

It Takes an Entire Institution: A Blueprint for the Global University

William Brustein

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Confronted with a world that is strikingly different from what it was just a decade ago, higher education faces rapidly shifting economic, political, and national security realities and challenges. To respond to these changes it is essential that our institutions of higher education graduate globally competent students, that is, students possessing a combination of critical thinking skills, technical expertise, and global awareness allowing them “not only to contribute to knowledge, but also to comprehend, analyze, and evaluate its meaning in the context of an increasingly globalized world.”¹ For our students global competence is an indispensable qualification of global citizenship, that is, the ability to work cooperatively in seeking and implementing solutions to challenges of global significance, e.g., economic, technological, political, and environmental. Moreover, global competence is essential to our students as they enter an increasingly competitive global marketplace and to our nation as it addresses its global security needs. The skills that form the foundation of global competence include the ability to work effectively in international settings; awareness of and adaptability to diverse cultures, perceptions and approaches; familiarity with the major currents of global change and the issues they raise; and the capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries. If are institutions of higher education are to be successful in equipping our students with the above-mentioned skills, they will need to pursue a comprehensive and a systemic approach to campus internationalization.

However, discussions of internationalization of our campuses rarely address the process in a comprehensive and systemic fashion. Rather the prevalent tendency is to focus on one or another element of internationalization like global partnerships, recruitment of international faculty and students or study abroad initiatives.² The benefit of a systemic approach to internationalization is that it allows us to comprehend how one decision, activity, custom or structure can either inhibit or spur significant change in the overall process. Take for instance the case of a university seeking to increase its study abroad participation five-fold within ten years. The prospect of reaching that goal will likely be influenced by factors such as internationalization being included in the strategic plans of all units, a requirement that all students complete an internationally-focused minor or certificate, the elimination of financial and curricular barriers to study abroad, the establishment of incentives to faculty for developing and leading learning abroad programs, and the university setting up partnerships with foreign universities. To provide both scholars and practitioners with a blueprint for a comprehensive internationalization of our campuses, this paper lays out what the author observes are the principal constituent components or pillars of a global university.

What is a global university? For the purposes of this paper I employ language from the 2004 NASULGC Task Force report, *A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University*, which states that a global university is one in which international and multicultural experiences and perspectives are fully integrated into its teaching, discovery, and engagement missions. But what are the pillars or components required to attain the full integration of international and multicultural experiences and

perspectives? The twelve pillars upon which a global university sits are I) internationalizing strategic planning, II) internationalizing the curriculum, III) eliminating barrier to study abroad, IV) requiring foreign language proficiency, V) creating international internships, VI) internationalizing faculty searches, VII) incorporating international contributions into faculty reward system, VIII) upgrading senior international officers' reporting relationships, IX) placing senior international officers on key councils and committees, X) eliminating barriers to international student recruitment and retention, XI) drawing upon the expertise and experiences of immigrant communities, and XII) making global partnerships an institutional priority. Below I lay out what steps we need to take to set in place the twelve pillars of the global university.

Pillars enable buildings to stand but pillars are held erect by a strong foundation. The foundation in which the twelve pillars of a global university reside is comprised of two elements. First, full internationalization is not simply the creation of international "silos" or "stove pipes", that is, a college or school of international studies offering stand-alone degrees and possessing its own faculty tenure lines. Not that a school of international studies cannot be part of a global university but true internationalization calls for a *thorough infusion or integration* of international experiences and perspectives within the teaching, discovery, and engagement missions of each academic unit within the university. Second, successful internationalization requires that faculty, administrators and staff perceive internationalization as *adding value* to what they do and helping them reach their goals. Internationalization efforts will eventually wither on the vine if they depend solely on altruistic motivations or top-down enforced compliance.

Pillar I: Internationalization is included in the strategic plans of all departments, colleges, and schools within the university

No one doubts that positive effects of including internationalization in the institution's strategic plans and goals. However, comprehensive internationalization is unlikely to occur unless every unit within the institution including academic departments, colleges and schools also incorporate plans as well as benchmarks for internationalization within its own goals for its teaching, discovery, and engagement missions. I have seen this work most successfully where the chief academic officer of the university requests that each dean include international in his or her annual strategic planning and where each dean partners with the university's senior international officer (SIO) in an effort to facilitate the infusion of the international dimension within the college or school. In this process the extent to which the SIO is able to speak convincingly to the expected added value to the college or school that increased international activities will produce, the greater the likelihood of success. Furthermore, successful internationalization of college-based units may benefit from the establishment of an international advisory council chaired by the university's senior international officer and made up of each college's most senior administrator charged with the college's international portfolio. International advisory councils reporting directly to the SIO and comprised of those within the colleges' senior administration tend to be more active and effective as change agents than councils constituted by deans and chaired by the campus' chief academic officer.

Pillar II: International aspects are integrated into all majors or all students (including those in the professional schools) complete a relevant internationally-focused second major, minor or certificate

If the training of globally-competent graduates is accepted as one of the chief goals of our system of higher education, our curricula will have to be redesigned to ensure that outcome. Most of our institutions address the need for global competence by adding a diversity or international course(s) requirement—hardly sufficient to instill global competence in our students—or by offering degrees, minors or certificates in area or international studies. However, there are major shortcomings in the way both area and international studies are generally carried out. Area studies programs tend to be highly descriptive and too often display an apparent abhorrence towards theorizing. The curriculum frequently resembles a cafeteria-style menu: one selection or course from this shelf, followed by selections from various other shelves. Somehow students are expected miraculously to pull together the disparate pieces into some coherent whole. Area Studies fail frequently to take advantage of opportunities to generalize from their rich contextual findings to the broader world. International studies programs (particularly when they fall under the rubric of international relations) frequently manifest a lack of appreciation for the importance of the local and regional cultural contexts. There are few, if any, attempts at applying the theoretical approaches to the empirical context of the regions. As a result, American students often complete these programs without any competency in a foreign language or any knowledge of or any specific grounding in the culture of a society outside of the U.S.

