INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 83:
Special Issue 2015

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

International Higher Education is the quarterly publication of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE).

This special issue is made possible through a cooperative arrangement between CIHE and the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. The journal is a reflection of the missions of both centers to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through *International Higher Education,* in its regular quarterly issues and in this special issue, a network of distinguished international scholars and doctoral students offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. This special issue provides a specific focus on one of the key pillars of higher education in this age of global knowledge: its internationalization. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, Russian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at *http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe*.

SPECIAL ISSUE ON INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Key Trends

Internationalization of the Curriculum

National Developments

Departments

The Future of Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe

Hans de Wit and Fiona Hunter

Hans de Wit is Director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College and was previously Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu. Fiona Hunter is Associate Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan. E-mail: fionajanehunter@gmail.com.

Internationalization of higher education (IoHE) is a relatively new phenomenon but, as a concept, it is one that is both broad and varied. Over the last 30 years, the European programs for research and education—in particular the ERASMUS program but also research programs like the Marie Curie Fellowships—have been the motor for a broader and more strategic approach to internationalization in higher education in Europe and have set an example for institutions, nations, and regions in other parts of the world. The internationalization of higher education has been influenced by the globalization of our economies and societies and the increased importance of knowledge. It is driven by a dynamic and constantly evolving combination of political, economic, sociocultural, and academic rationales. These rationales take different forms and dimensions in the different regions and countries, and in institutions and their programs. There is no one model that fits all. Regional and national differences are varied and constantly evolving, and the same is true within the institutions themselves.

In a study for the European Parliament—a project of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in partnership with the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the European Association for International Education (EAIE)—which includes 17 country reports (ten from Europe and seven from the rest of the world), we identify key trends in current national strategies and for the future of internationalization in Europe.

Ten key developments for Europe and the rest of the world can be identified:

1. The growing importance of internationalization at all levels (encompassing a broader range of activities, more strategic approaches, and emerging national strategies and ambitions);

2. An increase in institutional strategies for internationalization—with accompanying risks, such as homogenization, and limitations, such as a focus on quantitative results only;

3. The challenge of funding, everywhere;

4. A trend toward increased privatization in IoHE, through revenue generation;

5. The effects of the competitive pressures of globalization, with increasing convergence of aspirations, if not yet actions;

6. An evident shift from (only) cooperation to (more) competition;

7. Emerging regionalization, with Europe often seen as an example for other world regions;

8. Rising numbers of stakeholders and participants involved in internationalization everywhere, with the resulting challenge of quantity versus quality;

9. A lack of sufficient data for comparative analysis and decision-making;

10. Notable emerging areas of focus, in particular internationalization of the curriculum, transnational education, and digital learning.

In Europe, it is apparent that internationalization as a strategic process began with ERASMUS. The program created common understandings and drivers for internationalization in most countries, and this was further reinforced by the Bologna Process. Internationalization is now becoming mainstream at the national and institutional levels in most countries of the world, and in particular in Europe. The rhetoric speaks of more comprehensive and strategic policies for internationalization, but in reality there is still a long way to go in most cases. Even in Europe, seen around the world as a best-practice case for internationalization, there is still much to be done, and there is an uneven degree of accomplishment across the different countries, with significant challenges in Southern and, in particular, Central and Eastern Europe.

Two surveys on internationalization in Europe and the world, one by IAU and one by EAIE, draw a highly encouraging picture for Europe. Moreover, the IAU survey showed that Europe is the region most often prioritized in institutional internationalization activities in other parts of the world.

A Scenario for the Future

A Delphi Panel exercise among key experts in international higher education around the world confirmed this picture and resulted in a scenario for the future of internationalization of higher education in Europe. This scenario sees IoHE as a continually evolving response to globalization driven by a dynamic range of rationales and a growing number of stakeholders. While it expects mobility and cross-border delivery to continue to grow, it calls for a stronger focus on the curriculum and learning outcomes to ensure internationalization for all, and not just for the mobile few. It identifies

partnerships and alliances in varying forms as becoming increasingly important for both education and research and recognizes the key role of the European Commission in supporting IoHE development.

Inevitably, there are barriers to be overcome, linked mainly to funding and regulatory constraints, but also to institutional issues of language proficiency and the nature of academic engagement and reward. Equally, there are enablers such as technology, stronger (and more equal) collaboration, a greater focus on qualitative outcomes, the fostering of public-private initiatives, and greater alignment between education and research as well as between different levels of education.

Internationalization as "the *intentional* process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society."*

The scenario envisages that, if the barriers are removed and the enablers activated, a European higher education will emerge whose graduates will be able to contribute meaningfully as global citizens and global professionals in a Europe that is better placed not only to compete but also to cooperate.

Redefining Internationalization

As an outcome of this Delphi Panel exercise, this study has revised Jane Knight's commonly accepted working definition for internationalization as "the *intentional* process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society."*

This definition reflects the increased awareness that internationalization has to become more inclusive and less elitist by not focusing predominantly on mobility but more on the curriculum and learning outcomes. The "abroad" component (mobility) needs to become an integral part of the internationalized curriculum to ensure internationalization for all, not only the mobile minority. It reemphasizes that internationalization is not a goal in itself, but a means to enhance quality, and that it should not focus solely on economic rationales.

Most national strategies, including in Europe, are still predominantly focused on mobility, short-term and/or long-term economic gains, recruitment and/or training of talented students and scholars, and international reputation and visibility. This implies that far greater efforts are still needed to incorporate these approaches into more comprehensive strategies, in which internationalization of the curriculum and learning outcomes as a means to enhance the quality of education and research receives more attention. The inclusion of "internationalization at home," as a third pillar in the internationalization strategy of the European Commission—*European Higher Education* in the World—as well as in several national strategies, is a good starting point, but it will require more concrete actions at the European, national, and, in particular, the institutional level for it to become reality.

The importance of the role of the European Union and the Bologna Process in the development of IoHE in Europe, but also around the globe, is undeniable and has to be built on even further. In this process, however, it is essential to focus on partnerships and collaboration that recognize and respect the differences in contexts, needs, goals, partner interests, and prevailing economic and cultural conditions. Europe can only be an example if it is willing to acknowledge that it can also learn from elsewhere; it offers an important model but not the only one for the modernization of higher education.

Summing up, we can say that the future of IoHE in Europe looks potentially bright, but its further positive development and impact will only take place if the various stakeholders and participants maintain an open dialogue about rationales, benefits, means, opportunities, and obstacles in this ongoing process of change. We cannot ignore the fact that IoHE is also being challenged by increasingly profound social, economic, and cultural issues, such as the financial crisis, unfavorable demographic trends, immigration, and ethnic and religious tensions. While these challenges represent a threat, they also foster awareness of the importance of IoHE in developing a meaningful response. ■

Why Internationalize Education?

Robert Coelen

Robert Coelen is Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at Stenden University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands, and can be contacted at robert.coelen@stenden.com.

Despite a long history of internationalization activities at the institutional level and at times at the program level, many faculty members still struggle with the imperative to internationalize their classes or programs. Given the learning outcomes of internationalization—which should include intercultural effectiveness, among others—and given the tremendous forces of globalization that include significant migration (which, according to UN data, involved 210 million people in 2010), it is hard to understand why anyone would still question the need for this response by those directly responsible for delivering education.

Changing Global Forces

Since the turn of the century, we have been witnessing unprecedented changes in global business. Until about that time, there had been little variation in the geographic location of the Fortune Global 500 companies, and about 95 percent of them were located in so-called developed regions. By 2010, the proportion in developed regions had gone down to 83 percent, and in 2014 to 69 percent. This trend is expected to continue with a further decline to 54 percent in 2025. This statistic is a clear indicator of the shift toward an upsurge of "non-traditional" countries with significant business activity.

McKinsey & Company have shown in various reports how the global distribution of the middle class is likely to change. In 2030, it is expected that some 66 percent of the global middle class will live in the Asia-Pacific region. Countries such as India and China, and others in Asia, will race ahead while the "traditional" regions—such as Europe and North America—will see significant proportional declines. By 2030, the aircraft manufacturing industry predicts a significant increase in regular passenger air travel in and to these non-traditional countries—with destinations within China experiencing the greatest increase. These increases can be seen as resulting from enhanced business activity and more leisure travel by the growing middle classes.

Another major global force is that of urbanization and the development of a much-enhanced network of significant global urban centers. Air travel during the last century mostly took place between the well-established major capitals of the world, but this is now undergoing dramatic change in two ways. First, more and more airports are now located in cities that are not capitals, either established *de novo* or by updating disused or former military airports. Secondly, and possibly more significantly, their status has been promoted to that of international gateways, often as a result of budget airlines seeking out better value connections. Such new connections not only drive leisure travel upwards, but also increase business mobility and that of students. Newly connected urban centers, by virtue of the nature of the urban workforce, also create concentrations of knowledge societies in this new global network. Predictions are that 440 emerging cities in this global network will contribute 47 percent of total global economic growth by 2025, and will have 1 billion new consumers. This network will be a large part of the playing field of the professionals of the future and requires such professionals to be internationally aware and interculturally effective.

Apart from the ability to fund leisure travel, the middle classes can also be identified as wanting a good education for their children, in addition to housing, health care, and pensions. One would, therefore, also expect to see an upsurge in demand for higher education.

It is likely that in such a future our graduates will work with people from, or in, another culture.

Indeed, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) data show that, on the basis of current trends, half the number of projected graduates in 2030 (aged 25 – 34) will come from China and India alone, with Europe and the United States together accounting for less than 25 percent. It is likely that, in such a future, our graduates will work with people from, or in, another culture. Indeed, even today many companies in Europe have to resort to recruiting graduates from outside their home country due to a lack of suitable domestic graduates, thereby already creating significantly intercultural workplaces.

The Impact of Technology

A fourth major global force is the advancement of technology. In a recent survey of education experts carried out by the World Innovation Summit for Education (WISE), 50 percent of those polled predicted that by 2030 the most important source of knowledge will be available as online content. This statistic is not surprising given the huge increase in information on the Internet and the increasing ease with which this can be published. Learning materials that are

available in an electronic format are easily distributed and adapted, making this an attractive proposition for ongoing development, and also for creating blended programs with online course provision alongside limited periods of on-campus attendance.

Another effect of technology that is relevant for this discussion is the phenomenon described by Carl Benedikt Frey and Michael A. Osborne, namely that of job polarization. They note that, with current developments in computer technology, significant shifts could be expected to occur in the nature of jobs in twenty years or so, with some jobs being performed entirely by computers. However, many jobs would not fall into this category: the type of jobs that would be least likely to be replaced by computer technology include jobs in which heuristics, human social interaction, working in cramped spaces, and innovation play a significant role.

All the global changes combined create a future in which intercultural contact will be the norm, rather than the exception. Thus, it follows that the skills, attitudes, and knowledge required to be interculturally effective should become a more significant part of a student's development than they have been heretofore.

Higher Education's Response

The congruence of a number of predictions about global development—including the expansion of a globally interconnected urban center network, a shift in economic activity toward emerging economies, a redistribution of the world's middle classes, job polarization, and technology—fuel a move toward a very different and rapidly changing environment in which our graduates will eventually work and live. Higher education institutions must ensure that future graduates are well equipped to deal with the challenges that such a world will present to them. Attributes required of these graduates include those that are a necessary outcome of the internationalization of higher education, namely international awareness and intercultural competence. An added bonus would be the further development of so-called 21st century skills resulting from international mobility. These attributes will prepare our graduates more adequately for the future. Notwithstanding the numerous changes mentioned in this article, mankind's current activities are creating other challenges, such as global warming, the uneven availability and distribution of fresh water and food, a decline in biodiversity, and significant human migration as a result of conflict. If global economic changes are not driving our graduates' need to become internationally aware and interculturally effective, then these other challenges will certainly push this agenda forward. It is up to us to do what we can to pave the way and ensure that our graduates are prepared for the challenge. With such a massive agenda, one would have to ask whether we should not start with internationalization at the level of primary education, rather than introduce it only at the higher education level. ■

Integrating Institutional Policies and Leadership for 21st Century Internationalization

John K. Hudzik

John K. Hudzik is NAFSA: Association of International Educators Senior Scholar for Internationalization at Michigan State University and Chair of the Scientific Committee of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy. E-mail: hudzik@msu.edu.

Higher education is challenged to respond to a wide set of motivations and purposes for internationalization. There is pressure to mainstream student, staff, and faculty access to international perspective, involving all institutional core missions, and making ubiquitous who is expected to contribute and to be involved. In consequence, the need for deliberate and systemic institutional policies and leadership to support a more pervasive internationalization becomes necessary.

Motivations behind internationalization now encompass diverse purposes and intended outcomes, including access to global sources of cutting edge knowledge and partnerships, building cross-cultural knowledge and skills, developing an informed citizenry and workforce for a global environment, enhancing the global standing of the higher education institution, and promoting peace and mutual understanding, to name some.

