

IT TAKES AN ENTIRE INSTITUTION:

A BLUEPRINT FOR THE GLOBAL UNIVERSITY

William I. Brustein, PhD

Vice Provost for Global Strategies and International Affairs
Professor of Sociology, Political Science and History

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

William I. Brustein, PhD

In 2009 I authored an essay entitled “It Takes an Entire Institution: A Blueprint for the Global University” that appeared in Ross Lewin’s edited *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*.¹ During the past few years many colleagues in international education have expressed their gratitude to me for presenting a set of highly-interrelated steps critical to the establishment of the global university. Since completing this essay in 2009 I have had the fortune to serve as the Vice Provost for Global Strategies and International Affairs at The Ohio State University which has afforded me a platform to design novel strategies to further Ohio State’s comprehensive internationalization as well as to observe a plethora of best practices across the globe. In the hope that my experiences and insights may have value to colleagues in the field of international education working toward building the global university, I offer below a revised version of my earlier essay.

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.”² 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

¹ William Brustein, “It Takes an Entire Institution: A Blueprint for the Global University.” In Ross Lewin, ed., *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*, (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 249-65.

² NASULGC Report, *A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University*, 2004.

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 our 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 education abroad initiatives.³ 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 double its education abroad participation within five 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 major, minor or certificate, the elimination of financial and curricular barriers to education 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? While institutions of higher education may refer to themselves as global universities there is, to my knowledge, no accepted definition of what constitutes a global university.⁴ For the purposes of this paper, a global university

³ A recent notable exception is John Hudzik, *Comprehensive Internationalization: Institutional pathways to success*, New York, Routledge, 2015. Hudzik's study focuses primarily on various strategies and practices shaping the path toward campus comprehensive internationalization and includes contributions by international education practitioners across the globe on their efforts to internationalize their institutions.

⁴ By contrast, there is general consensus on a definition for the internationalization of higher education, that is, "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education." See Jane Knight, "Internationalization Remodeled:

is one in which international and multicultural experiences and perspectives are fully embedded into its teaching and learning, research and discovery, and engagement and outreach missions.⁵ A global university is akin to what the famous classical sociologist Max Weber referred to as an “ideal type.” An ideal type is an analytical construct employed for the purpose of comparing real-world or empirical phenomena. In other words, it serves as a measuring rod to compare concrete realities. Take for example Weber’s well-known study of capitalism where he constructs an ideal type of capitalism to compare and contrast various economic systems around the world in terms of how each measured up to his ideal type. For Weber, while certain states like the U.S., Great Britain, and the Netherlands exhibited many of the characteristics embodied in the ideal type of capitalism, no national economy fully met all the prerequisites for his ideal type of capitalism.⁶ In much the same way, I argue that no single institution of higher education has yet to incorporate fully all the components of a global university.

Whereas we can agree that a global university is an institution where international experiences and perspectives are fully integrated into the core missions of the institution, there is no majority view on the constituent components or pillars required upon which to erect a global university. In other words, we don’t have an acknowledged path or a blueprint to establish a global university. What are the pillars required to support a global university? How can an institution of higher education measure its progress towards becoming a global university? The blueprint to construct a global university, from my perspective, should comprise ten pillars. Without these pillars in place a global university is beyond reach. The ten pillars upon which a global university sits are I) internationalizing strategic planning, II) internationalizing the curriculum, III) eliminating barriers to education abroad, IV) requiring foreign language proficiency, V) internationalizing faculty searches, VI) incorporating international contributions into the faculty reward system, VII) upgrading senior international officers’ reporting relationships and placing senior international officers on key university councils and committees, VIII) embracing a holistic approach to the international student experience,

Definition, Approaches, and Rationales.” *Journal of Studies in International Education*. SAGE, Vol. 8, no.1, 2004:5-31; Philip G. Altbach and Jane Knight, “The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities.” *Journal of Studies in International Education*. SAGE, vol. 11, 2007:290-305; Hudzik, *Comprehensive Internationalization*.

