Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education Conference, Duke University

The Challenge of Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Global Learning for All

Madeleine F. Green
Vice President, American Council on Education

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes research conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE) on the state of internationalization of U.S. higher education, analyzes barriers to internationalization at the campus level, and suggests strategies to achieve internationalization throughout the undergraduate experience. It summarizes the findings of a two-phase research effort, funded by the Ford Foundation, which included a review of research conducted before 2000; surveys of public opinion before and after September 11, 2001; and a survey of college-bound high school seniors. It also included surveys of institutional policies and practices (n=752), of faculty (n=1,200), and of students (n=1290). Together, these data provide a picture of the climate for internationalization, interest among prospective and current students, and the attitudes and practices of faculty members. While attitudes of students, faculty, and the public are largely positive and favorable toward international education, institutional practices and policies reveal that most institutions are only minimally internationalized.

The major work of internationalization rests on the shoulders of faculty and requires vigorous support from institutional leaders. Barriers to internationalization can be institutional, such as scarce resources, disciplinary paradigms, and structures, or the absence of incentives. They also can be individual in nature, including lack of faculty expertise, lack of interest, negative attitudes, or the unwillingness or inability of faculty to integrate international learning into their disciplinary perspectives. Experience with eight institutions in ACE's Promising Practices project and its Internationalization Collaborative, as well as insights from the literature, provide insights into successful strategies for promoting integration of internationalization into the undergraduate experience.

A coherent, institution-wide (or unit-wide) strategy is essential and difficult, requiring highly committed leaders, wide faculty engagement, and persistence over time. Institutions must lay the groundwork by outlining goals and articulating underlying assumptions about internationalization. Leaders create energy and momentum, focus attention, and keep the agenda moving. They must continually widen the circle of participation and share leadership responsibilities. In addition, they must identify and align resources, remove barriers, and help people think differently. Supporting structures are essential, although no single structure will work for all campuses. An international office should facilitate coherence and coordination among the many threads of internationalization. This paper concludes with five recommendations.

Introduction

It is not a new idea that an undergraduate education must produce graduates who will contribute to civic life, both locally and globally; lead productive work lives; and understand that the fates of nations, individuals, and the planet are inextricably linked. While 25 years of national commissions and blue-ribbon reports decrying Americans lack of global knowledge and language proficiency have failed to move internationalization to the center of the national education debate, September 11 drew national attention to these issues. But it is far from certain that a new public awareness of the rest of the world (or at least of a few global hot spots) resulting from September 11 will translate into changes in educational public policy or practice.

The aftermath of World War II and the emergent Cold War gave shape and voice to the need to educate Americans about the world beyond our borders. Especially prominent in the post–WW II era were the foreign policy and national security rationales (De Wit, 2002); they are once again prominent, especially in public policy. Other rationales have changed little in the past half century. The United States needs informed and tolerant citizens who can work in multicultural environments. We need language and area experts to teach and serve in government. The world needs more, not less, knowledge and understanding. A liberally educated person must understand other cultures, points of view, and ways of thinking. And there have been shifts. Terrorism has replaced the Cold War as the driving force of national security. Economic competitiveness, especially dominance over the Japanese in business, was the preeminent rationale in the 1980s and early 1990s, but that has taken a backseat to national security after September 11.

But the world has changed profoundly since World War II—politically, economically, socially, technologically—and these shifts have produced a new context for internationalization. The first is globalization. Americans travel (55 percent of all citizens have been outside the United States, as have 62 percent of high school students [Hayward and Siaya, 2001]); immigration peaked in the 1990s; and the world is at our doorstep through technology. An educational system that does not recognize these

realities or capitalize on the information so readily available through technology cannot be excellent

The second shift is the continued democratization of higher education. Approximately 65 percent of high school graduates go on to college. Only 27 percent of students are "traditional students"—18 to 24 years old, financially dependent on their parents, and attending college full time, directly after high school. If higher education is for all, then so must be international learning. The notion that it should be the province of a few, the fortunate who go abroad or an elite who enter international careers, is antiquated and impractical in a diverse democracy. All students must be prepared to live in the global environment.

The third major shift is the gap between the growing national recognition of the need for global and international education and the current state of internationalization in U.S. higher education. Research from the American Council on Education (ACE) indicates that there is widespread public support, as well as faculty and student interest. But the gap between attitudes and actions is considerable, and this gap should provide both energy and opportunity to move on internationalization in ways that may have not been possible before now.

Although abundant rhetoric about the urgency of international and global learning existed even before September 11, there was little data about actual practice beyond those on student mobility and language study. In 1998, ACE initiated a series of initiatives to map the state of U.S. higher education internationalization and to document the practices of colleges and universities that have made substantial progress in enhancing the international dimensions of undergraduate education.

The mapping effort, funded by the Ford Foundation, represented the first comprehensive research on internationalization conducted since the 1987 ACE study by Richard Lambert (Lambert, 1989). The latest ACE effort was a two-phase study building on the research needs identified by the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA, 1995). The first phase summarized existing research and identified the knowledge gaps that would be important to pursue in the survey research undertaken in Phase II (Hayward, 2000). The second phase consisted of three surveys—

of institutions, faculty, and students (Siaya and Hayward, forthcoming). These data provide an essential foundation for any national dialogue on internationalization.