The outcome expectations for internationalization have expanded beyond teaching and learning to also strengthen cross-border scholarship, research, and problem-solving service missions. The contemporary stakeholders of internationalization are diverse, each with particular outcome preferences (e.g., faculty for scholarship, career opportunities, and reputation; students and families for learning, jobs, and access to global opportunities; institutional leaders for access to funding and improved institutional reputation and capacity building; governments for workforce development and connections to the global market place).

Governments can help higher education internationalize through policy and funding, but it is what happens within the higher education institution itself that is the decisive variable. As detailed in my 2015 publication, *Comprehensive Internationalization: Institutional Pathways to Success*, there is a strong case for success in institutional internationalization being dependent on the interplay of (a) effective change leadership, (b) a strong institutional culture for internationalization, (c) strategic inclusion, and (d) key administrative practices and policies. These four strategies need to be integrated and mutually reinforcing. None are sufficient on their own; all are necessary.

The outcome expectations for internationalization have expanded beyond teaching and learning to also strengthen cross-border scholarship, research, and problem-solving service missions.

Extend the Leadership Team

Leadership is needed from the top (presidents, vice-chancellors, provosts, deans); from the middle (directors and chairs); and from the base (influential faculty, staff, and students). Effective leadership for internationalization is neither solely top-down, nor solely bottom-up; rather, it is both. Top leadership sets institutional tone, reaffirms institutional values and coordinates overarching priorities, but the work and creativity of internationalization depends on the faculty, key staff, and academic and support units.

While the international office can play important facilitation and coordination roles, internationalization will not be robust without a diverse leadership team of people and offices from throughout the institution being fully involved. The international office, regardless of its particular form must effectively partner with leadership at all levels throughout the institution.

Build a Supporting Institutional Culture

Institutional culture defines driving values and priorities in practice. Comprehensive and strategic internationalization is stymied if there is no widespread culture to support it. Building such a culture relies in part on an institution-wide dialog up, down and throughout to educate and mobilize attention to integrating international dimensions into all core missions—building understanding of what it means, why it is important, and how it strengthens an institution and its intellectual core in the 21st century. A widespread dialog builds an appreciation for all to play roles in the internationalization process.

Engage in Strategic Inclusion

Strategic inclusion incorporates internationalization into key institutional processes and decisions relating to missions and values, policy and budget planning, institutional branding and human resource management, and contributes to key moments of institutional change during leadership transitions, quality reviews, curricular revisions, and strategic planning. It is not that internationalization dominates decision making in these arenas, but rather that it becomes fully and consciously incorporated into them.

Implement Key Policies and Practices

Institutional case stories and the literature point to several actions that further strengthen the position and role of internationalization in higher education. Policies and practices of considerable importance include:

Define Goals, Success, and Intended Outcomes. A clear sense of intended goals and expected valued outcomes from internationalization provides the basis for directing people toward action and for defining success. Different stakeholders have particular priorities for defining success; and institutions also will differ on how they define it. The key is to identify the success motivators for the particular institution; even better are assessments that demonstrate actual outcomes along these lines.

Reward Success. What is counted and rewarded is what counts and motivates action. Students look for what counts in their curricula and matriculation requirements and what will advance their learning and careers. Faculty want to advance their careers, strengthen their intellectual reputations, and improve access to funding and scholarly opportunities. Institutions want to build their rank, stature, reputations, and access to support. Will efforts of people and units to internationalize be rewarded in a way which is consonant with such objectives? If international effort is not even counted in curricula or in personnel actions, or at best only tolerated, the motivations are weak; if it is encouraged, supported and expected, motivations strengthen. Does the institution reward international engagement and activity by students and staff?

Integrate Internationalization into Existing Missions and Dual Purpose Funding. If internationalization is seen to add another mission to the traditional three (teaching, scholarship, and service), it will be marginalized. If internation-

alization becomes integral to strengthening existing missions, it becomes much more sustainable. There is not enough new money available at almost any institution to fund internationalization completely on its own. There are many examples of institutions successfully funding internationalization by dual purposing existing programs and expenditures to include an international dimension: for example, expanding existing faculty domestic expertise and research priorities to include cross-border work and partnerships; taking existing courses and curricula; and integrating international content and dimensions.

Challenge the Status Quo and Encourage Adaptive Bureaucracy. Strategic and comprehensive internationalization is almost certain to require organizational change. Yet, in most organizations the status quo and comfort of the familiar is a powerful narcotic inhibiting change. However, internationalization forces change in curricula, research foci, and inclinations toward forging partnerships abroad. Partnerships with institutions in other countries and cultures will require adaptability and a willingness to recognize that "our way" is not the only way of doing things; administrative policies and procedures will change. A key enabler of change is building an institutional openness to examining policies, procedures, and rules that were designed for a different age and primarily for domestic stakeholders.

Recruit and Develop Human Resources for Internationalization. Internationalization is driven and delivered by faculty, staff, and students, who at a minimum are interested in and see the importance of international engagement. An important enabling condition therefore is whether the institution has and seeks to attract such individuals. Is there an institutional commitment to international engagement in its branding, in its messages to prospective students, and when advertising faculty vacancies? Furthermore, what commitment is the institution willing to make to further educate and develop its existing faculty and staff for international activity?

In Sum

Institutions will vary substantially in the exact ways they approach more comprehensive and strategic internationalization. There is no best model per se; rather, there are several valid models. The "best" model for an institution is the one that fits its particular culture, capabilities, core values, and missions. Practice must be fashioned from within, but giving attention to the leadership and policy factors above in institutionally relevant terms helps to build success. ■

"Internationalists" and "Locals" in Research: Similar Productivity Patterns Across Europe

Marek Kwiek

Marek Kwiek is Director of the Center for Public Policy Studies and the UNESCO Chair in Institutional Research and Higher Education Policy at the University of Poznan, Poland. E-mail: kwiekm@amu.edu.pl.

The relationships between international cooperation and research productivity have been widely discussed in research literature, and there is a general assumption that international collaborative activities in research lead to an increase in research productivity. International research collaboration is most often found to be a critical factor in predicting high research productivity.

A recent study investigated how strongly international collaboration in research is correlated with higher than average research productivity and whether the relationships found hold across all academic disciplines. Analysis was conducted with reference to two separate groups of academics, termed internationalists and locals. We define "internationalists" as academics indicating their involvement in international research collaboration and "locals" as academics indicating their lack of involvement in it. We used the data created by the global CAP and the European EUROAC projects on the academic profession—"The Changing Academic Profession" and "The Academic Profession in Europe: Responses to Societal Challenges," respectively. The primary data come from 11 European countries, with 17,211 usable cases.

Internationalization Productivity, and Academic Fields

Our research demonstrates that across all major clusters of academic fields, the difference in productivity rates between European "internationalists" and "locals" is statistically significant. Those European academics who were collaborating with international colleagues in research had published, on average, substantially more articles in academic books or journals, than their colleagues in the same academic field who were *not* recently collaborating internationally.

The percentage of academics collaborating internationally in research across Europe is high and it is an activity reported, on average, by two thirds of academics. There are huge cross-disciplinary and cross-national differences, though. The share of "internationalists" varies significantly

across the five major clusters of academic fields that we studied: life sciences and medical sciences, physical sciences and mathematics, engineering, the humanities and social sciences, and the professions (teacher training and education science, and administration, economics, and law). Academics in the cluster of physical sciences and mathematics are by far the most internationalized (three quarters of them are collaborating internationally) and academics in the cluster of the professions are the least internationalized (only about half are collaborating internationally).

"Internationalists" across eleven European countries across all academic fields had published, on average, about twice as many articles as "locals." In some academic fields, "internationalists" produced, on average, about 140 percent more articles (the engineering cluster) or about 120 percent more (the physical sciences and mathematics cluster), while in others (the humanities and social sciences, and the professions) they produced about 70 percent more articles in a three-year reference period (2005–2007 for CAP and 2008–2010 for EUROAC countries). "Internationalists" in life sciences and medical sciences—the academic fields with the highest productivity rate—produced, on average, 8.80 articles, which was about 80 percent more than "locals," who produced 4.91 articles, on average. The academic field with the highest productivity rate differential between "internationalists" and "locals" in Europe is engineering, with average productivity rates of 6.97 articles for the former group and 2.91 articles for the latter.

"Internationalists" across eleven European countries across all academic fields had published, on average, about twice as many articles as "locals."

In all 11 European countries studied, international collaboration in research is correlated with a substantially higher number of publications. Only for the Netherlands, the most highly internationalized system in Europe, are the results not statistically significant. If we assume that the mean number of publications of "locals" is 100 percent, then the field mean for "internationals" varies from about 240 to more than 400 percent. International collaboration pays off most in terms of knowledge production in engineering (on average, academics collaborating internationally produce four times more publications), and the least for the humanities and social sciences and the professions (producing about two and a half times more publications).

Cross-national differences apply: leaders in internationalization are the relatively small systems of Ireland and the Netherlands (with more than four in every five academics collaborating internationally, on average), followed by Austria, Switzerland, and Finland (with three out of four academics collaborating internationally). The two least internationalized systems are the relatively large systems of Poland and Germany, with slightly less than half of all academics collaborating internationally (about 48 percent). The remaining countries can be termed internationalization moderates.

Caveats

There are two reservations: one regarding the direction of causality in the research productivity-international cooperation relation and one regarding publication numbers. The identification of high research productivity correlates (e.g., international collaboration) does not necessarily imply the identification of causal relations. International cooperation in research may be generally undertaken by more productive academics, as such academics are sought by the most productive academics across all systems. Also, more productive academics tend to have better access to funding for international cooperation. There is also an important difference to be made between publication numbers and their scientific significance. Numbers do not necessarily determine scientific value, but it is often assumed in the studies on social stratification in science that a higher number of publications tends to lead to more consequential research than a lower number.

Conclusions

Research productivity of European academics is highly correlated with international research collaboration: the average research productivity rate of European academics involved in international collaboration ("internationalists") is consistently higher than the rate of European academics not involved in international collaboration ("locals") in all clusters of academic fields and in all 11 countries studied.

The distinction between "internationalists" and "locals" permeates European research. Some systems, institutions, and academics are consistently more internationalized in research than others. For "internationalists," the international academic community is a reference group, while "locals" publish predominantly for the national academic community.

Internationalization increasingly plays a stratifying role in academia, though—more international collaboration tends to correlate with higher publishing rates, and those who do not collaborate internationally may be losing more than ever before in terms of resources and prestige.

Competition is becoming a permanent feature of the European research landscape, and local prestige, combined with local publications, may no longer suffice in the race for resources (both national and international) and wider academic recognition. Huge cross-disciplinary and cross-national differences apply, but, in general, the role of internationalization of research in European universities is greatly increasing. ■

Ensuring Equality in Higher Education Partnerships Involving Unequal Universities in Divergent Contexts

Cornelius Hagenmeier

Cornelius Hagenmeier is Director of International Relations at the University of Venda, South Africa. E-mail: chagenmeier@gmail.com, cornelius.hagenmeier@univen.ac.za.

A collaborative approach to internationalization through international partnerships is widely practiced and considered essential for higher education. However, the theoretical underpinnings of university partnerships have yet to be fully analysed and understood. The Nelson Mandela Bay Declaration on the Future of Internationalization (2014) proclaims that the future agenda for internationalization should concentrate on "gaining commitment on a global basis to equal and ethical higher education partnerships."

Equality in Partnerships

While equality is commonly cited as a core principle underlying higher education partnerships, the doctrine is not yet clearly defined and the academic discourse on developing suitable concepts and strategies to achieve it is in its infancy. Inequalities are inherent to many higher education partnerships, and especially to those between universities of unequal strength. Inequalities are especially apparent when finance is provided by external donors, who may often be located in the context of the "stronger" university and who award funding exclusively to this partner because they share the same context.

Formal Equality

Generally, recourse is made to a formal conception of equality in higher education partnerships, based on that aspect of Aristotelian understanding of equality which espouses that "things that are alike should be treated alike." This works well and achieves equitable results in instances where equality is to be accomplished between entities that are similar in their core characteristics, but has limitations with regard to realizing equality between entities with dissimilar features.

In higher education partnerships in which one partner makes a larger financial contribution than the other, pursuant to its superior economic strength, the stronger partner's influence on partnership decision-making processes is likely to be weightier. This dynamic is at times used by universities to secure a competitive advantage, especially when the partners are universities that vary greatly in size, shape, research output, reputation, and economic strength. The absence of formal equality poses a threat to the success and sustainability of partnerships and can result in the dominance of one partner to the relationship over the other. The prevalent influence of the dominant, economically stronger partner on the decision-making processes in a partnership is often justified by reference to larger financial contributions.

While equality is commonly cited as a core principle underlying higher education partnerships, the doctrine is not yet clearly defined and the academic discourse on developing suitable concepts and strategies to achieve it is in its infancy.