5 See NASULGC Report, *A Call to Leadership*.

6 Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. (New York: Scribner, 1958).

IX) drawing upon the expertise and experiences of and engaging fully local immigrant or diaspora communities, and X) making global academic partnerships an institutional priority. Below I lay out what steps we need to take to set in place the ten pillars of the global university.

Pillars enable buildings to stand but pillars are held erect by a strong foundation. The foundation in which the ten 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 global or 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. To put it simply, internationalization is not simply an end of itself, it is a means to strengthen the core missions of teaching, discovery, and engagement.

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

No one doubts the 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 college partners with the international affairs office 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 (Senior International Officer) 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 SIO 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.

The Ohio State University provides an excellent example of embedding internationalization into the strategic planning process. Beginning in 2008, the university's President and Provost convened a high-level campus-wide council on strategic internationalization. The charge to what became the President's and Provost Council on Strategic Internationalization (PPCSI) included the call to establish international strategic goals for the university (not simply for an Office of International Affairs). After more than a year of meetings, the PPCSI presented a list of six international goals for the university. They were:

- Increase the percentage of international faculty and students
- Promote scholarship on the major global issues
- Create international dual degree programs
- Promote collaboration with alumni and Ohio's international business ventures
- Develop an international physical presence
- Increase international experiences for undergraduate, graduate and professional students

These goals were then approved by the university's senior leadership, the Council of Deans, and the Board of Trustees. With the approval by the principal governing bodies at the university, the six goals then became part of the annual review process of academic and service units on campus. Each dean, vice provost and vice president, as part of his or her annual performance review, had to report on the progress made within their units on each of these six goals. If deans were evaluated on progress on the university's six international goals, it is not difficult to imagine that those who report to them (e.g., department chairs and faculty) would out of self-interests understand the need to

incorporate internationalization into their activities.⁷ With the approval of the six PPCSI goals, Ohio State set out to ensure implementation. One of the first steps was the creation of an International Affairs Committee (IAC) comprised of faculty or administrative representatives from each college (15 colleges within Ohio State) and from each Vice Presidential unit (e.g., Office of Research, Office of Enrollment Management, Graduate School, Office of Student Life, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, etc...). Where the Ohio State model for its International Affairs Committee differed from others that I have participated in i.e., the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is that the charge to the committee included not only to serve as an advisory body but, most importantly, called for the establishment of particular working groups comprised of IAC members. More specifically, each working group took on one of the six international goals with the objective to develop concrete policies and programs relevant to that goal. Within the first two years of its existence, the IAC came forward with new policies for campus MOUs and MOAs, the guidelines for international dual degrees, and the architecture for the global option (GO)—an innovative curriculum enhancement. In 2014-15, the IAC members agreed that with the considerable success achieved in the implementation of the six university international goals, the time was right to undertake a review of the six existing goals for the purpose of revising them or developing new goals. The key lessons to derive from the Ohio State experience with internationalizing the strategic planning process is to make sure that the strategies and goals are university goals and that the committee responsible for oversight also includes within its mission the objectives of crafting specific policies and programs aligned to the goals.

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

⁷ At Ohio State while advancing the six international goals remains a priority in the evaluation of deans and vice presidents, it is no longer incorporated into the annual performance reviews.

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. Few of the above approaches sufficiently produce *both* the depth, that is, training a cadre of regional/area studies experts and the breadth, namely, educating non-international or area studies specialists to understand their disciplines within a regional or trans-regional sense.⁸ 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,⁹ 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

⁸ See Charles King, “The Decline of International Studies.” <https://foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2015-06-16>.

⁹ Agnes Caldwell (editor), *Critical Thinking in the Sociology Classroom*, Washington, D.C.: The American Sociological Association, 2004.

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 best-selling book, *The World is Flat*¹⁰ 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.¹¹

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

11 "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.