At the same time, ACE sought to understand the strategies and policies that furthered internationalization at the institutional level. With funding from the Carnegie Corporation, ACE initiated the Promising Practices project, which identified a diverse group of eight colleges and universities that had made significant progress in "comprehensive internationalization"—that is, in embedding internationalization into the fabric of the institution. The project sought to adapt an internationalization self-assessment process developed and piloted in Europe by the Institute for Management in Higher Education (IMHE) and the European University Association (EUA) to the needs and practices of U.S. institutions. In addition, ACE formed the Internationalization Collaborative in 2000. The Collaborative is a network of some 45 institutions that are seriously pursuing internationalization. Each member institution has formed an internationalization leadership team, sends representatives to an annual meeting, and contributes examples to an ACE web page devoted to good practice in internationalization.

This paper summarizes the considerable amount of data gathered in the mapping project and other ACE research, and highlights learned from the Promising Practices project (Engberg and Green, 2002) and the Internationalization Collaborative (see www.acenet.edu/programs/collaborative). In addition, much of what we learned about the process involved in internationalization was rooted in another ACE effort, the Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation (see www.acenet.edu/programs/change), a five-year project funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, involving 26 institutions attempting to undertake transformational change.

Public Support for International Education

A 2001 ACE telephone survey of 1,006 Americans aged 18 and older examined international experiences and attitudes regarding international education, as well as their knowledge of world events, people, and geography (Hayward and Siaya, 2001). (The survey was conducted prior to September 11.) Overall, Americans thought that the United States should be involved in world affairs, and that events outside this country had an

impact their lives and careers. Eighty percent of the respondents believed that the United States should be involved in world affairs—an increase of 15 percent over an earlier survey asking the same question. More than half believed that knowledge of international issues would be important to their careers in 10 years, but 90 percent thought that it would be important to the careers of future generations. Younger respondents—between 18 and 29 years of age—were much more likely to respond that international issues would be important to their careers.

Support for international learning and language training was very high: 85 percent of the respondents indicated that it was important to know a foreign language; 86 percent believed that knowing another language would help them secure a job; and 75 percent thought that studying a foreign language should be required in high school. Support for international learning at the college level was equally strong: 70 percent favored a language requirement in college and nearly three in four respondents believed that colleges and universities should require general courses covering international topics. An equal proportion believed that students should have a study abroad or other international experience while in college. The survey also demonstrated strong support for the presence of international students on campus, with 86 percent agreeing that their presence enriches the learning experience of American students.

To gauge changes in public support for international education post–September 11, we again administered the survey in spring 2002 and re-examined data from ACE surveys of faculty and students conducted in 2002 (Siaya, Porcelli, and Green, 2002). Overall, public, student, and faculty support were largely unchanged. Public support for foreign language learning remained particularly strong. The intensity of support increased in several areas, including foreign language training. However, Americans—especially older respondents—expressed concern about study abroad and the presence of international students on campus. In the 2002 survey, 79 percent of respondents agreed that students should have a study-abroad experience during college, with 40 percent strongly agreeing. In 2000, 75 percent agreed, with approximately one-third strongly agreeing. While this seems like a slight positive shift, a more specific inquiry revealed some doubts. More than 40 percent of the 2002 respondents said that they were less likely to encourage a family member to study abroad after the events of September 11.

Hesitancy increased with age and is especially visible among those over 45. A similar pattern emerged concerning international students on campus. The 2002 survey asked how likely the public would be to support an increase in the number of international students and scholars at their local college or university since September 11. While 25 percent said they would be more likely, 42 percent said they would less likely to do so. The likelihood of responding "less likely" was greater in the over-45 age group.

We draw two conclusions from this research. First, the public strongly supports foreign language training and international learning. One might consider this support latent, since it has not translated into grass-roots campaigns to increase international education in the schools or demands on educators. It also is not clear the extent to which the public would support international education over competing priorities. General support for international learning as an abstract idea is only a first step in moving from good intentions and positive inclinations to an action agenda.

We draw the second conclusion from the increased hesitancy about study abroad and international students demonstrated by older respondents. Because members of governing boards and policy makers are largely in this age group, and people older than 45 are more likely to vote than younger people, an advocacy agenda must take their attitudes into account.

The State of Internationalization: Research Findings

A Review of the Research. A synthesis of existing research, which mostly covered student mobility and language study, found that relatively few undergraduates gained international or intercultural competence in college (Hayward, 2000). According to data from the Modern Language Association (MLA), foreign language enrollments, as a percentage of total higher education course enrollments, declined from 16 percent of course enrollments in the 1960s to an average of 8 percent from the mid-1970s to the present. Language requirements for admission to four-year colleges declined from nearly 34 percent of institutions in 1965 to 20 percent in 1995. Through his analysis of 1981-92 NCES transcript data, Adelman found that only 14 percent of undergraduate students had taken more than four credits of international studies (Hayward, op. cit., p. 11). Lambert found that 77 percent of four-year institutions reported some international content in their

general education requirement. For 47 percent of those, it was Western history or civilization; for 35 percent, it was world history or culture; 29 percent distributed the requirement among a number of international possibilities, and slightly more than 20 percent required non-Western history, civilization, or culture (Hayward, op. cit. p. 14). Both the Adelman and Lambert data are a decade old and the review of available research yielded little information about academic requirements and policies relevant to internationalization.

ACE Institutional Survey. The ACE survey of institutional policies and practices, conducted in 2001 (Siaya and Hayward, forthcoming), provides a very mixed picture of internationalization on campus, with variation both within institutional types and among them. ACE surveyed a stratified sample of 1,501 regionally accredited, degree-granting institutions and received 752 responses. The survey identified seven dimensions of internationalization: articulated commitment, academic requirements, organizational structure, funding, communication structure, faculty development opportunities, and student opportunities. Overall, 35 percent of institutions cited international education in their mission statements; 28 percent included it as one of the top five priorities in their strategic plans. About half had a campus-wide committee or task force in place working solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus, and 34 percent had conducted a formal assessment of internationalization in the last five years. Four and a half percent had guidelines that specified international work or experience as a consideration in faculty promotion and tenure decisions.