Substantive Equality

A consensus exists that higher education partnerships should be equal or at least equitable, but it remains to be determined how this can be achieved in a global landscape characterized by unequal resources and divergent strengths of universities and higher education systems. As demonstrated above, formal equality is problematic as a conceptual basis for equality in higher education partnerships. It is necessary to interrogate whether equality should not be defined differently, for example by using an understanding that emphasizes the second element of the Aristotelian conception of equality—namely that "things that are unalike should be treated unalike in proportion to their unalikeness." A substantive conception of equality based on this

principle has been widely used in human rights, labor, and gender discourses. It provides for the unequal treatment of fundamentally different cases and may be used in the higher education context to avoid the inequitable tendencies alluded to above.

A substantive understanding of equality in partnerships could provide a suitable theoretical framework to achieve the equitable sharing of the benefits of joint endeavors and consequently lead to real equality in partnerships. Such an understanding would reflect the differences between the entities involved in the relationship and provide a framework which acknowledges that diversity can serve as the foundation for equitable governance structures for partnerships. It considers that the nature and quantity of contributions to partnerships should depend on the individual partner's respective strength, but that the relationship should remain reciprocal.

To create certainty and promote equity, it would be desirable to adopt a conception of equality that clearly defines the extent of contributions required by partners. A useful example for the application of the principle of substantive equality is the 2013 internationalization policy of the University of Venda in South Africa, which adopts a substantive understanding of equality and defines it to mean that "every partner to a relationship should make contributions which are equally meaningful taking the context of the partner into consideration."

Conclusion

To counter inequalities and even exploitative undercurrents, which characterize many contemporary higher education partnerships, it is necessary to develop a theoretically sound conception of equality in alliances between universities of divergent strength, which goes beyond formal equality and rather looks at substantive equality. Further research will be required to gain a deep understanding of the present paradigm, which could serve to appropriately conceptualize a model that can advance genuine equality in higher education partnerships. It appears, *prima facie*, that the adoption of a substantive understanding of equality may facilitate the development of an equitable paradigm, which would ensure that genuine equality can be achieved in mutually beneficial and reciprocal higher education partnerships. ■

Internationalization, the Curriculum, and the Disciplines

Hans de Wit and Betty Leask

Hans de Wit is Director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu. Betty Leask is Pro Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia. E-mail: B.Leask@latrobe.edu.au. This contribution is based on our Foreword for Wendy Green and Craig Whitsed. 2015. Critical Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum in Disciplines. *Sense Publishers, Dordrecht.*

In the last decade, institutions of higher education, national governments, and (inter)national organizations have become more proactive, comprehensive, diverse, and innovative in their approaches to internationalization. Critical reflection on their outcomes—in particular their impact on student learning—has resulted in a search for approaches to internationalization that have deeper meaning and greater impact.

The search for new approaches is evident in the increasing use of terms such as "deep internationalization," "transformative internationalization," and "comprehensive internationalization." While such terms are increasing in number and frequently used, the challenge is to align rhetoric with practice. These terms are consistent with using internationalization as a driver of quality and innovation and reflect growing interest in ensuring the majority of students and staff are engaged in and changed by the internationalization agenda. They also have the potential to stimulate the development of approaches that address existing inequalities in educational opportunity and outcomes in the world today. Haphazard approaches to internationalization that focused on a minority of students or on profit rather than education are not consistent with such terms and insufficient in universities operating in a globalized world. In this super-complex world, multiple dimensions of being are required of both individuals *and* institutions. In this world, coherent and connected approaches to international education, which address epistemological, praxis, and ontological elements of all students' development, are urgently needed. Focusing attention on these goals has the capacity to transform an institution's approach to internationalization and the identity of the institution.

The curriculum is the vehicle by which the development of epistemological, praxis, and ontological elements can be incorporated into the life and learning of today's students, ensuring that they graduate ready and willing to make a positive difference in the world of tomorrow. Recently, questions related to the relationship between the in-

ternationalization of higher education, the curriculum, and the disciplines have been raised. Some of these questions are discussed briefly below.

Is Global Citizenship a Possible and Desirable Outcome?

The development of responsible global citizens may be one way in which universities can have an impact on local communities and global society. But how do we define "global citizenship" as an outcome of internationalization? What knowledge, skills, and values will the global citizen display? How would we develop and measure these in the context of the curriculum of a program of study? Is global citizenship indeed possible in a world in which the nation-state dominates politically and the gap between the rich and poor of the world is widening?

Some argue that the pursuit of global citizenship as an outcome of international education is not even desirable, that it will inevitably exclude some. This could lead to the creation of a stronger transnational elite, further increasing the privilege and power of some groups compared with others.

These are important issues that are often overlooked in the pursuit of global citizenship as an outcome of internationalization of the curriculum.

What is the Role of Mobility?

Mobility is still the main focus of many institutional approaches to internationalization. This is in part because mobility is easy to translate into numbers, percentages, and targets. Measurable targets are required for the rankings of universities nationally, regionally, and globally. However, even if the ambitious goals set by the Ministers of Education of the Bologna signatory countries are met, around 80 percent of students will not be able or willing to study abroad. This highlights the importance of the "at home" component of internationalization, which not only looks at the outcomes, impact, and quality of internationalization, but is focused on internationalized learning outcomes for all students instead of the mobility of the minority. This raises the question: "How can we shift, in many institutions, from an almost exclusive focus on mobility for the elite to a focus on curriculum and learning outcomes for all students, mobile or not?"

How Does Context Influence Curriculum Internationalization?

Institutional mission, ethos, policies, and priorities influence approaches taken to internationalization. The local context—the social, cultural, political, and economic conditions—provides opportunities and challenges for internationalization of the curriculum. National accreditation requirements for registration in professions often focus on local legislation and policy. Different national and regional contexts provide different options for internationalization of the curriculum. The global context is also important. Globalization has contributed to increasing the gap between the rich and the poor of the world, and the exploitation of the "South" by the "North." The domination is not only economic, it is also intellectual: the dominance of Western educational models, what research questions are asked, who will investigate them, and if and how the results will be applied. Discipline communities are a strong driver of approaches to content selection, teaching, learning, and curriculum design in the national and global contexts. Critical decisions about whose knowledge will be included in the curriculum and how to teach and assess learning, are determined by the discipline community. Disciplinary, institutional, local, national, regional, and global factors interact in different ways to facilitate and inhibit, drive, and shape approaches to internationalization, including the way in which learning outcomes are defined, taught, and assessed. Hence, we see approaches to internationalization of the curriculum that are both similar and different within and across disciplines.

Coherent and connected approaches to international education, which address epistemological, praxis, and ontological elements of all students' development, are urgently needed.

How Do We Define Internationalization of the Curriculum?

Can we come to some international, if not global, agreement on at least the general characteristics of the concept and the process of internationalizing the curriculum? This definition needs to be broad enough to allow context sensitive, discipline-specific interpretations, that are detailed enough to ensure key components of the curriculum are addressed and all students are influenced and included. The definition by Betty Leask (2015) addresses these points: "Internationalization of the curriculum is the process of incorporating international, intercultural and global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods and support services of a program of study."

A Shifting Focus

These unresolved questions highlight a shifting focus in approaches to internationalization—away from ad hoc, marginal, and fragmented activities toward broader, more diverse, and more integrated and transformative processes. Although there is still a strong focus on the abroad side of internationalization, there is an ever stronger call for attention to the internationalization of the curriculum at home. There is increasing recognition of the need for institutions to pay more attention to involve more, and even all, students in internationalization. The focus is, however, shifting slowly and more is imagined than achieved.

Internationalization is not a goal in itself but it is a means to enhance the quality of the education, research, and service functions of higher education. The context influences the why, what, and the how of internationalization; therefore, the way in which internationalization of the curriculum is interpreted and enacted, is both similar and different across disciplines and fields of study. There is no one model of internationalization fit for all higher education systems, institutions, and disciplines. ■

Europe Calling: A New Definition for Internationalization at Home

Jos Beelen and Elspeth Jones

Jos Beelen is Chair of Expert Community Internationalisation at Home, the European Association for International Education, The Netherlands. E-mail: j.beelen@hva.nl. Elspeth Jones is Emerita Professor of the Internationalisation of Higher Education at Leeds Beckett University, UK, and Honorary Visiting Fellow at the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy. E-mail: ej@elspethjones.com.

In recent discussions on the internationalization of higher education, the constant introduction of new terms and definitions has rightly been criticized. Although the authors are fully aware of this, they consider that the importance of clarifying the concept of internationalization at home overrides the urge to limit the number of definitions. They have recently proposed a new definition of internationalization at home. Although defining it does not guarantee its implementation, since there are fundamental challenges to be overcome, it is hoped that this redefinition might bring implementation a step closer.

Continued and Growing Attention to Internationalization at Home

The concept of internationalization at home plays a useful role in certain contexts, particularly where the emphasis of internationalization efforts has traditionally been on mobility. It is increasingly clear that mobility can bring substantial benefits to participants, and countries around the world are seeking to increase the number of students taking part. However, it is also recognized that mobile students will continue to make up a relatively small proportion of the student body, and internationalization at home is a convenient term to designate internationalization activity aimed at the whole student body. Now that internationalization at home has, since 2013, been included in the European Commission's education policy—*European higher education in the world*—it might even be said that it has gained momentum and has moved to the center of the debate on the internationalization of higher education.

"Internationalization at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students, within domestic learning environments."

Internationalization at home is now also on its way to becoming an item in the educational policies of European Union member states; e.g., the two Nuffic studies published in 2014 in the Netherlands were intended to form the basis for a Dutch national policy for internationalization at home.

It seems that, for once, policy is following practice. In the Netherlands, 76 percent of universities have already included internationalization of home curricula in their policies. For Europe, the percentage is somewhat lower at 56 percent, as we learn from the recently published *EAIE Barometer*. It is not simply about policy-making, however. Most European universities claim to be undertaking activities to implement internationalization at home. According to *Trends 2015*, the recently published survey of the European University Association, 64 percent of European higher education institutions are doing so.

Conceptual Fog

With the attention on internationalization at home increasing, it is all the more important that the concept is understood clearly, and shared understanding is not simply as-

sumed. The original definition of internationalization at home, dating from 2001, was not very helpful: "Any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility." The confusion centers around the overlap between internationalization at home and internationalization of the curriculum as it has developed as a concept, particularly in Australia and the United Kingdom.

Internationalization of the curriculum, on the other hand, refers to dimensions of the curriculum regardless of where it is delivered. In this sense it may include mobility for the students that choose that option, or it can refer to curriculum for transnational or other forms of cross-border education. The confusion over the two terms is also reflected in surveys. The *EAIE Barometer,* for instance, includes both concepts as items in the same question on content of internationalization policies.

Other Implementation Issues

Even when the conceptual fog lifts, a big challenge remains: supporting academics so that they can capture intended internationalization in learning outcomes, plan assessment, and design learning environments that enable students to achieve intended learning outcomes. This is the system that underlies the European quality label CeQuInt, established in 2015. The articulation of these outcomes is a crucial task. When we see in the *4th Global Survey* of the International Association of Universities that the internationalization of learning outcomes is booming, in fact this is mostly at the institutional level. At that level, it is easy to pay lip service to introducing outcomes for international and intercultural learning, since that is not where they are assessed. The real challenge is to contextualize internationalized learning outcomes in individual programs of study and support academics in crafting outcomes and assessment. For this, they need support from both educational and internationalization experts. The new definition hopefully contributes to reaching a common understanding of internationalization at home, which may assist this challenging task.

The new definition—coined by the authors and proposed in a 2015 publication, *The European Higher Education Area: Between critical reflections and future policies states:* "Internationalization at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students, within domestic learning environments."

The definition stresses inclusion of international and intercultural aspects into curricula in a purposeful way. This implies that adding or infusing random internationalized elements or electives would be insufficient to internationalize a program. It also emphasizes the role of internationalization for all students in all programs and does not simply rely on mobility to offer international and intercultural perspectives. In talking of "domestic learning environments," the definition makes it clear that these may extend beyond the home campus and the formal learning context to include other intercultural and/or international learning opportunities within the local community. These may include working with local cultural, ethnic, or religious groups; using a tandem learning system or other means to engage domestic with international students; or exploiting diversity within the classroom. It also includes technology-enabled or virtual mobility, such as through Collaborative Online International Learning.

It must be highlighted once more that these contexts may be seen as learning environments, but it is the articulation and assessment of internationalized learning outcomes within the specific context of a discipline which will allow such environments to be used as a means of achieving meaningful international and intercultural learning. ■

Internationalization of the Curriculum and the "New Normal": An Australian Perspective

Craig Whitsed and Wendy Green

Craig Whitsed is Senior Lecturer at the Centre for University Teaching and Learning at Murdoch University, Australia. E-mail: c.whitsed@murdoch.edu.au. Wendy Green is Senior Lecturer, Higher Education, at the Tasmanian Institute of Learning and Teaching at the University of Tasmania, Australia. E-mail: w.j.green@utas.edu.au.

The adjective "normal" is often used to describe the present state of conditions, in colloquial terms, as being acceptable or okay. However, "the trouble with normal is it always gets worse"—or so wrote the Canadian folk singer-songwriter Bruce Cockburn in 1993, reflecting on the social and political conditions of the period, which coincides with the beginnings of the modern era of internationalization of higher education.

