



A Call to Leadership

*The Presidential Role in
Internationalizing the University*



A Call to Leadership

*The Presidential Role in
Internationalizing the University*

A Report of the NASULGC Task Force on International Education

OCTOBER 2004

Task Force on International Education

Dr. William B. DeLauder, CHAIR,
President Emeritus, Delaware State University

Dr. C. Eugene Allen
*Vice President, International Programs,
University of Minnesota*

Dr. Emily Y. Ashworth
*Assistant Provost, International Programs,
Texas A&M University*

Mr. Kerry D. Bolognese
*Director, Marine, Environmental and
International Affairs, NASULGC*

Dr. William I. Brustein
*Director, University Center for International Studies,
University of Pittsburgh*

Dr. Winfrey S. Clarke
*Associate Dean for Agriculture and Director
of Research, Virginia State University*

Dr. Madeleine Green
*Vice President, International Education,
American Council on Education*

Dr. Richard H. Herman
*Interim Chancellor, University of Illinois,
Urbana-Champaign*

Dr. John Hudzik
*Dean, International Studies and Programs,
Michigan State University*

Ms. Arlene Jackson
Director, International Education, AASCU

Ms. Miriam Kazanjian
Consultant, American Council on Education

Dr. William B. Lacy
*Vice Provost, University Outreach and International
Programs, University of California, Davis*

Dr. Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien
Chancellor Emeritus, University of New Orleans

Dr. Sandra Russo
*Director, Program Development and
Federal Relations, International Center,
University of Florida*

Ms. Kathryn St. Clair
*Executive Director, Office of the President,
University of Cincinnati*

Mr. Richard S. Stoddard
*Assistant Vice President, Federal Relations,
The Ohio State University*

Dr. Terry Tucker
*Associate Director, International Institute for Food,
Agriculture and Development, Cornell University*

Ms. Sara West Tully
*Administrative Director, Center for International
Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison*

Dr. Vivian A. Vidoli
*Dean, Graduate Studies and Research,
California State University, Fresno*

Dr. Nancy L. Zimpher
President, University of Cincinnati

Contents

Introduction	v
Executive Summary	vii
I. The Internationalization Challenge	1
■ <i>A Failing Report Card</i>	3
■ <i>Heeding the Call</i>	4
II. Four Good Reasons to Internationalize	7
1. <i>For Our Students</i>	8
2. <i>For Our Communities</i>	10
3. <i>For Our Nation</i>	12
4. <i>For Our Institutions</i>	14
III. The 3 A's of Presidential Leadership	17
IV. Articulate: Creating a Transforming Vision	19
■ <i>How will internationalization transform our students?</i>	20
■ <i>How will internationalization transform our faculty and staff?</i>	23
■ <i>How will internationalization transform our institutions?</i>	26
V. Advocate: Mobilizing Support	31
1. <i>Personal Advocacy Roles</i>	31
2. <i>Institutional Advocacy</i>	33
3. <i>Community Advocacy</i>	35
4. <i>Policy Advocacy</i>	36
5. <i>After Advocacy</i>	37
VI. Act: Leadership Action Strategies	39
■ <i>Build Capacity</i>	39
■ <i>Be Accountable</i>	42
■ <i>Forge Partnerships</i>	43
■ <i>Develop Funding Relationships</i>	45
VII. Conclusion	47
References	48



T HIS DOCUMENT IS AN INVITATION TO LEADERSHIP.

It is not another white paper on the importance of international education or report on the advantages of study abroad. Emphatically it is not a recommendation to academic leaders to add yet another priority program to the growing list of higher educational “must-do’s.”

It is a challenge to NASULGC presidents and chancellors to commit to the one significant act that has the potential to transform and enliven our institutions. This is a call to internationalize our nation’s land-grant and major public research institutions, setting the pace for change in this new century.

If we are to maintain our place at the forefront of the world’s institutions of learning, we must truly be universities and colleges of the world. To make this claim we must internationalize our mission—our learning, discovery and engagement. And it is the presidents and chancellors who must lead the charge.

It is time to act. It is time to lead.

—*NASULGC Task Force on International Education*

Executive Summary



GLOBAL LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION by American colleges and universities—a hallmark during the past century—is increasingly at risk, ironically by the very forces our institutions helped to create. Advances in technology and telecommunications and a remaking of the global economy have created a world in which interdisciplinary, cross-border research and discovery are the norm and expectations for students prepared to live, work and contribute to an interconnected world are high. Institutions who are able to prepare students-of-the-world will be the colleges and universities of the next century.

Poised for Leadership

NASULGC's state universities and land-grant colleges are both eminently qualified and aptly poised to take a leadership role in creating the new global university. Our history of recreating ourselves to serve a changing society has prepared us to lead the next wave of change as well. To do so, however, will require determined and inspired leadership by presidents and chancellors, for the challenges are great. National security concerns are affecting our ability to keep our campuses open to international student and faculty exchanges. Education-abroad programs, while increasing in number, still involve only

3 percent of undergraduates annually. Only one in 10 American students studies a foreign language. The sad truth is that American campuses have failed to internationalize at the very time it is essential to serving our students, our communities and the world.

Four Good Reasons to Internationalize

The rationale for internationalization—and by that we mean integrating international perspectives and experiences into learning, discovery and engagement—has never been more urgent:

1. **For our students** internationalization helps them to develop the global critical thinking essential to contributing as citizens of the world and competing in the international marketplace.
2. **For our communities** internationalization links them to the world, expanding opportunities for university service and engagement while also enhancing their global competitiveness.
3. **For our nation** internationalization contributes to national security and a vital economy, and prepares future world leaders who know and value American democracy.
4. **For our institutions** internationalization enlivens faculty scholarship and teaching, expands research opportunities, and provides a pathway to national and international distinction.

The 3 A's of Presidential Leadership

Let there be no mistake. Internationalization does not involve tweaking the academy around the edges. It will require substantive, transformative change at all levels. That change will be possible only with the determined leadership of presidents and chancellors. It will require a focus on the “3 A's of presidential leadership”—to articulate, advocate, and act.

Leaders must articulate a vision for internationalization—one that is right for each campus and that contributes to creating “globally competent” students, faculty and staff, and institutions.

Leaders must advocate for international education. This will involve making the case for internationalization at the personal level, throughout the institution, and among a broad range of communities (both here and abroad), as well as engaging in policy advocacy to preserve international student and faculty exchange.

Leaders must act to implement transformational change. The first priority should be the simple, yet immensely powerful act of repeatedly and consistently encouraging internationalization across campus. Leaders also will build institutional capacity and mobilize board support. They will hold themselves and the campus accountable for results. They will connect the campus internally and with international partners. And presidents and chancellors will back up internationalization with the dollars to fund the transformation and the accountability to make change happen.

Internationalization is not the latest academic fad, nor is it a simple add-on to existing practice. It is the single most important leadership challenge of the new century. NASULGC presidents and chancellors have both the responsibility and the capacity to take up the challenge and to create the new global university.

I. The Internationalization Challenge



THE CHALLENGE TO INTERNATIONALIZE HIGHER EDUCATION is not new—and has never been more urgent. As Kofi Annan, Secretary General of the United Nations, has observed, the challenges of our world today are “problems without passports” for which we need “blueprints without borders” (1998).

Advances in technology, communications, economic development, and transportation—driven in large part by the vitality of America’s colleges and universities—have created a world in which investors now transfer millions of dollars around the globe with a mouse click and the most remote village is linked by cell phone to anywhere in the world. Countries, regions, and individuals are connected as never before in our history.

The new world our institutions have helped to shape demands, in turn, new changes from higher education. Companies that face increasing competition from other nations in the race to attract scientific and high-tech talent require graduates who are at home in

“We are all students of the world we live in and today our world is more interdependent than ever before. The challenges we face in areas such as security, democratic development, economics and health cannot be addressed by any country acting alone.”

**—Colin Powell,
U.S. Secretary of State**

other languages and cultures and who can help America compete in the global marketplace. The public health, social, and environmental challenges that recognize no boundaries—like SARS and AIDS—require research expertise that crosses institutions, disciplines, and borders. The increasing diversity of our local communities requires citizens who are energized by the vibrancy multicultural perspectives add to our social fabric.

And, in the wake of 9/11 and subsequent acts of terrorism, world security demands the exchange of ideas and individuals who understand the values of peace and democracy and can provide the critical global perspectives necessary for our shared future. As Nannerl Keohane, president of Duke University notes, the imperative to understand our world well—or risk losing it—has never been clearer than it is right now (2003).

This imperative has not been lost on higher education—especially on our international peers. In 1999, recognizing the importance of education to “strengthening stable, peaceful and democratic societies,” leaders from 29 European countries signed the *Bologna Declaration* to encourage European cooperation and cross-border access for higher

education (p. 1). Calls for increased internationalization closer to home have been issued by the American Council on Education (ACE), in its user’s guide, *Internationalizing the Campus* (Green & Olson, 2003), and by NASULGC in its 2000 report, *Expanding the International Scope of Universities: A Strategic Vision Statement*. Its GASEPA Task Force report—*Globalizing Agricultural Science and Education for America*—called for a “new education environment” that would prepare students, faculty, and business leaders to operate in an increasingly competitive and globalized world (1998, p. 2).

Defining Our Terms

Internationalization: the process of integrating international and multicultural perspectives and experiences into the learning, discovery and engagement mission of higher education (Knight, 1994).

Globalization: the integration of countries and people as the result of economic, technological and knowledge advances.