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 from campus academic units in designing undergraduate programs that will let 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.

An increasing number of colleges and universities are balking at simply adding the traditional diversity or international course requirement, or the popular stand-alone degree in international studies but instead are moving toward developing a comprehensive and coherent internationally themed curriculum that will train our students to become globally competent critical thinkers no matter their discipline.

Moving in the right direction and helping develop the trend are universities such as the University of Pittsburgh which has a Global Studies certificate and the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech) with its International Plan that integrates international components into its traditional Bachelor of Science degree. Both of these institutions have had these international components in place for the past few years. But the next big trend is where The Ohio State University is moving. As part of its institutional international strategy, Ohio State recently developed the Global Option, a certificate bearing program designed to enable students to successfully acquire international expertise through the integration of new requirements within their field of study. The University of Pittsburgh's Global Studies certificate provides a useful model with its creation of an international curriculum component available university-wide. Through its graduate and undergraduate certificate program, students in any major have the opportunity for interdisciplinary training concurrent with academic or professional degrees. Global Studies students can choose one of six global concentrations (changing identities in a global world; communication, technology and society; conflict and conflict

resolution; global economy and global governance; global health; and sustainable development) and unite it with the study of a particular region and language. This program helps students develop an awareness of major currents of global change and the issues they raise, the capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries, and personal adaptability to diverse cultures.

The Pitt Global Studies certificate 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. While the Pitt Global Studies certificate lays the groundwork for global training, it is time for colleges and universities to rethink the content of every major in an effort to integrate international content into each course required for the major and into the major's capstone experiences.

Georgia Tech has made tremendous strides along these lines through its International Plan, a \$3.5 million initiative launched in 2005. The plan is designed for students to achieve four skills, abilities and attitudes. The International Plan also requires at least six months abroad (study, work, research), coursework on selected international subjects, achievement of second language proficiency and integration within programs of study. The same program of study is offered to all students of any major. Upon completion of the undergraduate degree in the student's major and the International Plan requirements, the student's transcript and diploma state that the degree is a "Bachelor of Science with International Plan."

Ohio State has taken the certificate bearing programs and the International Plan one step further. Rather than developing a university-wide one-size-fits-all program, Ohio State developed a template that colleges can use to design their own Global Option.

The Global Option at Ohio State has been four years in the making and is driven by students achieving the skills that form the foundation of global competence which 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; the capacity for effective communications across cultural and linguistic boundaries; and comprehending the international dimension of one's field of study. It is these skills that will add value to the technical expertise students gain during their college career and make them more

attractive to potential employers.

The Global Option focuses on six programmatic areas that serve as the basic framework.

- Education Abroad: introductory education abroad (e.g. Global May/Summer) and/or a discipline-specific education abroad program
- Two on-campus courses with strong international focus, preferably within major
- World language other than English or native language; majors that do not require language studies complete the general education language requirement; all other complete language studies above and beyond the requirements by the major, as determined by the College Curriculum Committee Global Option
- One capstone project (research, internship, service learning) in discipline on an international theme
- Evaluation of global competencies on a standardized assessment
- Comprehensive e-portfolio of international activities

At Ohio State, programs have been developed and implemented in the Colleges of Social Work; Public Health; Engineering; Education and Human Ecology; Business, and Public Policy while pilot programs are in the works in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences; Nursing; and Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. While development of the Global Option will be driven by each academic unit, these programs certainly can serve as a guideline to implement the Global Option throughout the curriculum of any discipline.