The Need to Problematize the Normal

In the context of higher education and the internationalization of the curriculum, perhaps it is less a case of the normal getting worse, and more a case of needing to problematize the normal in new and potentially challenging ways.

If international education is to remain relevant, it must be critically reflective, as we will elaborate.

Over the past three decades, the world has witnessed seismic shifts in technology, communications, scientific advancement, and sociopolitical structures. Paradoxically, globalization has simultaneously narrowed and widened, captured and liberated, constrained and afforded the social imaginary and accompanying opportunities at the national and individual level. During this time, globalization has influenced and shaped the world in new and often unpredictable ways; this is no less evident than in the higher education sector.

This disruptive force, as some have termed globalization, challenges us to reconsider the assumptions that have come to underpin the normal in the rationales, approaches, and practices for learning and teaching in universities. As globalization's transformative processes assert greater influence, it is important to reflect more critically and purposefully on what has come to be the "new normal." One definition, which suggests what the "new normal" refers to, comes from the Urban Dictionary: "The current state of being after some dramatic change has transpired. What replaces the expected, usual, typical state after an event occurs. The new normal encourages one to deal with current situations...."

As globalization's transformative processes assert greater influence, it is important to reflect more critically and purposefully on what has come to be the "new normal."

Learning and Teaching for a Globalized World

The world is globalized—this is a 21st century reality. Yet, there is little understanding of how the processes and products of globalization are shaping, and can potentially shape, university teaching and learning.

As one response to the changing global reality, the International Education Association of Australia's Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC) Special Interest Group hosted a forum in Melbourne (July 2, 2015), entitled *Learning and Teaching for a Globalised World: Internationalisation of the Curriculum*. In his keynote, "Internationalization of the Curriculum: The Challenges of the New Normal," Fazal Rizvi, Professor in Global Education Studies at Melbourne University, invited the audience to reconsider the dominant and enduring assumptions, which have framed understandings about international students, international engagement, and approaches to internationalization of the curriculum during the past three decades. According to Rizvi, these hegemonic assumptions of the world—grounded in what was once normal—shaped the early ideas about the role, function, and purpose of international education, and about international students and how they should best be taught and integrated into the university system and structures. In the Australian context, where an economic rationale has driven the recruitment of incoming international students, much of this focus has been remedial. Institutions and academics recognized the diverse learning styles of international students and moved to ensure that they were accommodated, supported, and ultimately assimilated. While the widespread development of "internationalization of the curriculum" policies in Australian universities has supported the inclusion of international content into course material and the recognition of cultural diversity, it has also supported the dissemination of the dominant (heavily Anglo-Europeanized) knowledge and skills for participation in the global knowledge economy, on the assumption that this is what international students desired and lacked. As a consequence, there has been a tendency to problematize international students in Australian universities.

Rizvi argues that while these assumptions continue to dominate internationalization discourses, strategies, and practices prevalent in Australian universities, it is now time to problematize and challenge the assumptions about what is considered "normal."

Problematizing Normalized Assumptions

Globalization—with its disruptive shifts in technologies, coupled with the growth of an aspirational middle class in the "global South" and increasingly porous national borders world-wide—should prompt us to reconsider the dominant "international student" construct. Rizvi asserts the normal framing of international students, reflected across government and university policy and in empirical research, propagates assumptions of international students as "national beings" who need to be made into "international beings." In other words, he says, these students are viewed as a kind of cultural *tabula rasa*. Early approaches to internationalization of the curriculum, which largely cast international students in deficit terms, are challenged by the realities of the globalized new normal, where even the remotest village in India (or Australia) is made "local," and prospective students can build connections with, and knowledge about, universities and their locales long before their arrival.

Responding to the New Normal

Since Hans de Wit and Jane Knight wrote *Strategies for In-*

ternationalization of Higher Education: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives in 1995, Rizvi observes that new realities have emerged, which demand a response within the curriculum. These new realities include increasingly diversified communities; increased cultural exchange; hybridization of peoples, cultures, and practices; new patterns of interconnectivity; "place polygamy;" increased capability to remain connected transnationally; and shifting notions of citizenship. Globalization and digitization have influenced the world in profound and subtle ways, but as yet universities have moved slowly to respond. Today's international students are not the same as the early pioneers that came before them. Technologies such as Skype are instantly and constantly connecting them with their parents and friends in their homes, villages, and towns. Some have experienced travel or study abroad prior to commencing their university education, but all have had virtual encounters with the broader world. Twitter, Weibo, and Whatsapp, for example, are bringing our world to them in new, exciting, and often perplexing ways.

Internationalization of the Curriculum: Imagining New Possibilities

In her 2009 article, "Using Formal and Informal Curricula to Improve Interactions Between Home and International Students," Betty Leask defined "internationalization of the curriculum" as the "the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the preparation, delivery and outcomes of a program of study." Importantly, this definition frames IoC as an ongoing process, which involves and changes all students through strategies that enable them "to become more aware of their own and others' cultures." As such, it represents an open invitation to engage in the domain of the transformative, i.e., the potential of becoming. Moreover, in our 2015 publication, *Critical Reflections on the Internationalisation of the Curriculum: Reflective Narrative Accounts from Business, Education and Health,* we argue that in order for the transformative potential of IoC to be realized, it must involve and change individual faculty (academics), their disciplines, and their institutions. It is now time, we hope, for a new "imagining [of] as yet unrealized possibilities" across all levels of the university as they engage with their curricula.

In the context of the internationalization of the contemporary curriculum it is not so much that normal is becoming worse, as it is in danger of losing relevance. In the new normal, each teacher and each student is both knowledgeable and "ignorant," and has much to learn from the other. According to Michael Singh, knowledge and ignorance can intermingle productively in our "new normal" classrooms: by acknowledging ignorance, we can stimulate the production of knowledge through intercultural dialogue and debate, and in turn, create new fields of ignorance. To remain relevant, we need to imagine the rich potential that the new, highly mobile, highly interconnected "normal" affords and respond reflexively, with minds open to ignorance and knowledge.

■

Faculty and International Engagement: Has Internationalization Changed Academic Work?

Douglas Proctor

Douglas Proctor is a PhD candidate in international higher education at the University of Melbourne, Australia, and a member of the International Education Association of Australia Research Committee. E-mail: dproctor@unimelb.edu.au.

Scholars, practitioners, and professional bodies in international education might not agree on what internationalization is, but they all concur that the involvement of faculty is crucial to its success. Certainly at an institutional level, with the adoption of comprehensive strategies for internationalization, faculty are now actively encouraged to reconsider their work in a new light. However, it remains unclear to what extent the internationalization of higher education has influenced or transformed the work undertaken by academic staff.

Changes to the Academic Profession

Internationalization is considered to be one of the most transformative contemporary influences on higher education, its institutions, and communities, including teaching and research faculty. With faculty lying at the heart of the generation, application, and dissemination of knowledge, it is therefore reasonable to expect that internationalization has influenced the patterns of faculty work in higher education.

Over the last quarter century, two major international surveys of the academic profession—the 1992 Carnegie study and the 2007 Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey—have sought to collect data on the attitudes of faculty toward their work, including some of its international dimensions. By virtue of methodology, these two studies have focused on aspects of internationalization that can be read-

ily measured, such as patterns of faculty mobility. Where feasible, longitudinal comparisons have been sought between the two studies, although the relative lack of focus on international dimensions in the earlier Carnegie study has not facilitated this task.

Looking at the 2007 CAP survey alone, the principal findings in relation to the internationalization of the academy are based on a number of proxy indicators. These include personal characteristics, such as country of birth, current citizenship, and the place of origin of the respondent's highest degree level qualification. While analysis of these proxy indicators has enabled conclusions to be drawn in relation to the mobility and migration of faculty, as well as looking for possible patterns of generational change, the indicators provide little insight into faculty opinions about internationalization or their rationales for participating in international activities—let alone the possible effects of internationalization on academic work.

With over half of the available variables relating to academic mobility and migration, the CAP survey did, however, show a marked bias toward the international mobility of faculty as a vector for internationalization. This presupposes that the internationalization of faculty can be described by their mobility, and likewise that the cross-border movement of faculty is a significant component of their internationalization.

Faculty Responses to Internationalization

Moving beyond the international mobility of faculty (which has been a generally accepted practice in academia for centuries), various empirical studies have sought to confirm key drivers and barriers to faculty engagement with internationalization. Principally conducted in North America, these studies have outlined a range of motivating and resistance factors for faculty and have shown that institutional and disciplinary contexts are key determinants in shaping academic behavior in this area.

While senior leadership has been distinguished as an influencing factor on the internationalization of faculty (for example, in providing clarity for faculty on the nature of their involvement), many of the direct motivating factors for faculty to engage with the international dimensions of academic work relate to personal or intrinsic characteristics, such as prior personal or professional experience in an international context. Faculty appear to be motivated by rationales for internationalization focused on the "greater good," rather than by economic factors. Current involvement with international activities also leads to a greater perception of the importance and benefit of those activities.

Nevertheless, a wide range of individual resistance factors and obstacles to faculty international engagement has also been identified. Many of these can be framed in terms of institutional support for the international engagement of faculty, with barriers including the nature of academic employment policies, incentives for staff involvement, workload and time management issues, limited funding, lack of support personnel, and the availability of relevant professional development. Other resistance factors derive from personal rather than institutional barriers, such as fear of the future, a hesitancy to collaborate internationally, or an unwillingness to question the dominant international paradigms of a particular discipline for fear of censorship by colleagues.

However, the most common barrier to the active engagement of faculty with internationalization derives from the variable understandings and multiple definitions of internationalization which are in use. This fluidity in the ways in which individuals understand and make sense of internationalization, both among faculty and between faculty and their institutions, has been found to be a significant impediment to the international engagement of faculty.

However, the most common barrier to the active engagement of faculty with internationalization derives from the variable understandings and multiple definitions of internationalization which are in use.

Interestingly, but perhaps unsurprisingly, earlier studies into faculty engagement with internationalization have focused almost uniquely on the internationalization of teaching and learning, rather than on the internationalization of research or other aspects of academic work. Although growing sophistication in the analysis of citation data is now able to provide a measure of the changing exposure of faculty to international research collaboration, little macro-analysis of these data is currently available. Similarly, it is unclear how faculty engagement with the international aspects of research is connected to the internationalization of teaching and learning, and whether either aspect of internationalization has actually served to change academic work.

Internationalization and Academic Work

Although analysis of research citation data may highlight changing patterns of faculty work in terms of international collaboration, earlier studies into faculty engagement with

internationalization do not always shed new light on the ways in which internationalization has changed or influenced academic work. Furthermore, analysis of survey data on the academic profession suggests that the internationalization of higher education may have been more rhetoric than reality, given limited changes to demographic patterns and faculty behaviors over the 15 years between 1992 and 2007.

What is clear, however, is that the international strategies of many institutions now envisage a holistic or comprehensive approach to internationalization across all areas of activity. These strategies assume the active involvement of faculty, although it remains to be seen whether faculty are motivated to adjust their work in response, and whether particular levers are likely to influence this next phase of faculty internationalization. ■

Building an Inclusive Community for International Students

Rachawan Wongtrirat, Ravi Ammigan, and Adriana Pérez-Encinas

Rachawan Wongtrirat is Assistant Director for International Education Initiatives in the Office of International Programs at the University of North Carolina, Charlotte, US. E-mail: rwongtri@uncc.edu. Ravi Ammigan is Director of the Office for International Students and Scholars at the University of Delaware, Newark, US. E-mail: rammigan@udel.edu. Adriana Pérez-Encinas is a lecturer and researcher in higher education and business organizations at the School of Business and Economics, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain. E-mail: adriana.perez.encinas@uam.es.

With the desire to connect campuses to the world, institutions of higher education are enrolling increasing numbers of international students, with a view to enhancing global perspectives and enriching the collegiate environment for the entire campus community. At the same time, the demand from the international student population has also increased. Project Atlas, conducted by the Institute of International Education, indicates that there were 2.1 million international students worldwide in 2001, with international student enrollment doubling to 4.5 million by 2012, representing an annual growth rate of almost 6 percent. Among the competitors for the global market share, the host countries with the highest number of enrolled international students were the United States (886,052), the United Kingdom (481,050), China (356,499), France (295,092), and Germany (282,201). Although these numbers are good news for higher education at large, at an institutional level, international student enrollment often increases without adequate consideration of how the growth in enrollment will affect the campus capacities to serve and assist these students.

Enrolling international students, from either a degree mobility or credit mobility perspective, comes with institutional responsibilities regarding their development and success. The authors believe that international student support services and a positive international student co-curricular experience are essential for the successful creation of an inclusive community for international students. Although we may assume that a higher number of international enrollments would be better supported with enhanced international student support and services on a particular campus, this is not necessarily the case. The challenge to providing suitable services is that, although the international student population is conflated under the label "international students," there is great diversity among the students, who come from various countries around the world, and this needs to be taken into account.

