

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Global Opportunities and Challenges for Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes

Laura E. Rumbley, Robin Matross Helms,
Patti McGill Peterson and Philip G. Altbach (Eds.)



SensePublishers

**Global Opportunities and Challenges for
Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes**

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Volume 31

Higher education worldwide is in a period of transition, affected by globalization, the advent of mass access, changing relationships between the university and the state, and the new technologies, among others. *Global Perspectives on Higher Education* provides cogent analysis and comparative perspectives on these and other central issues affecting postsecondary education worldwide.

Series Editor:

Philip G. Altbach

Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, USA

This series is co-published with the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

Global Opportunities and Challenges for Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes

Edited by

Laura E. Rumbley

Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, USA

Robin Matross Helms

American Council on Education, USA

Patti McGill Peterson

American Council on Education, USA

and

Philip G. Altbach

Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, USA



SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM / BOSTON / TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-94-6209-861-9 (paperback)
ISBN 978-94-6209-862-6 (hardback)
ISBN 978-94-6209-863-3 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, The Netherlands
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

Printed on acid-free paper

All rights reserved © 2014 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Laura E. Rumbley, Robin Matross Helms, Patti McGill Peterson, and Philip G. Altbach</i>	
PART 1	
GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT—NEW MODALITIES	
1 Introduction	9
<i>Patti McGill Peterson</i>	
2 A Presidential Perspective on Global Engagement	11
<i>Lou Anna K. Simon</i>	
3 A “Primer” for Global Engagement	15
<i>Robin Matross Helms and Laura E. Rumbley</i>	
4 The Complexities of Global Engagement	19
<i>Philip G. Altbach</i>	
5 Global Engagement at US Community Colleges	23
<i>Rosalind Latiner Raby</i>	
6 The Strategic Management Challenge for Research I Universities	29
<i>Wolfgang Schlör and Timothy Barnes</i>	
7 Internationalizing Learning Communities at Liberal Arts Colleges	35
<i>Jane Dammen McAuliffe and Susan Buck Sutton</i>	
8 Developing US Partnerships: Perspectives from Abroad	41
<i>Francisco Marmolejo</i>	
9 When Partnerships Fail: Lessons from the United Arab Emirates and Singapore	45
<i>Spencer Witte</i>	

10	Institution-Industry Partnerships Abroad <i>Joseph E. Aoun</i>	51
11	International Networks and Consortia <i>Betsy E. Brown</i>	55
12	International Joint and Double-Degree Programs <i>Jason E. Lane and Kevin Kinser</i>	59
13	Global Engagement and Legal Issues <i>David Fleshler and Peter M. Poulos</i>	63

PART 2

**CHINA—EMERGING OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION COOPERATION**

14	Introduction <i>Patti McGill Peterson</i>	71
15	The World of Universities in Modern China <i>William C. Kirby</i>	73
16	Chinese Higher Education: Statistics and Trends <i>David A. Stanfield and Yukiko Shimmi</i>	77
17	Chinese Challenges: Toward a Mature Academic System <i>Philip G. Altbach</i>	83
18	China's Elite Sector and National Projects <i>Wang Qi</i>	87
19	Reform at Peking University <i>Min Weifang</i>	91
20	China's Internationalization Strategy <i>Yang Rui</i>	95
21	US and Chinese Partnerships and Their Dilemmas <i>Kathryn Mohrman</i>	99

22	China and the Community College Connection <i>Dona M. Cady</i>	103
23	Planning a Physical Presence in China <i>Andrew Scott Conning</i>	107
24	Applying to US Institutions: The Chinese Student Dilemma <i>Linda Serra Hagedorn and Zhang Yi (Leaf)</i>	111
25	US Universities Serving Chinese Students: A Culture of Accountability <i>Tim Hathaway</i>	115
PART 3		
INDIA—THE NEXT FRONTIER		
26	Introduction <i>Patti McGill Peterson</i>	121
27	India's Strategic Importance <i>David J. Skorton</i>	123
28	Creative Solutions to India's Higher Education Challenges <i>Pawan Agarwal</i>	127
29	India: The Dilemmas of Reform <i>Philip G. Altbach</i>	131
30	India's National Knowledge Commission <i>P. J. Lavakare</i>	137
31	Higher Education and the Indian Labor Market <i>Lakshmi Narayanan</i>	143
32	Partnerships in India: Navigating the Policy and Legal Maze <i>Rahul Choudaha</i>	147
33	International Partnerships: An Indian Perspective <i>Fazal Rizvi</i>	151