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.¹² 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 education abroad offices and to provide scholarships to students. Frequently, the costs of program fees (on top of tuition) serve to place education 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 raises 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 education abroad. The ACC presidents in 2004 agreed that a percentage of the revenues generated from their schools' participation in football bowl games will be used for education abroad and other international activities at their schools. Also, advancement efforts in support of education abroad scholarships have huge potential to become a means to raise funds for education abroad on our campuses. Over the years I have witnessed the tremendous appeal that contributing to education abroad scholarships holds for donors. Indiana University provides an excellent example of an institution receiving a substantial gift for education 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 2013-14 sent approximately 305,000 students abroad) program fees, student fees or bowl revenues may likely be insufficient. If our government and our campuses are truly

¹² By education abroad opportunities I refer to study abroad, internships, service learning, field study and research abroad.

committed to quality education abroad opportunities for all students we need to move to a system where the costs of education abroad—including the costs of maintaining an education 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 education abroad will certainly help move us closer to our goal of making education abroad accessible to all students. But unless we are able to address students' concerns that their participation in education abroad will result in additional curricular hurdles potentially delaying their graduation or that the education 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 education abroad opportunities, we will fall far short of our education abroad goals. Both the University of Minnesota and Georgia Tech have made significant strides in working with academic departments to integrate relevant education abroad experiences into each major. These efforts appear to have reduced many of the perceived disincentives for students regarding curricular barriers to education abroad and both institutions have witnessed a substantial increase in education abroad participation. Similarly, participation by students in education abroad has skyrocketed at The Ohio State University in a period of three years from roughly 1,900 to 2,700 due largely to curricular and financial changes. At Ohio State, students can now complete six of their general education credit requirement through education abroad and receive a major financial subsidy for pursuing credit-bearing education abroad during the summer term and/or enrolling in the university's Second-year Transformational Experience Program (STEP).

However, efforts to reduce disincentives faced by faculty to initiate faculty-led education abroad experiences have been less successful. The perception of few benefits from faculty involvement in creating and leading education abroad programs often discourages faculty participation. Many academic departments continue to discount the importance of faculty involvement in education 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 education abroad activities we see increased participation. Incentivizing faculty involvement in education 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. During my years as the SIO at Pitt, RAP had 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 engaged in pre-departure training and post-return collaboration. Upon return from overseas, faculty were 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 education 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. While I served as Pitt's Senior International Officer (2001-06) the university 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 visit companies, hear talks about the country, sightsee, interact with local students, and enjoy ethnic meals. Students must keep a journal and 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 education abroad programs. One initiative at Illinois is the campus-wide education abroad development grant program launched in winter 2008 which allows faculty to compete for funds for the purpose of designing and leading short-term education abroad trips. In addition to using the funds from the grant to design an education 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 education 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 education 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 education 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 education abroad initiatives at Ohio State, the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Illinois by incentivizing faculty to design and lead education abroad courses and incentivizing students to participate in these faculty-led initiatives have resulted in a more creative menu of education abroad choices for students as well as led to a dramatic

increase in education abroad rates of participation at each of the three schools. Ohio State and Illinois, for example, have climbed into the top ten U.S. institutions in terms of total students studying abroad according to the IIE 2015 Open Doors report—which is quite admirable for state-supported large research universities. At the three schools the faculty buy-in programs like RAP have 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 education abroad adds value to the teaching, research, and engagement missions of each academic unit within the institution, these programs are unlikely to succeed.

Education abroad is no longer simply taking courses at a foreign institution. 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 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 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

A truly internationalized major for all students will require rethinking how we develop foreign language proficiency for our students. As stated in the 2007 MLA (Modern Language Association) report, deep cultural knowledge and linguistic competence are equally necessary if one wishes to understand people and their communities.¹³ 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 8.1 percent in 2013. The MLA in 2015 reported that total language enrollments on our campuses decreased by an additional 6.7 percent between 2009 and 2013. Among the top ten languages taught at U.S. colleges and universities only two (Chinese and American Sign Language) exhibited an increase in enrollment between 2009 and 2013 (Chinese=2 percent, American Sign Language=19 percent) while all others witnessed a decrease including Spanish. Spanish, the most highly enrolled second language on U.S. campuses, fell for the first time in the history of the MLA survey.¹⁴

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

¹³ "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World," Modern Language Association, 2007.

¹⁴ "Enrollments in Languages other than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2013," Modern Language Association, 2015.

