. Upon their return, faculty members submit a report, give a presentation, or assist with study-abroad orientation.
• Lock Haven University has developed a one-week faculty orientation program at one of its overseas sites. Targeting tenure-track faculty, this project will eventually bring international experience to nearly all faculty.
• Tidewater Community College designates financial awards to encourage faculty study and research. These stipends are provided by a professional development fund overseen by their faculty-led International Education Committee.
• Maricopa Community College District (MCCD) promotes faculty experiences abroad through its internal grant for faculty exchange programs. Proposals receive funding based on the priorities identified in the district’s Strategic Plan for International & Intercultural Education, which is the Governing Board’s mandate to internationalize Maricopa community colleges.

Strategies to foster faculty engagement.
Institutional policies and practices can facilitate or impede faculty work in internationalization. Administrators at every level play an important role in lowering the institutional barriers to internationalization and in actively encouraging faculty engagement. Chief academic officers, deans, and department chairs can support faculty engagement in a variety of ways:
• Include international experience and competence, as well as foreign language competence, as a criterion for hiring, promotion, and tenure.
• Provide funding for faculty to attend international conferences, conduct research, or teach abroad.
• Encourage faculty to apply for Fulbright awards and provide institutional funding for recipients in addition to the Fulbright stipend.
• Provide incentives (such as funding and release time) for faculty to infuse international content and perspectives into existing courses or to develop new ones with international focus.
• Provide incentives (such as funding and release time) for faculty to participate in international team teaching and collaborative work with other faculty across the disciplines.
• Provide incentives (such as funding, release time, and technical support) for faculty to engage in team teaching and joint research with faculty in other countries.
• Provide workshops on pedagogy and international content.
• Provide language-learning opportunities for faculty and staff.
• Encourage faculty to develop international study, internships, and community service opportunities for students.
• Provide faculty and staff with opportunities to lead students in study, travel, and work abroad.
• Facilitate faculty and staff exchange agreements and international development contracts.
• Provide grant-writing support to faculty and staff interested in institutional capacity-building in the area of internationalization.

Individual barriers to internationalization. Although an internationalization plan should include strategies for addressing institutional barriers to faculty engagement, it is also important to recognize individual or personal barriers. Lowering institutional barriers will facilitate the involvement of faculty who are already motivated to engage in internationalization. To widen the circle beyond this core group requires examining the individual attitudes and beliefs that drive faculty behavior. Among the most salient barriers are attitudes toward international learning, personal knowledge and expertise with other cultures and languages, and cognitive skills relevant to international instruction.

Attitudes toward international learning. Faculty motivation depends considerably upon their attitudes toward international/intercultural learning. Some faculty members may express personal interest; others will perceive such learning as extraneous to their personal and academic goals. The value that faculty members place on international/intercultural learning often relates to their personal experiences in interacting with people from other cultures. The Bennett Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity is a helpful tool for understanding individuals’ diverse attitudes toward dealing with differences. According to this model, these attitudes span the continuum, ranging from denying any difference or defending against difference (“ethnocentrism”) to adapting to, or integrating, different ways of being (“ethnorelativism”) (Bennett, 1996). Those faculty who fall into the “ethnorelative” stages of intercultural sensitivity will be the most likely to have a personal commitment to continuous international learning; they will seek international/intercultural experiences for themselves and their students. Those faculty who fall into the “ethnocentric” stages of intercultural sensitivity will be less inclined to seek international/intercultural experiences for themselves or their students, because such experiences challenge their perceptions of the world and their place in it. They may be uncomfortable, for example, when discussing sensitive issues with international students in their classrooms, because they are not personally prepared to guide students in understanding the diverse cultural perspectives that may surface around these issues. Or, they may have had negative international/intercultural experiences that drove them toward ethnocentric attitudes.

Some faculty members also may consider international learning irrelevant for students. They may question that students studying a particular field, for example, would ever be in a position to need global competencies. These faculty members think that students should instead acquire additional technical expertise in their fields.
They may express reservations about some students’ abilities to tackle complex global issues or learn about remote cultures and unusual languages. They may believe that everyone speaks English and that the world is becoming culturally homogenous through globalization—therefore, students do not need to study other languages or cultures. Or, they may believe that the campus experience is already sufficiently internationalized due to the high number of first-generation immigrants or visa-holding international students on campus. In each of these cases, the faculty members’ attitudes toward internationalization will likely manifest themselves in dismissive or oppositional behavior.

- **Personal knowledge and expertise.** Faculty’s willingness to engage in internationalization also depends upon their personal capacities and experiences with other cultures and languages. Faculty who were born into another cultural tradition, either in another country or in a strong ethnic enclave within the United States, are likely to use their own cultural and linguistic heritage to fuel their personal interests. Faculty who have spent substantial time abroad conducting research, development work, or teaching also are likely to have developed cultural and linguistic competencies. Faculty with formal international training in graduate school who continue to conduct internationally focused research and teaching are the resident experts; they can serve as a helpful resource for institutions looking to internationalize their campuses.

At the other extreme are faculty who cannot draw upon any such experiences. Consequently, they cannot engage comfortably in international teaching, research, or advising. These faculty members will be more inclined to articulate their concerns and doubts about internationalization—and to ignore it in their own professional lives. Their opposition or indifference likely stems from concerns about their own personal capacity to contribute meaningfully to internationalization efforts and about their role in an ever-changing institutional environment.

- **Cognitive competence.** “Cognitive competence” refers to the intellectual processes that faculty use to deliver internationalized curriculum. Even those faculty who possess international knowledge and expertise may need to shift their thinking before they are motivated and able to apply their international knowledge and experiences to their teaching (Ellingboe, 1998). For example, faculty who have had international experiences—such as conducting international research or development projects—may not have seen the connection between these experiences and their teaching. Or, faculty with advanced levels of second-language proficiency may not see the point of engaging in language across the curriculum programs. Another illustration of a lack of cognitive competence is the faculty member who does not know how to proceed in infusing international content into the discipline, nor in the related pedagogical and assessment issues. These faculty members may need to further develop or refine some of the intellectual skills relevant to internationalized instruction.
Cognitive competence can be compared with Paige and Mestenhauser’s concept of an “internationalized mindset” that is integrative, intercultural, interdisciplinary, comparative, transferal, contextual, and global (1999). Faculty members with an international mindset draw upon knowledge from diverse settings, cultures, and languages to internationalize the curriculum. They use integrative skills such as translating, synthesizing, and connecting, and they are adept at identifying the cultural influences that shape these examples. As faculty members use interdisciplinary or comparative approaches, they will need to grapple with issues such as how disciplines are culture-bound and the limits of comparative analysis. As they transfer ideas or adopt theories developed in a particular context, they will need to refine their analytical skills so that they can effectively analyze the original context from which they draw the knowledge, as well as the implications for the new context. These tasks are particularly challenging because, by definition, internationalization is an intellectually expansive practice that surpasses in scope the more traditional intensive practice.

The mindset needed to internationalize the curriculum may require faculty to develop or refine a different set of intellectual skills from those emphasized in their original graduate training and by their professional disciplinary associations.

Addressing individual barriers through faculty development. Champions who seek to engage a wide group of faculty in internationalization efforts will need to be mindful of these individual barriers—attitudes toward international learning, personal knowledge and expertise, and cognitive competence—and develop faculty development strategies that address them.

A cautionary word about faculty development: Although faculty are by definition intellectually curious, some resent the very notion of “faculty development” programs. As Margaret Miller notes:

Many of us in academe got our doctorates in the secret hope that once we had the unfortunately labeled “terminal degree,” no one would ever again question our credentials. While faculty do acknowledge the need to keep up with new developments in their fields, the suggestion that they need to be “developed” implies some imperfection in their training, which is an insult to both them and their mentors. But faculty do not spring full-armored from their doctoral programs, like Athena from Zeus’s brow, complete in wisdom. They emerge more or less well prepared for the complex demands of their work-life, and that preparation needs to be continually renewed throughout a long professional life (2002).
Good Practice

Faculty Engagement Strategies

**Workshops on Internationalizing the Curriculum:** Dickinson College’s international research seminars unite faculty research interests with study-abroad curriculum development at Dickinson sites abroad. Dickinson also sponsors a summer workshop to train its education-abroad directors and faculty in internationalizing the curriculum. One recent workshop focused on incorporating field research into study-abroad programs.