Academic requirements are an important dimension of internationalization. The ACE 2001 data on foreign language requirements can be compared to the 1987 Lambert data: 23 percent of four-year institutions have a foreign language admission requirement for all students, compared with 3 percent in 1987. Twenty-seven percent of four-year institutions have a foreign language requirement for all students, compared with 16 percent in 1987. While almost no community colleges have foreign language graduation requirements for all students, 25 percent have one for some students, compared with 13 percent in 1987. Spanish is by far the most popular language offering, with 89 percent of institutions that offer languages offering Spanish. Less than 10 percent of institutions that offer languages offer Arabic (7.2 percent), Portuguese (4.5 percent), Korean (2.2

percent), Persian (.4 percent), Hausa (.3 percent), Hmong (.3 percent), Polish (.2 percent), Turkish (.2 percent), Wolof (.2 percent), Estonian (.1 percent), Farsi (.1 percent), or Thai (.1 percent). Not surprisingly, research universities were more likely to offer less commonly taught languages than other types of institutions.

Requiring courses with an international focus is an important way to ensure that students acquire some international knowledge during their undergraduate studies. Forty-one percent of institutions have an international course requirement. Of those with a requirement, more than 60 percent require one course, 21 percent require two courses, and 19 percent require three or more courses. Furthermore, 62 percent of those with a requirement require students to take a course that primarily features perspectives, issues, or events from non-Western countries or areas.

Funding for international programs and studies makes a rhetorical commitment real. Fifty-seven percent receive some external funding for international education. Twenty percent had received federal funding in the past three years; 10 percent, state funding; and 34 percent, private funding. Research universities were the most active in seeking external funding: 81 percent of research universities actively seek external funds for international education, compared with 64 percent of comprehensives, 54 percent of liberal arts, and 38 percent of community colleges. Fifty-eight percent of research universities had received funding from the federal government for international education in the past three years.

ACE Faculty Survey. The faculty survey showed high support for international education among U.S. faculty, although previous research revealed that faculty do not see international engagement for themselves as a high priority (Altbach, 1996). In 2002, ACE surveyed by telephone 1,200 faculty, who represented 559 of the 752 institutions included in the institutional survey. Faculty support for international education is demonstrated by the finding that 67 percent of faculty agreed that it is the responsibility of all faculty to provide undergraduates with an awareness of other countries and cultures. An almost equal proportion, 64 percent, believe that graduates of their institutions had gained awareness about other countries, cultures, or global issues.

Faculty reported a high level of proficiency in foreign languages: 56 percent reported that they could speak or read at least one other language besides English. Of

those, 73 percent said they could read a journal article in their second language and 46 percent said they could give a presentation on a topic in their field to native speakers. Ninety percent of faculty had traveled outside the United States; 23 percent had taught at a college or university; 50 percent had attended a conference outside the United States and 20 percent had participated in a service or development project. The proportion of faculty engaged in international activities at research universities was the highest among all institutional types. When it comes to taking active steps to internationalize their courses, only about half the faculty are using resources at hand: 50 percent had asked a foreign-born student or scholar to present in class, and 52 percent had used a reading from a foreign-born author in class. Forty-one percent of faculty had taught an internationally oriented course.

ACE Student Surveys. In 1999, ACE and the Art & Science Group conducted a telephone survey of 500 four-year college–bound high school seniors (studentPOLL, n.d.). The findings suggested "a frustrated ideal," that is, high school students enter college with a strong interest in international courses, foreign language learning, and study abroad. But we know from other studies that few follow through and actually participate in those international learning opportunities. Nearly 50 percent indicated they would like to study abroad, but only three percent did so before they graduate. When asked to name the most important activity they wanted to pursue in college, the first choice was obtaining a job or internship (33 percent) and the second was study abroad (18 percent). Ninety-eight percent of the respondents had studied a foreign language in high school, and 57 percent planned to continue foreign language study. There are conflicting data on the percentage of college students taking foreign languages in college: Lambert, using 1986 transcript data, cited 48 percent and U.S. Department of Education 1972–93 transcript studies indicated 27 percent (Hayward, 2000, p. 7).

The 2001 ACE student survey included 1,290 respondents, representing 45 percent of the institutions responding to the institutional survey. Overall, the survey showed that college students, like high school seniors, were positively inclined toward international experiences and learning. Sixty percent strongly or somewhat disagreed that "the more time spent in class learning about other countries, cultures, or global issues, the less time is available for the basics." Thirty-five percent disagreed strongly with the

statement that “learning about other countries, cultures, and global issues is useful, but not a necessary component of my education”; 31 percent somewhat disagreed. Twenty-six percent thought that it was very important to speak a foreign language in order to compete successfully in the job market; 49 percent thought it very important to understand other cultures and customs; 42 percent thought it very important to be knowledgeable about international issues and events. Like high school seniors, college students support study abroad, at least in theory. Twenty-three percent strongly agreed that all undergraduates should have a study abroad experience some time during their college or university career, and 35 percent somewhat agreed.