International Education: the full spectrum of educational programs and practices that facilitate internationalized learning. This includes curriculum, education abroad, international research and scholarship, university engagement, and the involvement of international students and scholars on U.S. campuses.

Global Competence: the ability of faculty, staff and students not only to contribute to knowledge, but also to comprehend, analyze, and evaluate its meaning in the context of an increasingly globalized world.

A Failing Report Card

Despite broad recognition that higher education has a vital role in preparing the workers and citizens of an increasingly connected world, the internationalization scorecard for American colleges and universities is underwhelming, to say the least.

The United States falls short on virtually all indicators of international knowledge, awareness, and competence. In a National Geographic-Roper (2002) poll of geographic knowledge among young adults in nine countries, Americans finished next to last. Fewer than 25 percent of the Americans surveyed could name four countries that acknowledge having nuclear weapons.

Efforts of U.S. colleges and universities to redress these failures by encouraging education abroad and foreign-language study have been largely inadequate and sporadically effective. Despite widespread agreement that education abroad is essential to providing students and faculty with global competence—70 percent of the public believe it should be encouraged or required (Riedinger, Silver & Brook, 2002; Riedinger, Silver & Wallmo, 1999)—only a dismal 3 percent of U.S. college students in four-year programs participate in education abroad each year (Hayward & Siaya, 2001). Those who do tend to be white, female, middle class, and choose European or English-language destinations (Green & Olson).

Why don't more students participate in foreign study? Many believe that higher education itself gets in the way through inattention to the needed international dimension of curricula, failure to allocate university resources to internationalization, and overly constrained degree requirements that leave no room for international content and experiences. Neglect by faculty and advisors in educating students about the need to develop international perspectives and understanding is also a frequent problem (Hudzik, 2004).

Foreign-language study—essential to understanding other cultures both at home and in the world—is, fortunately, on the rise. Unfortunately, it is still undertaken by fewer

“More troubling is the impact that declining foreign enrollment could have in the war on terrorism. To defeat terrorism, our global military, law enforcement and intelligence capacities must be complemented with positive initiatives and programs aimed at the young people in developing nations who will guide their countries in the future. No policy has proved more successful in making friends for the United States, during the cold war and since, than educating students from abroad at our colleges and universities.”

**—Robert M. Gates, President
Texas A&M University**

than one in 10 American college students. Enrollment in foreign languages has fallen from 16 percent in the 1960s to less than 9 percent today (Welles, 2004). This decline mirrors the percentage of four-year institutions that have language-degree requirements for some students: between 1965 and 1995 that number fell from almost 90 percent to only two thirds (Engberg & Green, 2002).

The growth rate of enrollment of international students on our campuses—another marker of efforts to internationalize the academic experience—is also slowing. According to the report *Open Doors*, in 2003 the number of international students in the United States grew less than 1 percent (to 586,000) following a five-year average annual growth rate of 5 percent (Chin). Applications from graduate students are down even more: A joint survey by NASULGC, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS), and several other higher education associations found that 60 percent of the 250 responding institutions had declining graduate applications, with the top 16 responding research institutions experiencing average drops in applications of more than 27 percent (NAFSA, 2004). A follow-up survey by CGS found that some of the largest declines were from countries with historically high U.S. enrollment—China, India, and Taiwan—and in traditionally popular fields of study—engineering and the physical sciences (Brown & Syverson, 2004). This has serious implications for the graduate programs at many institutions that depend on foreign student enrollment and for the future ability of higher education to meet America’s demand for a highly qualified science and technology workforce drawn from home and abroad.

The international student elite is not forsaking education—it is going elsewhere. Reports from the British Council, an organization that promotes British universities around the world, suggest the decline in American study is mirrored by increased enrollment at universities in Great Britain, Canada, and Australia, among others. British universities, for example, are experiencing a jump of 12 to 15 percent a year in non-European student enrollment (Jacobson, 2003).

In a world that is both more competitive and less secure, higher education cannot fail in its responsibility to educate for the future—an *international* future.

Heeding the Call

America’s land-grant colleges and major public research universities are uniquely equipped to answer this call to serve an interconnected world. We have, as the authors of the 2000 NASULGC report on international education wrote, “a long history of recreating ourselves to reflect the changing nature of the society [we] were created to serve” (p. 3).

Our tradition of educational access and opportunity, our heritage of discovery in service to our communities, and our engaged partnerships provide the foundation and the template for an enlarged mission that integrates an international perspective into our ongoing mission. If, as NASULGC president C. Peter Magrath says, “international education in all of its dimensions is a mainstream obligation of universities,” it is an obligation we are historically prepared to embrace (2004). We have both the responsibility and the capacity to lead the way.

Such leadership will not result simply by adding more study-abroad scholarships or refining our international recruiting. International study must move from the periphery to the center of our institutional teaching, research, and engagement commitment. Our missions must be reframed to include global as well as metropolitan and regional communities. Our partnerships must grow in diversity, reach, and location.

In short, internationalizing our colleges and universities will require transforming our institutions—a transformation that demands the committed leadership of presidents and chancellors.

“Our world requires that higher education accept the responsibility for preparing globally educated students. We cannot fail in this responsibility.”

**—John Welty, President,
California State University,**

II. Four Good Reasons to Internationalize



THE NEED FOR GLOBALLY COMPETENT students and faculty is critical. The competition to provide an internationalized academic experience is growing. All this may be true, but why is internationalization right for individual NASULGC campuses and a challenge ripe for presidential leadership?

At its core, internationalization is the critical means whereby the quality of our academic learning, discovery, and engagement can be enhanced, broadened, and enlivened. When we integrate international perspectives, experience, and discovery into our institutions, it expands our capacity to address the challenges of the new century and the needs of the world. It enables us better to serve our students, our communities, our nation, and the academy.

1. **For our students** internationalization helps them to develop the global critical thinking essential to contribute as citizens of the world and compete in the international marketplace.
2. **For our communities** internationalization links them to the world, expanding opportunities for university service and engagement while also enhancing their global competitiveness.

3. **For our nation** internationalization contributes to national security and a vital economy, and prepares future world leaders who know and value American democracy.
4. **For our institutions** internationalization expands research opportunities, enlivens faculty scholarship and teaching, and provides a pathway to national and international distinction.

1. Internationalize—For Our Students

Being globally literate is a vital measure of the well-educated citizen and worker of the 21st century. For students to contribute and succeed today, they must not only have a broad knowledge of the world, its people, politics, and cultures, but more importantly, have developed the skills to comprehend, analyze, and evaluate that knowledge.

These skills are not gained by completing a single global studies course—no matter how well designed or taught. They are gained from an undergraduate and graduate curriculum that infuses international perspectives across all courses and majors. They are acquired by immersion in a campus culture that engages students from foreign countries in co-creating an environment of multicultural diversity. They are attained through foreign language study and in opportunities to learn and discover with other scholars around the world.

Internationalization improves learning

Internationalization of the academic experience has immediate benefits for student learning. Integrating international perspectives and foreign languages into the curriculum challenges students to apply their knowledge more broadly to global situations. Learning with students from around the world enriches classroom discussion and facilitates the sharing of new ideas. Opportunities to study or do research abroad helps students apply their understanding in unfamiliar situations and to evaluate their ideals in different contexts. As Professor Thomas Michaels of the University of Minnesota tells his students, “the most surprising result from study abroad may be how much better you understand your own culture.”

Internationalization benefits research and graduate study

Global competence is also imperative for those students who go on to graduate study. According to the National Science Board, international academic collaborations are expanding in response to the complexities of new scientific fields, new communication and technology advances, and government policies and incentives. Among co-authored articles published in the United States in 2001, for example, one in four had at least one foreign co-author, up from 10 percent in the late 1980s. And about 45 percent of the world's co-authored articles had at least one U.S.-based researcher (2004). Professional success for researchers and faculty increasingly demands the ability to work in a global context with colleagues around the globe. Our institutions must foster the skills and networks to do so, beginning with undergraduates.

“Whether or not times are uncertain does not affect the reality that international experience is necessary for success in most fields—and an advantage in every career field.”

—Marilyn Stotts, UC Davis student, Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany

Internationalization prepares students for citizenship

One of the most important values for internationalization lies in its contributions to preparing students to be citizens of the world. The decisions they are called on to make throughout all facets of their lives—what they consume, whom they elect, the service they give, the change they promote—have global implications as well as national impact. Students who have interactions with international students on campus will be able to analyze more effectively current issues, events, and opportunities. Informed by global perspectives, they will be more prepared to lead our nation now and into the future.

They will also be better prepared to live in an America that increasingly reflects the diversity of world communities. Students who have a greater understanding of world cultures are better prepared to appreciate the assets in the immigrant and minority neighborhoods of their own communities, and to understand their contributions to the complex tapestry of our nation.

Internationalization prepares students for the workplace

Students who experience such learning have an important advantage in the workplace. As Douglas Daft, chairman and CEO of the Coca-Cola Company has said, understanding and valuing different cultures is “an absolute imperative for anyone who works at the Coca-

"I strongly believe international education and foreign-language competence are critical to the ongoing success of U.S. business and the U.S. economy. . . . Whether it's marketing and advertising, labor relations, working with local dealers and suppliers, understanding consumer preferences, or navigating foreign financial markets—there is simply nothing like speaking the language and understanding the culture."

**—Rick Wagoner,
President and CEO, General Motors**

Cola Company," which currently operates in 200 countries and in 125 languages (2004). Large companies are not the only ones who value global competence; in a world where Web commerce allows even small businesses the opportunity to be international players, women and men who are able to think globally are needed everywhere—from small start-ups to multinational mega-corporations.