International Student Support Services

Provision of student support services is of primary interest in the development of a strong international student program. With the number of internationally mobile students rapidly increasing, it is important that support services for these students grow similarly.

Successful management and operation of support services for international students can validate an institution's commitment to campus internationalization and to providing quality services. Internationalization itself is one indicator of quality in higher education, as Hans de Wit points out in the 2011 book, *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalization of Higher Education*, but it is not the only one. An institution that recognizes the value of enrolling international students on its campus must also recognize that it has an ethical responsibility to provide a range of support services that enhance international students' well-being and ensure their success. According to the European Union's Erasmus Impact Study (2014), the increase in the number of incoming and outgoing students through Erasmus has led to an increased awareness of the necessity of providing support services and streamlining administrative procedures. At many universities, this has led to the establishment and/or further strengthening of support services for outgoing and incoming students.

There is a variety of organizational structures for international student support services and there is no one

best model that each campus should follow. Some institutions trust that campus internationalization works best if international activities are united under one international umbrella, while others believe decentralization works best for their campus and political environment. Regardless of organizational structure, international education activities are generally the same across the board, although there are differences from country to country and from campus to campus. The authors argue that an institution should consider three factors that impact institutional support services for international students: hiring international education professionals, allocation of resources for program operation and management, and professional development for staff.

International Student Co-Curricular Experience

An inclusive community refers to a community that provides a welcoming environment in which its members feel connected, safe, and experience a sense of belonging. Student engagement in co-curricular activities can be a powerful instrument that affects international students' sense of belonging and success. Many campuses, therefore, purposefully implement and develop student engagement programs, with the aim of building an inclusive community for international students. The authors argue that high-impact international student programming should be developed with at least two main objectives: international student engagement and retention; and international education and global connection. An administrator whose primary role is to respond to the needs of international students' extra-curricular activities should consider four key components: cultural and social involvement, educational aspects, personal and/or professional development, and global leadership experience.

Provision of student support services is of primary interest in the development of a strong international student program.

Examples of international student extra-curricular programming are clearly seen at Old Dominion University (US), the University of Delaware (US), and the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Spain). Programs focusing on international student engagement and retention include welcome receptions, field trips and excursions, weekly coffee hour, ice-cream socials, residence life mixers, and Erasmus socials. Educational programs at these three institutions include orientation programs, intercultural communication training, academic skills workshops, and athletics sessions. Personal/professional development programs include workshops on resumé writing, time management, study skills, employment options, and writing a research paper. Programs on global leadership experience include access to an international student advisory board and global mentorship. Other programs that focus on international education and global connection encompass international festivals, film screenings, and events celebrating local holiday traditions. Educational programs include global cafés, invited speakers, international education week, essay contests, and Erasmus in Schools programs. On the personal/professional development side, programs include presentations by international educators, university fairs, and events dealing with international etiquette. Global leadership experience is supported by global ambassadors programs and student leadership programs.

Conclusion

An inclusive international student community can be created as long as an institution is committed to developing a strong international student affairs environment on campus. Ultimately, an institution that desires to connect the campus to the world by enrolling international students must also help them succeed and retain them, in order to continue the engagement. Effective international student services and extra-curricular activities can be powerful and have a strong impact on international students' overall experience, development, and success. While focusing on services and program implementation and development, it is also important that international educators take account of student engagement by allowing international students to have input into the programs created for them. With experience, institutions have acquired more professionally trained staff, and allocated more offices and resources to support services and extra-curricular activities for international students. Finally, when evaluating services provided by international student support offices and when advocating future funding, it is important that international educators carry out critical assessment of international programs and the international student experience. ■

Outward Mobility of Saudi Students: An Overview

MANAIL ANIS AHMED

Manail Anis Ahmed is an international higher education management professional with experience working with institutions in the United States, South Asia, and the Middle East. She is the Head of Global Resource Development for Habib University, a private liberal arts university in Karachi, Pakistan. E-mail: manailahmed@gmail.com.

Since the earliest group of six Saudi students was sent by King Abdul Aziz to acquire higher education in Cairo in 1927, Saudi Arabia has come very far in terms of outward student mobility at the university level. The country's first university was not established until 1957, so for many decades prior to this, and indeed until the current time in certain fields, Saudi students have had no choice but to head overseas for a university education. Both the government and private citizens have been conscious of this need and have committed substantial sums of money—and corresponding amounts of energy and effort—to educating university students overseas.

The Saudi Scholarship Program

The most noteworthy aspect of Saudi university students' outward mobility has been the custodian of the Two Holy Mosques Scholarship Program. This has been a multi-million dollar undertaking—and arguably the largest national scholarship program worldwide. Launched by the late King Abdullah in 2005, this program formalized the longstanding and already active outward flow of Saudi students to universities worldwide. It aimed to send 50,000 Saudi men and women to higher education institutions overseas. Renewed with the subsequent five-year Saudi development plan in 2010, it has to date educated a far greater number of citizens than was earlier envisioned.

The most recent time frame for which the Saudi government has made numbers publicly available is the Saudi statistical yearbook from the Hijri year 1433–1434, corresponding to the academic year 2012–2013. These include statistics for general demographics, health, social services, transportation, communications, water, energy, the labor market, and so on. A substantial section deals with education, within which higher education both inside and outside the country is addressed. In total, for the academic year 2012–2013, almost 200,000 Saudi students were overseas to acquire higher education (199,285 to be exact). Of these, a staggering 165,908 were funded by government scholarships, with the rest being privately funded.

Saudi Female Students Abroad

The yearbook provides statistics for both males and females. One of the most remarkable things about the breakdown of students by gender is the substantial proportion of Saudi students studying abroad who are female (150,109 males and 49,176 females—roughly a 3:1 ratio). It is a testament to the Kingdom's commitment to education for women that the program generously sponsors an accompanying male relative for every Saudi female awarded a scholarship. The Saudi cultural bureaus and missions in the host countries provide orientation and assistance to these citizens at every stage of the educational process. This has been a creative way to ensure that Saudi females can receive the same world-class education as their male counterparts, without ruffling religious feathers or upending the status quo. The cultural and social expectations of Saudi females are thus upheld, while they avail themselves of world-class educational opportunities.

Breakdown by Destination Country

Saudi students travel to more familiar systems such as the United States, Britain, Canada, and Australia—but also to European countries, such as the Netherlands, Germany, and Italy, and indeed many countries in Asia, such as China, India, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, and Japan. In addition, there is a substantial number of Saudi students studying in other Arab countries, such as Egypt, Lebanon, and Jordan. The overwhelming majority of students predictably head to English-speaking countries, with the United States being the single host country with the largest influx of Saudi students at any given time, with Britain following close behind.

Breakdown by Field of Study

Writing in 2009, the Undersecretary for Scholarships at the then Ministry of Higher Education, Abdullah bin Abdul Aziz Al-Mousa, reflected on the purpose of Saudi scholarships to foreign universities being to "train and develop Saudi human resources with the aim of enabling them to become competitive in the labor market and scientific research, and provide key support to public and private Saudi universities." This has been ensured, according to him, by highlighting fields critical for the country's economic development, and encouraging Saudi students to undertake programs of study within them.

Consequently, the Saudi government encourages scholarships in medical/health and engineering sciences, followed by information/communication, computer science, and basic sciences. Business studies—in subjects such as accounting, management, finance, e-commerce, insurance, marketing, and regulatory law—are also encouraged, however; this field is favored more by self-funded students

coming from entrepreneurial and industrial backgrounds. Therefore, when viewed by subject breakdown, the largest single field of study turns out to be business and management—with engineering and related sciences following close behind. The third predominant field of study is medical and health-related sciences, the fourth being informatics. Quite surprisingly, over 7,000 Saudi students were enrolled in humanities subjects in 2012 2013, another 3,644 in the social sciences, and 1,496 in the arts. However, a deplorably low number undertook teacher training (a mere 1,899), which would be a contributing factor to why the overall quality of teaching in the Saudi state educational system is slow to improve. On the other hand, though low, enrollments in environmental protection studies, agriculture, forestry, fish farming, productivity and manufacturing industries studies, science education, and press and media studies, indicate important steps in the right direction for the Kingdom.

The most noteworthy aspect of Saudi university students' outward mobility has been the custodian of the Two Holy Mosques Scholarship Program.

Breakdown by Academic Level

Within higher education, Saudi students abroad are clustered for the most part at the bachelor's degree level (60 percent). Some 24 percent are studying for their master's degrees, and another 5 percent toward their doctorate. Of the total number of scholarship recipients, the government sponsors a substantial proportion (8 percent) for fellowships and other advanced professional training. The remaining take up studies for associate degrees, intermediate and higher diplomas, and other training programs.

Implications of Outward Student Mobility

The social and cultural impact of this massive student movement outward is quite clearly evident to any resident of the Kingdom. Briefly, the country has changed and is changing rapidly as a result of this internationalization of higher education. It has seen a sharp increase in entrepreneurship, new ideas, and new institutions of all sorts, as Saudi students return to their home country. Workforce localization is slowly taking place and Saudi citizens are on track to gradually replace the expatriate professional labor force. However, much depends on the continuation of the scholarship program in the years to come. With the passing of King Abdullah and the merger of the ministries of education and higher education by King Salman, it remains to be seen whether the program will continue in its current form, or be subsumed into new priorities and ultimately new realities for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. ■

Past, Present, and Future of Higher Education Internationalization in Russia

Anna Chamchiyan

Anna Chamchiyan is a PhD candidate and works as the head of the Department for Academic Mobility and International Programs at Ulyanovsk State Technical University, Russia. E-mail: a.chamchiyan@gmail.com.

Modern research works in the field of the Russian higher education development and internationalization are full of contradictions. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Russia takes second place in the world in the absolute number of higher education students and is one of four top countries (along with the United States of America, India, and China) hosting more than 40 percent of the worldwide higher education student body. But providing a comprehensive evaluation of processes taking place in the Russian higher education system, particularly of the internationalization of Russian higher education, is difficult due to a lack of adequate resources and a manifest disagreement between ambitions and facilities of the Russian higher education system and the actual level of its higher education internationalization and competitiveness.

In the 20th century, Russian higher education (or Soviet higher education during the period of the Soviet Union) was considered to be one of the strongest academic structures in the world. Now Russia's leading universities are not even listed in the top 100 of the world's best universities, although some universities have maintained recognition of excellence in some specific fields of study, such as physics and mathematics. To understand the nature of changes taking place in Russian higher education in the context of general globalization and higher education internationalization, we should take a look at the genesis and the history of the internationalization of higher education in Russia.

First Internationalization Initiatives

Higher education internationalization in Russia covers the last 70 years, starting from the period following World War II. Between 1950 and 1960, as a result of the movement toward independence in various countries around the world, countries with developed economies contributed to the training of professionals for former colonies—by means of academic mobility, teaching international students, and developing specific educational programs. This was the case in the East as well as in the West. The most significant example in the Soviet Union was the establishment of the Peoples' Friendship University in 1960 dedicated to the education of students from all over the world. Taking into account the geopolitical context of that time, mostly students of socialist countries from Asia, Latin America, and Africa studied in the Soviet Union. Only 3.2 percent of all international students in the Soviet Union came from North America and Europe.

Worldwide recognition of scientific and academic achievements of Soviet universities and academies of sciences allowed the Soviet Union to remain extremely competitive internationally.

Increasing Internationalization During the Soviet Union Era

During the following period, from 1960 to 1991, such phenomena as international scientific competition, systematic academic exchanges, a rush for a supply of talented scientists, and wide recognition of international scientific cooperation became key factors of scientific development—not only for academic and scientific institutes such as universities and academies of sciences, but also for countries and economies. International projects in the fields of space, nuclear research, medicine, and other fundamental research areas can be mentioned as examples. Worldwide recognition of scientific and academic achievements of Soviet universities and academies of sciences allowed the Soviet Union to remain extremely competitive internationally.

At the same time, the expansion of the international dimension in higher education continued and brought some new modes of educational export, such as joint universities, academic franchise establishment, and branch development. With the assistance of the Soviet Union, 66 universities, institutes, educational centers, and field departments were established in more than 30 countries, providing education to more than 100,000 students following Soviet education standards, using Soviet Union teaching materials, and the support of seconded Soviet academic staff. Examples of these educational establishments are polytechnic universities in Kabul, Afghanistan (1963), Mumbai (formerly Bombay), India (1961–1966), Conakry, Guinea (1963), the Rangoon Institute of Technology, Myanmar (established in 1961 on the structural base of an existing college, according to the official history of the Rangoon Institute of Technology), as well as the Higher Technical School in Phnom Penh (Cambodia) and the Mining Engineering Institute in Annaba (Algeria). Branching was also common for Soviet universities—e.g., the Pushkin State Russian Language Institute had branches in 14 countries—educating thousands of Russian language teachers every year. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, most branches closed and the assistance to universities in partner countries finished. Since that time, other countries—including the United States of America, France, and the United Kingdom—have replaced the Soviet Union as the key player in many regions.