These positive attitudes emanate from a high degree of personal experience with travel, and a modest amount of personal experience with international study and travel. Sixty-four percent of respondents had traveled outside the United States (compared with 55 percent of the general public); 7 percent had participated in a study abroad program prior to attending college; and 10 percent had participated in a study or work abroad program as an undergraduate student. Another 5 percent had participated in a college-sponsored program outside the United States. These experiences are largely short term, with 43 percent spending one month or less; and 31 percent spending between one and six months abroad. For those students who had not gone abroad, only 12 percent cited lack of interest as the reason; personal and financial obstacles were cited most frequently (15 percent citing family obligations; 11 percent cannot afford to take the time off; and 28 percent indicating that it was too expensive). The level of participation in on-campus international activities was very low, but for each activity, a sizeable proportion indicated interest. Only 4 percent had participated in a buddy program that pairs U.S. students with international students; 42 percent expressed an interest in participating. Seven percent had participated in international clubs or organizations and 13 percent in study groups with international students; 34 percent and 41 percent, respectively, indicated they would be interested in these activities.

Thus, the picture emerges of students who are favorably inclined, but whose actual level of participation is low. The gap between disposition and behavior is significant, suggesting that campuses need to explore more deeply the reasons for nonparticipation and devise strategies to address them.

Barriers to Internationalization[i]

These data suggest that although U.S. colleges and universities have made progress in some areas in the past 15 years, most are not highly internationalized. And indeed, significant barriers to internationalization exist at the institutional level and must be addressed. Some of these barriers reflect the attitudes and culture of the wider American society. The belief that there is no need to learn other languages because English has become the universal language constitutes a powerful obstacle to language learning. American's chronic disinterest in the rest of the world, although somewhat mitigated by the events of September 11, is reflected in a deficit of public knowledge and understanding of international matters, as well as student course-taking patterns. According to the most recent National Geographic-Roper survey, 18- to 24-year-old Americans ranked next to last (only ahead of Mexico) among nine countries (Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, and the United States) in the average number of questions they could correctly answer about world geography and events. They ranked last in the number of countries they correctly identified on a world map. Nearly one-third of U.S. young adults think the U.S. population is between 1 billion and 2 billion, and only 25 percent could correctly identify the population of the United States.

In short, colleges and universities have a tremendous amount of work to do to overcome the lack of knowledge and awareness that young people bring to college, not to mention the absence of external pressure. Although the public is generally very supportive of international education, as we have outlined above, it is not clamoring for an internationalized curriculum or for greater access to study abroad. Similarly, legislators and policy makers are far more preoccupied with matters such as accountability and financial management than they are with the notion that the internationalization of higher education contributes to workforce preparation and effective citizenship.

Barriers can be institutional in nature, caused by policies, practices, and traditions, or they can be individual, resulting from faculty and student attitudes (see Ellingboe,

1998). Of course, there is a connection between individual and institutional obstacles to internationalization, but they are worth examining separately.

Individual Barriers to Internationalization

Attitudes. Individual motivation to be involved in internationalization depends considerably upon one's attitudes toward international/intercultural learning. Some students and faculty may be personally interested; others will perceive such learning to be extraneous to their personal and academic goals. The value they place on international/intercultural learning is often correlated with their personal experiences interacting with people from other cultures.

Some consider international learning irrelevant. They may doubt that individuals studying a particular field, for example, would ever need global competencies and believe that acquiring additional technical expertise in their fields is more important. They may hold the view that everyone speaks English and that the world is becoming culturally homogenous through globalization, thus removing the 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.

Personal Knowledge and Expertise. Because academic expertise is a central source of satisfaction and self-worth for faculty, their willingness to engage in internationalization will depend on their personal capacities and experiences with other cultures and languages. Those who were born into another cultural tradition, either in another country or in a strong ethnic enclave within the United States, are likely to have their interests fuelled by their own cultural and linguistic heritage. Faculty who have spent substantial time abroad also are likely to have developed cultural and linguistic competencies, and those with formal international training in graduate school are likely to continue to carry out internationalized research and teaching.

At the other extreme are individuals who have no international experience or interest in engaging in international learning or teaching. Faculty in this position will be more inclined to articulate concerns about internationalization and to ignore it in their

own professional lives. It is likely that their opposition or indifference is grounded in their concern about their own personal capacity to contribute meaningfully to internationalization efforts and about their role in a changed institutional environment.

Cognitive Competence. "Cognitive competence" refers to the intellectual processes that faculty use to deliver internationalized curriculum. Even faculty with international knowledge and expertise may need to expand their thinking before they are motivated and able to apply their international knowledge and experiences to their teaching. For example, faculty who have had international experiences—such as conducting international research or development projects—may not have made the connection between these experiences and their teaching. Or, faculty with advanced levels of second language proficiency may not see the point of being involved in a language across the curriculum program.

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 (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999). Faculty members with an international mindset draw upon knowledge from diverse settings, cultures, and languages to internationalize the curriculum; use such integrative skills as translating, synthesizing, and connecting; and 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 such issues 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 to be able to analyze effectively the original context from which the knowledge is drawn, as well as the implications of the new context. These tasks are particularly challenging because, by definition, internationalization is an intellectually expansive practice, rather than the more traditional intensive practice associated with scholarly inquiry. In short, the mindset needed to internationalize the curriculum may require faculty to develop or refine a different set of intellectual skills from those that were emphasized in their original graduate training and by their professional disciplinary associations.

Institutional Barriers to Internationalization

Institutional policies, practices, and circumstances may present significant barriers to internationalization, as well as to other kinds of academic innovations.