2. Internationalize—For Our Communities

One of the historic strengths of the NASULGC colleges and universities has been the mutually supportive community-university relationships that define our engaged learning and discovery. While such engagement is frequently seen in local or regional terms, the demands of globalization have exploded that perception. Our community now includes the *global* community, expanding the dimensions of our engagement. Our internationalization challenge is to reach out to communities beyond our national borders and to connect our local communities to the world.

Internationalization translates local expertise globally

NASULGC institutions that are already actively engaged with their communities bring exceptional advantages to an enhanced international role. A recent report by the American Council on Education noted that institutions in other countries are increasingly looking to institutions with a land-grant tradition as models because of our strong community ties (Green & Olson). We are experts at building partnerships, at forging networks that link research, learning, and the needs of a community or constituency. We are at home in multicultural and urban environments and know first-hand how valuable such diversity can be. We are already working on the challenges of our communities—the educational, economic and social issues for which our regional solutions have global ramifications. This experience is invaluable in an international context. As Steve Garlick, a consultant and former executive with the Australian governments notes, "Universities have been slow to recognize

that regions, because of their diversity, provide a potential global platform to aid their own distinctiveness and competitiveness in research and teaching” (2003, p. 52).

Internationalization expands service

Many NASULGC institutions have been “ambassadors to the world” (Green, 2004), engaged in international outreach for years, helping to contribute agricultural, healthcare, and economic solutions to developing countries and assisting the U.S. government in fulfilling its international development agenda (Scherper, 2003). From agricultural to environmental collaborations and from educational to healthcare outreach, NASULGC institutions have led the way in sharing and translating their expertise and ideas, literally around the world. Such efforts have not only helped foreign partners energize economies, feed people, and empower fledgling communities, but also have benefited our colleges and universities with scholarly exchange, opportunities for innovative research, connections to unique research sites, cross-national faculty and student collaborations, and even access to funding streams that can help offset downturns in state and federal funding (Green, Eckel & Barblan, 2002).

Internationalization is integral to the service mission of NASULGC institutions. Bernard Goldstein, dean of the University of Pittsburgh’s Graduate School of Public Health acknowledges that the school’s global health program expands its research but also has a moral dimension. “From a public health point of view, it is almost unethical for an American school involved in public health not to have a global dimension to its program,” he says (Chichowicz, 2003, p. 6).

Internationalization connects local communities

Internationalization also offers important opportunities to connect local communities to the world. Our increasing global economic and social interdependence requires that the civic, business and educational leaders of the towns, cities, and states we call home are prepared to compete internationally. To do so they require the knowledge and networks our institutions can provide, as well as the leadership training we can offer. California State University, Fresno, for example, offers an Administration of Justice and Culture study-abroad program that is held overseas for American criminal justice professionals, community

“In thinking about the world in the twenty-first century and what it needs to have for leaders, whether they are in small towns or major corporations, it is so essential that our leaders (as well as ordinary citizens) have a global understanding.”

**—Lou Anna Simon, President,
Michigan State University**

leaders and students. The program includes site visits and tours of courts, law enforcement agencies, and correctional facilities in other countries. Alcorn State University has created virtual connections through its Agnet-Africa electronic forum (www.agnetafrica.org) that promotes online sharing of information among agribusiness trade associates, American entrepreneurs, researchers, and farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Connecting local communities to emerging markets, potential trade partners, access to foreign workforces, and technology for an interdependent world will be essential if our communities are to survive and thrive in the global economy. Leadership and language training provided by continuing education programs will be crucial to creating community capacity and competitiveness (GASEPA).

3. Internationalize—For Our Nation

Internationalization serves not only our students and communities but our national interest as well.

Internationalization enhances national security

The reality of our post-9/11 world is shifting political relationships, imbalanced demographic pressures, rapidly changing technologies, instant communications, and global interdependence. Essential to our national security will be individuals who have foreign language expertise, an understanding of diverse cultures, and the ability to think criti-

“America’s most burning issues—from national security to competing in a global economy to how one might go about making peace—are all very much informed by international education, or devastatingly crippled by the lack of it. If the U.S. is to continue to exercise our leadership role in the decades ahead, we must focus responsibly on strengthening the ability of Americans to understand other cultures and nations and to speak their language, literally and figuratively.”

**—Nannerl Keohane,
President, Duke University**

cally within a global context. They are, unfortunately, in short supply. A 2002 report by the General Accounting Office revealed a 44 percent shortfall in Army translators and interpreters in five critical languages and a 26 percent shortfall for the State Department (Green & Olson). As retired Admiral Bobby Inman noted in a recent speech, “The needs of the country—whether for national security or the global economy—are continuing to grow at a far faster rate than we are equipping ourselves to deal with [them]” (2003).

In addition to preparing Americans to protect our national interests, internation-

alization also contributes positively to the “war of ideas,” as President Robert Gates of Texas A&M writes (2004). Of the 65 Nobel Prizes in medicine and physiology awarded to Americans since 1949, 40 percent have gone to foreign-born scientists; 18 of the 44 Nobel Prize winners in physics were foreign born, as were 13 of the 37 winners in chemistry (Mazzola, 2002).

Educational Diplomacy

Foreign students who study at American colleges and universities return to their home countries with a deeper appreciation for democracy and with relationships that can help to forge bridges of peace and collaboration among nations. The good will and strong personal ties to this nation built through generations of students coming to our colleges and universities from around the world are important underpinnings of U.S. foreign relations. As Norman Peterson notes, one of the root causes of terrorism is the cultural chasm that exists between the West and the fundamentalist Muslim world. “Until this cultural gap has been narrowed or closed the threat of terrorism will always be with us,” he writes. “International exchange programs are the best way to address this critical task” (2003).

Internationalization benefits economic competitiveness

Internationalizing the university not only contributes to America’s national security, but it is also vital to our country’s continuing economic leadership—a leadership that has been built on the scientific and research dominance of U.S. universities. Other countries are currently challenging that dominance, however, and emulating the U.S. model of knowledge-driven economic growth. The European Union, for example, has set a goal of becoming “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world by 2010” (National Science Board) and it is focusing on its higher education systems to help do so.

Within the context of such increasing global competitiveness, U.S. colleges and universities must increase their efforts to build international collaborations among the

World leaders who have studied at American institutions:

- Abdullah Bin Al-Hussein, King of Jordan
- Vincente Fox, President, Mexico
- Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, President, Philippines
- Jacques Chirac, President, France
- Kofi Annan, Secretary General, United Nations
- Martin Torrijos Espino, President, Panama
- Lee Hsien Loong, Prime Minister, Singapore

world’s preeminent researchers. As Emily Young Ashworth writes, the country that is able to support collaboration among the best researchers in the world—wherever they are located—will be most successful in the new century (2003). Colleges and universities with faculty and staff committed to international learning and research will best meet this challenge.

If America is to remain technically competitive, universities must also seek to attract the world’s best minds in science, engineering, and technology, especially in the light of projected declines in the cadre of scientific and engineering experts over the next two decades due to retirement and demographic changes. According to the National Science Board, foreign students currently represent half of all U.S. graduate enrollment in engineering, mathematics, and computer science programs. Foreign students, writes Ashworth, “are critical to our national vitality” (p. 2). The creation of an academic environment that is open, welcoming, and supportive will continue to assure American leadership in innovation and discovery.

4. Internationalize—For Our Institutions

Attracting the best research minds and encouraging collaborative scholarship not only benefits our national competitiveness, it also strengthens our institutions. Internationalization fosters faculty renewal, enhances research, and improves institutional market competitiveness.

Internationalization fosters faculty and staff renewal

Internationalization provides faculty and staff with opportunities to invigorate their own scholarship, as they partner with colleagues abroad, teach and study at centers in different countries, contribute to international conferences, advise students on international education opportunities, or work with foreign students on campus. Integrating international perspectives into the curriculum often prompts faculty to adopt new pedagogy and to create interdisciplinary or cross-institutional courses. Internationalization offers the opportunity for faculty and staff to create new programs in partnership with sister institutions abroad. Internationalization raises the bar for academic excellence by holding faculty and staff scholarship and teaching to world standards.

Internationalization enhances research

Internationalization also enhances the research activities of our colleges and universities. In addition to attracting the best of the world's students and researchers, internationalization encourages open inquiry and collaboration. Increasingly, the best research now occurs in the context of global partnerships. Such international linkages, says C. Peter Magrath, are the "intellectual lifeblood of America's colleges and universities" because they provide both students and faculty with opportunities to work and study with individuals who can provide alternative viewpoints or ideas.

Research that addresses global issues may also offer commercial benefits. In 2000, research and development expenditures by foreign-owned firms in the United States increased to \$26 billion, up from only \$6.7 billion in the 1980s (National Science Board). At the same time, the potential for patenting and licensing the results of research is increased through global partnerships. The National Science Board (NSB) reports that, since the 1980s, between 44 and 48 percent of all U.S. patents have been awarded to inventors outside the United States. "The volume and nature of these foreign-owned patents provide insight into the relative technological competitiveness of other countries," the NSB report notes. The institution that is able to create and sustain networks of collaboration among the best researchers, scholars, artists and students will be most successful in fulfilling its discovery mission and in reaping financial benefits from its research.

"The openness of our campus to students, scholars and faculty from all over the world is one of our greatest strengths, and is at the heart of the phenomenal success of the American research university."