Additionally, our area and international studies programs often fail to give appropriate attention to such crucial steps as 1) integrating relevant learning abroad opportunities into the degree, minor or certificate, 2) incorporating critical thinking skills of knowledge, comprehension, analysis, synthesis, explanation, evaluation, and extrapolation into the learning experience,³ 3) assessing or evaluating global competence as an outcome, and 4) aligning the area or international studies concentration to a disciplinary major (e.g., biology, anthropology, history, engineering).

This last point deserves further examination and will likely engender controversy among international educators. We must continually ask ourselves if we are doing a disservice to our undergraduate students by encouraging them to spend their undergraduate years pursuing stand-alone degrees in area or international studies. I often meet with heads of multinational corporations, government offices, and NGOs. When I ask these leaders to describe to me what they look for when making hiring decisions they invariably begin by reminding me that they hire engineers, chemists, economists—in other words graduates with technical expertise. They proceed, however, to inform me of the enormous added value they see in graduates who combine a technical expertise with area and international studies knowledge, foreign language, and learning abroad experience. In particular, they highlight the benefits of global awareness, cultural sensitivity, and foreign language competency. It would appear that the assessment of these leaders is consistent with remarks advanced by Thomas L. Friedman in his recent best-selling book, *The World is Flat*⁴ and with the findings of the 2006 Committee for Economic Development's (CED) *Education for Global Leadership...* report. Friedman suggests that companies of the 21st

century will seek to hire graduates with technical expertise, especially in engineering, science, and business. But he notes that these same companies in an effort to come to terms with “glocalization”, that is, the interface between global economic tendencies and local cultural values, will require that our technical experts possess a familiarity with regional and local cultures, for without knowledge of these cultures our companies are unlikely to be successful in understanding local consumer tastes. Even within the U.S., according to the CED report, there is a great demand for globally-competent workers who possess the skills to transcend cultural barriers and work together in global teams. The CED report notes that American affiliates of foreign companies employed more than 5.4 million U.S. workers in 2002. Inadequate cross-cultural training of employees in U.S. companies results annually in an estimated \$2 billion in losses. To wit: the CED report cites the highly embarrassing incidents of the worldwide dissemination of Microsoft Windows 95 that placed the Indian province of Kashmir outside of India’s geographical boundaries and the distribution in Arab countries of a video game in which Arabic chanting of the Koran accompanied violent scenes.⁵

I proffer an additional criticism of stand-alone undergraduate degrees in area and international studies: if we are to achieve global competence then we are obliged to internationalize the educational experience regardless of the discipline. If we require students to select either a stand-alone major in area or international studies or a traditional disciplinary degree, students most likely will opt for the latter and we will be left with a situation where only a small number of students will have exposure to an international studies concentration. Global competence cannot be the preserve of only a few students.

It is incumbent upon us as international educators to gain buy-in and participation in designing undergraduate programs that will let their students earn area studies certificates or minors truly linked and relevant to their disciplines, or carefully thought out disciplinary or international and area studies majors where *both* disciplinary expertise and area/international studies are fully integrated. The answer is not area studies *or* disciplines—it is developing a comprehensive and coherent curriculum that will train our students to become globally competent critical thinkers.

The University of Pittsburgh's Global Studies certificate provides a useful model of creating an international curriculum component available to all students. The Pitt Global Studies certificate provides undergraduates and graduate students across the entire campus with an opportunity for interdisciplinary training concurrent with academic or professional degrees in a major field. In consultation with an academic advisor, students design an individualized program of study requiring no less than 18 credits. Global Studies students choose one of the six global concentrations (sustainable development; globalized economy and global governance; changing identities in a global world; communication, technology and society; global health; and conflict and conflict resolution) and unite it with the study of a particular region and a language of that region. In so doing, the program effectively integrates the study of major global issues with the study of their application in different regions and cultures, ensuring both the global relevance of area studies and the empirical grounding of globalization studies. The six Global Studies concentrations are thus designed to promote holistic learning while creating new and specialized forums for discussion and learning that break across

disciplinary boundaries in order to better address the causes, consequences and search for solutions arising from globalization. To ensure interdisciplinary learning, students take three courses in two departments other than their major. Each certificate student must complete a capstone research project as part of the coursework on a topic relating to chosen global and regional concentrations.

The University of Pittsburgh's Global Studies certificate is a major step forward toward providing students with a relevant international curriculum component open to all students. However, it falls short of a fully integrated internationalized curriculum because it is an add-on. To ensure a globally-competent curriculum our colleges and universities need to rethink the contents of each academic department's major in an effort to infuse the international into each course required for the major and into the major's capstone experiences. Georgia Tech has made tremendous strides in this direction through its International Plan (IP). In the Georgia Tech International Plan international studies, language acquisition, and an overseas experience are integrated into the traditional Bachelor of Science degree for the various disciplines. Furthermore, upon completion of the undergraduate degree in the student's major and the IP requirements, the student's transcript and diploma state that the degree is a "Bachelor of Science with International Plan. The next step for schools like Georgia Tech should be to seek ways to internationalize each and every course within the major.

Pillar III: Financial, curricular and other barriers are overcome to make education abroad accessible and affordable for all students and education abroad offerings are

evaluated in terms of quality and relevance to the educational and career objectives of students

If we are to reach the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act's goal of sending one million U.S. students abroad by 2017, we are obliged to rethink how we currently finance learning abroad opportunities. Most institutions rely chiefly on program fees (user fees) ranging from a few hundred dollars to thousands of dollars to fund the operation of their study abroad offices and to provide scholarships to students.