Financial Resources. The problem of insufficient resources exists on nearly every campus and is the most frequently cited barrier to change. Funding for course development and for international travel and work is in short supply. Insufficient funding is further exacerbated by the marginal status of internationalization on most campuses. Budget cuts hit travel first, with international travel especially vulnerable. The good news is that even small investments can have a significant impact. Grants for course development, partial funding for faculty travel, and release time for project and curriculum development can cost relatively little. External funding can also provide essential discretionary dollars. For students, the absence of financial assistance is a significant barrier to study abroad, as is lost income from their work. Title VI and other federal programs are a key source of funding for faculty development, research abroad, and curricular revision. As we will discuss later, federal funding can only *support* an institutional effort; it cannot create a strategy or commitment where one does not exist.

Disciplinary Structures. The disciplines, which serve as the organizing principle for the institution as well as for scholarship, are a second important institutional barrier to internationalization. Academic departments are the keepers of curriculum, faculty lines, teaching assignments, and resources. Discipline-based structures prevent many faculty members from working across disciplinary boundaries—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 to develop internationalized courses, engage in interdisciplinary research, or devise experiential learning experiences for students (i.e., study, internships, or community service projects abroad). In addition, internationalization challenges many of the fundamental assumptions of the knowledge systems that the disciplines have painstakingly constructed—such as the assumption of the universality of knowledge (Mestenhauser, 1998).

Promotion, Tenure, and Other Incentives. If international scholarship, teaching, and service are not recognized or, worse yet, are considered a distraction from the more "important" work of faculty, this 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 recognize international work in their tenure and promotion guidelines (Siaya and Hayward, forthcoming). The absence of other incentives, such as faculty development funds or recognition, also serves as an obstacle.

Elements of Success[ii]

Drawing on ACE's experience in the Promising Practices project (Engberg & Green, 2002), with institutions in the Internationalization Collaborative, and what we discovered about the change process from the ACE Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation, this section outlines successful strategies in internationalization. Here, we focus on the need for an articulated strategy, the crucial role of leadership, institutional structures, and partnerships.[iii] Because successful change is often thwarted by insufficient attention to process, rather than by lack of good ideas, this section takes a holistic process approach, rather than addressing the various components, such as language study, curriculum, development cooperation, international students, study abroad, and the like. The discussion of content, of course, must be undertaken by the faculty in the context of their scholarly disciplines.

A Conceptual Framework and Strategy. On most campuses, international education consists of a series of disconnected activities that are weakly integrated into the core academic mission. While many institutions offer a diversity of international learning opportunities, few do so with much intentionality. The result is a fragmented hodgepodge of programs and activities that are rarely sufficiently integrated to create maximum institutional impact or to benefit learning.

Because there are so many different aspects of international education, each group engaged in internationalization may see its particular focus as defining the whole. Thus, for many, study abroad *is* international education, and other dimensions play barely a supporting role. Many a proud college president has cited new study abroad programs on campus as irrefutable evidence of the advance of internationalization on campus, even though only a handful of students participate. Some will point to the presence of large

numbers of international students on campus as the hallmark of internationalization, although their impact on other students or the campus environment is undirected and unclear. Compounding this problem is the lack of integration among the component parts. Different reporting structures and different goals may isolate the different activities so that there is little synergy among them. Many scholars of internationalization have observed the problem of fragmentation.

Putting it all together into a coherent, institution-wide strategy (or, in a larger institution, into a college-wide strategy) is a tremendous challenge that requires highly committed leaders, wide faculty engagement, and persistence.

Comprehensive internationalization is no less than an institutional transformation. Not all institutions will have sufficient commitment to or interest in internationalization to achieve such a transformation, and it is certainly possible to have a less ambitious agenda. But without clear institutional goals and internationalization as a priority, it is impossible to move beyond a collection of useful activities that affect a relatively small group of students. Comprehensive internationalization occurs when internationalization is both broad and deep. It results from multiple interrelated changes—one program or policy change produces a cascading series of other changes. For example, internationalization of the curriculum will require new attention to faculty development and interdisciplinarity, which in turn will require different approaches to faculty rewards and the hegemony of the academic department. Comprehensive internationalization affects “the hearts and minds” of faculty and staff, requiring that they change voluntarily. It is a long-term undertaking, involving many people, usually requiring five to 10 years to become embedded in the fabric of the institution.

Many campuses fail to lay the groundwork for their plans, jumping immediately into an action agenda. It is easy to assume that shared goals and assumptions exist that undergird the internationalization agenda, but without their explicit exploration, it is highly likely that people will be using the same words differently (e.g., *international education*, *internationalization*, and *globalization*) or proceeding from very different mental models of internationalization. The following questions form a useful framework for grounding a strategic effort:

- **Why internationalize?** This question provides an essential point of departure. Why is it important? Is it necessary? How will it improve this institution? What do we hope to accomplish by internationalizing?
- **Who should be involved?** Internationalization, like other important campus changes, cannot be decreed or accomplished by a few individuals. Whom to involve, how, and at what point in the process are crucial decisions in ensuring that various stakeholders own the international agenda and have a say in its development as well as its implementation.
- **How shall we proceed?** Change is often thwarted by insufficient attention to process, rather than by a lack of good ideas. A process for appropriate consultation of stakeholders and governance bodies and the design of a communications process are two important elements of the process that can be trouble spots. Crafting an inclusive and intentional process is a decisive factor in successful internationalization.
- **What needs to be done?** 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 have different interests, and internationalization requires making choices, resolving conflicts about values and priorities, and putting the pieces together into a coherent whole.

Any framework, including the one above, depicts the universe as more orderly than it really is. Internationalization, like other major changes, is not a linear process. Successes are matched by setbacks, interruptions, and distractions. The work is difficult and frustrating, and at the same exciting and energizing.