**Mini-Grants for Curricular Development:** Portland State University (PSU), through its Internationalization Action Council, administers Internationalization Mini-Grants. These awards further PSU’s goal to increase opportunities for faculty, academic professionals, and staff to incorporate international dimensions into their teaching, scholarly agendas, programs, and professional development. All PSU staff, faculty, and departments are invited to apply. Priority is given to those proposals that focus on international awareness, international collaborations, international scholarship, and/or international community-based learning. Each selected proposal is funded up to $1,500.

**International Visiting Scholars:** Grinnell College, through its Center for International Studies, organizes an annual series of visits to campus by international scholars, writers, artists, and others. Visitors are invited by faculty and work closely with host departments in teaching courses, working in the fine arts, or participating in other programs.

**Global Virtual Faculty:** The Global Virtual Faculty (GVF) program at Fairleigh Dickinson University (FDU) involves scholars, professionals, and experts from around the globe in courses taught by FDU faculty. The Global Virtual Faculty program brings a global dimension to the learning experience by offering an online dialogue of different views and observations on the issues being studied. Typically, a Global Virtual Faculty member partners with an onsite faculty member to teach an online course. GVF members come from a variety of backgrounds and include such individuals as a former head homicide investigator for Scotland Yard, a senior journalist from India, a historian from the Caribbean, an Arabic language and literature instructor from Egypt, and an economist from Australia.

**Faculty Invited Abroad:** Arcadia University faculty are invited to accompany administrators who are evaluating Arcadia’s study-abroad programs. This annual, one-week experience for one to three Arcadia University faculty members is paid for by the Center for Education Abroad. This initiative has increased faculty understanding of and support for Arcadia’s study-abroad programs.

The way in which an institution develops and presents any faculty engagement or development initiative will determine its reception by the faculty. The approach is particularly important to consider with respect to faculty who have little or no international knowledge or expertise. How can faculty development efforts appeal to a person’s innate curiosity and desire to learn, without emphasizing a deficiency in his or her training or abilities? Successful development efforts respect faculty autonomy; they do not presume to dictate the critical knowledge base in the disciplines. In its efforts to widen the circle of faculty involvement in internationalization, an institution will want to demonstrate respect for faculty members’ training, disciplinary perspectives, and current work.

Internationalization leaders are more likely to succeed if they keep the following important principles in mind: *ownership* (faculty-led committees that are empowered to develop strategies), *choice* (opportunity to develop strategies), and *support* (financial support and incentives for faculty initiatives).

- **A variety of faculty development strategies.** A well-crafted faculty development plan provides options for faculty members with different levels of expertise. Campus leaders will want to develop a variety of options and offer incentives that will allow faculty to participate in diverse opportunities that align with their needs and interests. Sustained institutional investment in a strong faculty development plan is one of the pillars of successful internationalization.
Faculty who are active participants in internationalization represent perhaps the most receptive audience for faculty development opportunities. Such opportunities can help them expand their research, learn about another area of the world, or share their expertise with others. This group of faculty also might welcome the opportunity to develop an international resource center, host or attend an international conference, or participate in faculty seminars related to their research, teaching, or service. Several institutions rely on resource centers, such as those financed by the federal Title VI funds, as important avenues for faculty development. Grants and development assistance contracts also provide valuable opportunities for faculty, administrators, and graduate students to work on real-world programs in intercultural settings.

Faculty who possess some personal knowledge and expertise with other cultures and languages but who have not used this expertise to internationalize their work might be the ideal candidates for workshops on infusing international content into the curriculum or diversifying pedagogical strategies. Faculty who have had no significant international experience have the most to gain from opportunities to experience the culture of another country. While most faculty choose to go abroad to experience other cultures, they also can benefit from working with international visiting faculty and scholars on campus. Technology now available on many campuses serves as yet another means of acquiring international expertise--faculty members can team-teach or conduct joint research with faculty from other countries without leaving their home campus.

**Resources**

**Opportunities for Faculty Development**
Many consortia that administer education abroad opportunities for students also provide professional development opportunities for faculty and administrators. Two examples of such consortia include: 
**College Consortium of International Studies (CCIS).** CCIS member institutions sponsor professional development seminars for faculty and administrators in various countries each year. The objectives of these seminars are (1) to encourage more understanding and active support of CCIS study-abroad programs sponsored by member institutions; (2) to acquaint participating administrators and faculty members from CCIS member institutions and other colleges with important themes and aspects within a given country or area, in order to promote international/intercultural understanding; and (3) to foster the internationalization of the college curriculum. [http://www.ccisabroad.org/seminars.html](http://www.ccisabroad.org/seminars.html)

**Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE).** Hosted by academic institutions abroad, the CIEE seminars provide one- to two-week intensive overseas experiences, offering focused updates on global issues and regions that are shaping the course of world events, while introducing participants to scholarly communities overseas. By exploring international issues and exchanging views with colleagues in other countries, seminar participants can re-examine their own disciplines within an international context and incorporate global perspectives into their teaching and research. Seminar participants are faculty and/or administrators at two- or four-year higher education institutions. [http://www.ciee.org/ifdc.cfm?subnav=IFDC](http://www.ciee.org/ifdc.cfm?subnav=IFDC)

Some universities also provide seminars that are open to faculty from other institutions. For example, the **West Virginia Consortium for Faculty and Course Development in International Studies (FACDIS)** is a consortium of 20 West Virginia higher education institutions. It has more than 375 participating faculty in international studies and foreign languages, drawn from more than 15 disciplines. Devoted to improving international education in West Virginia, the Consortium works to assist in revising and enriching international studies and foreign language courses, help faculty remain abreast of new knowledge and innovative teaching methods in their fields, encourage the active use of varied instructional materials, increase student and faculty participation in study-abroad programs, and provide professional development opportunities for public school teachers. [http://www.polsci.wvu.edu/facdis/aboutfac.html](http://www.polsci.wvu.edu/facdis/aboutfac.html)

In addition, several U.S. government agencies offer competitive grants focused on international faculty development, including the Department of Education and the Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. See Appendix D for more information.
Conclusion
Faculty engagement forms the cornerstone of internationalization. No one strategy is sufficient to internationalize the faculty. A combination of well-crafted and well-supported faculty development options will contribute considerably to successful internationalization. These options include short-term faculty seminars, collaborative opportunities with visiting international faculty, technologically enabled interaction with faculty in other countries, workshops on internationalizing the curriculum, international conferences and seminars, faculty exchange opportunities, and externally funded development contracts.

Identifying the primary institutional and individual barriers to faculty engagement is a critical early step. Then, campus leaders can develop policies and practices that address the institutional obstacles and work with the faculty to overcome the individual barriers. When creating faculty development plans, campus leaders will want to focus on principles of faculty ownership, choice, and support. They also should act on every opportunity to integrate faculty activities with other internationalization strategies. Strong, sustained leadership from administrators at every level of the institution, combined with a constantly widening circle of engaged faculty, will lead to successful internationalization.
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Chapter 9
Elements of Success

Successful internationalization efforts depend upon several important process questions (the “how”) that can be pivotal to success. Internationalization, similar to other significant changes, requires a thoughtful process, leadership, and strategic investments. To have an impact that is both broad and deep requires vigorous leadership at the top as well as throughout the institution, broad engagement of the campus community, and well-crafted goals and strategies. Certainly, institutions cannot do everything at once, but the pieces should fit together as part of a larger design, with strategies that are mutually reinforcing and coherent. Leadership, resources, organizational structures, and partnerships are four key elements of a successful institutional strategy.

Leadership

Leadership at the top is essential to successful internationalization. The president and provost, as well as other senior leaders such as the chief student affairs officer and chief development officer, are key players. As leaders, they must consistently articulate the importance of internationalization, stay focused on the issue, provide symbolic support, engage external groups, and develop on-campus leadership and support. Leadership by senior administrators is necessary but not sufficient. Leadership at all levels throughout the institution is required to move any important change agenda forward. But without champions at the top, progress will be limited.

Chapter 3 outlined three important leadership tasks in the change process: creating energy and momentum, removing barriers, and helping people think differently. This chapter suggests a number of additional leadership tasks and elaborates on the many different ways leaders can shape internationalization.

Create energy and momentum. Doing business as usual on any campus requires nearly all of everyone’s time and energy. Thus, moving in a new direction requires generating a sense of excitement and positive energy, and motivating faculty and staff to take on new assignments and push their thinking in new directions. This is no small challenge.