Frequently, the costs of program fees (on top of tuition) serve to place learning abroad beyond the reach of many students. Recently, a few institutions, including the University of Texas (system), Georgia State University, and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign have seen efforts by campus student groups to levy upon themselves a general student fee to allow the funding of student scholarships for eligible students seeking to study abroad. In the case of the University of Illinois, the initiative originated with a group of passionate undergraduates working closely with the campus' study abroad office and office of student affairs. These students went out and obtained the 2,000 signatures necessary to place the initiative for a student study abroad fee of \$5 per semester on the student ballot. The measure passed overwhelmingly in February 2008 and has the potential to raise approximately \$300,000 per year for study abroad scholarships. To put this in another way: an institution would need to receive a gift of \$9 to \$12 million to reach the figure of \$300,000 per year. However, the student fees do not cover the operating costs of the study abroad office. Much like the University of Texas, Georgia State University, and the University of Illinois the schools of the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) have come up with an innovative model to assist in the funding of

study abroad. The ACC presidents have agreed that a percentage of the revenues generated from their schools' participation in football bowl games will be used for study abroad and other international activities at their schools. Also, advancement efforts in support of study abroad scholarships have huge potential to become a means to raise funds for study abroad on our campuses. Over the years I have witnessed the tremendous appeal that contributing to study abroad scholarships holds for donors. Indiana University provides a recent example of an institution receiving a substantial gift for study abroad scholarships which the university agreed to match.

To reach the goal of the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act (the U.S. in 2005-06 sent approximately 200,000 students abroad) program fees, student fees or bowl revenues may likely be insufficient. If our government and our campuses are truly committed to quality learning abroad opportunities for all students we need to move to a system where the costs of study abroad—including the costs of maintaining a study abroad office—are built into tuition (or in the case of public universities and colleges covered by tuition and state revenues) so that students attending institutions of higher education pay the same sum whether or not they participate in a learning abroad experience. Learning abroad is an academic priority and should be treated and funded no differently from other academic priorities.

Addressing the financial constraints of study abroad will certainly help move us closer to our goal of making study abroad accessible to all students. But unless we are able to address students' concerns that their participation in study abroad will result in additional

curricular hurdles potentially delaying their graduation or that the study abroad offerings have little or no relevance to their educational or career objectives as well as to gain the buy-in of departments and their faculty, especially in terms of the faculty creating academically relevant study abroad opportunities, we will fall far short of our study abroad goals. Both the University of Minnesota and Georgia Tech have made significant strides in working with departments to integrate relevant study abroad experiences into each major. These efforts appear to have reduced many of the perceived disincentives for students regarding curricular barriers to study abroad and both institutions have witnessed substantial increase in study abroad participation. However, efforts to reduce disincentives faced by faculty to initiate faculty-led study abroad experiences have been less successful. The perception of few benefits from faculty involvement in creating and leading study abroad programs often discourages faculty participation. Many academic departments continue to discount the importance of faculty involvement in study abroad for it is not seen as contributing to the priorities of teaching and research. On the other hand, when faculty perceives value to engaging in study abroad activities we see increased participation. Incentivizing faculty involvement in study abroad activities can take many forms including extra pay, fulfilling teaching requirements, and furthering research objectives.

Allow me to provide some innovative examples of which I have first-hand experience.

The first is the Research Abroad Program (RAP), a jointly-sponsored and funded program of the University Center for International Studies (UCIS) at the University of Pittsburgh and its University Honors College. RAP was created so that undergraduates

interested in serious scholarship could engage in UCIS-faculty led research projects overseas. RAP gives faculty members and students the opportunity to work as a team to contribute to an existing body of knowledge rather than simply disseminating or absorbing information, as is the case in the traditional classroom. In RAP, the faculty members recruit undergraduate students for their research projects and faculty members and students work together as a research team. Faculty benefit from the research insights, skills and assistance students bring, as well as the opportunity to pursue their own research during the summer. And students benefit from the hands-on, research-related experience in a real world situation that has an impact on the direction of their career path. Over the past several years RAP has funded teams from biology, public health, communications, engineering, history, religious studies, education, and French and Italian conducting summer research in India, Great Britain, France, Costa Rica, Peru, Italy, Tanzania, St. Kitts, and Ireland. Both faculty and students engage in pre-departure training and post-return collaboration. Upon return from overseas, faculty are strongly encouraged to collaborate on publishable papers with the student members of the team.

Another example from the University of Pittsburgh of an initiative to incentivize faculty to incorporate study abroad into their teaching and research is the Integrated Field Trip Abroad (IFTA) program. IFTA is an optional extension of a spring term course. It is a related three-credit course which exposes students directly to the content of the spring-term course and/or enables them to apply directly what they learned in the spring term. Enrollment is limited to students who have taken the related spring-term course; the faculty member of that course with grant funding from the university's Title VI Area

Studies or Global Studies programs develops the IFTA and accompanies the group abroad. During the past few years Pitt has sponsored a large number of IFTAs. The 2005 Andrew Heiskell award-winning Plus3 program—for Business and Engineering freshmen— was Pitt’s inaugural IFTA program. For the Plus3 program students complete the Managing Complex Environments course, including four mandatory spring workshops, in the spring term prior to departing. Students spend two weeks overseas (students select one country among Brazil, Chile, France, China, Germany or the Czech Republic) where they will visit companies, hear talks about the country, sightsee, interact with local students, and enjoy ethnic meals. Students must keep a journal and will compose a written group report on one of the companies visited and orally present upon return. Additional IFTAs have included “ State Reform in Finland and Estonia,” “Islamic Culture in Sarajevo,” “Czech Republic and Poland: Impact of the European Union and Globalization,” and “Dublin and Belfast: Comparing Communication Science and Disorders Across Cultures.” Opportunities to add a comparative/international emphasis to their courses and to build collegial ties with foreign colleagues are two of the apparent benefits the faculty derive from sponsoring IFTAs.