34	India's Relationships Beyond the United States <i>Neil Kemp</i>	155
35	Indian Bilateral Higher Education Development Initiatives <i>Yukiko Shimmi and David A. Stanfield</i>	161
36	Addressing Global Challenges: The University of Nebraska in India <i>James B. Milliken</i>	163
37	India and US Community Colleges <i>Miriam J. Carter, DeRionne Pollard, and Sanjay Rai</i>	169
38	Exploring Future Student Recruitment in India <i>Wesley Teter</i>	173
39	US Study Abroad in India <i>Shannon Cates and Jonathan Ferguson</i>	179

PART 4**ARGENTINA, BRAZIL, CHILE: "ENGAGING WITH THE SOUTHERN CONE"**

40	Introduction <i>Patti McGill Peterson</i>	187
41	The Southern Cone of the Americas: Higher Education at a Crossroads <i>Jorge Balán</i>	189
42	Higher Education: Main Features, Key Issues, and Challenges <i>Ana García de Fanelli</i>	195
43	Argentina: Student and Scholar Mobility <i>Karina Felitti and Andrea Rizzotti</i>	201
44	Pursuing Partnerships with Argentina <i>Liz Reisberg</i>	205
45	Overview of the Brazilian Higher Education System <i>Marcelo Knobel</i>	209

46	Brazil: Student and Scholar Mobility <i>Maria Krane</i>	213
47	Collaboration Between Brazilian and US Institutions: The Time is Ripe <i>Rita Moriconi</i>	219
48	Chile: An Overview <i>Andrés Bernasconi</i>	225
49	International Academic Mobility in Chile <i>Nuria Alsina</i>	229
50	US-Chilean University Partnerships: Why is Chile a Model for the Future? <i>Ned Strong</i>	235
51	Southern Cone Countries: Global Engagement Beyond the United States <i>Leandro R. Tessler</i>	239
	About the Contributors	243
	About the Editors	253

Introduction

*Laura E. Rumbley, Robin Matross Helms,
Patti McGill Peterson, and Philip G. Altbach*

Higher education leaders today are recognizing the need to develop an international strategy for their institutions but may lack the knowledge and perspective required to inform good decisions. Students are graduating into an increasingly integrated international environment that, while offering exciting opportunities, also presents many challenges. Faculty are challenged by the need to exercise greater stewardship over a globally oriented curriculum. They are also interested in expanding international research networks and collaborative projects. Institutions must create educational environments where students will begin to appreciate the complexity of global integration and develop skills to navigate it successfully. International outreach and initiatives enrich institutional culture but must be based on good information and analysis.

To address this need, the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) in 2012 launched a publication and webinar series titled *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders*. The purpose of the series is to assist campus leaders, particularly American college and university presidents, chief academic officers, and senior international officers, in their efforts to make sense of a broad and complex set of issues inherent in the internationalization of American higher education today. In an era of “information overload” and in light of the realities of time constraints faced by busy institutional leaders, each *Brief* publication is organized around one clearly defined topic. The *Briefs* are also presented in a highly readable format, consisting of 10-12 articles of 1,000-1,300 words in length, on various dimensions of the primary subject matter.

In order to provide readers with a relevant and compelling set of insights and perspectives on each *Brief* topic, the authors represent

a wide range of backgrounds, ranging from university presidents, to policymakers and scholars, to frontline administrators and program officers. Each has recognized expertise in different areas of the issues under consideration, and all are sensitive to the particularities of the American higher education context. They are concerned with presenting information and ideas that US institutional leaders might find most useful in their strategic decision-making processes.

Although the *Briefs* have largely been conceived to serve as resources for an American audience, the material they contain has much wider applicability. While contexts certainly vary by country, university leaders and policymakers everywhere face similarly pressing needs to understand the shape and scope of new internationalization trends and developments. They are also called upon to further their understanding of specific countries and regions where opportunities to engage are currently unfolding. The topics covered by the ACE-CIHE *Briefs*, therefore, resonate beyond the scope of any one particular national environment, and can be a useful resource for many higher education leaders around the world.

Current Content: Responding and Leading

Our first set of *Briefs* was designed to provide analysis of issues of pressing current interest—specifically, three significant countries/world regions and the broad theme of global engagement. The three countries/world regions included in this book—China, India, and the southern cone of Latin America—are among the most dynamic parts of the world for many reasons, but particularly in terms of their roles as sources of internationally mobile students. Together, they are the source of well over one-third of the world’s mobile student population. Opportunities for partnerships and other models of engagement are emerging, in some cases spurred by government initiatives and funding.