**—Charles Vest, President
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology**

Internationalization improves institutional competitiveness

Internationalization also offers colleges and universities a market edge in attracting students and creating a distinctive identity. A 2000 poll of college-bound high-school seniors found that 86 percent hoped to participate in international programs and almost half wanted to study outside the United States (Hayward and Siaya). Many universities find that learning-abroad scholarships are important tools in recruiting outstanding freshmen.

Internationalization also can be a pathway to national or international distinction. As Earl Kellogg writes, "a strong international dimension in our learning mission is a prerequisite for being a great university" (2004). At the University of Minnesota, the

opportunity for faculty to teach on site at the university's Executive MBA programs in Poland, Austria and China has significantly helped to internationalize the business faculty. Stephen Dunnett of the University at Buffalo, The State University of New York, credits his university's cooperative programs in Malaysia, China, Latvia, and Hungary with enhancing its international student recruitment efforts and building its academic reputation. "UB's international programs have raised the university's profile around the world and

"The [New American University]...will be international in its orientation and cosmopolitan in its character; its graduates will pursue their careers within an increasingly global economy and an increasingly diverse workforce. ... Study abroad will become the norm; both the student and faculty bodies will become conspicuously international in their membership and productivity in a diverse community will increasingly come to be regarded as a 'job skill.' ...[T]he great research universities will become ever more international in their membership and outlook."

**—Frank Rhodes, president emeritus,
Cornell University**

contributed to its reputation as a world-class institution of higher education," he writes (2003).

While the pragmatic arguments for internationalization are compelling, there is an equally principled reason: It is right for NASULGC institutions. It is integral to our mission to bring together students and scholars, to encourage intellectual exploration, and to support discovery and scholarship that serves our world. As Magrath notes, "universities not fully engaged with students and scholars from other lands are ultimately not worthy of the name 'university.'"

III. The 3 A's of Presidential Leadership



THE CASE FOR INTERNATIONALIZING our colleges and universities is compelling and uniquely suited to the history, capacity, and strengths of NASULGC institutions.

It is not a fourth addition to our tripartite mission of learning, discovery, and engagement but rather a means to enlarge and define more deliberately that mission in a new century marked by global interdependency. Internationalization is the framework within which individual institutional missions find resonance and from which presidents and chancellors can help to recreate education for the future. NASULGC institutions have the opportunity to lead by the example they choose to set.

And what, exactly, does it mean to lead the charge for internationalization? Creating the global university of the future cannot be accomplished by executive fiat, yet *it cannot succeed without deep presidential commitment*. That is because internationalizing the campus involves enlarging the mission, shifting the academic culture, broadening perspectives, making new connections, getting everyone involved, and changing the way things get done. And those tasks land squarely at the door to the president's office.

If we are to redefine higher education—to create the new, global university—it will require leaders who are willing to commit to the “3 A's of Leadership”—articulate, advocate, and act:

Articulate a clear and compelling vision for a global university within the unique context and heritage of each individual institution;

Advocate for the importance of internationalization, on campus and off;

Act, by implementing specific action strategies that will advance the vision and hold the institution accountable for transformation.

IV. Create a Transforming Vision



LEADERSHIP BEGINS WITH A VISION. The president or chancellor’s first task is to describe what the future can be so that supporters can rally around, make it their own and help to create it.

At the heart of the international vision is the idea of transformation—our students, faculty, and institutions will be changed and empowered to contribute to our global future. What that transformation looks like will vary for each institution, reflecting existing priorities, historical strengths and unique assets. But if internationalization is to galvanize the campus, the president must identify the ways in which students, faculty, and the institution itself will become better. Successfully articulating a transforming vision will involve attention to three important aspects: The effects of internationalization on students, on faculty and staff, and on the institution itself. In each case, the goal should

ARTICULATE

be individuals and institutions that are more *globally competent*, able to contribute to and thrive amid the demands of an interconnected world.

Each president will craft a vision right for her or his institution. What follows are markers of what the vision may entail.

The Task Force on International Education has identified a range of “promising practices” already tested at NASULGC institutions. They are available at www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm. We also invite you to contribute your own.

How will internationalization transform our students?

Presidents and chancellors have a unique opportunity to shape what the citizens of tomorrow will be by the vision for globally competent students they communicate today. How can we define global competence for our graduates? How will they be different from those who have not studied at an internationalized university? While there is no single checklist or definitive list of attributes all graduates must attain, there is a spectrum of learning outcomes our graduates should embrace. These goals should apply to both U.S. and international students on our campus—both groups need to work together to build the international attributes our world needs.

Globally competent graduates...

1. Have a diverse and knowledgeable worldview

As graduates of an internationalized university, students develop a conceptual framework that informs the way they look at the world—both its history and current events as they unfold. Students continually use this framework to analyze and compare political, cul-

“As we set about the task of trying to revitalize undergraduate education, we felt that study abroad needed to be very much at the center of that picture. Internationalizing the curriculum is about transforming the student experience—transforming in a real sense, the kind of contributions we make to the development of our students as they study with us and also as they go out into the world.”

**—Bob Bruininks, President,
University of Minnesota**

tural, economic, historical, environmental, scientific, and technological developments. Students do not view the world through a single cultural lens and are able to identify and appreciate various viewpoints. While globally competent students recognize and value cultural differences, they also are aware of the growing interconnectivity of the world and of the necessity for them to function within it.

While the materials to build this framework are made available to students through general education offerings, foreign language courses, and study abroad programs, what really strengthens this framework is the

globally competent university’s curriculum, which infuses all things international into all possible realms of the university. The university’s curriculum is widely internationalized, regardless of department, at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional school levels. At the University of Rhode Island, for example, the International Engineering Program

offers students a dual engineering and language degree and a six-month internship with international companies abroad. The program has proved so attractive that despite no institutional language requirements, 20 percent of URI engineering students are enrolled in the program.

2. Comprehend the international dimensions of the major field of study

Globally competent students not only construct an overall framework to inform their worldview, they also seek to understand the international dimensions of their chosen major. While some disciplines may appear to be “international by nature” (e.g., anthropology) or unrelated to culture or location (e.g., physics), globally competent students recognize the need for international awareness regardless of subject. Students therefore actively seek out—and the university deliberately provides—faculty members and curriculum offerings that fulfill this need across disciplines.

3. Communicate effectively in another language and/or cross-culturally

Globally competent students recognize that while English is often considered the world’s dominant language, that may not always, and should not always, be the case. Institutions continue to debate mandating language requirements; the methods each college and university chooses to encourage language study must reflect each institution’s history and environment. What should be consistent across institutions is a commitment to increasing language study and opportunities for all students (science majors as well as those in the humanities) to develop expertise across three types of competencies: at the specialist level, at the general proficiency level, and at the cross-cultural communication level.

At the specialist level, students study foreign language with the specific intent of becoming specialists in one or more non-English languages. The demand for such specialists is ever increasing and NASULGC institutions can be vital partners in meeting this need.

“There is no greater way to study a language than to immerse yourself completely in it. My three months in Mendoza, Argentina, gave me a better command of the Spanish language than my five years of high-school and university-level Spanish ever did. Beyond that, I came away from the program with increased self-confidence, self-awareness and a desire to see and experience all that the world has to offer.”

**—Katy Peterson, UC Davis student,
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo,
Mendoza, Argentina**

Most students can—and should be—encouraged to become proficient in at least one language other than English. Globally competent students recognize that knowledge of a foreign language opens the door to a more in-depth understanding of the cultures and peoples associated with that language. Even if fluency is not fully achieved, students gain basic cross-cultural communication skills by learning about other countries and cultures.

Due to the lack of emphasis on foreign-language acquisition at the elementary and secondary levels, proficiency may not be possible, but achieving cross-cultural communication competency can be attainable for the majority of students and should be a university-wide goal.

4. Exhibit cross-cultural sensitivity and adaptability

In addition to foreign language skills, globally competent students exhibit both cross-cultural sensitivity and adaptability, taking advantage of opportunities to interact with diverse individuals. In doing so, globally competent students question assumptions and challenge stereotypes of their own culture and of others.

“The world just knows so little about [China], its culture, and its history. And it will be interesting to see how things change here as the nation opens up more and more to the world and its influences.”

— **Breene Busch, Texas A&M student, Peking University, Beijing, China**

Examples of meaningful interactions and experiences are membership in one or more internationally oriented student organizations, involvement in activities that bring together international and American students, and participation in an education abroad experience through study, internship, or work programs. Learning in another country not only uproots students but also

immerses them within the host country’s culture, providing the opportunity for students to assess their assumptions about the world and their own culture.

5. Continue global learning throughout life

Globally competent students recognize the worth of international understanding for its own sake as well as for personal fulfillment. The importance of being globally competent does not rest solely on the promise of a better job upon graduation, but rather that it prepares students for lifelong growth as citizens of the world. Internationalization should connect students to the ideas and people who can instill habits of thought and practice that embrace larger vistas, worldwide challenges, and opportunities to serve the global family.

How will internationalization transform our faculty and staff?

Because faculty and staff are critical contributors to achieving a more internationalized campus, engaging faculty should be a priority for presidents and chancellors and a central focus of the university's internationalization strategies (Green & Olson). Faculty and staff are responsible for creation of the curriculum and its delivery, the research that is envisioned and conducted, and the outreach/development programs that are designed and delivered. And yet, as a study published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching notes, U.S. faculty are less internationally engaged, less connected with scholars abroad, and less well traveled than those from 14 other countries (Altbach, 1996). As Gene Allen notes, "the 'land-grant issue' for this century is how our faculty connect to and reach out to the world" (2004 b).