Certainly, institutions cannot do everything at once, but the pieces should fit together as part of a larger design, with strategies that are mutually reinforcing and coherent.
**Make the case.** A first step in generating momentum is to articulate the case for internationalization. If people are not convinced that the new direction is a positive one, they will have no reason to pursue it. Chapter 2 discussed the importance of clarifying the rationale for internationalization and articulating it to the campus community. We also noted that a key leadership task is to affirm continually the importance of the work at hand and the underlying reasons for it. A compelling case for change will be tied to aspects of the external environment such as the demographics of the local community, the job market for graduates, or the changing regional economy. Another important driver might be enhancing the institution’s distinctiveness and attractiveness. Leaders can make the case using data (for example, conducting studies of course enrollments in language or internationally focused courses) or more qualitative approaches (for example, sharing stories about the positive results of partnerships with institutions in other countries, or conducting focus groups with students about education abroad).

Reliable data and engaging anecdotes capture the attention of stakeholders; it is important to share them widely. Successful leaders develop ways to engage the attention of the campus community, outlining a vision of the future that is compelling and positive. Leaders have many opportunities and venues in which to make the case—regular presentations of data and progress reports to the students and their parents, faculty, board, and other important constituencies; showcasing the work of the internationalization task force or committee; disseminating reports or writing regular columns in a campus newspaper; developing a web site devoted to internationalization; or incorporating internationalization as a theme of speeches and interactions with campus groups.

Unfortunately, innovation is often perceived as a zero-sum game. New directions or initiatives always run the risk of being seen as “one more thing to do” or as competing with existing activities and resource allocations. Although these perceptions have some validity, internationalization presents an opportunity for learning, for doing the same things differently (new course content, different pedagogies or research topics). In making the case for internationalization, leaders will have to be mindful of the never-ending competition for resources and legitimacy.

**Focus attention and communicate widely.** Attention is a scarce commodity on every campus. Internationalization leaders themselves are pulled in varying directions by the crisis of the day, making it difficult to sustain their own and others’ attention on key forward-looking issues. Leaders must find ways to shine the spotlight on internationalization regularly, in public presentations as well as in everyday conversations. E-mail and the web serve as helpful tools for regularly communicating the work of the task force and announcing speakers and events. The topics that leaders choose to include in their personal communications, in conversations among colleagues, and in meeting agendas signify powerful statements of commitment and values. Unfortunately, most campuses suffer from information overload, and people routinely screen out many communications. But visible actions must support statements of commitment. Developing incentives
for internationalization, launching new projects, and hosting campus events make internationalization real and concrete. Whatever the mix of strategies used, the key point is to keep internationalization as a centerpiece of the institution—or at least a top institutional priority.

*Use deadlines effectively.* Enlisting wide participation is often a slow process. Imposing public deadlines and holding people to them is one way to keep the process moving. Institutions can maintain progress by following the timetable of a consultant’s visit, or establishing an external review team. Internally imposed deadlines—for example a report to the board of trustees or to the president—also will provide a clear timetable for the work of a group. Deadlines must be real and consequences must be attached to not meeting them. Artificial deadlines—with no consequences—damage the credibility of those who set them.

*Gain external recognition.* On many campuses, internationalization has been a marginal activity, championed by a few enthusiasts who often feel isolated and unappreciated. External recognition of the internationalization agenda and accomplishments validates the importance and quality of the work. This recognition may take the form of external grants, gifts, participation in national projects, and invited presentations at regional or national meetings. Campus leaders play a key role in facilitating opportunities for recognition through their connections to community groups, foundations, and statewide, regional, and national associations.

*Continually widen the circle of participation.* In order to be successful, involvement in internationalization must extend beyond the circle of true believers. Leaders must create rich opportunities for involvement in ways that suit the interests and needs of potential participants and that are integrated into ongoing campus work. For example, if department heads meet regularly, leaders will want to put internationalization on their agenda. By meeting with this group (or working to influence its agenda), they can start new conversations, get a sense of who might be potential champions or advocates, and learn where opportunities exist to introduce international learning into ongoing curriculum revision or to support a nascent internationalization effort.

Institutions can further widen the circle of participation by bringing different players to the table and facilitating new conversations across the campus. For example, on one large campus, the different colleges did not know about one another’s ongoing internationalization initiatives. The leadership team simply catalyzed a system of information sharing at regular deans’ meetings that proved both useful and validating to the colleges involved.

*Share the leadership.* Leaders must continually identify and mobilize new champions and advocates. Faculty leadership is essential to a change that affects teaching and learning, and internationalization is no exception. Department heads, deans, and mid-level administrative leaders are also important players. Thus, an important task of senior leaders is to identify and
engage faculty and other leaders, who in turn find like-minded colleagues to work with them. Sharing the leadership brings different talents to the table. Some will bring long experience with international studies, others a deep understanding of student interests and concerns. Yet others will provide institutional memory and savvy about how to get things done. Inviting people into the work of internationalization should be an active process; leaders will have to identify individuals whom the institution can approach to solicit their participation. Although a few people will step forward, institutions will still have to work at the process of widening participation and sharing leadership. This critical step cannot be left to chance.

Create coherence and synergy.
Coherence and synergy are especially difficult to achieve in large, decentralized institutions, where the locus of strategic change is usually the constituent units (such as colleges or schools in a university, or campuses in a multicampus institution). In the case of a research university, regular communication among leaders in different units promotes essential cross-fertilization of ideas and facilitates collaboration. In a multicampus system or complex institutions, the priorities and goals of the constituent campuses or colleges often differ. If institutions aim to make internationalization a system-wide undertaking, system and campus leaders should consider the desired level of coherence and coordination as well as the possibilities for collaboration and synergy. In brief, the role of leaders is to identify points of synergy and bring the different players together. The nature of academic institutions is such that this rarely happens spontaneously.

Remove barriers. A major leadership task is removing the barriers that stand in the way of good ideas and creative energy. The litany of barriers to innovation is familiar—not enough resources, no incentives, not enough time, “it will never fly here,” to name a few. The challenge is to reject the immutability of such barriers and find ways to lessen their impact or remove them altogether. (See Chapter 8 for suggested strategies that address institutional barriers to internationalization.)

Provide incentives. Institutional leaders can influence internationalization through key decisions on incentives and rewards. Incentives such as a small grant to internationalize a course, or a travel grant, can serve as important sources of legitimacy and motivation. Building international activity into the reward structure for faculty—in hiring, promotion and tenure, and merit raises—will surely bring about results. Recognition of faculty contributions to internationalization can serve as an important symbolic expression of institutional goals and values, and honors faculty members in meaningful ways.

---

**Good Practice**

**Coherence and Synergy:**
**The University of Wisconsin’s Institute for Global Studies**

Founded in 1999, the Institute for Global Studies (IGS) is a collaborative initiative involving all of the University of Wisconsin institutions and other state, national, and international partners. IGS conducts faculty conferences around particular themes to help build collaboration. [http://www.uw-igs.org/aboutigs/](http://www.uw-igs.org/aboutigs/)
Develop new skills and knowledge. Any major change will require significant faculty and staff development. Many faculty possess little international experience or expertise in internationalization; therefore, they often cannot envision their potential role. Staff development should not be overlooked. Advisors and student affairs personnel have sustained direct contact with students; their outlook and experiences will shape their contributions to internationalization and their messages to students. One institution made sure that a wide variety of administrators, including business officers, fund raisers, and student affairs personnel, had opportunities to participate in institutionally sponsored academic travel programs. They developed a firsthand appreciation for the institution’s work, as well as deriving significant personal learning and enrichment.

Work effectively with governance bodies. The work of internationalization may be done by many governance bodies, including the curriculum committee, the general education committee, promotion and tenure committees, the internationalization task force or leadership team, and the faculty senate. Academic changes must wind their way through the appropriate governance bodies—creating inevitable layers of complexity and coming up against campus politics. Although an internationalization leadership team may be an ad hoc group with a limited life span, it will have to connect its work at crucial points with the ongoing governance processes of the campus. Leaders will want to develop open lines of communication to these bodies early in the process, engaging them as appropriate and always keeping them informed. When internationalization efforts require formal decisions, the governance committees already will have been engaged in the developmental work, rather than presented with a fait accompli for approval.

Help people think differently. Creating change often requires changing people’s attitudes and providing them with new skills and knowledge. In the case of internationalization, people may need to be convinced that it is indeed vital in today’s world, and that students must be prepared for a different future than the one that students faced a quarter century ago. Or, faculty may not see their work or their discipline as relating to international and global issues; a shift in their mindset would be required. For example, a useful question to provoke new thinking is, “What would this institution look like if it were internationalized? What would be different?”