The University of Illinois has also explored avenues to incentivize faculty participation in designing and leading short-term study abroad programs. One new initiative at Illinois is the campus-wide study abroad development grant program launched in winter 2008 which allows faculty to compete for funds for the purpose of designing and leading short-term study abroad trips. In addition to using the funds from the grant to design a study abroad course, the faculty member can employ the funds to cover the costs of a research

trip overseas to the country or region in which the study abroad program will take place. There was an overwhelming faculty response to this initiative from across the campus. A new initiative at Illinois to further incentivize faculty participation in designing and leading study abroad is the Faculty Study Abroad Banking System. Under consideration is establishment of a campus-wide “banking system” for faculty to lead study abroad programs. The program would allow faculty to “bank” teaching credits in exchange for leading courses and other for-credit programs abroad, and exchange those credits at a later point for on-campus course releases. In turn, courses taught abroad will become part of the faculty’s annual evaluation. The plan is that for study abroad courses taught during summer, winter, or spring breaks, faculty will receive 50 percent of credits taught towards course release during a regular term.

These study abroad initiatives at the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Illinois by incentivizing faculty to design and lead study abroad courses and incentivizing students to participate in these faculty-led initiatives have resulted in a more creative menu of study abroad choices for students as well as led to a dramatic increase in study abroad rates of participation at both schools. Illinois, for example, has reached a participation rate in study abroad of 30 percent which is quite admirable for a state-supported large research university. At both schools the faculty buy-in programs like RAP has also created international opportunities that give students skills to solve global problems. The success of each of the programs mentioned above depends on the extent to which comprehensive internationalization becomes institutionalized within the culture of the college or university. Without the support of the institution’s senior leadership and the

belief that study abroad adds value to the teaching, research, and engagement missions of each academic unit within the institution, these programs are unlikely to succeed.

Pillar IV: Foreign language proficiency is a requirement for all students and efforts are made to customize language instruction to fulfill the learning objectives of both majors and non-majors of foreign languages

Among the challenges we face is the lack of adequate foreign language preparation for our students. Enrollment in foreign languages in U.S. universities and colleges has fallen from 16.5 percent (language course enrollments per 100 total student enrollments) in 1965 to less than 9 percent today; and between 1965 and 1995 the share of 4-year institutions with language-degree requirements for some students fell from roughly 90 percent to 67 percent while in 2001 only 27 percent of four-year institutions of higher education required foreign language for all students.⁶ Most disconcerting is that among the foreign languages taught in U.S. institutions of higher education the percentage of students taught such critical languages as Chinese (3.3 percent), Russian (1.6 percent) and Arabic (1.5 percent) are wholly insufficient when compared to Spanish (52.2 percent), French (13.1 percent), German (6 percent), Italian (5 percent) and American Sign Language (5 percent).⁷

Foreign language proficiency is a necessary component of global competence. If our institutions are to produce globally-competent students, foreign language preparation has to extend beyond students matriculating in our departments of foreign languages and literature. The multicultural character of our societies and the globalizing trend of the

workplace require foreign language competency for graduates in the social and natural sciences and in our professional schools. Too often at our institutions the primary responsibility for foreign language preparation falls upon faculty in language and literature departments who have few resources and limited interest to teach foreign languages to students including both majors and non-majors. In most research universities promotion and tenure for faculty in language and literature departments are dependent more on publishing articles and books in literature and producing marketable literature Ph.D. students than on teaching foreign language courses to non-majors. Complicating matters further, foreign language departments have resisted efforts to allocate tenure track positions to language teaching specialists for the national reputation of a language and literature department correlates strongly with research publications in the field of literature rather than the teaching of foreign languages. Moreover, non majors in literature and language often find the content of foreign language courses irrelevant to their disciplinary interests and boring. Our challenge is to create a comprehensive and effective plan for foreign language preparation on our campuses that has as a primary objective the attainment of at least conversational proficiency in a second language for all our students. To that end, our campuses should strive to facilitate foreign language training for *all* faculty which, among other things, would spur the creation of new programs for languages-across-the-curriculum.⁸ We need to do a better job of drawing on our international students and members of our heritage communities who have received training in the teaching of second languages to assist us in the foreign language preparation of our students. Responsibility for foreign language preparation may need to be placed under a campus-wide entity to ensure a more flexible approach and to allocate

resources in a more effective way. Furthermore, institutions of primary, secondary and tertiary education must work together to improve the foreign language preparation of students especially in regard to proficiency in critical languages like Mandarin, Japanese, Korean, Arabic, Russian and Farsi so that when students arrive on our campuses they have a solid footing on the way to advance foreign language learning. These goals are totally consistent with the aims of the U.S. Department of Education's Title VI programs for international and area studies—programs which are an excellent source of funding for improving foreign language acquisition on our campuses.

There are some notable examples of universities which are piloting efforts to integrate the learning of foreign languages into the campus-wide curriculum. SUNY-Binghamton, the University of Richmond, the University of Mississippi, and the University of Iowa have been leaders in creating Cultures and Languages Across the Curriculum (CLAC) programs. At SUNY-Binghamton student tasks in many social science undergraduate courses include reading and research in a foreign languages with the purpose of completing assignments and projects in which a non-U.S. approach and perspective to critical global issues is produced and presented to the class.