Presidents and chancellors can impact those connections by challenging their institution with a picture of what "globally competent" faculty and staff can be. There is no single template, of course, nor would we want cookie-cutter definitions for all faculty and staff. There is, however, a range of characteristics that can be nurtured and supported across the institution. These characteristics also build on one another, enlarging the international capacity of faculty and staff, and providing opportunities to engage others new to international education. Much like the spirals of a nautilus,

How Can Academic Leaders Support Globally Competent Faculty and Staff?

- Internationalize job descriptions and hiring processes.
- Develop salary and promotion guidelines that recognize and reward international contributions.
- Provide international initiative funds that assist faculty and staff in meeting and working with international colleagues.
- Assist faculty and staff in integrating international dimensions into the curriculum.
- Provide help to faculty and staff to become more competitive in seeking international grants and contracts.
- Establish campus awards for outstanding international contributions.
- Communicate international program initiatives and accomplishments on campus and off.
- Support policies that encourage foreign partnerships and enable faculty to explore international projects and sabbaticals.
- Nominate colleagues for NASULGC's Malone Award (see www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm).

radiating outward from the center, internationalization, rooted in mission, encourages both individual and institutional growth.

Globally competent faculty and staff combine personal attributes with internationally focused activities on campus and abroad. They have an “international mindset” (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999; Green & Olson), as well as experience and ongoing practice in applying that mindset to their teaching, scholarship, and engagement.

This means that in synthesizing ideas and information, they draw upon, integrate, and compare information from a diverse set of disciplines, cultures, international experiences, and perspectives that are derived from multiple sources and experiences. Unfortunately, a well-developed international mindset is rare among new Ph.D. graduates and many faculty because the interdisciplinary, intercultural, and diverse experiential aspects do not fit the focused disciplinary nature of typical Ph.D. programs (Allen, 2004 a). An international mindset also is not necessarily associated with everyone who teaches or knows a foreign language or has an international reputation in research. Thus, campuses that aspire to have more faculty who are globally competent need to have multiple ways to assist faculty in moving toward this goal.

Global competence for faculty and staff can be assessed across a spectrum that includes personal competence and active practice on campus and internationally. (See www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm for a “Scorecard of International Experiences” for faculty and staff to use to evaluate experiences that can expand global competence through greater understanding of cultural and global issues). It would be rare for any individual to exemplify all of the following, but the vision for internationally engaged faculty and staff should embrace:

1. Personal competence

Globally competent faculty and staff members demonstrate an interest in other countries, cultures and world affairs, and value the differences among them. This interest is evidenced in discussions, involvement in international groups, and participation in seminars and workshops that go beyond the individual’s disciplinary expertise.

Faculty and staff on the internationalized campus have significant understanding of another culture, country, or region of the world and are conversant in one or more foreign languages. This understanding is reinforced by travel, study, and links to other regions and countries. The individual is recognized on campus as having some special knowledge and insight related to a specific culture, country, or region.

2. Active practice on campus

Globally competent faculty and staff members integrate international dimensions and comparisons into courses that help students value different cultural or global perspectives in addressing issues. When appropriate, they use international students and study-abroad alumni as additional resources in classes.

These individuals participate in or give leadership to interdisciplinary discussions, seminars, or classes related to international topics or another region of the world. Such initiatives may lead to awards, grants, or contracts from federal agencies, many of which are associated with developmental funding that is only awarded to interdisciplinary groups.

Globally competent faculty and staff develop or deliver a learning-abroad course, research opportunity, or internship that involves students from the campus because they understand the value of such learning to students' academic experience. Such international education programs could be self-standing or linked to an on-campus course or program, and could be focused on students seeking any degree. They also model the importance of working with scholars and students from other countries by advising and hosting international students and scholars, encouraging their participation in classroom discussions and campus life activities, and assisting them with home stays.

Globally competent faculty are also international scholars and researchers. They collaborate with colleagues abroad, co-authoring publications, serving on research teams that involve faculty from universities around the world, or conducting research outside the United States. Such practice promotes interdisciplinary scholarship that is reflected in collaboration on campus as well. International research involves students in international opportunities and frequently is focused on developing real-world solutions to global problems, research that is applicable in local as well as international communities. At the University of Pittsburgh, for example, the Global Academic Partnership program provides grants of up to \$25,000 for faculty teams that include members from at least two Pitt schools in collaboration with universities abroad and that focus on applied research. Faculty are also required to create course work based on their research efforts (Altdorfer, 2002).

3. Active practice abroad

Globally competent faculty and staff members participate in international meetings and belong to international associations. They create a network of international colleagues that

evolves into joint efforts such as technology-linked classes, research grants, development projects, exchange of students, and formal linkages or agreements involving units of their campuses. Closer to home, faculty and staff work within their disciplines to encourage academic professional societies—the “pool of peer pressures”—to incorporate international dimensions into their disciplines and programs (Allen, 2004 b).

Faculty and staff visit learning-abroad sites of interest and advise students about the importance of participating in international education experiences and other classes, programs, and activities that develop or expand their international perspectives. Such faculty and staff are also critical partners with study-abroad professionals in identifying courses and programs that can be integrated into the degree requirements of students. They are also active in pioneering ways in which technology can better link U.S. and foreign universities.

The internationalized university or college facilitates and values the time that faculty and staff live and work in another country for an extended period of time. It encourages faculty and staff to incorporate their experiences and scholarship into their professional lives and into the life of the campus, its programs, and curriculum when they return. Sabbatical leaves, Fulbright and other fellowships, grants, special research sites or facilities, and development projects provide multiple opportunities to help facilitate this meaningful kind of international experience.

How will internationalization transform our colleges or universities?

It is not the president or chancellor’s task to implement an international mission but it emphatically is her or his responsibility to lay out a clear picture of what the globally competent institution looks like and then clear the path for transformation to happen.

A globally competent NASULGC college or university is a local, national, and international resource of knowledge creation and dissemination (DeLauder, 2004). It integrates international perspectives across the missions of teaching and learning, discovery, and engagement—indeed, that is what makes it distinctive. Specifically, a globally competent NASULGC college or university is one that:

1. Has internationalization as an integral part of its vision, mission, and strategic plan.

The institution's board of trustees, president or chancellor, and administrative leadership identify internationalization as a long-term priority. The strategic plan incorporates international education as vital to the successful fulfillment of the institution's mission and sets specific goals and assesses outcomes of all international activities and efforts. The university models a commitment to internationalization through the institution's memberships in international associations and organizations, through its active partnerships with peer institutions abroad and in its collaborative efforts to encourage internationalization throughout the disciplines and higher education in general.

2. Has strong commitments and financial support from top university administrators.

The personal commitment of the president or chancellor is mirrored in the leadership team, from provost, deans and department chairs to vice presidents and assistant chancellors. The vision for an internationalized campus and the images used to create it are reinforced and enlarged by all university leaders. Just as important, they are backed up with dollar investments.

Presidents and chancellors can encourage deans and department chairs to internationalize by incorporating international aspects into job descriptions of faculty and staff and they can provide financial incentives to share responsibility for integrating international education into teaching and scholarship. This financial support involves providing appropriate infrastructure to support all international

Creative Financial Strategies to Encourage International Education

- Offer research grants to faculty who create proposals for interdisciplinary, cross-boundary international collaborations.
- Use learning-abroad scholarships to assist in recruiting outstanding freshmen.
- Provide student stipends to participate in faculty-led research projects abroad.
- Establish scholarships or stipends for international students who team with faculty to bring international perspectives to a course or program.
- Consider awarding some learning-abroad scholarships on the basis of essays rather than only financial need.
- Help study-abroad and financial aid offices to work closely together.
- Offer fellowships for masters and professional degree students for scholarship done abroad.

activities. This should include a central office responsible for coordinating international activities but also involves creating policies and procedures that facilitate global competence for faculty, staff, and students; supporting and galvanizing leaders at all levels of the institution; and using friends and alumni to advance a network of support for international education.

3. Integrates international perspectives into all curricula and co-curricula programs.

The university has a strong international dimension in the general education requirements so that every student will have basic international understandings. This will go beyond courses that provide global perspectives on physical and human geography, world history, the arts, religion and politics to also include multiple opportunities to comparatively study cultures of the world and to involve students in working more effectively across cultures. At the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, for example, a BA/BS in Global Studies partners the College of Letters and Science with professional schools to provide concentrations in global management, global classrooms, or global communication, among other areas. The program has rigorous requirements for language proficiency, learning abroad, and internships. The internationalized university has a strong foreign language program and provides language instruction in a variety of Western and non-Western languages. It offers a wide variety of learning abroad opportunities for students, faculty, and staff.

4. Promotes, encourages, values, and rewards faculty and staff involvement in international activities.

It has a diverse faculty and staff, the majority of whom have international experience. It has a tenure, promotion, and merit salary system that values and rewards international involvement. In practical terms this means administrative leaders write internationalization into job descriptions, set aside money for faculty travel and development in international activities, recognize international scholarship with titles like "International Professor of...", and define clearly the kinds of international activities that add value to the institution.

5. Integrates international perspectives into appropriate research and outreach programs.

It has substantive and active linkages with institutions in other countries, and encourages faculty to collaborate with overseas scholars and to be involved in international devel-

opment activities. It provides financial incentives and support to faculty and students to make travel to international sites and access to specialized equipment possible. It recognizes the importance of attracting talented faculty and graduate students from around the globe to the university and builds international requirements into recruiting and hiring practices. It encourages and makes international expertise available to community groups, governmental agencies and the news media.