Create multiple campus conversations. Although higher education institutions are often accused of talking things to death, conversation is the cornerstone of change. People need to be engaged in conversations that raise questions such as, Why is internationalization important? What are the implications for teaching and scholarship? What new pedagogies might be involved? Where are there potential synergies with other groups, both on and off campus? Conversation helps people get comfortable with new ideas and see their implications from multiple points of view. Institutions use a combination of the following to promote conversations: symposia (using faculty, community members, outside speakers), retreats, informal gatherings such as brown-bag lunches (for faculty, staff, and students), ad hoc task forces, institutional roundtables, and town meetings. In addition to such special
events, more routine gatherings such as those of department heads, deans, the president’s cabinet, and board meetings can reserve a block of time for discussion of internationalization, thus making it part of the group’s ongoing work.

**Learn from outsiders and their ideas.** One campus began its work on internationalization by identifying similar institutions that had made significant progress. It sent a team to visit these institutions and reported to its leaders on what the visiting team had learned. Institutions can draw upon many models of good practice by looking to their neighbors in the state, to similar institutions in their region, and to national organizations. Statewide or regional consortia and national associations can help identify institutions that may share innovative practices. Working with other institutions—be it comparing notes, pooling resources to bring speakers to multiple campuses, or developing joint programs—creates both efficiencies and opportunities to expand intellectual and programmatic capacity.

Consultants, as noted in Chapter 5, also can be helpful in providing the “outsider’s eye” and advice. In addition, a visiting peer review team will enrich the review exercise by holding up a mirror to the campus and suggesting ways to improve. And finally, bringing in speakers (such as scholars, alumni, and community members) to provide a wider perspective on internationalization can broaden campus thinking beyond the confines of its routines.

**Use cross-departmental work groups.** Internationalization demands cross-disciplinary and cross-functional collaboration. No single group can possibly own the internationalization agenda (not even the chief international officer) or implement it without the collaboration of many campus players. The groups that do the work of internationalization—be they the internationalization leadership team, an ad hoc group to review language study or study abroad, or a committee that brings international speakers to campus—provide an opportunity for people who do not work together to think about internationalization from a campus-wide perspective, and in the process, to build personal relationships that cross status and functional lines. Internationalization provides an excellent opportunity to create campus community while moving the agenda forward.

**Resources**

A second element of success is providing the necessary resources. A wise administrative officer once defined a budget as “a numerical expression of a plan.” Internationalization becomes real (and legitimate) when the institution devotes human and financial resources to achieving expressed goals. In the absence of such alignment, internationalization is an aspiration, not a reality.

Every institution has more claims on existing resources than it could possibly fund. And resources are indeed required to support faculty engagement in internationalization (such as faculty development and international travel), student participation in education abroad, programming for international students and scholars, and curriculum development and co-curricular programming. As a continuing commitment and cumulative process, internationalization requires ongoing financial commitments and periodic assessment of whether those investments are achieving the institution’s goals.
Four typical sources of new funding for internationalization are internal reallocations, gifts (to the operating budget or the endowment), grants, and monies raised through fees (such as surpluses in study-abroad programs). External funding is as important for its symbolic value as for its monetary support. Gifts and grants provide external recognition of the quality and importance of internationalization, and reflect the commitment of faculty and leaders to obtaining those resources. Most institutions rely on a combination of reallocation of existing resources—frequently incrementally and over time—and modest external funding. Reallocation, the most delicate of tasks, risks creating “winners” and “losers.” Funds for new initiatives can be created by earmarking an existing pool of discretionary funding, or “taxing” departments and schools to create new pools. Even modest funding goes a long way in supporting good ideas and curriculum development and in reinforcing the centrality of internationalization. Some high-impact investments of funds, frequently of modest dimensions, include the following:

- Providing grants or release time for faculty members to develop courses with international or global perspectives and content.
- Allocating travel stipends to faculty for research, teaching, and travel (sometimes tied to course development). These funds can be earmarked from the ongoing faculty development budget.
- Making institutional financial aid portable for study-abroad programs sponsored by institutions other than the home institution.
- Supporting extra discussion sessions for a course using a foreign language (language across the curriculum).
- Earmarking existing funds for campus speakers and sponsoring student activities for internationally focused programming.
- Conducting inventory on and tapping into community internationalization resources, such as local businesses and ethnic communities.
- Sharing resources and programming with neighboring institutions.

Of course, reallocating existing funds will not address all needs; institutions also need new monies. Federal and state grant programs, corporate gifts (cash and in-kind), and private donations can provide vital enhancement to existing efforts. Institutional grant and development offices should make resource material available to faculty and staff and become as knowledgeable as possible about funding opportunities. If internationalization is indeed a strategic priority, then it also will figure into the fund-raising efforts by the president and development office. Institutions can raise money for study-abroad scholarships (or endowments for study-abroad scholarships), faculty development grants, and particular curricular innovations (such as language teaching or global environmental issues).

**Supporting Structures**

Providing the required organizational support for internationalization is a third key element of success. Many institutional leaders seek to identify the “right” structure. Given the diversity of U.S. higher education institutions, it is difficult to offer blanket prescriptions. ACE survey research showed a variety of organizational arrangements: 29 percent of institutions designated no office to oversee international education programs; 20 percent tasked a single office to administer or oversee it.
A large, decentralized campus may employ international directors in all or some of the colleges and/or have a central coordinating office headed by a director or dean. Sometimes international education is included in the portfolio of a vice president or associate vice president. Most campuses with a high level of internationalization also have a visible international office headed by a chief international officer. That individual is usually a senior person (faculty or staff) with strong credibility across campus. It is also important for that office to report to a fairly senior person on campus, such as the chief academic officer (or an associate/assistant vice president) or the university president. If campus leaders see internationalization as a real institutional priority, it is important that a senior person have responsibility for oversight and coordination, with some discretionary resources to encourage participation and innovation. Otherwise, the problems of incoherence and lack of synergy will persist, even on a small campus.

It is important that the institution’s structure facilitate coherence and coordination among the many threads of international education (curriculum, international students, education abroad, faculty development, and campus life) and that it can access sufficient resources and personnel to accomplish its mission. A creative, energetic chief international officer will always have more ideas and plans than resources; this situation is to be expected, if not hoped for. A good working relationship between the chief international officer and the person to whom he or she reports can help address the question of discretionary resources in the context of the institution’s current situation.
**Partnerships**

The creative use of partnerships constitutes a fourth element of successful internationalization. “Going it alone” is becoming increasingly difficult for colleges and universities. Although partnerships cannot substitute for the establishment of support structures on campus, they represent important ways to extend institutional capacity and to avoid reinventing the wheel. Possible partners include U.S. colleges and universities, institutions in other countries, and businesses.

**Other U.S. colleges and universities.**

Higher education institutions have a history of cooperative arrangements with other institutions in the form of articulation agreements for transfer of credit. National, regional, and statewide consortia also can advance internationalization in the broad sense, although a number of existing consortia focus on study abroad. (See sidebar on this page.) Common goals and shared resources enable institutions to undertake a variety of tasks:

- Organize conferences for faculty and staff to address issues of common interest.
- Encourage innovation and good practice by disseminating newsletters and web publications.
- Foster communication through list-servs.
- Organize study-abroad programs for member institutions.
- Share faculty expertise to offer less commonly taught languages or courses otherwise unavailable.
- Engage in joint advocacy efforts.
- Apply for external grants from state and federal agencies.
- Develop partnerships with K-12 schools to provide them with teacher in-service programs and curriculum development assistance.

---

**Resources**

**A Sampling of International Education Consortia**

**National Consortia**

American Council on International Intercultural Education (ACIIE)
http://www.aciie.org

The Coalition for International Education (CIE)
http://www.duke.edu/web/cis/globalchallenges/cie.html

Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC)
http://www.conahec.org

**Regional Consortia**

Appalachian College Association Collaborative Initiative
http://www.acaweb.org/

Associated Colleges of the Midwest
http://www.acm.edu/index.html

Associated Colleges of the South
http://www.colleges.org/

Community of Agile Partners in Education (CAPE)
http://www.acape.org/about/about.html

Committee on Institutional Cooperation
http://www.cic.uiuc.edu/

Five Colleges
http://www.fivecolleges.edu/

Great Lakes Colleges Association
http://www.glca.org/index.cfm

Mid-Continent Consortium
http://www.utm.edu/departments/artsci/modlang/consortium.shtml

The Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA)
http://128.146.12.142/mucia/

**Statewide Consortia**

Florida Consortium for International Education
http://www.dbcc.cc.fl.us/fcie/index.html

Illinois Consortium for International Education
http://www.siu.edu/~econdev/cbs/exportsite/icie.html

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
http://www.mnscu.edu/

South Carolina International Education Consortium
http://www.octech.org/sciec/doc1.htm

Texas International Education Consortium
http://www.tiec.org/
• Organize faculty development workshops.
• Collaborate on development cooperation initiatives and proposals.
• Share visiting international scholars and experts.
• Develop international internships for students of consortium members.