Pillar V: Opportunities for students' international internships are made available

We can all agree on the value to students of combining educational and practical work experience while in school. Companies around the world are especially looking for future employees and internships can serve as an excellent means for both the student and company to evaluate each other for future employment opportunities. Our colleges and

universities can play an instrumental role in increasing international internship opportunities through efforts by senior administrators to include internships as a priority item in discussions with the private sector and in the planning of high-level foreign travel missions. Furthermore, our faculty provides one of the richest resources for international student internships through their collegial networks and contacts with the private and public sectors. Since many of our international and domestic alumni work in multinational corporations and NGOs they are well positioned to open doors for international internship opportunities. Our institutions need to take advantage of this rich resource. Also, whether it is from a civic obligation or self-interests, I have found that locally-based globally-focused companies are often quite interested in creating international internships for students at neighboring schools. An excellent example of the role that locally-based firms play in creating international internship opportunities is the newly-established University of Illinois' 3+2 program with Tsinghua University in Beijing, China. This program enables students at both universities to spend three years at their home university and two years at the partner university while earning an undergraduate degree from their home institution and a Master's of Science at the partner university. Built into the two years at the partner university is an internship at a locally-based multinational corporation. The corporations find this arrangement quite attractive as they envision it as a vehicle to recruit well-trained graduates who already possess a good knowledge of the company and who they will likely place in their operations within the student's home country.

Pillar VI: Faculty searches are international and global experience is preferred

The market today for exemplary scholars is truly worldwide and our best universities seek the highest quality talent regardless of country of origin. All one has to do is to survey the top research journals and the most prestigious university presses to ascertain the extent to which authors represent all corners of the globe. We need to continue to advertise our faculty searches in outlets which are accessible to a worldwide audience and to make sure that we have adequate funding to invite in candidates from abroad. But there is still much more we can achieve in regards to highlighting the preference for hiring faculty whose teaching, discovery and engagement involve international experiences and perspectives. On one level, a prominent scholar lacking international experiences and perspectives would appear oxymoronic. Nevertheless, I frequently encounter directors of area studies programs bemoaning the fact that they can't get the history department or the political science department to hire someone with a Brazilian or a South Asian expertise, that there are no funds to hire a specialist of East Asian literatures, or the college of law has no one on its faculty able to cover European Union legal policy. A great university combines both disciplinary and area studies expertise, for each enriches the other. There are methods to ensure that our institutions continue to hire exceptional faculty who possess international experiences and perspectives. Several universities have committed to establishing international faculty lines for which the various colleges and schools within the university compete. The program is overseen by the campus' senior international officer who is responsible to make sure that the overall international needs as dictated by the teaching, discovery, and engagement missions of the university are addressed. Tenure is held within the colleges and schools for these international lines. When the line becomes vacant, it reverts back to the senior

international officer who can choose to continue the line in the same college or re-open the competition. Another means to ensure that faculty with international experiences and perspectives are hired which does not require the creation of new faculty lines is a program by which the university offers incentives to departments to include global experiences as a preference in its hiring. Here, for example, a department agrees to include in its ad for a faculty search a preference for an economist with teaching and research expertise relevant to Africa. If the department hires such an individual it receives extra funds to be utilized in the start-up package for the new hire or to use as it sees fit to address other departmental needs. A third avenue to enhance the hiring of faculty with global experiences and perspectives is to make it a priority of the campus' capital campaign. Recently, the University of Illinois has created the new position of director of international advancement initiatives. The position oversees the efforts to raise private, corporate and foundation funds for the university's international initiatives and will report to the university's senior international officer. It is important to note that this position is not envisioned to solicit funds to erect "international silos" within the university but to work closely with the development directors in each college and school to further their internationalization efforts. Having a designated development officer focusing on the international dimension should help in our efforts to recruit faculty with global experiences.

Pillar VII: Faculty reward and tenure include research and teaching abroad

We have discussed above that faculty are more likely to engage in international activities if they perceive direct benefits from their participation. Attracting world-class students

with whom to work, collaborating with non-U.S. scholars on teaching and research initiatives, adding a comparative/international component to one's teaching, locating new sources of funding through internationally-focused RFPs, or gaining access to important non-U.S. primary or secondary research sources are appealing incentives to faculty. Yet, if the faculty's commitment to international activities is not reflected in the annual merit review or tenure and promotion process, faculty are likely to discount the importance of international engagement. All of us have surely heard of stories where junior faculty who have led students on a study abroad program during an academic term were informed that such activities might hurt them when it comes to the tenure and promotion decision or where faculty who spent time abroad teaching on an exchange were chastised for abandoning departmental committee chores. A truly global university will require that the faculty's contributions to the internationalization of teaching, discovery, and engagement are fully appreciated and counted in both annual merit reviews and promotion and tenure decisions. Michigan State University is currently in the process of rethinking the requisites for promotion, tenure, and merit salary reviews by making faculty internationalization contributions one of the primary measures of research, teaching, and service. Our underlying assumption is that internationalization offers added value to the teaching, discovery, and engagement missions of the institutions and that our institutions should not diminish these contributions by discounting them in terms of the departmental incentive structure. To do so would be to create disincentives for an activity that benefits both the faculty member as an individual and the institution as a whole.