Early Russian Federation Period

The third period covered the years from 1991 to 2010. During that period higher education internationalization became a reflection of the process of globalization taking place all over the world. It also resulted in the Bologna Process of creating a European Higher Education Area, which Russia entered in 2003, and the idea of higher education harmonization in Europe stimulating the same elsewhere in the world. The development of a postindustrial society and the transfer to a knowledge economy requires, among other things, reforming the higher education system. This period was crucial for Russian higher education for various reasons, given that it had to manage internal modernization issues and adapt to Bologna requirements during critical changes in the political, economic, and social contexts of Russia, and without sufficient financial support from the government.

In terms of internationalization, Russian universities were concentrated primarily on participating in joint research projects, maintaining the existing level of international cooperation, and providing opportunities of academic mobility for students and faculty. Networking and forming effective regional and global organizations and alliances replaced double-side agreements on cooperation and degree recognition. The focus on fundamental issues of higher education internationalization and on internationalization strategy appeared only by the end of the Twentieth century as this phenomenon spread globally and be

came an objective process in the modern higher education context. The third period became an opportunity to define internationalization and recognize its value for the development of the global knowledge economy, to compare and compete, to race for internationalization numbers, and to make successful (and less successful) attempts at modeling and managing the process of internationalization within a university or a national system.

Recent Initiatives, Challenges, and Opportunities

Currently, and looking to the future, Russian higher education internationalization is full of challenges, contradictions, and promising approaches and perspectives. Its principal focus is threefold: the education of talented young people, educational export, and international rankings. At the moment the main instrument for the education of talented young people is the Global Education Program, which started in 2014 and allows at least 1,500 applicants to receive sponsorship for studying at the master's or PhD level in the world's top-ranked universities. The export of educational services is carried out according to the Education Export Concept, a Russian Federation project for the period 2011–2020, and includes not only teaching nonresident students outside Russia, but also attracting more international students to study in Russian universities through more effective recruiting strategies, modernizing university infrastructure, teaching in English, developing massive open online courses, etc. Improving the Russian higher education reputation is part of the Project 5–100, a new project aimed at maximizing the competitive position of a group of leading Russian higher education institutions in the global research and education market. According to Quacquarelli Symonds, over the 2014–2015 academic year, the universities participating in Project 5–100 significantly improved their positions in international rankings in 36 subject areas, which can be considered as the basis for moving at least five Russian universities into the top-100 world universities list by 2020.

At the same time the key task that Russian higher education institutions have to fulfill nowadays is to make internationalization a fundamental basis for every significant part of their activity that requires an international approach. In other words, there should be a clear understanding of the importance of creating comprehensive internationalization processes, policies, and strategies within each university. With the main purpose of spreading the internationalization process throughout the overall system of higher education, the internationalization of the curriculum and learning outcomes should be added to the Russian higher education development strategy to engage all students, faculty members, and administrators in the process of internationalization, and provide them with suitable instruments to learn how to study, live, and work effectively in a globalized era. ■

Changing Trends in Japanese Students Studying Abroad

Annette Bradford

Annette Bradford is assistant professor at Meiji University, Tokyo, Japan. Her research focuses in internationalization in Japanese higher education. E-mail: bradford@meiji.ac.jp.

The Japanese government has long valued international student mobility, viewing international students as prime players in its strategy for higher education internationalization, and positioning them at the center of many government-led initiatives. However, in recent years, following a dramatic decline in the number of Japanese students studying abroad and significant media focus on the inward-looking tendencies of Japanese youth, much government and higher education institution attention has turned toward outward mobility. Initiatives to increase the numbers of Japanese students overseas have begun in earnest, and, perhaps as a result, the past two years have shown an uptick in the number of Japanese students venturing abroad for academic study.

the Inward-Looking Issue

According to data compiled by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), the number of Japanese students studying abroad at higher education institutions hit a high of 82,945 in 2004. By 2010 the number had fallen to 58,010 and by 2011, the number of Japanese students overseas had declined further, reaching a low of 57,501. Around 2010, media reports, which proclaimed that Japanese students have a "Fear of Studying Abroad" and "hinder [the] nation's economic growth," became regular. These reports were bolstered by a widely reported survey conducted by the Sanno Institute of Management in 2010, which found that nearly half of the new employees at companies in Japan did not want to work overseas. Japanese students gained the reputation that they were narrow-minded and inward-looking, and not interested in overseas study.

Much of the discourse emphasizing the introverted nature of young Japanese could be a result of an over-reliance on the data pertaining to the number of Japanese students studying in the United States. Indeed, the number of Japanese students studying in the United States declined much more rapidly than did the number of students studying in other countries. Between 2004 and 2011, the number of Japanese students in the United States dropped by 53 percent. However, there were significant increases in the number of students studying in Latin America (600 percent), the Middle East (200 percent), and Asia (41percent). These figures show shifting patterns of student mobility and indicate changes in the areas of interest for students. They also suggest a Japanese student body open to new international experiences.

The overall decline in the number of tertiary students studying abroad masks other promising trends in Japanese international education. Push factors that might have once driven Japanese students overseas to seek long-term education abroad have decreased. A much more international educational experience is now available *within* Japan. There is increasing diversity in Japan, both in terms of the people living and studying within its borders and in terms of the types of higher education available. For example, more higher education institutions provide an internationally focused curriculum, and many teach courses through the medium of English. Students participating in these models of higher education are much more likely to study abroad on short-term programs, and consequently may participate in modes of overseas study that are not captured in national outbound student numbers.

Analyses of data and research reports have largely concluded that the decline in the number of students studying overseas was not the result of the students' outlook, but the result of various obstacles that simply do not incentivize study abroad. Failure of the education system to prepare students for overseas study; economic stagnation; excess enrollment capacity of Japanese higher education institutions; institutional constraints related to the academic calendar and transferring in credits earned overseas; and the hiring practices and preferences of Japanese companies, which do not advantage significant overseas experience—all of these factors have been cited as reasons for the decline in Japanese students abroad. Japanese students simply weigh the opportunities and risks of overseas study and many favor the conventional route to domestic employment.

The decreasing size of Japan's youth cohort is also often cited as a reason for the decline in the number of Japanese students overseas. However, this argument is not particularly valid when one consults university enrollment data. Despite a 20 percent drop in the total number of 18-year-olds in the general population, there has been an increase in the number of new entrants enrolling in four-year universities, and the total number of university students rose by 5 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Japanese Student Sentiment

Studies examining Japanese perspectives toward study abroad have found university students to be more positively inclined toward overseas study than popular media analysis might suggest, with students desiring intercultural experiences, improved English language abilities, and global perspectives. A recent nationally representative study of 2,004 students and new graduates conducted by the British Council found that 45 percent would like to, or have already participated in, a period of overseas study. This suggests Japanese students maybe be more favorably inclined toward study abroad than students from the United Kingdom (37 percent) or the United States (44 percent). The report concludes that student concerns about overseas study are not due to a cultural mind-set that is exclusive to Japan.

Recent Policy

The rhetoric focused on inward-looking students has, however, served as a useful tool for reinvigorating policy discussion about international student mobility. The concept has been appropriated by MEXT and other government bodies and has kick-started the implementation of initiatives designed to internationalize Japan's education system. Government funding for outbound mobility increased in 2012, and new initiatives that include collaborative mobility programs, joint degrees, credit transfer mechanisms, and scholarships for study abroad have been launched. In 2013, the Japan Revitalization Strategy announced a government target of doubling the number of students studying abroad to 120,000 by 2020. These initiatives recognize student interest and aim to reinvigorate outward mobility by removing some of the obstacles students face when deciding to venture overseas. It is too early to fully assess the outcomes of programs such as the "Reinventing Japan" project (2011), the "Tobitate!" (Leap for Tomorrow!) study abroad campaign (2013), and the TeamUp campaign (2015). Yet, the recent upturn in the number of students studying overseas indicates a promising trend. MEXT reported 60,138 Japanese nationals studying abroad in the academic year 2012–2013, and, the using a different dataset, Japan Student Services Organization figures for 2013–2014 indicate a continuing increase. ■

Coordinated German Internationalization: Broadening Perspectives

Bernhard Streitwieser, Jennifer Olson, Simone Burkhart, and Niels Klabunde

Bernhard Streitwieser is an assistant professor of International Education at George Washington University, US. E-mail: streitwieser@gwu.edu. Jennifer Olson is a post-doctoral fellow in the Department of Education at the University of Oslo, Norway. E-mail: j.r.olson@iped.uio.no. Simone Burkhart leads the Strategic Planning Division at the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). E-mail: burkhart@daad.de. Niels Klabunde is a research consultant at the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany. E-mail: nklabunde@gmx.de. *This paper is an abridged version of "Internationalization in Germany," in the* Research Study on Internationalisation of Higher Education *(IP/B/CULT/IC/2014-002) for the European Parliament: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/540370/IPOL_STU%282015%29540370_EN.pdf.*

Over the past decade, through efforts at the federal, state, and institution levels, Germany has steadily defined its goals and aligned its priorities for successfully promoting the internationalization of its higher education system. These efforts have primarily aimed at increasing Germany's institutional rankings, participating in the global circulation of talent, developing a stronger sense of European identity among citizens, and diversifying a population challenged by a low birth rate and a rapidly aging population. More recent discussions in Germany have focused on assessing the economic benefits of the growing internationalization of the country's higher education institutions, and the potential impact this will have on local and national economies.

A Shift in Focus

In a newly released report from the Stifterverband and McKinsey organizations, the focus is on the current and anticipated impact that international students will have on the German economy. The report advocates looking more closely at how universities deal with issues of retention—currently, there is a 41 percent drop-out rate before graduation in undergraduate courses; in master's level courses it is much lower, at only 9 percent—and how to improve completion rates as a way to retain a talent pool that Germany will need in the future, not to mention the 4.3 billion euros international students may add to the economy in the coming decade. More recently, the arrival of hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugees, many with advanced educational credentials and training, has further sharpened the question of how best to utilize and integrate skilled migrants. Several dozen German universities have recently announced plans to accommodate Syrian refugees by granting permission to audit courses, while their refugee status is processed.

By directly addressing the beneficial economic impact of international students in Germany, a long-dormant debate about charging international students tuition may also re-emerge, although the Stifterverband-McKinsey report only touches lightly on this question. According to the study's survey of 230 businesses, 45 percent supported the idea of charging tuition to foreign students, while 30 percent rejected it—a finding somewhat higher than the results from polls of state voters, who have continuously rejected charging higher education tuition for any students, including those from abroad. An important question is how sustainable tuition-free higher education in Germany will be in the long term.

Mobility and Beyond

Germany today is the world's fifth most attractive host country for internationally mobile students, and its higher education landscape is quickly diversifying as its population of foreign students continues to rapidly expand. Since 2010, the number of foreign students at German universities has grown substantially and now stands at 319,283, up from 244,775 five years ago. This figure combines both categories of foreign students in Germany: the so-called *Bildungsinländer*—i.e., foreign students who have generally studied in Germany and lived in the country before entering university—and *Bildungsausländer*, who are foreign students who earned their higher education credentials outside of the country before entering a university in Germany.

Germany now also sends one third of its students abroad each year, although this figure has remained somewhat stagnant over the past decade. Today, more than half (57 percent) of Germany's higher education institutions offer master's programs taught in English and aim directly at bringing international students to Germany. The government follows this up by offering attractive incentives for foreign students to stay on for longer-term employment. The most headline-grabbing element of German internationalization, however, continues to be the tuition-free higher education it offers, not only for domestic students but also international students seeking full degrees in Germany. The continued belief in education as a public right in Germany appears steadfast at a time when other countries are either introducing tuition systems or, if they already exist, increasing tuition year by year.

Defining Goals and Aligning Priorities

Internationalization in Germany can be characterized as being a more coordinated process than in most of the other education systems in Europe and beyond. This is due to the leadership and support of five powerful promoters of German internationalization: the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, the German Research Foundation, the German Rectors Conference, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. Over recent decades, the primary internationalization agendas have been set by these five federal-level players who have defined broad goals, which have then been carried out at state and local levels by agencies, research institutes, foundations, and academic institutions.

Federal, State, and Institutional Policies and Practices

The joint strategy to internationalize German higher education institutions, declared in 2013 by the federal and state-level ministers of education and science, continues to play out today in important ways. That strategy identified 9 common goals that addressed themes related to student mobility, internationalization at home, staff development, international research cooperation, increased student services, strategic frameworks for action, and targets for transnational education. At the institution level, many German universities then subsequently developed or revised their own international strategies to focus not only on national priorities—such as increasing mobility, fostering international research cooperation, and internationalizing the curriculum—but also on expanding the international profile of their own administrative staff or improving services for incoming international students and outgoing domestic students. To assist in the implementation of these strategies, in 2009 the German Rectors' Conference, with the financing and collaboration of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, created the "Audit Internationalisation of Universities" process. This audit is a 12-month service that brings together an external expert commission with an institution-appointed team to jointly evaluate the institution's internationalization process and formulate concrete recommendations tailored to its unique profile, needs, and interests.