Institutions in other countries. Collaboration with institutions in other countries should be a key element of any institution’s internationalization strategy. There are many ways to work together, and many different reasons to do so, including fostering collaborative research and teaching, sponsoring student and faculty exchange, and creating “sister institution” relationships. Effective collaborations require building trust between the partner faculty and departments and getting to know the other’s educational system, both of which happen over time. Faculty interstand connections are key; institutional agreements and memoranda of understanding are only real when they are made operational by faculty working together across borders.

Businesses. The business community is an obvious partner for internationalization. Most business schools offer international business courses or programs, and most have established linkages with U.S. firms conducting international business as well as with multinational and foreign corporations. Internationalizing business education is a rich, complex topic in its own right, and there is a considerable amount of literature on the topic.

Effective partnerships with business need not be limited to the business schools. Other professional schools, such as colleges of engineering, agriculture, or journalism, can establish productive links. Arts and sciences faculty also bring vast knowledge of languages and world regions. Thus, college and university faculty members can play a role in helping businesses develop international markets and relationships by offering their expertise in a wide variety of areas. Businesses, in turn, can offer advice on program development, provide internships for students (at home and abroad), and lend financial support for international activities. Partnerships highlight the institution’s international capacity and the mutual benefits to businesses and the institution, and they will likely generate goodwill and support for campus internationalization among the business sector.

Resources

Where Credit Is Due
Where Credit Is Due: Approaches to Course and Credit Recognition Across Borders in U.S. Higher Education Institutions, a publication from the American Council on Education, illustrates the processes and products that have been shown to facilitate credit and course recognition in consortial projects. The guide includes sample documents, instruments, and frameworks employed to effect or ease credit recognition.

The authors’ most interesting finding is that project directors and others believe that credit recognition occurs in a broad context of relationships and communications. That is, the key factor in successful portability of credit is the development of professional trust among partners; and the establishment of this trust requires face-to-face meetings among project personnel at the outset of each project. In other words, foundations for successful credit recognition stem from qualitative rather than mechanistic or formulaic solutions.

http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international/pubs.cfm?pubID=282
Conclusion
Implementing good ideas and innovative approaches to internationalization requires a thoughtful process and well-crafted strategies, leadership, sound organizational structures, sufficient resources, and partnerships to enhance capacity. Internationalization takes time and requires sustained commitment. It is difficult for those most invested in internationalization to see their progress along the way; the shadow of the next challenge always looms larger than the lights of successes to date. Thus, it is essential to take stock periodically, and review institutional progress against articulated goals. A continuous cycle of assessing outcomes against goals, refining those goals, and adjusting strategies should be integral to the internationalization process.

This chapter has described a set of strategies that are grounded in the culture and environment of each campus. The implementation of such strategies is far more complex and nuanced than any handbook can fully capture. Successful internationalization requires a sophisticated balance of process and product, goals and outcomes, and people and structures.

Good Practice

Keys to Success in Establishing International Linkages
1. **Strong support from the dean.** The dean’s support is important to help overcome faculty resistance to the establishment of linkages, as well as to help negotiate the bureaucratic maze. It is important to educate deans about possible difficulties so that they are prepared for the inevitable hurdles ahead.
2. **A champion.** In the long run, faculty are the foundation for all internationalization activities. Early-stage linkages require continuity and the development of institutional memory. It is more likely that faculty members will provide such continuity than will more mobile administrators.
3. **A plan.** It is important to develop a plan that includes strategic objectives. In developing this plan, consider the institution’s financial and human resource limitations. Overseas commitments can be expensive because of extra travel and communication costs. Also be aware of the typical student profile. For instance, institutions in which many students work full time in addition to pursuing their studies will find they cannot sustain exchange programs lasting more than a few weeks.
4. **Two-way benefits.** It is crucial that both parties to an agreement feel that they are benefiting from the relationship. These benefits need not be the same for both parties.
5. **Equality in the relationship.** All partner institutions must be considered equals, with none seen as a “country cousin.”
6. **Creativity.** Creativity is needed to deal with the different structures of national educational systems, the differences between institutions, and the many bureaucratic rules that make interinstitutional collaboration difficult. Barriers that can be overcome with creativity range from incompatible calendars to large discrepancies in faculty salaries.
7. **Institutions, not individuals.** Linkages should be established between institutions, not individuals. Though many linkages are initiated and sustained by personal relationships, eventually they must rise above this in order to become long-term relationships. All individuals involved initially should consider what systems will be needed to institutionalize the link.
8. **Incrementalism.** Linkages should be developed slowly, as two institutions get to know each other. Many schools start with student exchanges, a relatively low-risk form of collaboration that generally benefits students.
9. **Opportunism.** Be opportunistic in seeking possibilities for linkages, and be prepared to act quickly when opportunities present themselves. If your institution is clear about its objectives, it will be far easier to seize opportunities that present themselves.
10. **Centrality within the institution.** The individuals involved in establishing linkages must occupy a central position within the institution. Faculty must be part of the process. They should be consulted about the appropriateness of prospective partners and provide feedback on issues such as student performance.

(adapted from Tucker, S., in Scherer et al., 2003)
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Appendix A
Questions to Guide an Institutional Internationalization Review

A useful review will raise questions and guide institutional strategy. Thus, the emphasis in the review process should be on analysis rather than description. In considering each of the areas outlined below, the following questions can help shape an action agenda emerging from the review:

• How well is this area currently working?
• How do we know?
• What changes might we make in the short term?
• What changes should we consider for the longer term?

Articulated Commitment: Mission, Goals, and Vision
To what extent is internationalization integral to the institution’s identity and vision?
• Is global/ international learning articulated as part of the institution’s vision, mission, or goals? Where (for example, in the mission statement, strategic plan, or recruiting materials)?
• What are the goals for internationalization (for example, preparing students for work in a global society or connecting international and multicultural agendas)? Where are they articulated?
• To what extent has the institution developed student learning goals associated with the global and international dimensions of undergraduate education? What are they? Where are they articulated? Who knows about them? How consistent are goals for different programs or colleges with one another? How do faculty assess student achievement of those goals?

The Environment for Internationalization
How does the local, state, and broader environment affect current internationalization efforts? What impact will the environment have on future internationalization efforts?
• Does the immediate environment from which the institution draws its students suggest a special approach to internationalization (for example, immigrant populations, local cultural ties to other countries and regions)?
• Does the institution’s location facilitate certain kinds of international interactions with a particular region or regions? What local organizations or businesses have strong international ties? Are they focused on particular parts of the globe?
• What opportunities exist in the local environment to enhance the institution’s internationalization efforts? To what extent has the institution taken advantage of them?
Strategy
To what extent does the institution have a clear strategy to accomplish the goals it has articulated?
• Does the institution have a strategic plan? Where does internationalization fit into the plan? If internationalization is not part of the strategic plan, where else is it outlined?
• What are the main components of the institution’s internationalization strategy?
• How does this strategy take into account the institution’s mission, history, and students?
• How does the institution assess its progress in achieving its goals?

Structures, Policies, and Practices
To what extent are institutional structures, policies, practices, and resources aligned with the institution’s goals? Which ones promote internationalization? Which ones impede it?

Organizational Structure and Personnel
• What governance and administrative structures support internationalization? How well are they working?
• Where does primary responsibility for internationalization lie? What other structures or bodies share responsibility? How effective are these arrangements?

Policies and Practices
• How does the institution promote faculty engagement in internationalization? To what extent does the institution reward or penalize faculty for international activities and internationalization of their courses, especially in the hiring, promotion, and tenure processes? What are the barriers to engagement? To what extent is the institution succeeding in removing them? What is the evidence?
• To what extent are students encouraged to take courses with international content? To take language courses? To study abroad? Who provides such encouragement? How do advisors encourage or discourage students in this arena? How do departmental requirements and practices encourage or discourage international learning?
• How effective are the administrative policies and procedures for financial aid transferability and the articulation and transfer policies? Do differential costing structures exist?
• What policies or practices hinder internationalization efforts at this institution?
• What policies or practices facilitate internationalization beyond those already mentioned?

Resources
• What financial resources does the institution provide for internationalization? What resources are available to support the following: curriculum development; faculty international travel and research; students’ study- or work-abroad opportunities; infrastructure (such as library holdings, technology, or language labs); and co-curricular programs?
• What is the balance between internal and external funding sources for internationalization? Has this funding increased, decreased, or remained the same during the last five years? 10 years?
• How well do institutional resources align with institutional goals? What are the most important targets for future investment?