6. Has a campus culture that values and encourages international aspects in all programs, among faculty and students, and in campus life.

It recognizes the value that international faculty and students provide to the learning, discovery and cultural life of the campus and to the engagement efforts of the university through the diversity of their perspectives. It provides a welcoming, stimulating and supportive environment for international students, faculty, visiting scholars and staff, an environment in which university leadership is active and visible. It promotes greater involvement of all students in international activities. It encourages and supports activities that bring international and domestic students together for meaningful cultural and intellectual exchanges.

"[International students and scholars] enrich our communities with their academic abilities and cultural diversity and they return home with an increased understanding and often a lasting affection for the United States. I can think of no more valuable asset to our country than the friendship of future world leaders who have been educated here."

—Colin Powell, U.S. Secretary of State

V. Mobilizing Support



ARTICULATING A VISION for what internationalization can mean for your campus is the beginning. The next step is to translate it into terms that will resonate with a wide range of constituents. Presidential advocacy involves taking the elements of international education that appeal to different audiences and demonstrating their value to mobilize support and allies. Presidential advocacy includes both personal and public dimensions and must permeate all activities.

Advocacy is so important because presidents and chancellors uniquely connect to such broad networks of individuals. They can interact with students, faculty, administration, and staff on campus, as well as donors, civic and business leaders, and legislators off campus. The president has great convening power and can bring together groups of individuals to galvanize internationalization efforts. The president's bully pulpit—used judiciously—can help to set institutional priorities and motivate for change.

ADVOCATE

1. Personal Advocacy Roles

Successful internationalization is predicated on the wholehearted endorsement of the president or chancellor. This endorsement goes beyond words—it is demonstrated by deeds that define the focus of presidential efforts. It realigns personal priorities and

A Checklist for Presidents & Chancellors

Are you ready to internationalize? Do you...

- Believe international education is essential to your institution's mission?
- Appoint leaders who reflect your international vision?
- Speak frequently on campus and off about internationalization?
- Personally encourage students to learn, research, and intern abroad?
- Encourage students to acquire second language capacity and skills?
- Encourage interaction between U.S. and international students on campus?
- Create a welcoming campus for international students and scholars?
- Support faculty development that involves international scholarship and curricula?
- Include internationalization as a central part of strategic planning?
- Appoint institutional leaders who advocate internationalization?
- Host events and forums that bring international perspectives to the community and campus?
- Actively raise funds for international initiatives and education?
- Advocate for budgetary and personnel systems that support internationalization?
- Facilitate or support one or more institutional international partnerships?
- Regularly discuss international education with the board and policy makers?

activities around internationalization, from which presidents and chancellors are justified in asking for change from others.

Personal advocacy is reflected first and foremost through the personal, one-on-one relationships that create the spark for change—conversations with students about the importance of learning a second language; discussions with faculty about incorporating comparative international content into courses; and conversations with trustees, donors, former students, and business executives on their role in increasing internationalization on campus. It includes frequent communication about presidential efforts and initiatives on behalf of internationalization.

Personal advocacy of internationalization provides the energy essential to drive change more broadly, but only if delivered with conviction—and delivered relentlessly. Personal advocacy involves telling stories (to inspire and motivate), creating relationships (to mobilize and fertilize), and asking the right questions (to challenge the *status quo*).

2. Institutional Advocacy

There is no defined pathway to the globally competent university. Each institution must create it on the foundations of its unique history, mission, current performance, and strategic plan (Moats-Gallagher, 2004, McCarthy, 2003). Strategies that work at one institution will fail at others. The role of the president or chancellor is to commit to the hard work of helping the campus discover what fits best. This will involve assessing the need and creating a process for change.

Assessment involves determining not only the formal ways in which international education is practiced and supported on campus, but also discovering the underlying culture and assumptions that play an important role in how people actually behave. If faculty are encouraged to devote time to integrating international perspectives into their courses or if their departments value cross-boundary partnerships, a shining presidential vision for international education not only will be applauded but successfully implemented and enlarged. If the university structures education abroad programs so that students do not have to delay graduation to participate, students will be less hesitant to pursue learning abroad. And if the university values the contributions of international students and scholars, it will work toward providing a nurturing environment that is supportive and welcoming.

A useful beginning to internationalizing the campus can be to commission an institutional assessment exercise, championed by the president or chancellor. It should be designed to measure the degree to which the institution practices and supports internationalization—in everything from campus culture to administrative policies to faculty and financial support mechanisms. The American Council on Education's *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide* has an informative template for conducting a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis (Green & Olson).

Once a clear map of campus internationalization has been determined, the process for moving forward can be defined. This can only be done collaboratively. Institutional advocacy is directed primarily at creating involvement and capacity. The new global university requires a birthing process—led by the president—that builds teams, empowers leaders (and followers), and involves faculty, staff, students, administrators and friends.

Let there be no mistake. Creating the new global university will not involve tweaking the academy around the edges. It will require substantive, transformative change at all levels.

Advocating Institutional Change

What If?....

- International aspects were integrated into all majors—including the professions?
- Internationalization was included in the strategic plans for all schools and colleges?
- Global competence included learning from American immigrant communities as well as countries abroad?
- Faculty searches were international and global experience was preferred?
- Opportunities for student international internships were expanded?
- Every department included courses designed with international partners?
- Growing global research partnerships was an institutional priority?
- The chief international executive reported to the chief academic officer and was positioned to interact effectively with deans and other councils and committees?
- Faculty reward and tenure included research and teaching abroad?
- Financial, curricular and other barriers were overcome to make education abroad accessible and affordable for all students?

Let there be no mistake. Creating the new global university will not involve tweaking the academy around the edges. It will require substantive, transformative change at all levels, in what is learned, discovered and shared.

Eckel, Hill and Green call this “deep change” and describe it as intentional, pervasive, and long-term (1998, p. 4). Roles will be redefined. Reporting structures re-arranged or shattered. Curricula rewritten. Creative new ways of “doing” explored. Research paradigms reinvented. New champions identified and nurtured.

Deep change requires relentless communication, making the case to faculty, staff, students, and campus leaders. It involves finding the images or benefits that appeal best to each constituency and, as William Brustein and Eileen Weiner write, explaining them in terms that “bring the value home” (2004, p. 12). Leaders also advocate for institutional change when they help to create an environment in which it is safe to advance and try new ideas—and safe to fail in the service of “what if?”

Shared governance can be a powerful ally in transforming mission and culture and in helping to create new pathways for change advocacy. The presidential task is

to enlist faculty and staff convinced of the benefits of internationalization in making the case and mobilizing support.

Student organizations also have much to gain and much to contribute to an understanding of internationalization. They also bring important energy and creativity to the

process and can provide extraordinarily persuasive spokespersons to share the value of international experiences with the board, policy makers, and donors.

Institutional peers and presidential colleagues are also critical in this endeavor, both domestically and abroad, to provide new perspectives, proven approaches and radical ideas. Institutional advocacy will be both richer and more credible if it is informed by a network of supportive colleagues. In this case, NASULGC provides a vital forum, one that should be reinforced with networks of expertise from personal and institutional connections abroad.

3. Community Advocacy

The commitment to internationalization will fail if it is isolated from the communities our institutions serve. The global, engaged university is just that—connected and energized by partnerships that help to define and enable our mission. The presidential commitment to international education on campus will be mirrored by an equally pervasive presence beyond it—making the case in boardrooms, community centers, foundation offices, schools, and alumni living rooms here and abroad.

Community advocacy often begins in the corporate community because many business leaders do not need to be convinced of the importance of an international education for their future employees. They may not be united in the outcomes they desire or know how best to provide global competence, but presidents can encourage business leaders to advocate for internationalization with university administrators and faculty, and to provide vital connections to international internships, education-abroad funding, and mentoring professionals. They are also essential in helping presidents and chancellors to carry the vision of a new global university to state and federal legislators.

University alumni—especially those who have studied or worked abroad—can also be important supporters and motivators for students, faculty, and external supporters. Presidents and chancellors must also advocate for internationalization with civic and educational leaders. Pre-kindergarten through high school teachers and administrators can be partners in creating foundational student learning that incorporates international perspectives and ideas. Parents whose children have benefited from education abroad can share the stories that bring the values of internationalization home to all audiences. Civic leaders can support sister-city exchanges and trade missions as well as partner with the university in leadership training and policy development that supports global understanding and outreach.

The internationalization of our campuses requires an expansion of the notion of community—it is next door and also around the world. Presidents and chancellors are the connectors who help the campus think in global terms. Community advocacy must therefore encompass communities abroad. Leaders will actively seek out opportunities to forge new ties with institutions, organizations, and individuals outside the United States. Presidents can be the initiators of center-to-center linkages, cooperative education programs and satellite programs abroad.

“Educational exchanges are not a luxury, reserved for the few or pushed aside when other challenges preoccupy us. They are a matter of national interest ... [Educational diplomacy] can be a key catalyst for a more peaceful world.”

**— Richard W. Riley,
Former U.S. Secretary of Education**

4. Policy Advocacy

The international exchange of students and faculty—so critical to the internationalized university—has become increasingly difficult since the events of September 11, 2001. Increasingly cumbersome and time-consuming visa systems, escalating student fees levied by the federal government to underwrite data systems, and multiplying bureaucratic obstacles are crippling the ability of American colleges and universities to attract foreign students, send American students and faculty abroad, and to create productive international research relationships that involve technology and faculty exchange.