Pillar VIII: Senior international officers report directly to the chief academic and/or executive officer

At our most internationalized institutions the senior international officer (SIO) is charged with the task of maintaining and strengthening the comprehensive internationalization of the campus' teaching, discovery, and engagement missions. This task is more likely to be accomplished when the SIO reports directly to those who are chiefly responsible for the university's teaching, discovery, and engagement missions (i.e., the Provost and President or Chancellor). There are unfortunately still too many situations in higher education where the SIO reports indirectly to the chief academic and/or executive officer of the campus. Obviously the more doors there are between the SIO and the chief academic and/or executive officers, the greater the expenditure in time and the less likely the SIO's input will be presented as a priority and/or with the necessary conviction. Recently, there has been notable upgrading of the SIO position at institutions like Indiana University, the University of Minnesota, and Emory University, and the creation of new positions of Vice-President or Vice Provost at Brown University, Penn State University, Northern Arizona University, and the Ohio State University. Yet, we have also seen several instances lately where SIO's direct reporting lines have been downgraded from the Provost or Chancellor/President to a Dean, an Assistant Vice President or Vice Provost. Often, such downgrading appears to result from personnel changes at the provost or the chancellor level, administrative restructuring, or simply a desire by a Provost to reduce the number of direct reports. If direct reporting of the SIO to the chief academic and/or executive officer is a necessary component for the establishment of the global

university, what conditions can bring about that outcome? I propose that the following steps have to be in place:

- 1) a campus culture in which there is a consensus that internationalization adds value to the teaching, discovery, and engagement missions of the institution;
- 2) the mission statement and strategic plans of the institution firmly embed internationalization as a priority
- 3) faculty and student senates and external advisory boards defend internationalization as an institutional priority;
- 4) international programs and studies offices act entrepreneurial by attracting extramural funding (successful fundraising seems to provide greater credibility to units);
- 5) SIOs are able to stay on top of the evolving aspects of the international dimension (e.g., growing importance in areas like export controls, strategic international partnerships, and corporate relationships) so campus units can turn to them to oversee these changes as well as to provide the comprehensive framework in which these changes reside.

Pillar IX: Senior international officers are positioned to interact with deans and other councils and committees

As important as it is for the SIO to report directly to the chief academic and/or executive officer of the university, it is equally important that he or she sits on the Council of Deans. Our campuses tend to be highly decentralized with much power residing in colleges and schools. The SIO sitting on the Council of Deans reflects the significance given to the international mission but also facilitates the critical collaboration required for

the comprehensive internationalization of the academic goals of each college and school within the university. The SIO through his or her active cooperation with the members of the Council of Deans can be instrumental in furthering both the internationalization within each college or school and of a cross-fertilized internationalization, that is, international interdisciplinary collaborations across several colleges. It is paramount that the SIO becomes actively engaged in working groups and committees where much of the actual work of the Council of Deans is accomplished.

An international advisory council (IAC) chaired by the SIO and including each college's or school's most senior administrator overseeing the unit's international portfolio can serve as a very useful forum for developing and vetting proposals for consideration by the Council of Deans, enhancing the chances that those proposals will receive a prompt and favorable hearing. In addition to sitting on the Council of Deans and the International Advisory Council, the SIO should convene at regular intervals an external advisory board. An external advisory board comprised of influential individuals from the private and public sectors as well as academics not associated with the institution can perform a worthwhile role in the comprehensive internationalization of the university. During my years at the University of Pittsburgh I found our international studies' external advisory board a superb vehicle in providing a unique perspective on what employers seek in terms of our graduates' international skills, a powerful voice promoting internationalization to the university's senior administration, and a valuable conduit to gift prospects.

Pillar X: Barriers are eliminated to the recruitment of international students and international students are encouraged and given the opportunity to engage actively in the internationalization of the campus and community

No institution of higher education can aspire to become truly global without an active strategy to recruit, retain and integrate the highest quality international students. Our colleges and universities have for nearly a century attracted the best and the brightest from across the globe and have provided these individuals with a world-class education. Upon graduation many of these students have installed themselves in the U.S. and built exceptionally successful careers while at the same time they have, through their accomplishments, contributed to the improvement of the U.S. and the world. Others have returned to their home countries where they have made lasting impacts on their societies. Currently the U.S. receives more than 500,000 international students a year—a number that has not grown substantially since the fateful events of September 11, 2001. Gaining entry to our colleges and universities remains a priority for students around the world for they perceive that a degree from a top-flight U.S. institution of higher education will not only equip them with a first rate education, but will likely position them favorably for the marketplace whether that be in the U.S. or abroad. Few will disagree that one of America's greatest exports is its system of higher education. But the long view of history teaches that those who hold a pre-eminent position one day are likely to be replaced by others in the future. For instance, between 1880 and 1920 the brightest students and scholars in the fields of medicine and science from the U.S. and other countries flocked to Germany to work in the great scientific labs and receive a rigorous education. By the 1930s that was no longer the case. U.S. higher education is now facing rather stiff

competition for the best students by virtue of several factors including the emergence of excellent research institutes and universities outside of the U.S. particularly in East and Southeast Asia, a perception of heightened xenophobic attitudes within the U.S., and the erection of immigration obstacles in the wake of 9/11. More specifically regarding this last point, the current quota on H-1B visas of 65,000 is far too small and is quickly reached, hindering our need for highly skilled researchers and professionals while the wait for green cards is typically more than five years. Individuals contemplating their future educational plans are likely to act in a rational fashion and weigh the costs and benefits associated with selecting an institution of higher education in which to pursue their studies. While the incentive to earn a degree from a U.S. university is likely to remain quite high due to the academic quality of the degree program, the increase in the disincentives like immigration hassles, affordability, and the perception of a lack of hospitality may alter the balance against applying to and accepting admittance from U.S. colleges and universities in the future.