The Excellence Initiative

Over the past decade, large amounts of public funding allocated to specified target groups for clearly defined activities have further helped to accelerate the pace and perception of German higher education internationalization. The most internationally visible of these efforts has been the multi-billion euro German *Excellence Initiative* launched in 2004 and renewed in 2012. In its second wave, this competitive grant awarded an additional 2.7 billion euros across 45 graduate schools, 43 clusters of excellence, and 11 institutional strategies to support increased internationalization activities toward developing "world-class" institutions in the international educational market. While some critics have lamented that the *Excellence Initiative* is overly responsive to the pressures of global rankings and international competition and ignores institutional diversity and access, few have questioned the initiative's success at identifying a cadre of top-level research institutions that have influenced the international perception of Germany again offering a globally competitive higher education system.

Indicators of Success

According to a recent British Council report assessing 11 countries' progress in internationalization of their higher education systems, Germany was listed as the top country, with 8.4 points out of a total of 10 in the combined criteria of openness, access and equity, quality assurance, and degree recognition. The *European Quality Charter on Mobility of 2011/2012* listed Germany as the only country, among 36, that met all four goals of its scorecard: 1) national and regional strategies and initiatives and government-based or publicly-funded bodies devoted to providing information and guidance on learning mobility; 2) publicly supported internet-based information resources; 3) publicly supported personalized services for counseling, guidance, and information; and 4) involvement of publicly supported "multipliers" to further provide information and guidance. The January 2014 Eurydice report, *Towards a Mobility Scoreboard: Conditions for Learning Abroad in Europe,* which rates the 28 EU member countries' policies of promoting higher education mobility, singled Germany out along with the Netherlands, Italy, and Austria for providing the best financial support and closest monitoring of students from disadvantaged backgrounds seeking opportunities to engage in mobility.

Financial and Thematic Challenges

As a federal higher education system, however, Germany faces definite challenges to its continued promotion of international education. Whereas its national initiatives have done much to advance the pace of internationalization domestically, there is currently no clear indication that state support for universities will continue to ensure the self-sustainability of international activities at the institutional level. The imbalance of high rates of third party funding on the one hand, and declines in basic funding for university research and teaching on the other, jeopardizes certain long-term internationalization activities. In addition, in some cases basic funding by federal states is insufficient to render a significant impact on internationalization efforts. Also, as noted, the sustainability of tuition-free university

education remains a significant open question.

Apart from these financial issues, other challenges identified by the DAAD and other observers remain to be addressed. These include ensuring that standards for quality research, instruction, and study are maintained in the face of increased competition; ensuring that the curriculum and learning experience for students who are unable to study abroad substantively incorporates elements of internationalization; adjusting the higher education admissions process in order to open up new and more diverse educational pathways for incoming students; and taking advantage of novel learning opportunities presented by new media and innovative technologies. In institutions in more rural locations, the distribution of resources necessary for attracting foreign talent and increasing services for mobility of faculty also remain unevenly distributed. Finally, the development of virtual mobility through massive open online courses and the development of satellite campuses and joint and double-degree programs have not yet made significant headway into various federal policies. Creating additional monitoring systems and research chairs for internationalization may be one way to further develop the process of internationalization in Germany, much as has been done in other large higher education systems. ■

India's Emergence as a Regional Education Hub

Mona Khare

Mona Khare is Professor at the Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education and in the Department of Educational Planning, at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, India. E-mail: monakhare@nuepa.org; mona_khare@rediffmail.com.

India's move from being a North-South recipient to being a South-South, North-South, and triangular cooperation nation is seen as the result of increasing globalization and internationalization of education worldwide. However, increasing South-South cooperation is being seen more as a fallout from the formation of regional blocs, such as the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC); the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN); BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa); the trilateral agreement between India, Brazil, and South Africa (IBSA); and the E-9 (education) initiative, whereby 9 member countries (Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, and Pakistan) have come together with support from UNESCO, UNICEF, the United Nations Population Fund, and the World Bank to promote joint commitment toward strengthening educational ties. Initiatives—such as India's "Look East" policy, and many others—have further consolidated and strengthened relations between India and its neighboring countries with similar backgrounds and facing similar challenges. As a result, India is not only emerging as an economic leader in the region but its potential as an academic leader is also being recognized.

The post-1990 liberalization policy in India had a profound influence in opening up the education sector via greater collaborations and increased academic mobility of students, researchers, teachers, and academicians. In order to provide greater impetus to internationalization, regulations have been liberalized to allow twinning arrangements with foreign universities and opening campuses abroad. There is also an increasing desire and practice in Indian education institutions of hiring professionals from foreign education systems on attractive remunerations for short-term engagements. One result of this has been a conscious drive toward harmonization of curricula, assessment methodology, and standardization and accreditation mechanisms to encourage mutual recognition of degrees and credit transfer. This move has been an influencing factor in India emerging as a regional education hub in recent years.

India: An Historic Donor

India's involvement in education cooperation with South Asian and African countries can be traced back to several initiatives. Examples include its educational aid program to Nepal in the 1950s, the Technical Co-operation Scheme (TCS) under the Colombo Plan, the Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation Scheme (ITEC) that has been functioning since 1964, and the Special Commonwealth African Assistance Program (SCAAP) through which India has provided assistance to more than 150 countries in Asia, East Europe, Africa, and Latin America. According to the Ministry of External Affairs, India spends around Rs500 million (US$11million) annually on ITEC scheme activities, training around 3,000 people in the South each year. Funding through ITEC and SCAAP together has amounted to nearly US$2 billion since their inception.

Both ITEC and its sister program, SCAAP, use the same aid modalities, but whereas ITEC reaches 142 countries across Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Pacific as well as some small island nations, SCAAP targets only African countries in the Commonwealth (currently 19). ITEC and SCAAP aid comprises five

different modalities: training of personnel in India, project aid, technical assistance, study trips, and humanitarian assistance. India provides to all African countries with which it maintains diplomatic relations a certain amount of SCAAP/ITEC units that may be converted into aid via the afore-mentioned modalities. Having said that, the work of the programs was largely limited to capacity development and technical training/education as a demand side programmatic support. It is only in the last two decades that India has started targeting neighboring nations for academic support in a broader sense.

Recent Trends and Endeavors

India's potential as an academic leader is slowly building as its international education cooperation arena widens. India is trying to leverage its comparative advantage in the region in multiple ways in order to be recognized as a rising educational hub. The newer modes of collaborative ventures are testimony to the fact that India is all set to change its image as a source nation to a sought-after destination country—more so in Asia and Africa. Numerous attempts are being made via various schemes to attract foreign students to the country. The following efforts in recent years provide a subtle insight into this new dimension.

India as a Preferred Asian Destination. Until recently, India was only recognized as a major source country as far as international student mobility was concerned, but the past few years have seen an impressive growth in the number of foreign students coming to India. From a mere 6,988 in 2000, it grew to 27,531 in 2011 and then further to 33,156 in 2012, thus registering an increase of almost 21 percent in just one year. Although students are coming from more than 150 nations, the greater number is from Asia. The 2011–2012 All India Survey on Higher Education cites the top 10 sender countries to India as being Nepal, Bhutan, Iran, Afghanistan, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Iraq, China, and the United States. These 10 together accounted for 62 percent of the total number of foreign students in the country. UNESCO statistics show that the preferred destination of a large number of SAARC nation students is India, which figures much higher than other foreign destinations. These students are from Bhutan (71 percent), Nepal (19 percent), Afghanistan (16 percent), and the Maldives (14 percent).

Most students come to India to pursue undergraduate degrees and only a small number undertake doctoral programs. The main reason for the increase in foreign students coming to India for undergraduate education may be the high pace of India's higher education expansion in the past few years—by way of opening undergraduate and professional colleges—alongside a comparatively small higher education sector in its neighboring countries. Other factors contributing to this growth are geographical closeness, similar cultural underpinnings, plus the fact that the education experience is affordable—due not just to lower fees compared with other developed nations in the West and the Asian region but also to lower living expenses.

Systematic Partnerships in the Region. Although India has equally intensified and systematized its partnerships with the developed countries of the West, its regional focus in forging larger and larger numbers of international collaborations is evident from the fact that, of the 12 educational exchange programs/memoranda of understanding (EEPs/MOUs) signed during the last three years, 8 are with Asian and African countries. These include Mauritius, Yemen, Tajikistan, Burundi, Belarus, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Republic of Korea. Not only have the number of EEPs/MOUs signed in recent years increased manifold (currently totaling 48), the majority of them are with developing Asian and African nations, which look to India for leadership.

Development of Regional Multi-Country Universities/Centers. Such centers are the outcome of an increasing number of regional associations. Two institutions that have been set up under the aegis of the two most important regional associations deserve a special mention here. These are the South Asian University, set up by SAARC member nations, and the Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development, a UNESCO Category I institute in the Asia-Pacific region, both located in New Delhi—the Indian capital city.

Distance Education Network. India's largest open university, the Indira Gandhi National Open University, has almost 300 study centers in 38 countries located for the most part in Africa, Central Asia, and the Persian Gulf region. In addition, there are many other private management and professional institutes offering programs to foreign nationals via distance education.

Campuses Abroad. A small number of Indian educational institutions have branch campuses operating abroad, for example Birla Institute of Technology and Science in Dubai; Manipal University campus in Dubai, Malaysia, and elsewhere; and the SP Jain School of Global Management in Dubai, Singapore, and Sydney. In fact, Dubai is home to some of the leading names in India. The presence of a large South Asian expatriate population in Dubai, alongside growing host nation demand, are often cited as reasons why many Indian campuses have been operative there for many years. Furthermore, the number of overseas Indian branch campuses in other countries is growing fast, according to the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. India leads

in overseas higher education provision from non-Western countries, with more than 17 campuses abroad—10 of these in the United Arab Emirates, 4 in Mauritius, and the others in Malaysia, Singapore, and countries in the West.

The scope is wide for both private as well as public institutions, to open many more such campuses abroad, given their wide acceptance in the region. At the moment, it is predominantly private education providers who are exploring greener pastures to increase their higher education market share and profit, by widening their geographical base. Private education providers charge much higher fees than their public counterparts, and the fact that there is rapid growth in education provision abroad by private Indian providers suggests that students are prepared to pay these high fees to take Indian degrees outside India.

Engagement Through Short-Term Programs/Summer Schools. In an attempt to provide opportunities to undergraduate students from other countries, the "Connect to India" program funded by the Government of India has been initiated with the aim of fostering international goodwill through young students. Selected public universities of repute have been identified to offer short-term courses by way of summer schools in different disciplines from the June–July 2014–2015 academic session onwards. The courses would aim at providing a better understanding of contemporary India, its rich artistic and cultural heritage, its economic and technological progress, and so forth. The program would include visits to historical places and opportunities of greater community interaction through participation in cultural programs, yoga classes, and so on.

Recognition of Non-Indian High School Certification. As most students coming to India intend to join bachelor's degree programs, the Government of India has already accorded equivalence to some of the most popular systems of school education in the world and continues to add to the list in order to facilitate their entry into tertiary level education.

The evaluation unit of the Association of Indian Universities has been engaged in the work of providing academic equivalence to degrees/diplomas from foreign countries for the last 88 years. The unit is carrying out this work alongside the standardized assessment of accredited foreign university qualifications for bilateral agreements for student/faculty exchange within a traditional education exchange program involving various countries, which has been ongoing for many years and has produced a constant growth of student and faculty numbers.

Conclusion

Now that India's popularity as a higher education provider in the region is growing, it is the right time for India to consolidate its newfound regional educational leadership. Moving from an undergraduate education hub to a postgraduate and doctoral hub would help India to be recognized as a leader in the knowledge creation industry. Attempts to attract more students for postgraduate and doctoral studies—by way of starting SAARC, ASEAN, and other regional research centers, promoting cross-cultural interdisciplinary studies—can go a long way in furthering regional educational ties. As most of the countries in these areas are developing and have a very limited or small higher education sector, India should explore the possibilities of greater use of Information and Communication Technology to reach out to a larger student community in neighboring countries. Some other areas that demand harmonization in a global education scenario are the development of capacities to define and implement standardization/accreditation/assessment of learning achievements, the improvement of basic numeracy and English language skills, curriculum development and innovation, the development of teaching-learning materials, and the sensitization and promotion of inclusion in classroom practices. Given the gravity of the challenge of the employability skills gaps among youth in Asia and Africa, the provision of high-quality technical and vocational education and training programs is yet another area over which India's academic leadership can have a positive influence. For all of this to become a reality and at the same time give India a comparative advantage over other neighboring nations, India needs to strategically roll out its long-term plan with far-reaching goals and specific time-bound priorities. ■

Internationalization Trends in French Higher Education: An Historical Overview

Guillaume Tronchet

Guillaume Tronchet is professeur agrégé d'histoire and research associate at the Paris Centre for 20th Century Social History. He also maintains the French blog Chroniques de diplomatie universitaire *on educpros.fr. E-mail: gtronchet@gmail.com.*

For many policymakers in France, internationalization of higher education is a new subject. "Internationalization:

It's time to invest," concludes a recent report presented in January 2015 by the French government. "It's a new challenge for France," said the organizers of the Congress of the French *Grandes Ecoles* already in 2010.