We cannot wait until world conditions are more stable to internationalize our universities. We do not have the luxury of time or of complacency. Mobilizing our campuses and communities will be for naught if we find ourselves bound by policies and regulations—no matter how well intentioned—that unduly restrict our institutional ability to foster the free academic exchange of ideas and people.

NASULGC is joining with other educational associations to advocate for security policies that also support our vision of the new global university. Presidents

“Ultimate security depends, even in this unpleasant, post-September 11, 2001 world, on smart policies and procedures fused with an understanding that there is great security and strength in international educational mobility and the free exchange of ideas—and that these must not be held hostage to destructive forces. Weapons are unfortunately needed, and important, but ideas—and their free exchange—are ultimately even more powerful.”

**C. Peter Magrath
President, NASULGC**

and chancellors must join together to encourage legislators and citizens to support higher education's vital contributions to global understanding and peace.

While such national policy advocacy is important, so too is advocacy at the state level. Many state-supported universities are bound by policies that restrict the time and money their institutions can spend on international travel or activities. Presidents and chancellors must be the champions to help inform legislators and the public about the need to encourage—not restrict—the ability of faculty and educators to travel and work abroad and to change funding priorities accordingly. The case must be made that public investment in international efforts is not squandered but rather returns vital benefits to the university, to students, and to the state.

5. After Advocacy

Presidential advocacy—in the personal, institutional, community, and policy realms—is the engine that will energize the internationalization of our universities.

But it is not sufficient. In addition to advocacy, presidents and chancellors must also *act* to implement the action strategies that can transform higher education.

VI. Leadership Action Strategies



NOW FOR THE HARD PART.

University and college presidents and chancellors are tasked not only with envisioning change but also with being accountable for making it happen. They must inspire and they must also act. To lead the way in internationalizing our universities, presidents and chancellors must focus their efforts on four key action strategies:

- Build capacity
- Be accountable
- Identify and maintain partnerships
- Develop funding relationships

1. Build Capacity

While presidents and chancellors can serve as catalysts for action, transformational change requires academic leadership that is both broad and deep. Creating the “bench strength” for change begins with a “coalition of the converted”—a team of individuals from campus and/or community who understand the importance of international education and who can imagine what a globally competent university will look like. Ideally the team will include senior administrators, deans, faculty and staff, and students, but its impact can be enhanced with the addition of community, business and civic

ACT

leaders, members of the board of trustees, and regional funding organizations and individuals who have an interest in international education and existing relationships abroad.

The international team should be charged with spearheading the internationalization of campus, amplifying communication across all constituencies, building momentum for change, and recruiting and nurturing leadership for internationalization throughout the university. In this regard, supporting strategic hiring of globally competent administrators, faculty and staff, and encouraging faculty development in support of internationalization are key. The task of presidents and chancellors is to build team capacity by convening effective individuals, making the team visible, supporting the team's campus-wide implementation efforts, and consistently and broadly communicating the vision.

There is no recipe for institutional capacity, especially for internationalization.

There are, however a range of leadership activities that presidents and chancellors can adapt to the unique needs of their campus. These include:

What About Provosts, Vice Presidents, Deans & Department Chairs?

Internationalization requires broad institutional leadership. Provosts, vice presidents, deans and department chairs can and should take responsibility for on-the-ground implementation that involves:

- Personal commitment, evidenced by international relationships.
- Creating job descriptions and hiring systems for globally competent faculty and administrative staff.
- Allocating budget dollars to international education and research.
- Demonstrated commitment to fund-raising in support of internationalization.
- Interpreting and communicating the international vision for individual colleges and their community partners.
- Supporting faculty development that encourages internationalization.
- Developing and empowering leaders for international education efforts.
- Creating and facilitating networks and partnerships in support of international education.

Create Structures for the International Mission

When people can see tangible manifestations of internationalization, they are more likely to commit to the vision. Creating an international office, appointing a campus leader for internationalization who reports to the chief academic officer, and positioning centers for

international education visibly and in prestigious locations all send powerful messages about the priority that the institution gives to internationalization. The structural organization of the international mission will vary at each institution—at some it may require a centralized function, while at others it may involve a chief international officer who oversees programs diffused across colleges. At Indiana University, the Office of Overseas Study is a resource for all eight system campuses, helping to more broadly and consistently integrate international perspectives into curriculum. Presidents and chancellors must assure that the leaders who coordinate internationalization efforts have the authority to participate in policy making for the institution or system. The chief international officer should be a key player in the academic administration, should oversee a dedicated budget, and should be able to contribute to relevant university curriculum committees and deans' councils.

Mobilize the Governing Board

Institutional transformation must have both the enthusiastic approval of the governing board and its ongoing support if internationalization is to be long term and last beyond the tenure of a single president. The president or chancellor can leave an institutional legacy by identifying board champions, assisting the board in defining mission implications and goals for moving forward, and linking board members with specific expertise to internationalization efforts. For those NASULGC institutions that have state-appointed governing boards, presidents and chancellors will need to educate board members on the value that internationalization can bring to the state—a process that will benefit the university as board members take the message to state policy makers and the general public.

In addition to important state support, board members can add to the president's voice in the community, providing public legitimacy as well as potential national or international visibility for international education efforts.

Connect the Campus

International leaders will be successful if they are able to connect across schools, colleges, and academic units. Creating a coordinating or advisory council that pulls constituencies together (with a presidential mandate to do so) provides a forum for discussing new initiatives, reviewing existing programs, and helping academic units set international priorities.

Presidents and chancellors are also uniquely able to connect the efforts of the campus to international leaders in the community. Linking the international team, coordinating

councils, and faculty and staff to an external international advisory council of business and civic leaders with global experience and connections can produce new ideas and opportunities for the institution.

2. Be Accountable

Articulating and advocating a vision for the internationalized university require that presidents and chancellors also be accountable to the campus and community for making the vision real. This accountability does not require that presidents implement the vision but

that they set measurable goals and hold others at the institution responsible for reaching them. This involves establishing firm timelines, determining indicators for success and sharing publicly the outcomes (Vidoli, 2004).

For internationalization, this will mean charging the university to develop realistic measurements that reflect the goals of the institution across its tripartite mission of learning, discovery, and engagement. This may include setting targets for the number of students who pursue education abroad, for external funding for international research, for faculty publications co-authored with foreign collaborators, for partnerships with international development efforts, or for the numbers of students who study a foreign language. All indicators must reflect the unique assets and priorities of each institution.

But accountability requires more than attention to the numbers. It will require setting “audacious goals” that

Beyond the Numbers: Provocative Goals for NASULGC Institutions

By 2010...

- Triple education-abroad rates and numbers of international students on all NASULGC campuses.
- Double international research grants and awards.
- Incorporate international research, teaching and outreach dimensions into 50% of new faculty hires across all colleges.
- Increase the number of study abroad scholarships by 200% or an average of \$500 for every student enrolled in study abroad.
- Increase international faculty searches by 50%.
- Increase foreign co-authored publication rates by 50%.
- Make international education an accreditation self study.
- Incorporate international education into all college strategic plans.
- Support NASULGC in influencing a national policy on international education.

demand new ways of measuring. It will involve efforts to hold the campus accountable for monitoring the “soft” indicators of a campus culture that encourages international education, an environment of support for international students, or a positive climate for interdisciplinary faculty research. Such measurements are more difficult but the outcomes are vital to successfully internationalizing the university.

3. Forge Partnerships

Leadership in international education involves creating and strengthening partnerships within and outside the university. Internally, efforts to integrate international perspectives across curricula and to foster interdisciplinary approaches to learning, research, and engagement are best assisted by consistent supporting messages from the presidential bully pulpit and presidential actions that reward collaboration.

Of equal or even greater value is the role that presidents and chancellors can play in forging institutional partnerships domestically and internationally in support of internationalization. The president and chancellor are essential to creating these partnerships because linkages are best established between institutions, *not* between individuals, so that such partnerships can survive long-term (Tucker, 2003).

Local and national partnerships

Allies in the quest to internationalize can be found in local and national business partners, in state and federal government, and in peer institutions and associations such as NASULGC. Presidents and chancellors—aided by other academic leaders who have developed ties related to their school, college, or academic unit—have a vital role in identifying and facilitating the start-up and maintenance of relationships that can expand the university’s international capacity.

Business and civic leaders who are at home in a global economy can provide invaluable global connections. They will be motivated to partner by the possibilities for enhanced research capacity and for the employee relationships they can develop with globally competent and internationally competitive graduates. Because of their mission, NASULGC institutions have a tradition of building strong partnerships with business and industry across schools and colleges. Winfrey Clarke notes that in addition to business programs, such fields as agriculture, engineering, law, and medicine also have strong international ties (2004).

State and federal government priorities can also help to define productive partnerships around which presidents and universities can expand international efforts. State economic development goals, trade missions abroad, and national security issues can help institutions focus on priorities that may also provide significant funding and research opportunities. National research programs also can facilitate productive liaisons with universities here and abroad. The \$450 million National Science Foundation Integrated Ocean Drilling Program, for example, is jointly managed by Texas A&M and Columbia University and brings together scientists from around the world to further our understanding of earth's history, the deep biosphere, alternative energy sources, climate change, earthquakes, and volcanism.

Alumni both in the United States and abroad can provide connections to international student internship possibilities, mentor students and faculty, offer research partnerships with private business, and provide funding for student scholarships and faculty travel. Many institutions do not have adequate systems in place to track alumni abroad; however, this can be a priority presidential strategy.