The Curriculum and Co-Curriculum
To what extent is international learning an integral part of the institution’s educational offerings? What elements of the curriculum and co-curriculum foster international learning?

The Curriculum
• To what extent does the institution’s general-education curriculum include international or global content, perspectives, and different ways of knowing? What is the evidence?
• To what extent do the academic departments attempt to internationalize the major? To what extent do they promote or impede study abroad for students? What is the evidence?
• How rich are the opportunities for students to take courses with an international or global focus? What international majors, minors, concentrations, certificates, and courses are offered? What do enrollment patterns in these courses over time say about student interest?
• Does the institution have a language requirement (for some or for all students)? Why or why not? Is this requirement articulated in seat time or proficiency? What do enrollment patterns in language courses reveal? What qualitative data exists about language learning at this institution? What quantitative data?
• Has the institution gathered information about alumni use of language skills after graduation?

Co-curriculum and Campus Life
• How is internationalization manifested in the co-curriculum (e.g., international events, festivals, lectures, films?) To what extent do students, faculty, and staff attend these events?
• What are the enrollment trends of international students? How are they distributed among schools and colleges? Between undergraduate and graduate programs?
• How are international students and scholars integrated into campus life? What strategies are in place to help U.S. students learn from them? How well are they working?
• What opportunities exist in the local environment to enhance internationalization efforts? To what extent has this institution taken advantage of them? To what extent are the co-curricular activities open to and attended by members of the local community?

Study and Internships Abroad
What opportunities exist for education abroad? What are the trends for student participation in these programs during the past five to 10 years?
• How many students participate? What are their destinations? How much time do they spend abroad—two weeks? a summer? a semester? a year?
• What is the distribution of students by gender and race/ethnicity who travel abroad?
• How are students financing their study or internships abroad? Is financial aid portable? Can students tap into additional sources of aid?
• How are students prepared for education abroad experiences—a pre-departure orientation? A specific orientation course?
• To what extent does the institute sufficiently integrate students into the host country or in “island” programs?
• What issues, if any, surround the recognition of credit for study abroad?
• What impact do education abroad students create on the home campus upon their return? on residence life? on teaching/learning styles? on curriculum demands?

Engagement with Institutions in Other Countries
What linkages does the campus have with institutions in other countries for instruction, research, service learning, and development cooperation? How well are they working?
• To what extent does the institution engage in student, faculty, and staff exchange? Does the institution’s study-abroad programs facilitate such exchanges?
• To what extent do faculty members engage in collaborative research and development cooperation with faculty at institutions in other countries?
• What impact do these linkages create upon student international learning on campus?
• How does the institution fund such linkages?

Campus Culture
To what extent is internationalization part of the institution’s culture? What is the evidence?
• How many internationally oriented administrators, faculty, and staff work on campus? What are their areas of expertise or interest? What is the evidence?
• What are the attitudes of students, faculty, and staff toward international learning? What is the evidence?
• To what extent does the campus community perceive international learning as an important element of the educational process at the institution?

Synergy and Connections Among Discrete Activities
To what extent does synergy exist among the international components on campus? What communication channels exist, and how well are they working?
• What are the most important targets for future collaboration and connection between international programs and activities on campus?

Conclusions and Recommendations
What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the institution’s current efforts to internationalize? What opportunities exist? What are the threats to future progress? What are the most important conclusions emerging from this review?

Strategic Action Plan
What are the implications of this review process on the institution’s strategic priorities for the next year and for the next three to five years?
Appendix B
Survey Instruments for Gathering Information

International education practitioners and faculty members at diverse universities have developed the instruments included in this appendix. They were used as part of an internationalization review either to assess the impact of internationalization strategies or to identify prospective advocates for internationalization on campus. They are reproduced here with permission from the respective developers, with the understanding that readers who choose to adapt these instruments and use them on their campuses will reference them appropriately.
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Arcadia University
Internationalization Questionnaire

Dear Colleague,

As you may know, Arcadia University has been selected to participate in the “Promising Practices: Institutional Models of Comprehensive Internationalization” project sponsored by the American Council on Education and the Carnegie Corporation. Part of this project includes a self-assessment of the level of internationalization on our campus. Your answers to the following questions will help us determine the extent to which our faculty are or have been involved in international activities. Please return your completed questionnaire to Anna Wagner by Monday, March 26. Thank you very much for your help with this project. We appreciate your cooperation.

No rah Peters-Davis  Jeff Shultz

Status: Full-time____  Part-time____

The first set of questions relate to your experiences with international coursework and teaching.

1. Given the following definition of internationalization, please indicate which of the courses you teach on a regular basis include an international component and which do not. Please indicate the number and name for each course.

   “Internationalization refers to the process of incorporating into the curriculum and co-curriculum a broad range of intellectual and experiential activities designed to help individuals acquire an understanding of the cultural, social, and political systems of other nations and the interactions between them, as well as with, and between, multinational structures.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses that include international content</th>
<th>Courses that do not include international content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Have you had any teaching experience outside the U.S.?
   Yes ___ No ___

   If yes, please describe below:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

3. Have you worked with colleagues at institutions in other countries related to course
development or instruction?
   Yes ___ No ___

   If yes, please describe below:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

4. Have you had any other experience with instruction related to internationalization?
   Yes ___ No ___

   If yes, please describe below:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
The next question addresses your international research experience.

5. Have you ever conducted research with an international component, either on your own, with students, or with colleagues from other countries? Please indicate any sources of funding, if applicable.
   Yes ___ No ___

If yes, describe your experiences below:

Describe below the research you did on your own:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Describe below the research you did with students:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Describe below the research you did with colleagues at institutions in other countries:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
We are also interested in finding out about other international experiences that you may have. Have you ever:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studied abroad?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had internship experiences abroad?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in service activities abroad?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you born abroad or have you lived abroad for an extended period of time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are also interested in finding out about your competence in languages other than English. Please indicate below whether you can read, write, or speak a language other than English. If none, please check here ______.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Write</th>
<th>Speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Missouri Southern State College
International Mission Faculty Survey

Please assist us by completing the following survey. The purpose of this survey is to assess how MSSC’s international emphasis may have affected you and your teaching. Your responses will be compared to students’ responses from a similar survey administered on Senior Assessment Day, and to incoming freshmen students’ responses, from a similar survey to be administered during freshmen assessment. We are also interested in how your responses compare to a national sample of adults who answered some of the same questions. Please do not put your name or other identifying marks on this survey. Your responses are anonymous.

Please circle the letters that indicate the extent of your agreement with each of the following statements.

SD = Strongly Disagree
D = Disagree
N = Neutral
A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree

SD D N A SA 1. MSSCs international mission has enriched students’ education.
SD D N A SA 2. I am aware of international travel grants offered to MSSC students.
SD D N A SA 3. I am aware of sponsorship of study abroad programs for MSSC students.
SD D N A SA 4. I am aware of international symposiums at MSSC.
SD D N A SA 5. I am aware of international cultural events at MSSC.
SD D N A SA 6. The international mission is an asset to MSSC.
SD D N A SA 7. The international mission should be expanded.
SD D N A SA 8. The international mission has affected the types of classes offered at MSSC.
SD D N A SA 9. The international mission has been reflected in the content of the classes I teach.
SD D N A SA 10. Students’ career choices have been influenced by their international experiences at MSSC.
SD D N A SA 11. Study abroad programs are the best way for students to develop second language proficiency.
SD D N A SA 12. Study abroad programs are the best way for students to experience another culture.
SD D N A SA 13. Students can understand their own culture more fully if they have studied another culture.
SD D N A SA 14. Studying and living in another country makes students more mature people.
SD D N A SA 15. Students can learn in another country things that they would never learn in their own country.
SD D N A SA 16. International experience will give students a competitive advantage in their career.
17. Successful people will have to work effectively with people from other cultures.
18. Living in another country makes students more well-rounded people.
19. Knowing a foreign language will help students find a better job.
20. Knowledge of international issues is important for me.
21. Knowledge of international issues is important for younger generations.
22. College educated adults should be required to know a second language.
23. Students should have a study abroad experience at some time during their college career.
24. Students should be required to take courses covering international topics in college.
25. International education opportunities are an important facet of the college experience.

Please check the appropriate answer.
26. I was teaching at Missouri Southern before 1990, when the international mission was first established. Yes____ No____
   If yes, please skip to #27. If no, please check the box of all the items below which apply to you:
   ____ I was aware of MSSC’s international mission before I applied for a faculty position at MSSC.
   ____ MSSC’s international mission influenced my decision to apply for a faculty position at Missouri Southern.
   ____ MSSC’s international mission influenced my decision to accept a faculty position at Missouri Southern.