For obvious reasons much attention vis a vis international students has focused on barriers to recruitment. Often receiving scant attention are the barriers to retention. Are our international students completing degrees in a timely fashion? If not, why? Are we doing enough to integrate our international students into the life of our campus and community? Are we underutilizing the potential that our international students have to help us internalize our campuses? Far too often international students self-segregate and interact rarely with domestic students. Think for a moment how helpful international students can be to inform other students about non-U.S. cultures or to provide new or

different perspectives on issues especially in classroom discussions. Valuable interactions with international students on campus whether in the classroom or dorm may be the only exposure many of our domestic students will receive during their college years.

Moreover, we are failing to take advantage of the value of international students in terms of internationalizing our neighboring communities. Many of our colleges and universities reside in suburban and rural areas typically lacking exposure to diversity. What if we were to create ambassador or (reverse) Peace Corps programs where admitted international students who met certain requisites could receive additional financial assistance for serving as international ambassadors to our surrounding communities including regular visits to K-12 classrooms? A program of this kind has distinctly great promise to educate our communities about cultures like those in the Middle East, about which much ignorance in the U.S prevails.⁹

Our campuses must develop a campus-wide strategy to eliminate the “ghettoization” of our international students by establishing international or intercultural living and learning communities and by sponsoring regular social and athletic opportunities bringing together international and domestic students. To achieve this end will require a coordinated effort involving the offices of international students and scholars, study abroad, and student affairs. I cannot think of any more appealing setting than a social or athletic event to foster dialogue across linguistic and cultural boundaries. At the University of Illinois the Office of International Students and Scholar Services works closely with the Vice Chancellor’s Office of Student Affairs to organize twice-yearly World Cup indoor soccer tournaments where international students along with domestic students who have studied

abroad or plan to study abroad form country teams. Teams march into the event with their country flags and the games provide opportunities for international and domestic students to compete as well as to interact with one another. The World Cup events have grown in popularity and receive significant news coverage on the campus and in the community.

Pillar XI: American immigrant communities are drawn upon to contribute their rich expertise and experiences to the institution’s learning, discovery, and engagement missions

The rich mosaic of American society provides us with a natural resource that our institutions of higher education often overlook. The many immigrant or heritage communities in our backyards offer a great resource to our schools in assisting our internationalization efforts. The perspectives of immigrants vis a vis their country of origin, the U.S. and global processes are in many ways unique and would certainly enrich the classroom learning experiences of our students. In many parts of the U.S. and on many campuses I have observed the positive role that the Muslim immigrant community has performed in breaking down the stereotypes many non-Muslims have about Islam. A global university will eagerly utilize the valuable resource of immigrant communities and sponsor lecture series and conferences drawing upon the experiences and insights of these communities. Most importantly, immigrant communities can play a significant part in our desire to achieve foreign language proficiency for *all* students. To achieve foreign language proficiency for all our students—and there is no acceptable reason why that shouldn’t be the case—we will need to vastly increase the number of foreign language instructors serving our campuses. Whether as aides to our foreign language instructors or

instructors themselves, immigrants with the requisite language and teaching skills offer a logical and cost-effective means to fulfill our staffing needs. Moreover, in our desire to customize foreign language teaching to address the demand for second language acquisition by our students in the professional schools and science, we may find that many of our immigrants through their own professional backgrounds possess these particular language qualifications.

Our immigrant communities are also likely to contribute to our development efforts in terms of networking as well as gifts. In my years as a senior international officer I have found immigrant communities to be among the most receptive audiences to appeals to support campus international initiatives such as study abroad scholarships, international student fellowships, and area studies library collections.

Pillar XII: Global partnerships as an institutional priority

The last pillar of a global university and the one that has, with the possible exception of study abroad, received the greatest attention during the past few years are global partnerships as an institutional priority. The common wisdom is that in today's world if your institution is not engaged in cross-border education or does not have academic partnerships with foreign schools then your school is not global. The race among U.S. colleges and universities to set up partnerships (e.g., offshore campuses, joint or dual degree programs) with foreign counterparts is reminiscent of the California gold rush of 1849. Much like in 1849 I fear that this new gold rush has been undertaken without adequate strategic thinking about the expected benefits and risks and how these global

partnerships contribute to the teaching, discovery, and engagement missions of the university. There is no question that global institutional partnerships constitute a major building block of the global university for they can buttress and enrich the three principal missions of a university. However, frequently valuable resources are expended on establishing a partnership with a foreign institution without the partners sitting down in advance and asking what does each expect to gain from the partnerships and how much does each partner expect to contribute. For the partnership to have a realistic chance of succeeding it requires that each side sees it as adding value.

What objectives should a university pursue in establishing global partnerships?¹⁰ It makes little sense for our universities to attempt to set up institutional partnerships in as many countries as possible. It is much better to have a few substantial partnerships than to have many superficial ones. When deciding upon potential partners think of how that partner's research and teaching strengths could complement those of your institution. For instance, the University of Illinois and the University of Sao Paulo are planning a major collaboration in the study of bio-fuels alternatives and their social and economic implications. Illinois scholars are leaders in studying how to use corn crop residues, switch-grass, and *Miscanthus* in the production of bio-fuels while Sao Paulo scientists are prominent in the study of producing ethanol from sugar cane. Scholars at both Illinois and Sao Paulo believe that through their collaboration each will learn more about the field of bio-energy as well as develop policies to deal with the global social and economic implications of the adoption of bio-fuel alternatives. Faculty and administrators at both universities believe that by working together rather than alone the likelihood of

obtaining funding for the research from their respective state governments and from the private sector is much higher.