Despite the importance of these countries, however, their large and complex higher education systems represent uncharted territory for many—in universities, government agencies, and among faculty and students, as well. The *Briefs* dedicated to these specific parts of the world endeavor to stake out the most relevant data, core elements, and likely future directions of the higher education sectors in these parts of the world, in order to then provide informed insight into what all of this information means for international engagement prospects there.

In addition to *where* institutions are focusing their international energies, *how* they approach their work to internationalize and engage globally is a fundamental concern in the current conversation around internationalization in the United States, and elsewhere. For this

reason, the first “thematic” issue of the *Briefs* series zeroes in on the topic of “new modalities” for global engagement. Key questions raised here include such fundamentals as how one defines “global engagement” and where it fits into institutions’ missions and ethos. More specifically, the *Brief* provides perspectives on how global engagement plays out across various types of US institutions—including community colleges, research universities, liberal arts colleges, and others. The analysis also explores particular channels for engagement, such as international networks and consortia as well as growing interest in joint and double-degrees, among other modalities. Importantly, the lessons of “failure” are considered as well, as these experiences often provide some of the deepest learning for institutions and their constituents.

Overall, a primary purpose of the *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders* series is to provide key data, contextual information, and practical advice for institutions seeking to initiate or expand their global engagement—in particular geographic areas as well as through new types of activities and initiatives. More broadly, however, the *Briefs* are built around the collective effort of ACE and CIHE—drawing on their extensive national and international knowledge networks—to uncover issues of emerging importance and help US higher education leaders understand their place in the global higher education landscape. By including information and perspectives from non-US sources on how American interests intersect (or not) with other countries’ objectives and approaches, as well as balanced assessments of what may be gained or lost by action or inaction in the face of evolving opportunities and imperatives, the *Briefs* seek to provide an in-depth, multifaceted picture of both the current lay of the land, and new developments on the horizon.

From *Briefs* to Book

The *Briefs* series has been well-received. Electronic copies were circulated originally to those who subscribed to ACE’s webinar series—which featured commentary and interactive audience conversation with 3 to 4 contributing authors. The *Briefs* are now freely available on the ACE Web site.

Each *Brief* issue easily stands alone, with a clear logic as a self-contained publication. Collectively, however, the four initial *Briefs* in the series offer readers a unique and rather expansive picture of several important dimensions of the internationalization and global engagement agenda of concern to American higher education leaders today, with resonance beyond these shores, as well. This book, therefore, can serve as a most helpful resource to a variety of constituents—those

with responsibilities for internationalization working in the American higher education context; those working with US college and university counterparts in this domain; non-US university leaders around the world with similar interests and concerns; and students and scholars of internationalization in higher education, seeking new insights and perspectives on this phenomenon.

There is much more work to be done to make sense of the many dimensions of internationalization and global engagement jostling for our collective attention. The *International Briefs for Higher Education* series will continue to address these issues; a fifth installment, on the subject of international joint and double-degree programs, is due to be published in 2015. For now, this book stands as an important first step in our ongoing effort to compile and conserve important aspects of our collective thinking on these dynamic issues of our time.

ACE and CIHE: Natural Collaborators

The American Council on Education (ACE) and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) have a long track record of work in the internationalization and international higher education realms. Since its establishment in 1995, CIHE has incorporated research and analysis on the issues of globalization and internationalization into its broad suite of publications and information dissemination activities. It has done so with a particular eye on marshaling leading-edge knowledge from around the world, not simply from one national context. ACE, as the most prominent higher education association in the United States, has for more than two decades served as a reference point for key questions about the international dimensions of American higher education. ACE has been particularly influential in terms of its work to “map” internationalization on US campuses, its efforts to support strategic planning on campuses for effective internationalization, leadership development for internationalization, as well as helping to frame the national discussion around the internationalization of higher education, both in terms of policy and practice.

In 2011, ACE’s Blue Ribbon Panel on Global Engagement released *Strength Through Global Leadership and Engagement: US Higher Education in the 21st Century* (ACE 2011), an analysis of American needs and interests in relation to various core elements of internationalization. This report highlighted the crucial need for US colleges and universities to “engage strategically and substantively with a globalized higher education environment and interconnected world” (ACE 2011, p. 7). It also called upon ACE to renew its efforts to provide cutting-edge leadership

in this area. Meanwhile, ACE's 2012 report, *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* (ACE 2012), revealed that progress is being made across some dimensions, but that other aspects of internationalization lagged behind—for example in the area of faculty support/recognition, and curricular requirements for undergraduate students.