27. Please indicate the number of countries you have visited and the total amount of time you have spent outside the U.S. during the following periods of time.
   Before being hired to teach at MSSC: # of countries____ total period of time____________
   Between 1990-1995: # of countries____ total period of time____________
   After 1995: # of countries____ total period of time____________

28. I have a current passport. Yes____ No____
29. Please use the following definitions to determine your own foreign language proficiency. Then, indicate the languages you have studied below.

* **Novice**—The Novice level is characterized by the ability to communicate minimally in highly predictable common daily situations with previously learned words and phrases. The Novice-level speaker has difficulty communicating with even those accustomed to interacting with nonnative speakers.

* **Intermediate**—The Intermediate level is characterized by the ability to combine learned elements of language creatively, though primarily in a reactive mode. The Intermediate level speaker can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks. The speaker can ask and answer questions and can speak in discrete sentences and strings of sentences on topics that are either autobiographical or related primarily to his or her immediate environment.

* **Advanced**—The Advanced level is characterized by the ability to converse fluently and in a clearly participatory fashion. The speaker can accomplish a wide variety of communicative tasks and can describe and narrate events in the present, past, and future, organizing thoughts, when appropriate, into paragraph-like discourse. At this level, the speaker can discuss concrete and factual topics of personal and public interest in most informal and formal conversations and can be easily understood by listeners unaccustomed to nonnative speakers.

* **Superior**—The Superior level is characterized by the ability to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics. Using extended discourse, the speaker can explain in detail, hypothesize on concrete and abstract topics, and support or defend opinions on controversial matters.

The foreign languages I have studied and my levels of proficiency are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I have administrative control over other faculty members.  Yes ___  No ___

31. Please indicate the major category of your academic discipline, regardless of where you work.

___ Arts and Humanities, including History
___ Business
___ Life and Health Sciences, including Nursing, Dental Technology, Kinesiology
___ Math and Physical Sciences
___ Social and Behavioral Sciences, including Criminal Justice
___ Teacher Education
___ Technology, including Computer Science
___ Other
32. Please check all that apply: While teaching at Missouri Southern, I
   ___ revised an existing course to have a significant international component.
   ___ proposed a new course that has a significant international component.
   ___ taught a course that satisfies the core curriculum requirements in Area 5,
     International and Cultural Studies.
   ___ taught a course that is part of the international studies major and/or the
     international business major.
   ___ traveled with MSSC students outside the U.S.
   ___ traveled outside the U.S. on my own.
   ___ attended a seminar and/or a conference outside the U.S.
   ___ conducted research in my discipline outside the U.S.
   ___ received funds from the Institute of International Studies to enhance courses.
   ___ received funds from the Institute of International Studies to travel
     outside the U.S.
   ___ attended at least one lecture with an international focus at MSSC.
   ___ attended at least one cultural event with an international focus at MSSC.
   ___ increased my foreign language proficiency.
   ___ other activities related to the international mission (please describe).

33. Please describe what you think is necessary to get more faculty involved in implementing
    the international mission.

34. Please describe ways that you would like to see the international mission enhanced, if
    time or money were not a constraint.
1. **Languages Other Than English.** List those languages in which your proficiency level is (1) tourist level, (2) simple conversational ability, (3) intermediate reading, writing, and conversation, (4) full oral fluency, or (5) advanced writing, reading, and full oral fluency. Include the frequency of use (daily, weekly, once a month, once a year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Courses Taught With Significant International Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Institution</th>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Professional Experience Abroad.** Please include study, teaching, research, consulting, and employment. If trips are numerous, please list the most significant and summarize these experiences by indicating the frequency and typical length of stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution (if any)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Dates (or frequency)</th>
<th>Nature of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Current Contacts Abroad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Contact</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Nature of Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. International Conferences. Please list conferences which you organized or at which you delivered papers. Include conferences which are “international” because they were held abroad, involved international participants, or had an international theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your role</th>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Country/Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Internationally Oriented Research/Projects/Grants. Please list those that are international because of collaboration abroad, subject, or funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Participation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. International Professional Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Participation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Given the opportunity, would you be willing to participate in a working group for:

- International Student Orientation
- Education Abroad Advising
- Seminars/Lectures on International Affairs
- International Festivals
- Internationalization of the Curriculum
- Faculty/Staff Exchange
- Grant Writing/Fund Raising for International Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Hire at NJCU</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
International/Intercultural Competencies

Summary of Literature
What competencies do students need to become world citizens and succeed in today’s global workforce? What learning outcomes should institutions of higher learning focus on to enable students to meet the challenges of the 21st century? There is no easy answer and, while their have been many attempts to answer these questions, there is no consensus. Part of the problem, as is evident through the list below, is the interdisciplinary nature of the competencies. Each field brings to the debate its own perspectives and there has been little discussion among them. This list shows the range of competencies that have been discussed to date; it is not exhaustive. The first section is a summary of the extended section, which follows. Headings have been created for organizational purposes but with an awareness that some of the competencies could appear under multiple headings.

Knowledge
• Knowledge of world geography, conditions, issues, and events.
• Awareness of the complexity and interdependency of world events and issues.
• Understanding of historical forces that have shaped the current world system.
• Knowledge of one’s own culture and history.
• Knowledge of effective communication, including knowledge of a foreign language, intercultural communication concepts, and international business etiquette,
• Understanding of the diversity found in the world in terms of values, beliefs, ideas, and worldviews.

Attitudes
• Openness to learning and a positive orientation to new opportunities, ideas, and ways of thinking.
• Tolerance for ambiguity and unfamiliarity.
• Sensitivity and respect for personal and cultural differences.
• Empathy or the ability to take multiple perspectives.
• Self awareness and self-esteem about one’s own identity and culture.

1 Prepared by Laura Siaya, Assistant Director for Research, ACE Center for Institutional and International Initiatives, for the ACE Internationalization Collaborative Annual Meeting, March 16–17, 2001.
Skills

• Technical skills to enhance the ability of students to learn about the world (i.e., research skills).
• Critical and comparative thinking skills, including the ability to think creatively and integrate knowledge, rather than uncritical acceptance of knowledge.
• Communication skills, including the ability to use another language effectively and interact with people from other cultures.
• Coping and resiliency skills in unfamiliar and challenging situations.

Extended Review of the Literature

The terms used below are those utilized by the various authors and were included to facilitate your future searches for materials. Please note this is not an exhaustive list and the author would welcome any additions.

Knowledge

• Political Knowledge includes knowledge of one’s own political system, players, and events as well as international systems, leaders, and events. It also includes a knowledge of geography, institutions and their processes, and economics (Caprini and Keeter).

• “State of the Planet” Awareness is understanding of prevailing world conditions, developments, and trends associated with world issues such as population growth, economic conditions, inter-nation conflicts, and so forth (Hanvey). The Knowledge Dimension in the ETS study includes awareness of such topics as trade arrangements, energy, human rights, and population issues (ETS).

• Foreign Language Acquisition refers to knowledge of another language as a way to increase one’s understanding of another culture (Bonham).

• Knowledge of International Etiquette is understanding of appropriate international etiquette in situations with colleagues, to cover greetings, thanking, leave taking, gift-giving, and paying and receiving compliments (Stanley).

• Knowledge of Global Dynamics means comprehension of the hidden complexity that can alter the interpretation of world events (systems thinking) (Hanvey). It is linked to critical-thinking skills (Mestenhauser).

• Knowledge of Global and National Interdependence is knowledge of key elements of interdependency (Bonham).

• Awareness of Human Choices is an awareness of the problems of choice confronting individuals, nations, and the world (Hanvey).

• Perspective Consciousness is an awareness that one has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that there is a distinction between opinion and perspective (world view) (Hanvey).
• **Knowledge of Self** refers to understanding one’s own culture and place. Also known as **Personal Autonomy**.

• **Personal Autonomy** is an awareness of identity and includes taking responsibility for one’s actions and understanding one’s own beliefs and values (Kelley and Meyers).

• **Cross-Cultural Awareness** is an awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices found in the world (Hanvey).

• **Knowledge Ac quisition from a Multiple Perspective** refers to knowledge selected to represent the variety of cultural, ideological, historical, and gender perspectives present in the world (Lamy).

• **Exploration of Worldviews** is a review of the values, assumptions, priorities, and policy orientations that are used to interpret both public and private issues (Lamy).