Peer institutions and associations offer presidents and chancellors productive forums for idea exchange, mutual support, and promising practices. Sharing hard-won knowledge on how to internationalize provides presidents and chancellors with regional and national platforms for leadership and adds credibility and prestige to all NASULGC institutions.

International partnerships

Internationalization requires international partnerships. These relationships are not solely created by presidents and chancellors, but they must involve them. They include articulation agreements with institutions abroad for study and credit transfer, collaborative research and teaching arrangements, partnerships with business for technology transfer, service learning or research opportunities with non-governmental organizations, and student and faculty exchanges with sister institutions. Some institutions are exploring "cluster sites" around the world at which they concentrate their learning and research partnerships. The priority that presidents and chancellors give to forging international partnerships demonstrates the commitment the institution has to internationalization.

4. Develop Funding Relationships

No part of the presidential job description is immune from fund-raising, and internationalization is no exception. If international education is an institutional priority it must also be at the top of the presidential fund-raising agenda. In this effort academic leaders and institutional development officers share responsibility, but it is the president's job to signal its importance by the amount of energy devoted to it.

"Go west. Go east. Get out of the office," write Brustein and Weiner about the role of the president in advancing internationalization. Leaders must be willing to visit with international alumni, friends of the university, and with companies and foundations who share global priorities. Many universities have established international advisory boards that also help raise dollars for scholarships, faculty scholars, and international conferences.

Academic leaders should be familiar with federal funding programs that support internationalization and actively seek out partnerships with businesses abroad, especially those with strong research and technology interests. The president can also be an advocate with state legislators to encourage support of international education and to galvanize others to work on behalf of internationalization. Texas A&M students, for example, helped to convince the Texas legislature to revise the state law to permit the collection of a fee from all public institutions for international education scholarships.

VII. Conclusion



IT IS RARE IN THE HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION for opportunity, means, and tradition to coalesce at a time of great need. And yet that is precisely what is happening today, as social, political, and technological events unite to create a world in which international competence is essential for economic health and global peace.

NASULGC colleges and universities are uniquely positioned to meet this need and to lead higher education into a fuller, more rewarding conception of our collective mission to teach, discover, and serve. As engaged institutions we bring the partnering expertise, the research tradition, and the commitment to student learning together in ways that can invigorate international education and create a new template for the future.

International education is not peripheral to our mission but a means to renew it. As such, internationalization presents a unique opportunity for presidential leadership. Those academic leaders who heed the call will not only serve their own campuses and communities better, but will also lead in the transformation of higher education for the future.

REFERENCES

For examples of promising practices in international education from NASULGC member institutions, a detailed bibliography, faculty assessment tool and copies of all manuscripts from contributing members of the Task Force, see http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm

- Allen, G. (2004 a). *NASULGC Task Force Report on Internationalizing the Campus*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Allen, G. (2004 b). Personal correspondence, July 30, 2004.
- Altbach, P.G. (1996). *The International Academic Profession: Portraits of Fourteen Countries*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Altdorfer, J. (2003). GAP: Promoting Interdisciplinary Research. *Int'l*, (Fall). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh, University Center for International Studies.
- Annan, K. (1998). Commencement speech given at Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- Ashworth, E.Y. (2003). *Globalization of University Research and Development*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Bologna Declaration: Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. (June 19, 1999) European Centre for Higher Education. Retrieved August 9, 2004 from http://www.cepes.ro/information_services/sources/on_line/bologna.htm
- Brown, H. and Syverson, P. (2004, Summer). *Findings from U.S. Graduate Schools on International Graduate Student Admissions Trends*. Council of Graduate Schools. Retrieved September 20, 2004 from <http://www.cgsnet.org/VirtualCenterResearch/policyanalyses.htm>
- Brustein, W. and Weiner, E. (2004). *Funding and Resources for International Education*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Chin, H-K. K. (Ed.) (2003). *Open Doors 2003: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Chichowicz, R. (2003). Globetrotting. In *Pitt Chronicle*, July 7, 2003. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.
- Clarke, Winfrey. (2004). *Achieving International Competence: Diversity and Partnership*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Daft, D. (2004). "International Education Makes a Difference" Interview with Douglas Daft, Chairman and CEO of Coca-Cola. Institute of International Education. Retrieved 8/25/04 from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=29253>.
- DeLauder, W. (2004). *A Globally Competent NASULGC University*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Dunnett, S. (2004). "International Education Makes a Difference" Testimonials from IIE Network Members Institutions. Institute of International Education. Retrieved 8/25/04 from <http://www.iienetwork.org/?p=29252#ub>
- Eckel, P., Hill, B., and Green, M. (1998). *On Change: En Route to Transformation*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

- Engberg, D. and Green, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Promising Practices: Spotlighting Excellence in Comprehensive Internationalization*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Garlick, S. (2003). Creative Regional Development: Knowledge-Based Associations Between Universities and Their Places. In *Metropolitan Universities: Civic Engagement in Australia 14* (2), pp. 48–70.
- GASEPA (1998). *Globalizing Agricultural Science and Education Programs for America*. GASEPA Task Force. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Gates, R. (2004). International Relations 101. Op-Ed contributor. *New York Times*, March 31, 2004.
- Green, M. (2004). Personal correspondence, August 30, 2004.
- Green, M., Eckel, P., and Barblan, A. (2002). *The Brave New (and Smaller) World of Higher Education: A Transatlantic View*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and the European University Association.
- Green, M., and Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Hayward, F. and Siaya, L. (2001). *Public Experience, Attitudes and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys About International Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Hudzik, J. (2004). *Why Internationalize NASULGC Institutions? Challenge and Opportunity*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Inman, B. (2003). *Coping with a Turbulent World: The Critical Role of Education*. Address at the conference "Global Challenges and Higher Education," January 23–25, 2003, Duke University. Available at http://www.duke.edu/web/cis/globalchallenges/research_papers.html
- Jacobson, J. (2003). Foreign-Student Enrollment Stagnates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 7, 2003.
- Kellogg, E. (2004). *Global Competence and Citizenship*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Keohane, N. (2003) *Working Together to Promote Global Education*. Welcome address at the conference "Global Challenges and Higher Education," January 23–25, 2003, Duke University. Available at http://www.duke.edu/web/cis/globalchallenges/research_papers.html
- Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalisation: Elements and Checkpoints*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Magrath, C.P. (2004). *The Terrorism Threat: Is American Higher Education Held Hostage?* Speech delivered July 26 at the Salzburg Seminar Session 419: Changing Concepts of International Educational Mobility, July 24–29, 2004, Salzburg, Austria.
- Mazzola, G. (2002). *Foreign Student Impact on the Granite State: Statement on Behalf of International Student Scholars and Advisors of New Hampshire*. Southern New Hampshire University, Feb. 27, 2002. Retrieved September 20, 2004 from <http://www.snhu.edu/Archive/2002/3/19-461620.html>
- McCarthy, J. (2003). *Form Follows Function: Administrative Structures for International Affairs*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Moats-Gallagher, C. (2004). *Leading the Internationalization of Land-Grant Institutions: Crafting a Strategic Approach*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm

- NAFSA. (2004). Fewer International Graduate Students Applying to Study in the United States. Media release issued February 25, 2004, reporting on the survey conducted by the American Council on Education, the Association of American Universities, the Council of Graduate Schools, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- NASULGC, (2000). *Expanding the International Scope of Universities: A Strategic Vision Statement for Learning, Scholarship and Engagement in the New Century*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- National Geographic-Roper 2002 Global Geographic Literacy Survey*. (2002, November). Retrieved January 8, 2003, from National Geographic Education Foundation Web site: <http://www.nationalgeographic.com/geosurvey/download/RoperSurvey.pdf>.
- National Science Board. (2004). *Science and Engineering Indicators 2004: Vol 1*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.
- Paige, M. and Mestenhauser, J. (1999). Internationalizing Educational Administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 35 (4).
- Peterson, N. (2004). *National Security and International Exchange*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm.
- Powell, C. (2003). *Statement on International Education Week, 2003*. U.S. State Department, Washington, D.C. November 12, 2003.
- Riedinger, J., Silver, B., and Brook, K. (2002). Foreign Policy: Can America Go it Alone? (MSU State of the State Survey Briefing Paper, 02-51). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Public Policy & Social Research.
- Riedinger, J., Silver, B., and Wallmo, K. (1999). The International Orientations of the Michigan Public. (MSU State of the State Survey Briefing Paper, 99-44). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Public Policy & Social Research.
- Rhodes, F. (1999). The New University. In W. Hirsh and L. Weber, (Eds.) *Challenges Facing Higher Education at the Millennium*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Sherper, K. (2003). *BIFAD and USAID Cooperation: Strengthening the Partnership*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Siaya, L. & Hayward, F. (2003). *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: Final Report (2003)*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Tucker, S. (2003). Developing International Relationships. In R. Scherer, S. Beaton, M. Ainina and J. Meyer, *Internationalizing the Business Curriculum: A Field Guide (2nd Ed.)*. Euclid, OH: Williams Custom Publishing.
- Vidoli, V. (2004). *The Essential Elements of Leadership in Achieving International Competence*. Manuscript available at http://www.nasulgc.org/comm_intprogs.htm
- Wagoner, G.R. (2003). *Remarks On Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education*. Address at the conference Global Challenges and Higher Education, January 23-25, 2003, Duke University. Available at http://www.duke.edu/web/cis/globalchallenges/research_papers.html
- Welles, E. (2004). Foreign Language Enrollments in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2002. *ADFL Bulletin* 35 (2-3), Winter-Spring, pp. 7-24.