The momentum created by the Blue Ribbon Panel and “Mapping” reports, as well as the establishment of ACE's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), has provided impetus for a series of new ACE-led initiatives in the last few years. As a group, these initiatives are designed to expand the range of support provided to American higher education institutions to advance their international agendas in smart, principled, and sustainable ways. An important aspect of this work is a commitment to meeting the needs of the stakeholders involved—particularly at the level of strategic decision makers—for current information and thoughtful analysis about key issues related to the internationalization enterprise.

Given their respective resources and expertise, ACE and CIHE recognized that partnering would be an ideal way to advance well-informed conversations about international issues in higher education. Indeed, a wide range of topics could be addressed in a highly authoritative way by leveraging the scope and capacity of the combined networks of ACE and CIHE. While ACE's membership provides important insights into the needs and priorities of US higher education leaders, CIHE offers easy access to an extensive array of individuals with topic- and country-specific expertise. Together, our two organizations are well positioned to expand our baseline understanding of the many dimensions of internationalization in US higher education and beyond. We look forward to ongoing collaboration between the two organizations and to assisting with collaboration among institutions of higher education worldwide.

References

- American Council on Education. 2011. *Strength through global leadership and engagement: US higher education in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: ACE.
- American Council on Education. 2012. *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, DC: ACE.

Part 1
Global Engagement—*New Modalities*

1

Introduction

Patti McGill Peterson

We are pleased to publish the second in our series, *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders*. Our choice of global engagement as the theme for this issue is reflective of growing interest and activity among US colleges and universities, in the development of outreach and relationships with institutions in other countries.

Global engagement is a penultimate component of internationalization. Through whatever form taken—cooperative academic programming, dual degrees, or the joint development of a physical campus—it extends the reach of internationalization of US higher education significantly, by bringing partners from other countries into the orbit by which institutions define themselves and expand the parameters of what they are and who they serve.

The definitional nature of global engagement is exciting, as well as daunting. If it is aligned closely with the mission of an institution, carefully woven into its strategic vision, well-planned and executed, the results can be salutary. However, if it is done hastily, without careful planning and clear expectations on the part of all parties, the results can be disappointing and possibly damaging.

This *Brief* provides substantial insight into the dimensions of different aspects of global engagement. A number of the articles outline the path to successful global partnerships and several document some of the causative factors in unsuccessful joint ventures. Among them, a list of *sine qua nons* emerge for those who are contemplating global engagement. The critical importance of high-level leadership and coherent strategy rise to the top of the list. The combination of the two provides institutional commitment for a long-term horizon. The role of the faculty in the development and sustainability of joint initiatives is also a critical factor. And ultimately, the way in which high-level leadership engages with the faculty, in defining the framework and direction

for the institution's global engagement strategies, is an essential platform for success.

Many different models will undoubtedly emerge, as various types of institutions become more globally engaged. The report of ACE's Blue Ribbon Panel for Global Engagement not only viewed global engagement as a key factor for the future strength of US higher education, it also emphasized that one size does not fit all. The articles in this *Brief* underscore how different kinds of institutions with differing missions can develop their own successful modalities of engagement.

At the core of this rich mix of possibilities is the need for partners to be keenly aware of what each brings to the table and an inherent willingness to view one another with respect and mutuality. Global engagement of institutions across national borders holds the possibility of improving higher education worldwide. Engagement, if done well, is a tide that can lift all ships and is important well beyond individual institutions. The potential outcomes are a compelling global prospect.

2

A Presidential Perspective on Global Engagement

Lou Anna K. Simon

Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2012, published by ACE's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement in June, issues a clarion call for all academic institutions to become more global in vision, values, and strategic initiatives. As presidents, we overwhelmingly agree that it is desirable for our institutions to become more global. Partnerships, collaborations, and other ventures abroad are an important part of our efforts to make such a global vision a reality on our campuses and throughout US higher education.

Creating a “World-Grant” University

In framing the strategic position for Michigan State University (MSU) around our sesquicentennial and in anticipation of the sesquicentennial of the Morrill Act, we put forth the bold ideal of becoming “world grant” in our vision and actions. That frame serves as a 21st-century basis not only for aligning teaching and research and engagement but also for integrating internationalization across the mission.