Leadership

Simply put, 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, keep attention focused on the issue, secure and allocate resources for it, provide symbolic support, engage external groups, and develop on-campus leadership and support. While leadership by senior administrators is necessary, it is not sufficient. Faculty leadership is also essential.

Leadership at all levels and throughout the institution is required to move any important change agenda forward. The absence of champions at the top will inhibit progress. Four essential tasks of leaders, elaborated below, are to generate energy and momentum, identify and align resources, remove barriers, and help people think differently (Eckel, Green, & Hill, 2001).

I. Generating Energy and Momentum

Making the Case. Leaders articulate the case for change both internally, to the campus community, and externally, to stakeholders. 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 is the recognition of needed improvements to internationalization efforts already underway. Leaders can make the case using data (e.g., conducting studies of course enrollments in language or internationally focused courses) or more qualitative approaches (using stories about what has resulted from partnerships with institutions in other countries, or focus groups with students about education abroad).

Good data and engaging anecdotes capture the attention of stakeholders. 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 to make the case—for example, by giving regular presentations of data and progress reports to the faculty, board, and other important constituencies; and making the work of the internationalization task force or committee visible through widely disseminated reports, regular columns in a campus newspaper, a web site devoted to internationalization, or speeches and interactions with various campus groups.

Focusing Attention and Communicating Widely. Attention is a very scarce commodity on most campuses. And leaders themselves are pulled in a hundred 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 everyday conversations. E-mail and the web are helpful tools for regular communications about international activities and strategies.

Unfortunately, most campuses suffer from information overload and people routinely screen out many communications. Actions—especially those with visible results—speak louder than words. Developing incentives for internationalization, launching new projects, and holding campus events make internationalization real and concrete. Whatever the mix of strategies, the key point is that internationalization flourishes when it a centerpiece of the institution.

Using Deadlines Effectively. The cost of wide participation is often a very slow process. Effective leaders impose public deadlines and hold people to them. The timetable of a consultant's visit or an external review team can help establish these deadlines. Internally imposed deadlines—such as a report to the board of trustees or to the president—also provide a clear timetable to keep things moving.

Gaining External Recognition. On most campuses, internationalization is a marginal activity, championed by a few enthusiasts who often feel isolated and unappreciated. External recognition of the internationalization agenda and participants' accomplishments validates the importance of the work and its quality. This recognition may take the form of external grants, gifts, participation in national projects, or 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 Widening the Circle of Participation. In order to be successful, involvement in internationalization must go beyond the circle of true believers. Internationalization 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 the department heads meet regularly, leaders should put internationalization on their agenda. By meeting with this group (or working to influence its agenda), internationalization leaders can start new conversations, identify potential champions or advocates, and learn where opportunities exist to introduce international learning into ongoing curriculum revision or to support a nascent internationalization effort.

Sharing the Leadership. Leaders must continually identify and mobilize new champions and advocates. Faculty leadership is essential to a change that affects teaching

and learning; internationalization is no exception. Department heads, deans, and mid-level administrative leaders also are 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. Some leaders will emerge quickly, others over time. As work on internationalization proceeds, faculty, staff, and students will become energized by an opportunity to go abroad or to work with a foreign colleague and join the ranks of leaders and advocates. One institution worked to systematically send as many faculty abroad as possible, having them visit institutional study abroad sites, lead student groups, or conduct research abroad. The excitement generated by the newcomers to internationalization (and their credibility among indifferent or skeptical colleagues) turned out to be more energizing than the predictable voices of the true believers. Clearly, there is room for both.

Creating Coherence. Coherence is especially difficult to achieve in large, decentralized institutions, in which the locus of strategic change is usually the constituent units (such as colleges or schools in a university, or campuses in a multi-campus community college). In the case of the research university, regular communication among different units promotes essential collaboration or cross-fertilization of ideas. In a multi-campus system, the priorities and goals of the constituent campuses often differ. If internationalization is to be a system-wide undertaking, the 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 connections and points of synergy, and to bring the different players together to explore common interests. The nature of academic institutions is such that this rarely happens spontaneously; the centrifugal forces are simply greater than the unifying ones.

II. Identifying and Aligning Resources

Financial Commitment. Insufficient resources are frequently (but not always) a barrier to innovation; internationalization is no exception. Funding is also a major factor in the larger internationalization agenda, including support for program development, course revision, study abroad development, international speakers and scholars.

Most institutions rely on a combination of reallocated existing resources—frequently done incrementally and over time—and modest external funding. 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:

- Grants or release time for faculty members to develop courses with international or global perspectives and content.
- Travel stipends for faculty for research, teaching, 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 (for programs sponsored by the home institution and others).
- Supporting additional discussion sessions for a course using a foreign language (language across the curriculum).
- Earmarking existing funds for campus speakers or other student activities with internationally focused programming.
- Inventorying and tapping into internationalization resources in the community, such as local businesses and ethnic communities.
- Sharing resources by, for instance, programming with neighboring institutions.

Of course, reallocation of existing funds will not address all needs; new monies are also needed. 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 it a point to have resource material available to faculty and staff and to become as knowledgeable as possible about funding opportunities. If internationalization is indeed a strategic priority, then it will also figure into the fund-raising efforts of the president and development office. Institutions can raise money to fund study abroad scholarships (or endowments for study abroad scholarship), faculty development grants, and curricular innovations (such as language teaching or global environmental issues).

III. Remove Barriers

Providing Incentives. Carrots are much more powerful than sticks in bringing about change. Institutional leaders can influence internationalization through key decisions on incentives and rewards. Incentives such as a small grant to internationalize a course or to facilitate travel can be an important source of legitimacy and motivation.