People have short memories. They have forgotten—or simply do not know—that French universities were pioneers and leaders in internationalization between the end of the 19th and the middle of the 20th century, before being outshone by the United States and some other European countries. How can this be explained? And how can history help us understand some of the current trends in French higher education policy?

From Local to Global

During the 19th century, the global academic community was fascinated by the German university model. To counteract this influence, especially after the Franco-Prussian War, French elites of the new Third Republic decided to invest in higher education, in order to divert international students and scholars from Germany. By grouping together the existing faculties of arts, sciences, medicine, and law, 15 public universities were created in 1896, with a large autonomy of action in international academic affairs.

Local initiatives were then crucial. In order to increase the number of their students, and with the help of local actors—such as mayors, regional chambers of commerce, etc., who wanted to develop tourism and other economic opportunities for their cities—French universities launched what I call in my doctoral thesis "academic diplomacy." This entailed (among other things): marketing actions to promote French universities (handbooks, posters, advertisements in the international press); French language and culture courses for international students; international summer schools (the most famous was organized by the University of Grenoble in 1899); special degrees for international students; scholarships to study abroad; and new branch campuses abroad. In this final matter, the University of Lyon was very active in the Middle East with the foundation of a law school in Beirut, while Paris turned to South America, Grenoble to Italy, Bordeaux and Toulouse to Spain. French cultural and scientific institutes were subsequently founded in Florence, Madrid, London, and Saint Petersburg in the early 20th century.

The Defeat of Univerisity Autonomy

After World War I, as Philip Altbach and Hans de Wit stated in a recent issue of *IHE*, the development of international academic relations benefited from the rise of Geneva internationalism. France quickly took the leading position in the international student market: 17,000 students came to France in 1931—i.e., about 20 to 25 percent of the total number of internationally mobile students at this time—while only 9,000 international students went to the United States, about 7,000 to Germany, and 5,000 to the United Kingdom. The percentage of international students in French universities was up to 25 percent of the total number of students. In some universities this rate even reached 80 percent—e.g., Rouen University in 1930.

At the same time, government administration became more present in the process. The Ministry of Education was first involved from the 1910s and gradually nationalized academic diplomacy. After 1920, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs also came into play, developing its own "cultural diplomacy" to compete with other nations, especially the fascist countries. As I noted in my doctoral thesis, there were frequent conflicts between actors of academic diplomacy on the one hand, and of cultural diplomacy on the other. Universities tried to preserve their autonomy without success: the international academic policy of France gradually came under the control of governmental cultural diplomacy.

The Burden of History

The second part of the 20th century did not change this legacy. There were constant conflicts inside French administrations, between actors related either to higher education offices or to foreign affairs offices. The situation was complicated in the 1960s, first by the creation of a Ministry of Culture, which wanted to get involved in cultural diplomacy, and then after decolonization by the creation of a Ministry of Cooperation, which was in charge of relations with scholarship students from the former French colonial empire. Many reforms were then enacted before creating finally, in 2010, a unique national agency: Campus France was placed in charge of international student mobility and of the promotion of French higher education abroad. This could be translated into a new start for academic diplomacy.

The fact that the French government and higher education are both intrinsically linked to the Civil Service system is also significant. What kind of international autonomy can universities enjoy in this context? It is the government that sets down the rules for all public universities regarding scholar recruitments and student enrollments, and they do not always favor internationalization. For instance, as regards scholar recruitments, no foreign scholar could be appointed to an ordinary teaching position in France, until the Edgar Faure Law in 1968; this is one of the reasons why French universities could not keep German scholars who fled Nazism in the 1930s. Even though the recruitment of foreign scholars in France recently increased to an average rate of 18 percent of the total number of new recruits each year, this is still not common: in 2004, according to Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development figures, the percentage of foreign scholars in French higher

education was 7.5, a long way from the United States (30 to 40 percent), Switzerland (35 percent), the United Kingdom (20 percent), and Norway (10.5 percent).

As for international student enrollments, the "republican consensus"—based on the principle of nondiscrimination between French and foreign students—has maintained equal tuition fees for French and international students since 1914, a fact that contributes to the international attractiveness of French higher education. Universities have nonetheless been deeply impacted by government immigration policy, which has at times closed the doors to foreign students, especially between the 1970s and the 1990s and again in 2011–2012. The effect has been such that a French political scientist talked about "the end of foreign students."

A centralized national government, numerous conflicts between elements of this government and, on occasions, enactment of restrictive immigration laws have led to a stifling of international innovation in French universities. The changing world order since the 1970s has also contributed to live down this historical tradition: the shift from internationalization to globalization has drawn public attention to private schools, especially business schools, which are more comfortable with globalization and are active in funding branch campuses abroad—according to the Cross-Border Education Research Team, about 90 percent of French branch campuses abroad are private school extensions. Instead of internationalization, which is clearly not a "new challenge," it is globalization that places French higher education today at the crossroads. Reclaiming its own history could be part of the solution. ■

News of the Centers

CHEI

The Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) wishes its founding director, Hans de Wit, all the best in his new position at Boston College and welcomes the new director, Amanda Murphy. Amanda comes from a background in modern languages in the United Kingdom, having studied French and Italian at Cambridge University. She is full professor of English Language and Translation and Vice-Head of the Department of Language Sciences and Modern Literatures at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, where CHEI is based.

A strong believer in the advantages of knowing several languages and cultures—both in cognitive and human terms—and knowing the negotiation processes that plurilingualism entails, Amanda engages with the challenges of internationalizing the classroom at home and preparing students for the international workplace, also through coordinating a master's degree in International Human Resource Management.

CHEI is pleased to announce the admission of two new PhD students. Visjna Schampers, originally from Croatia and now teaching financial management at the Saxion University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands, will explore the relationship between internationalization and Catholic higher education; and Ravi Ammigan, originally from Mauritius and now working as Director of the Office for International Students and Scholars at Delaware University in the United States, will investigate international student engagement in university support services.

Visjna and Ravi participated in October 2015 in CHEI's autumn Research Seminar that brings together 25 doctoral students and researchers from a number of different programs and centers across the world. The seminar, normally held in Milan twice a year, was held in Siena back-to-back with the International Association of Universities' (IAU) Annual Conference, "Internationalisation of higher education: moving beyond mobility."

CHEI is delighted to be participating in a new Erasmus+ project. The partners are European and Israeli and the project sets out to build a sustainable technological platform for internationalization for the development and delivery of three key activities: multidisciplinary curricula led by international teams and delivered online; an international interactive online knowledge sharing hub to promote knowledge exchange and manage joint research projects; and international academic cooperation with industry and communities for the enhancement of skills and employability of students.

A key research project in 2015 was the study for the European Parliament on Internationalisation of Higher Education, carried out in conjunction with IAU and the European Association for International Education (EAIE), which brought together a team of 30 researchers worldwide. It presents an overview of internationalization in 17 different countries. It highlights key trends, paints a future scenario, and indicates possible pathways of development as well as presenting a revised definition for internationalization of higher education—all of which, it is hoped, will help frame institutional conversations for strategic choices in internationalization. Associate Director Fiona Hunter presented the study outcomes at the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) conference in Washington in February 2015, the European Association for International Education (EAIE) conference in Glasgow in September 2015, the Canadian Bureau of International Education conference in Niagara Falls in November 2015, and together with Eva Egron-Polak of IAU on November 12 at the European Parliament.

CIHE

Associate Director Laura Rumbley represented the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at the annual conference of the European Association for International Educa-

tion (EAIE) in Glasgow, in mid-September. Laura continues to serve as chair of the EAIE's Publications Committee, and is now involved with the EAIE Knowledge Development Task Force. CIHE doctoral graduate assistant Ariane de Gayardon published an essay, under the title "The international student fee question in France," in the EAIE's 2015 "Conference Conversation Starter" publication, A Wealth of Nations.

September 29-October 1, 2015, the Center hosted Andrés Bernasconi and Daniela Véliz, director and research associate, respectively, of the Center for Research on Educational Policy and Practice (CEPPE) of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile (PUC). The main purpose of the visit was to discuss a project to be completed by CIHE and CEPPE focused on a comparative examination of internationalization in the Catholic higher education context, to be completed over the course of 2016/2017. This work is made possible by the Luksic Fund, which supports collaborative engagement between Boston College and the PUC.

Working with Reisberg & Associates and Unnivers, the Center hosted a day-long seminar at Boston College on October 6, 2015 for a group of some 50 deans and other university officials from the University of Guadalajara. The main focus of the event was internationalization of higher education and its implications for this Mexican institution.

October 28-30, 2015, director Hans de Wit and doctoral graduate assistant Ariane de Gayardon attended the 2015 annual conference of the International Association of Universities (IAU), where Hans served as chair/moderator of a plenary session. They also participated prior to the conference in the Research Seminar of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI), with Hans de Wit as co-facilitator and presenter, and Ariane giving a presentation on her doctoral research.

On October 28, 2015 Laura Rumbley presented at a meeting of the Washington International Education Group, which featured the launch of a new publication—*Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs*—jointly produced by the American Council on Education's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement and CIHE. This report is available on the ACE website: www.acenet.edu/cige. Work is also underway on the sixth installment of the ACE-CIHE series, *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders*, under the title "Engaging with Europe: Enduring Ties, New Opportunities."

November 24-27, 2015, Hans de Wit delivered a keynote address at the annual international conference of ANUIES (Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior) in Puebla, Mexico. Hans also delivered a workshop and presented on a panel.

CIHE founding director Philip Altbach and doctoral research assistant Georgiana Mihut, along with Jamil Salmi, formerly of the World Bank, co-presented on the subject of "Sage advice: The role of international advisory councils in world-class universities" at the 6th International Conference on World-Class Universities, which took place in Shanghai on November 2-3. Altbach also attended a meeting of the Russian government's "5-100 University Excellence Committee," of which he is a member, in Vladivostok, Russia. Additionally, he spoke at the University of Hong Kong and Xiamen University in China.

The Center congratulates CIHE doctoral research assistant Georgiana Mihut on her recent "EMA Star Award," one of three such awards given out in 2015 by the Erasmus Mundus Student and Alumni Association (EMA). The award highlights the best contributions of members to EMA's development and promotion.

New Publications

De Wit, Hans, Fiona Hunter, Eva Egron-Polak and Laura Howard. *Internationalisation of Higher Education.* Brussels: European Parliament, Policy Department B, Structural and Cohesion Policies, 2015. 319 pp. PDF ISBN 978-92-823-7846-5. Web site: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies.

McGrath, Simon, and Qing Gu, eds. *Routledge Handbook of International Education and Development*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2015. 496 pp. $210 (hb). ISBN 978-0-415-74754-7. Web site: www.routledge.com

Green, Wendy and Craig Whitsed, eds. *Critical Perspectives on Internationalising the Curriculum in Disciplines. Reflective Narrative Accounts from Business, Education and Health*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2015. 328 pp. $54 (pb). ISBN: 9789463000833 (pb), 9789463000840 (hb), 9789463000857 (eb). Web site: www.sensepublishers.com

Jooste, Nico, Hans de Wit, and Savo Heleta, eds. *Higher Education Partnerships for the Future*. Port Elizabeth, South Africa: Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU), 2015. ISBN: 978-1-920508-62-3

Weimer, Leasa, ed. *EAIE Conference Conversation Starter: A Wealth of Nations.* Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, 2015. 54 pp. ISBN 978-90-74721-36-3.

Dobson, Gretchen, ed. *Staying Global: How International Alumni Relations Advances the Agenda*. EAIE Occasional Paper 24. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, 2015. 147 pp. 30 (pb). ISBN 978-90-74721-39-4. Web site: http://www.eaie.org/home/publishing/order-a-publication.html

Staunton, Louise, and Ciaran Dunne. *Diverse Voices: Listening to International Students*. Dublin: Irish Council for International Students, 2015. 129 pp. ISBN 0-9539595-4-6 (pb). Web site: http://www.icosirl.ie/eng/publications.html

Center *for* International Higher Education
Boston College
Campion Hall
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3813
USA

The Center For International Higher Education (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the International Higher Education quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE Web Site

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI)

The Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) is housed at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy, Europe's largest private university. Amanda Murphy is the director of CHEI, and Fiona Hunter serves as associate director. The Centre promotes and conducts research, training and policy analysis to strengthen the international dimensions of higher education. Founded in 2012, CHEI organizes seminars, conferences, training courses and workshops; designs, conducts and commissions research; disseminates results through publications and conferences; and offers one of the only doctoral programs in the world focused on the internationalization of higher education.

Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.

Editorial Office
Center for International
Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
USA

Tel: (617) 552-4236
Fax: (617) 552-8422
E-mail: highered@bc.edu
http://www.bc.edu/cihe

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policymaker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)