For a land-grant institution such as MSU, making this vision a reality means extending the traditional land-grant values of inclusiveness, quality, and connectivity to a world-grant or global frame. The last decade's dramatic shift in economies, communications, systems of trade, and research—and this shift's impact on local life worldwide—compels a land-grant institution to focus both locally and globally, in order serve students and society.

Becoming a world-grant university necessitates engagement in comprehensive internationalization—a concept aligned with ACE's past use of the term (Olson, Green, and Hill 2005). As my colleague and NAFSA Senior Scholar for Internationalization, John Hudzik notes, “Com-

prehensive Internationalization is a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise” (Hudzik 2011).

In pursuit of comprehensive internationalization, over the last 60 years, Michigan State University has expanded its global commitments, connections, and programming in all of its missions, both on and off its East Lansing campus. Our strategy in doing so has been to “leverage through integration and connectivity.” If internationalization is seen as an “add-on” responsibility to current priorities rather than integrated within them, it will always be undercapitalized and intellectually marginalized. Integration of internationalization into core missions, values, and priorities serves to leverage and “dual-purpose” existing resources.

For example, we have found that adding new courses is not necessary to internationalize the curriculum. Rather, we focus on adding an international perspective to existing courses in the majors, the general education curriculum, and our liberal learning goals. We work to synchronize study abroad with degree requirements. We have expanded service learning and internships abroad. We work to integrate international students more fully into campus academic and social life, with benefits for all. We prioritize building on existing institutional and faculty research strengths, broadening them to a global frame in both basic research and problem-solving applications. It is critical that ventures abroad, from research partnerships to full branch campuses, are seen as part of an overall internationalization strategy and are integrated with and connected to these and other related efforts on campus.

Goal: Ideas, Innovation and Talent Development without Boundaries

At Michigan State University, our founding values lead us to believe that all universities, as creators of knowledge, have a responsibility to participate with partners abroad—to ensure relevance for their institutions and stability for the communities in which they reside. Currently, MSU operates 270 study-abroad programs in more than 60 countries, representing all continents; sustains 210 partnerships with international institutions; and hosts more than 25 internationally focused centers, institutes, and offices. Approximately 1,500 of our faculty members are involved in international research, teaching, and service work.

In whatever form, our approach to global engagement always includes:

- Having a leadership team philosophy and shared understandings based on asking both “Why not?” as well as “Why?”;

- Beginning with “How can we do this?” rather than “How much will this cost?”;
- Working to find synergies across teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and outreach/engagement, rather than pursuing activities within isolated categorical boundaries;
- Collaborating with institutions, domestic and international, while at the same time maintaining our own distinctive approach to institutional programs and activities, thus contributing to the diversity of missions among American higher education institutions;
- Committing to long-term initiatives with potential far beyond short-term return on investment to ensure sustainability;
- Implementing global engagement initiatives through a series of persistent, manageable steps to make it less daunting for a broader range of partners, including other colleges and universities, to join us in pursuing an ambitious global agenda;
- Taking advantage of technology to enable innovation, idea- and talent-development capacity building without boundaries (The purpose of a university is to advance knowledge, creativity, and innovation. With today’s technology, there is no excuse for not engaging with those who can further, or benefit from, this worthwhile enterprise, wherever they exist.); and
- Advancing institutional transformation as well as the transformation of our global and local partners’ economies to facilitate increased, sustainable prosperity.

In terms of implementation, our experience has taught us some important lessons. First, global engagement must be seen as a team responsibility. Success requires an array of engaged leaders—particularly academic deans and key faculty, and leaders of campus support/service units from admissions to residence halls to the registrar. For us, this has meant continuous involvement and dialogue with all such leaders and offices as the international agenda unfolds. It requires ongoing presidential and provost engagement, in reiterating expectations to these leaders; it means paying greater attention to the international experiences or interests of candidates, in searches for new leadership and faculty; and it means giving clear notice of the importance of international engagement, not only in institutional mission and value statements, but in our institutional promotion and tenure guidelines.

It is also important to promote ongoing campus dialogue to build a shared vision and culture. A single set of conversations toward developing a strategic plan is insufficient. Widely ranging dialogue and communication is necessary to draw people into a growing understand-

ing of global engagement, its connection to core institutional missions and values, and the drivers and rationales behind it. This dynamic will enable the development of a shared framework for concrete actions and increase buy-in and ownership. This permits action to begin in one area while other areas are being developed.