Building international activity into the reward structure for faculty—in hiring, promotion, and tenure and merit raises—is sure to bring about results. Faculty recognition for international education can serve as an important symbolic expression of institutional goals and values, and honors faculty members in meaningful ways.

Helping People Develop New Skills and Knowledge. Any major change requires significant faculty and staff development. Many faculty have little international experience or expertise and therefore cannot envision how they can play a role in internationalization. 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.

Working Effectively with Governance Bodies. Many governance bodies, including the curriculum committee, the general education committee, promotion and tenure committees, an internationalization task force or leadership team, and the faculty senate, may do the work of internationalization. Academic changes must wend their way through the appropriate governance bodies—creating inevitable layers of complexity and politics. Some campuses have special task forces on internationalization—either a standing committee or an ad-hoc group. It is essential that, from its beginning, this group connect its work with the ongoing governance processes of the campus, engaging other bodies as appropriate and keeping them informed, so that when formal decisions are made, the committees have been engaged in the developmental work rather than being presented with a *fait accompli* for approval.

IV. Helping People Think Differently

Creating Numerous 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 about *why* internationalization is

important, what are the implications for their work as teachers and scholars, what new pedagogies might be involved, where potential synergies with other groups on and off campus may lie, and so forth. Conversation helps people get comfortable with new ideas and see the implications from multiple points of views. Institutions use a combination of the following to promote conversations: symposia (using faculty, community members, and 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 of department heads, deans, the president's cabinet, or board meetings can reserve a block of time for substantive discussion, thus making internationalization part of the ongoing work of existing groups.

Benefiting 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 report back on what they learned. There are many models of good practice that institutions can draw upon, looking to their neighbors in the state, to like institutions in their region, and to a broader population of colleges and universities across the country. State-wide or regional consortia, as well as national associations can help identify institutions that have innovative practices to share. Working with other institutions—to simply compare notes, pool resources to bring speakers to multiple campuses, or develop joint programs—creates both efficiencies and opportunities to expand intellectual and programmatic capacity.

Consultants also can be very helpful in providing the "outsider's eye" and advice. In addition, a visiting peer review team will enrich the review exercise by holding a mirror up to the campus and suggesting ways to improve it. And finally, bringing in speakers to provide a wider perspective on internationalization can broaden a campus's thinking beyond the confines of its familiar ways of doing things.

Using Cross-departmental Work Groups. Internationalization demands cross-disciplinary and cross-functional collaboration. No single group can possibly own internationalization (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—provides 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 by widening the circle of participation, and reaping benefits from the rich perspectives of different people.

Supporting Structures

Providing the required organizational support for internationalization is also key to success, and many institutions wonder what the "right" structure is. Given the diversity of U.S. higher education institutions, it is difficult to offer blanket prescriptions. ACE survey research has shown a variety of organizational arrangements: 29 percent of institutions had no office to oversee international education programs; 20 percent had a single office to administer or oversee international education programs *exclusively*; 26 percent had a single office that administers or oversees international education programs, among other functions; 4 percent had multiple offices whose exclusive purview was the administration or oversight of international education programs; and 26 percent had multiple offices that oversee international education programs and do other things at the same time (Siaya and Hayward, forthcoming) Even the titles vary, with 53 percent of the people heading international offices called "director," 12 percent "deans," 7 percent "assistant" or "associate deans," 8 percent "vice president," and 20 percent "other."

A large decentralized campus may have international directors in all or some of the colleges as well as a central coordinating office headed by a dean or included in the portfolio of a vice president or associate vice president. Most campuses that have a high level of internationalization have a visible international office headed by a chief international officer. That individual should be a senior person (faculty or staff) with strong credibility across campus. It is also important for that office to report to a senior person on campus—the chief academic officer (or an associate/assistant vice president) or the president. If internationalization is a real institutional priority, a senior person

should be charged with 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 structure facilitates coherence and coordination among the many threads of international education (curriculum, international students, study abroad, curriculum, campus life) and that it have sufficient resources and personnel to accomplish its mission. The definition of "sufficient" is subjective, to be sure. A creative and energetic chief international officer will always have more ideas and plans than resources; that 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.

Creating Partnerships

A final element of success is to reach out to partners. "Going it alone" is increasingly difficult for colleges and universities. While partners cannot substitute for supporting structures on campuses, partnerships of all kinds are important ways to extend institutional capacity and avoid reinventing the wheel. Among the possible partners are:

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 state-wide consortia also exist, often to advance education abroad, but several consortia promote broader internationalization agendas as well. 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.
- Disseminate innovation and good practice through newsletters or web publications.
- Foster communication through list-servs.
- Organize study abroad programs for member institutions.
- Share faculty expertise to offer less commonly taught languages or other courses.
- 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.
- Organize faculty development workshops.

- Collaborate on joint development initiatives and proposals.
- Share visiting international scholars and experts.
- Develop international internships for students of consortium members.

Colleges and Universities 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 collaborate, and many different reasons to do so, including fostering collaborative research and student and faculty exchange, and creating "sister institution" relationships. Some motivations are more entrepreneurial than academic in nature—creating joint programs to market beyond the collaborating institutions, relationships in which one institution is the "provider" of education to another; and those in which institutions abroad are serving as sites but not partners for U.S. study abroad programs (see *Guidelines for College and University Linkages Abroad*, 1998).