Several U.S. universities are capitalizing on their membership in international consortia to establish multi-dimensional bilateral and multilateral relationships with like institutions. Two such consortia are Universitas 21 and the Worldwide Universities Network (WUN). Universitas 21 includes the University of Virginia which has used the network to develop exchange relationships and co-hosted conferences with partners including the National University of Singapore, Hong Kong University, Waseda University, and the University of Melbourne. The WUN involving the University of Washington, Penn State, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the University of California-San Diego and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign on the U.S. side with several European and Asian universities has sponsored numerous research collaborations among the members and international conferences on international education. Members of the WUN each contribute \$60,000 a year for the purposes of creating a pool of funds to be allocated on a competitive basis to fund international and interdisciplinary research initiatives involving WUN partners.

Once you have constituted a viable institutional partnership think of ways your institution can build upon the initial relationship both vertically and horizontally. Again, the primary motivation for expansion has to be based on mutual self interests. A relationship initiated from complementary faculty research interests in chemical engineering can expand to include team-taught courses in chemical engineering and the development of a

professional dual degree master's as well as become a good starting point to explore the possibilities of teaching and research collaborations in other fields, exchange of faculty and students, recruitment of international students, development of an alumni chapter, fundraising initiatives, a portal for study abroad programs for that world region, and dual or joint degrees. The essential point is to see how other institutional objectives might be fulfilled by expanding upon the inaugural relationship.

In thinking about global partnerships we are obliged to consider the tension between the desire of universities in the wealthiest countries to recruit the best and brightest from abroad and the realization that for the developing countries, where many of these students originate, the education of these students abroad is likely to reinforce a brain drain. We should allow partnerships where degree seeking international students (or even non-degree seeking) have opportunities to return home and participate in capacity building in their home country. Dual or joint degree programs such as the University of Illinois's 3+2 specifying that students will return home upon completion of degree requirements and incorporating an internship with a NGO or a multi-national company may provide a useful model for combining academic training and job experience resulting in the placement of international students in attractive positions in their home countries. Whether building partnerships with institutions in developed or less developed countries, the reality is that viable and sustainable partnerships typically evolve from collaborations where both partners believe that they are benefiting from the relationship. Helping institutions and governments in Africa to build their own science and technology programs offers the promise that such capacity may better equip them to solve the

pressing problems in their societies—this type of collaboration is likely to be quite appealing to institutions in both developed and developing countries. The University of Pennsylvania’s “Penn in Botswana” initiative is noteworthy. Each year Penn sends faculty, residents, and medical students to Botswana to work with their African counterparts in the care in public hospitals. For its efforts particularly in combating and preventing HIV/AIDS the Penn program has received funding from the Merck and Gates Foundations as well as from the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. In addition to the invaluable international experiences and knowledge that students, scholars, and staff at universities in the developed world will gain from such participation let us not forget that finding solutions to pressing problems in the developing world clearly benefits us all.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it has become eminently clear that the flattening of the globe and the events of 9/11 have altered the world in which we live. Achieving global competence at our institutions is not only desirable in remaining competitive and adapting to our changing environment, but a *necessity*. The building blocks (students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, surrounding community, foreign universities, private and public sectors, etc...) for the global university are already within reach. Yet, if we are able to meld these blocks together, the collaboration will allow us to achieve true global competence by comprehensively internationalizing the teaching, discovery, and engagement missions of higher education. As is the case with all great edifices, the global

university will not arise overnight. But by erecting the twelve pillars detailed in the global university blueprint, its construction is certain to be accelerated.

Endnotes

¹ NASULGC Report, *A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University*, 2004.

² Recent notable exceptions are Christa L. Olson, Madeleine Green, and Barbara A. Hill, “Building a Strategic Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization,” American Council on Education, 2005; Task Force on International Education, “A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University,” National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 2004; JoAnn S. McCarthy, “A Roadmap for Creating the Global Campus,” *The Chronicle Review*, The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 29, 2007.

³ Agnes Caldwell (editor), *Critical Thinking in the Sociology Classroom*, Washington, D.C.: The American Sociological Association, 2004.

⁴ Thomas L. Friedman, *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twentieth-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

⁵ *Education For Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security*. Committee for Economic Development, 2006.

⁶ Ibid; “Enrollments in Foreign-Language Courses Continue to Rise, MLA Survey Finds,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 23, 2007, p. A13.

⁷ ADFL Modern Language Association Report on 2002 Enrollments in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education.; “Enrollments in Foreign-Language Courses Continue to Rise, MLA Survey Finds.” I agree with many that Spanish should be considered a critical language for Americans given its widespread use within the U.S. and its predominance within the Western Hemisphere.

⁸ Ann Schneider, “Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?” (unpublished paper), 2007.

⁹ The concept of a “reverse” Peace Corps was initially brought to my attention by Jack Van de Water.

¹⁰ For a superb checklist of the important questions to consider when thinking about international institutional partnerships see Madeleine F. Green et.al., *Venturing Abroad: Delivering U.S. Degrees Through Overseas Branch Campuses and Programs*, American Council on Education, May 2007, pp. 23-25.

References

ADFL Modern Language Association Report on 2002 Enrollments in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education.

Caldwell, A. (Ed.). (2004). *Critical Thinking in the Sociology Classroom*. Washington, D.C.:The American Sociological Association.

Committee for Economic Development. (2006). *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security*.

“Enrollments in Foreign-Language Courses Continue to Rise, MLA Survey Finds.” (November 23, 2007). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Friedman, T.L. (2005). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twentieth-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux.

Green, M. et.al. (2007). *Venturing Abroad: Delivering U.S. Degrees Through Overseas Branch Campuses and Programs*. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education (ACE).

McCarthy, J.S. “A Roadmap for Creating the Global Campus.”(June 29, 2007) *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). (2004). *A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University*.

Olson, C. L., Green, M., & Hill, B. (2005). “Building a Strategic Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization.” American Council on Education (ACE).

Schneider, A. (2007). "Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?"

(Unpublished Paper).