The Art of the Unreasonable

No longer can a university intending broader global engagement afford to wait for everything and everybody to be neatly in place before taking action. In today's competitive global higher education environment, opportunities will be lost. At MSU, we have found it important to build on strengths and existing institutional competitive advantages, but it is also exhilarating to be bold in addressing the chronic inertia that can impede reasonable progress of global engagement initiatives. The MSU strategy has been to build on strength, to set a bold long-range vision, to implement international engagement initiatives manageably through a series of unfolding projects that create momentum and lead to additional opportunities, and to ground all of this in a fundamental commitment to comprehensive internationalization.

Eli Broad (Broad and Pandey 2012) espouses the “art of the unreasonable” as the key to advancing change and innovation. Broad argues that being unreasonable is about having “outsized ambitions.” For a university, global engagement is also about having outsized ambitions—goals that cannot be constrained by the traditional boundaries of campus and ivory towers. If American higher education is to retain its prominence in the world in the decades ahead, more presidents need to encourage practicing the “art of the unreasonable.” I urge you to join me in being unreasonable about global engagement. Live the mindset, create the culture, and implement strategies that result, not just in more international linkages, programs, and places, but in truly global institutions.

References

- Broad, Eli, and Swati Pandey. 2012. *The art of being unreasonable: Lessons in unconventional thinking*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hudzik, John K. 2011. *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action*. Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.
- Olson, Christa L., Madeleine F. Green, and Barbara A. Hill. 2005. *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

3

A “Primer” for Global Engagement

Robin Matross Helms and Laura E. Rumbley

In late 2011, the American Council on Education’s Blue Ribbon Panel on Global Engagement released its report, *Strength through Global Leadership and Engagement: U.S. Higher Education in the 21st Century*. The report noted, “In the 21st century, higher education is explicitly, and fundamentally, a global enterprise,” and further that, “A prerequisite for success in this new era will be active, ongoing engagement on the part of colleges and universities in the United States with institutions around the world” (ACE 2011). As colleges and universities seek to prepare students to succeed in an increasingly globalized and interconnected world, they are recognizing the critical role of their relationships with institutions and other entities abroad in their internationalization efforts, and in the fulfillment of broader institutional missions and goals.

As interest in global engagement has proliferated, so too have the many forms such involvement may take. To some extent, each new collaboration or venture abroad by a US institution is unique, involving different players and different goals. However, as more institutions have entered the global arena, some common definitions and classifications for such ventures have emerged, which provide structure to the complicated landscape, and an analytical framework to help institutions better understand and evaluate global engagement opportunities.

What Is “Global Engagement”?

Global engagement, at its essence, is about committing to meaningful relationships with partners in other parts of the world. It represents a movement beyond the mechanics of carrying out more traditional campus-based international activities and implies dedication to a deeper and more prolonged commitment to international partnerships for mutual benefit.

Among the many types of global ventures, the most basic and most common are relatively small-scale collaborations, often spearheaded by faculty. Research collaborations between individual faculty members or teams of researchers are generally intended to result in some form of joint scholarly output—a paper, a conference presentation, or general advances in the field. Teaching collaborations involve faculty in different countries working together to instruct their respective students, often with the help of technology. Such arrangements may or may not include the physical movement of faculty or students from one country to another.

More complex, both in terms of definition and execution, are program- and institution-level collaborations. These efforts involve more people, including high-level leadership; require more coordination and a greater resource commitment; and entail signing a memorandum of understanding or other formal contract with partners. Examples of such collaborations and their commonly understood definitions include the following:

Joint degrees are collaborative arrangements, whereby courses leading to a degree are offered jointly by two institutions. Usually students from either institution may enroll and take courses at both participating institutions, and upon graduation receive either a single diploma conferred by both institutions, or a diploma issued only by the institution at which the student is registered.

Double/dual degrees involve students taking courses and receiving a separate degree or diploma from *each* participating institution. A common model for such programs is “2+2,” which requires students to spend two years on one campus and two years on the other campus. Double/dual-degree programs are sometimes referred to as “twinning arrangements,” particularly in the European and Indian contexts.

Branch campuses, as defined by Jane Knight (2005), are a situation where a provider in one country establishes a “satellite campus” in a second country for the purpose of either delivering courses or programs to students from that second country and/or potentially serving home campus students with study-abroad opportunities. Often, institutions collaborate with a university or other existing entity in the host country to secure physical space and manage logistics (such collaboration can be required by law in some countries and possibly referred to as a “joint venture”). Any qualifications awarded by the branch campus are from the home institution.

International “study centers” or “teaching sites” are a somewhat smaller-scale variation of the branch campus and involve a more limited physical presence in another country. For example, an institution plan-