Linkages with Businesses: As the CIBERs demonstrate, an obvious partner for internationalization is the business community. Most business schools have international business courses or programs, and important linkages with U.S. firms doing business internationally as well as with multinational and foreign corporations Other chapters in this volume discuss CIBERs in greater detail (see also Scherer, Beaton, Ainina, and Meyer, 2000).

Effective partnerships with business need not be limited to the business schools. Other professional schools, such as colleges of engineering or journalism, for example, also can establish productive links. Arts and sciences faculty bring 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 and provide internships for students (at home and abroad), as well as financial support for international activities. Partnerships highlight the international capacity of the institution, the mutual benefits to businesses and the institution, and are likely to generate goodwill and support by the business sector for campus internationalization.

Conclusion: The Role of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays in Internationalizing Undergraduate Education

As McCarthy noted in a policy paper developed for discussions of Reauthorization of Title VI of the Higher Education Act five years ago (McCarthy, 1998), the important sections of Title VI for undergraduate education are Section 602, National Resource Centers; Section 604, Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program (which supports the development of new programs in area studies, foreign languages, and other international fields); and the Centers for International Business Education (CIBERs). Sections 602 and 604 have the broadest effect on undergraduates. Also of importance are the Fulbright-Hays 102 (b) (6) programs to support faculty and dissertation research abroad, as well as group projects and seminars abroad for teachers and administrators, which are short-term. Group projects fund the training of faculty from a single institution or a group of institutions to conduct curriculum development in a country or region; seminars abroad are summer programs for undergraduate and K–12 teachers in a variety of fields.

The Title VI program is a small one, with $86.7 million in funding for FY 02; the many components are funded at levels starting at $1 million and rising to $27.5 million for the flagship National Resource Center program. Given the magnitude of the task of internationalizing undergraduate education in the United States, this is a paltry sum indeed. Title VI funding supports many different objectives and programs grouped under the banner of international and foreign language studies. The $4.6 million devoted to the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language programs is far too modest a sum to reach a large number of institutions. The program's role in supporting the internationalization of undergraduate education can only be catalytic—seeding innovative practice that can be replicated. The following recommendations echo those made by McCarthy five years ago and add some new dimensions:

1. Support institutions that have made an institutional commitment to internationalization, as evidenced by prior curricular changes, co-curricular opportunities, and allocation of resources. This approach should not exclude institutions that are in the early stages of internationalization, but rather seek to

support those that demonstrate a high probability of institutionalization of the effort.

2. Encourage initiatives that make international learning available to large numbers of students at the institution.
3. Encourage the development of international learning opportunities (on campus and off) suitable to today's "new majority" student, defined as working, part-time, adult, or first-generation college student.
4. Encourage interdisciplinary projects and approaches.
5. Encourage partnerships with other institutions and with K–12.

American higher education has a formidable task ahead in internationalizing undergraduate education if it is to close the gap between good intentions and performance, rhetoric, and reality. The lion's share of the responsibility and work lies with institutional leaders and with faculty, but federal support will be essential to catalyze innovation and supplement dwindling institutional resources.

References:

American Council on Education. (1998). *Guidelines for college and university linkages abroad*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Association of International Education Administrators (AEIA). (1995). *A research agenda for the internationalization of higher education in the United States*. Recommendations and report of the Association of International Education Administrators working group based on the 10-11 August 1995 meeting in Washington, D.C. Pullman, WA: AIEA.

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Eckel, P., Green, M., & Hill, B. (2001). *On Change V*: *Riding the waves of change: Insights from transforming institutions* (An occasional paper series of the ACE Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation and the Kellogg Forum on Higher Education Transformation). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Ellingboe, B. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait: Results, resistance, and recommendations from a case study at a U.S. university. In J. Mestenhauser and B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum, internationalizing the campus*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Engberg, D. & Green, M. (2002). *Promising practices: spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Green, M. (2002, May/June). Joining the World: Internationalizing Undergraduate Education. *Change*, 13-21.

Lambert, R. (1989). *International studies and the undergraduate*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Hayward, F. (2000). *Internationalization of U.S. higher education: Preliminary status report*. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education.

Hayward, F. & Siaya, L. (2001). *Public experience, attitudes, and knowledge: A report on two national surveys about international education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

McCarthy, J. (1998). Continuing and emerging national needs for the internationalization of undergraduate education. In J. Hawkins, C. Haro, M. Kazanjian, G. Merkx, D. Wiley. *International education in the new global era: Proceedings of a national policy conference on the higher education act, Title VI, and Fulbright-Hays programs*. Los Angeles: International Studies and Overseas Programs, University of California, Los Angeles.

Mestenhauser, J. (1998). Portraits of an international curriculum: An uncommon multidimensional perspective. In J. Mestenhauser and B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum, internationalizing the campus*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Paige, R. & Mestenhauser, J. (1999). Internationalizing educational administration. In Murphy, J. and Louis, K. *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scherer, R., Beaton, S., Ainina, M., Meyer, J. (2000). *A field guide to internationalizing business education*. Austin, TX: Center for International Business Education and Research at the University of Texas at Austin.

Siaya, L., & Hayward, F. (forthcoming 2003). *Mapping internationalization in U.S. higher education: Report, 2002*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Siaya, L., Porcelli, M. & Green, M. (2002) *One year later: Attitudes about international education since September 11*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

*Student*POLL (n.d.). Published by Art & Science Group, Vol. 4, No. 9.

---

[i] Portions of this section are adapted from Green, M. and Olson, C. (forthcoming 2003). *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
[ii] This section is adapted from Green, M. and Olson, C. *op. cit*.
[iii] See also Green, M. (2002, May/June). Joining the world: internationalizing undergraduate education. *Change,* 13-21.