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.

The 2007 MLA report recommends the replacement “of the two-tiered language-literature structure with a broader and more coherent curriculum in which language, culture and literature are taught as a continuous whole, supported by alliances with other departments and expressed through interdisciplinary courses...”¹⁵ While I do not disagree with the MLA recommendation, I would, however, propose that this more coherent curriculum, in addition to language, culture and literature, should include content courses like economics, engineering, mathematics and history. It is crucial that sociologists, engineers, health professionals and business students become conversant in foreign languages relevant to their fields of study. Ultimately this will equip our students with a set of skills to enable them to communicate effectively with native speakers in the target language, and equally be able to comprehend relevant written materials in the target language to achieve their academic objectives and to be able “to reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture.”¹⁶

Furthermore, 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

15 “Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World,” Modern Language Association, 2007.

16 Ibid.

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. 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.

Accordingly, our campuses should strive to facilitate foreign language training for *all* faculty members which, among other things, would spur the creation of new programs for languages-across-the-curriculum.¹⁷ How do we produce content-based foreign language expertise? I recommend that Title VI/Fulbright Hays launch an initiative to train language faculty in content-based language skills and non-language discipline-based faculty to incorporate language learning relevant to their disciplines. Fulbright Hays, in particular, should sponsor summer abroad for faculty members with the goal of improving the foreign language teaching skills of non-language and literature content-based faculty. The Monterey Institute of International Studies may provide a useful model for intensive training for both language and literature and non-language and literature faculty interested in developing foreign-language content-based courses.

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 language 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.

¹⁷ Ann Schneider, "Internationalizing Teacher Education: What Can Be Done?" (unpublished paper), 2007.

Pillar V: 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 sub-Saharan 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. A few years ago, the University of Illinois 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 reports to the university's senior international officer. It is important to note that this position was 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 VI: Faculty reward and tenure include research, teaching, and service 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, research and service 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 an education 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. Rutgers and Michigan State University are two universities which have revised their tenure and promotion criteria to explicitly recognize faculty international activities. In the case of Rutgers, the faculty are asked

to list their accomplishments in the areas of international research, teaching, curriculum development, advising international students, grant activity and service. The 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 VII: Upgrading Senior International Officers' reporting relationships and placing Senior International Officers on key university councils and committees

At our most internationalized institutions the 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 and/or Vice Provost at Lehigh University, Brown University, the University of Wisconsin, Penn State University, Rutgers University, Northern Arizona University, Ohio State and the University of Virginia. 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.

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. Many of 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 affairs committee (IAC) chaired by the SIO and including each college's and administrative unit's (e.g., enrollment management, student life, diversity and inclusion) 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. At Ohio State, the international affairs committee with representatives from all academic and administrative units serves as both advisory but, most importantly through its subcommittees, develops specific policies and programs addressing the

university's six international goals. For instance, the university's new policies on international agreements, international dual degrees as well as the guidelines for its global option issued forth from the subcommittees. It is important that our international affairs committee go beyond advisory and constitute working groups to design and to vet international policies and programs aligned to the university's international goals.

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 VIII: Embracing a holistic approach to the international student experience

No institution of higher education can aspire to become truly global without an active strategy to recruit and retain 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 975,000 international students a year—a number that has grown substantially during the past few years. 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 and subsequent terrorist attacks in the U.S. and Europe. More specifically regarding this last point, the current quota on H-1B visas of 85,000 (20,000 of which are reserved for master's degree holders) is far too small and is quickly reached¹⁸, 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 obstacles, 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 internationalize our campuses? Far too often international students self-segregate and interact rarely with domestic students. Think for a moment how the presence of international students can contribute to our efforts to promote diversity on our campuses. Our international students are critical to our efforts to inform domestic students about non-U.S. cultures and 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

¹⁸ In 2015 roughly 233,000 foreigners applied for H-1B visas.