**Attitudes**

• **Movement Toward Empathy** is seeing others as they see themselves, given their conditions, values, and so forth (Hanvey). It goes beyond sympathy (**ethnocentric thinking to ethnorelativistthinking**) to a fuller view that focuses on the other instead of the self (Bennett). Also reflected in the **Concern Scale** which is described as feelings of empathy and kinship with people from other nations and cultures (ETS, p. 136).

• **Enic Thinking** (Mestenhauser), **Intercultural Perspective Taking**, or **Allocentrism** is the ability to take a multiplicity of perspectives.

• **Reflective Attitude** is a reflection on the impact of decisions, choices, and behavior of self and others (Fantini).

• **Learning Attitude** is a willingness to learn from others and engage others (Fantini). Also termed **Flexibility Openness** on Kelley and Meyers CCAI Scale (Kelley and Meyers), and is similar to **Positive Orientation to Opportunities** (Brislin) or **Dynamic Learning** (Dinges).

• **Tolerance for Ambiguity and Respect for Others** (Fantini).

• **Personality Strength** refers to well-developed self-esteem and positive self-concept (Brislin), similar to the idea of **Integration**, that is, a growing coherence and increased synthesis of personality.

• **Global Understanding** aims to measure attitudes, such as interest about international developments, expression of empathy, feelings of kinship about others, and degree of comfort in foreign situations (ETS).
**Skills**

- **Technological Skills** mean an enhanced capacity as consumers of information; also, using technology to gain a better understanding of the world.

- **Second Language Proficiency Skills** refer to the ability to use another language to accomplish basic communication tasks (ETS). The BBCAI notes language skills to include the ability to understand a newspaper, technical reports, and everyday instructions (Stanley).

- **Critical Thinking Skills** refer to the ability to expand thinking to recognize issues, solutions, and consequences not ordinarily considered, that is, holistic thinking. It includes the ability to synthesize and integrate knowledge, rather than uncritical acceptance of knowledge, or meta-learning (Mestenhauser).

- **Comparative Thinking Skills** are similar to Critical Thinking Skills, in the ability to compare and contrast critically (Mestenhauser).

- **Skills for Understanding** are skills that enable students to analyze and evaluate information from diverse sources critically (Lamy).

- **Manage Stress When Dealing with Difference** (Hammer), also termed Emotional Resilience, is the ability to maintain a positive state, self-esteem, and confidence when coping with ambiguity and the unfamiliar (Kelley and Meyers). The BCCIE terms this Resiliency and Coping Skills and includes psychological preparedness and leadership skills in diverse situations (Stanley).

- **Strategies for Participation and Involvement** are strategies to allow students to connect global issues with local concerns and take action in the context of their own lives (Lamy).

- **Self-monitoring Techniques** relate to the ability to self-monitor behaviors and communication and take responsibility for one’s self (Spitzberg). This is similar to Autonomy, that is, autonomous self-regulation of actions.

- **Effective Cross-Cultural Communication Skills** are the ability to alter one’s communication and responses to reflect another’s communication style and thus build relationships (Hammer). Also termed Perceptual Acuity, which is attentiveness to verbal and nonverbal behaviors and interpersonal relationships, understanding the context of communication (Kelley and Meyers). This could also include the concept of Potential for Benefit, which includes an openness to change and the ability to perceive and use feedback as well as motivation to learn about others (Brislin).

- **Enhanced Accurate Communication Skills** refers to the ability to communicate with a minimal loss or distortion of the meaning (Fantini).
References
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Funding Sources

Government Funding for Faculty Development

Department of Education

- The Fulbright-Haas Faculty Research Abroad Program provides grants to higher education institutions to fund faculty to maintain and improve their area studies and language skills by conducting research abroad for periods of three to 12 months. http://www.ed.gov/offices/HEP/iegps/fra.html
- The Fulbright-Haas Group Project Abroad Program provides grants to support overseas projects in training, research, and curriculum development in modern foreign languages and area studies by teachers, students, and faculty engaged in a common endeavor. http://www.ed.gov/offices/HEP/iegps/gpa.html
- The Fulbright-Haas Seminars Abroad Program provides short-term study/travel seminars abroad for U.S. educators in the social sciences and humanities for the purpose of improving their understanding and knowledge of the people and culture of another country. There are approximately seven to 10 seminars with 14 to 16 participants in each seminar annually. http://www.ed.gov/offices/HEP/iegps/sap.html

Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs

- The Fulbright American Scholar Program sends faculty and professionals to more than 140 nations, and is administered by the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES). http://www.iie.org/cies/
- The Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence (SIR) Program targets U.S. institutions that do not often host foreign faculty—liberal arts colleges, regional universities, community colleges, and minority-serving institutions. Prospective institutions may be interested in initiating or expanding international programs, internationalizing their curriculum, or enhancing an area studies program. It is virtually the only Fulbright program that enables visiting scholars to teach in the United States about their home country or world region and to bring new-found teaching and community experience home. http://www.cies.org/cies/sir/sir.htm
- The Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowships bring mid-career professionals to the United States from developing nations, East and Central Europe, and newly independent states of Eurasia. http://www.iie.org/pgms/hhh
- The Fulbright Teacher Exchanges Program provides exchange opportunities for qualified educators to teach in other countries for up to one academic year. http://www.grad.usda.gov/International/ftep.html
Funding for Institutional Initiatives

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO)
The Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO), established in 1992, coordinates the efforts of the nation’s six major higher education associations to build their partnership with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and to help their member institutions plan and implement development programs with colleges and universities abroad. ALO provides funding for partnerships between U.S. institutions and partners in other countries to implement projects on development cooperation. http://www.aascu.org/alo

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education: International Education and Graduate Programs Service (IEGPS)
American Overseas Research Centers
This program provides grants to U.S. higher education institution consortia to establish or operate overseas research centers that promote postgraduate research, exchanges, and area studies. http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/aorc.html

Business and International Education
This program provides funds to higher education institutions that enter into an agreement with a trade association or business to improve the academic teaching of the business curriculum and to conduct outreach activities that expand the capacity of the business community to engage in international economic activities. http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/bie.html

Centers for International Business Education
This program provides funding to schools of business for curriculum development, research, and training on issues important to U.S. trade and competitiveness. http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/cibe.html

Institute for International Public Policy
This program provides a single grant to assist a consortium of colleges and universities in establishing an institute designed to increase the representation of minorities in international service, including private international voluntary organizations and the foreign service of the United States. http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/iipp.html

International Research and Studies
This program supports the development of surveys, studies, and instructional materials to improve instruction in modern foreign languages, area studies, and other international fields, to provide full understanding of the places in which the foreign languages are commonly used. http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/irs.html
Language Resource Centers
The Language Resource Centers Program provides grants to higher education institutions, or combinations of institutions, to establish, strengthen, and operate a small number of national language resource and training centers, to serve as resources to improve the capacity to teach and learn foreign languages effectively.
http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/lrc.html

National Resource Centers
This program provides grants to higher education institutions or consortia to establish, strengthen, and operate comprehensive and undergraduate language and area/ international studies centers. The centers serve as national resources for teaching modern foreign languages; instruction in fields needed to provide full understanding of areas, regions, or countries in which the language is commonly used; research and training in international studies; language aspects of professional and other fields of study; and instruction and research on issues in world affairs.
http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/nrc.html#app1

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program
This program provides funds to higher education institutions, combinations of institutions, or partnerships between nonprofit educational organizations and higher education institutions to plan, develop, and carry out programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.
http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/iegps/ugisf.html

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)

International Programs
FIPSE currently runs three international special focus competitions through its Comprehensive Program: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/FIPSE/international

The Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education is run cooperatively by the governments of the United States, Canada, and Mexico. The program funds collaborative consortia of at least two academic institutions from two or more states or provinces in each country. The funding period is up to four years, with institutions receiving funding from their respective governments.

The European Community/United States of America Cooperation Program in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training is run cooperatively by FIPSE and the European Commission’s Directorate General for Education and Culture. Each consortium consists of at least three postsecondary institutions from three or more member states in both the European Union and the United States, with funding periods up to three years.
The U.S.–Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program is run cooperatively by the United States (through FIPSE) and Brazil. This program is FIPSE’s newest competition and funds collaborative consortia of at least two academic institutions from each country for four years.

In addition to these special focus programs, FIPSE funds international projects through its Comprehensive Program. FIPSE welcomes proposals for projects which seek novel strategies for establishing an international dimension of issues related to all aspects of postsecondary education, including foreign language acquisition, the social sciences, health sciences, and information technology.

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/FIPSE/Comp/index.html