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.¹⁹

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, education abroad, enrollment services, ESL, and student life. 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. Ohio State through its Global Engagement Program has implemented a variety of activities to promote cross-cultural relationships on campus including the weekly English Conversation Program where international and domestic students meet to have cross-cultural discussions about different regions of the world and general topics affecting all college students.

Breaking down the walls separating international and domestic students is one of the key

¹⁹ I would like to thank Jack Van de Water for sharing the concept of a “reverse” Peace Corps with me.

steps to create the ideal international student experience. Ensuring that our international students will make the most of their educational experience requires that we engage them consistently from pre-arrival to post-graduation with special emphasis placed on continual educational support and mentorship during the international student's entire time on campus as well as on providing adequate information and training for faculty and administrative staff on how to interact successfully with people from other countries and cultures. It is particularly important that classroom instructors become more sensitive to the different ways students from other cultures learn. In my years as a senior international officer I have observed how a successful educational and cultural experience for international students can do wonders for future student recruitment, open doors overseas to educational, governmental and corporate entities, and establish a great foundation for future international advancement efforts. One university that is making great strides in enhancing the international student experience from recruitment to graduation is the University of Alberta. Leaders at the University of Alberta, realizing that many of the school's more than seven thousand international students will likely return home after graduation to seek employment opportunities, designed a specialized course for students to help with their re-immersion into their societies. Within the course students were provided information on career opportunities and helpful contacts information on Canadian companies operating in their native countries. A highlight of the course is an assignment where each student completes a research project for a Chinese or Canadian company.

Our international students can serve as our best ambassadors as we strive to become a global university. Let's ensure that we prepare them for success by implementing a holistic approach to the international student experience.

Pillar IX: 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 appeal to support campus international initiatives such as study abroad scholarships, international student fellowships, area studies library collections, and overseas offices. For instance, in 2011 the South Asian community of central Ohio proposed to support the establishment of the OSU Global Gateway Office in Mumbai, India by dedicating their 2011 annual fundraising banquet to the gateway initiative. A check for \$42,000 was handed to me after the event which helped us open the gateway office in Mumbai in March 2012.

Pillar X: Global academic partnerships as an institutional priority

The last pillar of a global university and the one that has, with the possible exception of education abroad, received the greatest attention during the past few years is 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 global partnerships (e.g., offshore campuses, overseas

offices, international joint or dual degree programs) 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 specifically 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 physical presence overseas without careful thought to how the presence benefits the institution or creating 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. What objectives should a university pursue in establishing global academic partnerships?²⁰ 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.

Whether it is establishing an overseas physical presence or an institutional partnership success requires a realistic assessment of what added value the effort is likely to produce versus not proceeding with the physical presence or institutional presence. Assessment of return on investment (ROI) and return on effort (ROE) should be long-term and should include not only those returns easily monetized (e.g., revenue-generating courses or training programs) but also activities that are less easily monetized or involving a much longer investment of time (e.g., the cultivation of key relationships with alumni, friends and local governments).

In order to enhance their relationships across the oceans, American universities have begun opening their doors in other parts of the world, which range from comprehensive brick and mortar branch campuses to small liaison offices. New York University's brick and mortar approach has been the most ambitious with Global Academic Centers spanning the globe and newly-established portal or franchise campuses in China, Abu Dhabi, and France. Other institutions embracing a brick and mortar model include

²⁰ 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.

Temple University in Japan, the University of Nottingham in China and Malaysia, Georgia Tech in France, Bryant University in China, Yale University in Singapore, and Duke University in China. In the cases of Bryant, Yale and Duke their overseas initiatives involve a partnership with a local university. At the other end of the scale with regard to physical presence there are a plethora of universities including the University of Chicago, Indiana University, the University of Virginia, the University of Illinois, the University of Minnesota, and Ohio State who have opened less-costly overseas centers or liaison offices. It is much too early to say which if any of these models of establishing offshore physical presence is optimal. But whichever model your institution chooses, you will unlikely find success without thinking seriously about why your institution seeks to establish a physical presence, how a physical presence contributes to your institution's paramount priorities, and which is the most realistic model of physical presence for your institution.

Take the example of Ohio State. As Ohio State methodically planned to expand its global reach, the development of Global Gateways, or smaller, multifunctional embassy-like offices, proved the best approach, providing the university more flexibility and offering new and unique ways in which to build partnerships with a wide variety of constituencies. The Gateway concept was born out of the need to be more strategic in the university's international engagement. The idea of establishing a physical presence in key locations around the world would enable Ohio State to develop broader and deeper ties. Ohio State looked at a variety of models including building "brick and mortar" campuses, but this concept, in reality, was not a good fit for the mission of a public land grant university. Building a campus would take a significant capital investment and would limit Ohio State's ability to expand to more than one international location. Opening Global Gateway offices proved the most viable and accessible way for Ohio State to build its presence across the globe.

To determine specific locations for the Gateways, Ohio State reviewed its existing international connections including Memoranda of Agreements and institutional partnerships, its international student populations, locations of education abroad programs and Ohio State alumni, and the presence of Ohio corporations in other countries. It was important to identify locations that already mapped well with the university in terms of existing collaborations, whether it was students, faculty, alumni or businesses. The final analysis deemed that the Global Gateways concept would advance Ohio State's engagement in a wide variety of international settings and fulfill its strategic partnership

goals at many different levels.

The Gateway model is designed to strengthen several priorities of any given university including faculty teaching and research collaborations, international institutional partnerships, international education experiences for students, recruitment of international students and scholars, international alumni networking, cultivation of donor prospects, and in Ohio State's instance, the global competitiveness of Ohio-based businesses. Ohio State is seizing the Gateway as a catalyst to enrich its international partnerships on many different levels. The Gateway as a tool to widen the circle of international partnerships must be undertaken with careful thought, knowledge and understanding of a university's current collaborations and future opportunities. Ohio State's Gateway site locations emerged from a systematic examination of those activities, as well as taking into consideration which countries Ohio-based companies had expanded to globally. Ohio State opened its China Gateway in 2010, its India Gateway in 2012, its Brazil Gateway in 2014, and is scouting opportunities in Turkey, Europe and sub-Saharan Africa for future gateway sites.

Once your institution has identified strategic regions or countries in which to build deeper and broader institutional relationships focus on potential institutional partners whose research and teaching strengths could complement those of your institution. Take the case of the University of Illinois which has a long history with higher education in the state of São Paulo in Brazil. In 2008 the University of Illinois and the University of São Paulo laid plans for 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 São Paulo scientists are prominent in the study of producing ethanol from sugar cane. Scholars at both Illinois and São 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.²¹

21 Two excellent examples of specialized joint ventures are the University of Michigan's joint institute

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 (U21) established in 1997 and the Worldwide Universities Network (WUN) founded in 2000. Universitas 21 consisting of 25 member universities spanning the globe employs the network to further collaborations in research engagement, educational innovation and the student experience while the Worldwide Universities Network comprised of 18 institutions focuses on joint explorations into four global challenges. Members each contribute annual dues which go to maintaining a central coordinating office as well as financial investment in various collaborations. In my view, the jury is still out regarding the value added that membership in the consortia delivers versus using the annual contribution to invest in your own faculty's strategic partnerships. A challenge confronting these networks is that faculty members' motivations for establishing partnerships is rarely driven by the fact that their institutions are part of a network—especially networks that did not evolve from existing faculty partnerships.

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, co-sponsoring of research conferences, development of an alumni chapter, fundraising initiatives, a portal for education 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

with Shanghai Jiao-Tong University in engineering and Northwestern University's Kellogg School's joint Executive MBA program with the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

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 promote 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 less-economically developed regions 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. 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 has 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 ten pillars detailed in the global university blueprint, its construction is certain to be accelerated.

