

Institutional flexibility allowed under new “incorporation” legislation permits universities to offer distinctive tenure arrangements and salary packages to entice internationally competitive scholars. At one university, exceptional scholars can earn up to twice their baseline salary based on performance. Knowledge of Japanese is not required because these scholars will teach at the postgraduate level, with international or internationally minded students. New facilities include more dormitories, world-class laboratories, and international student services and amenities. At a time when university budgets are being reduced by one percent annually, many Japanese higher education leaders are worried.

IMPACT ON FUNDING INTERNATIONALIZATION

Competitiveness and funding are common themes in all countries—to make higher education institutions attractive academically, research-wise, and physically—and thus draw international students and faculty. There are two main policy regimes. Germany and Japan are unapologetically using marketing and rankings to create greater vertical (reputational) and horizontal (functional) differentiation, concentrating “excellence” in 10 and 30 world-class universities, respectively. This will probably involve closing down some regional and private universities. In contrast, Australia—with its newly elected social democratic government—wants to “brand Australia” with a “diverse set of high-performing, globally focused” higher education institutions. Because rankings and similar benchmarking assessments do influence institutional behavior and performance, the policy choices are critical.



Internationalization on US Campuses: Slipping Backward?

KIMBERLY KOCH

Kimberly Koch is a program associate at the American Council on Education's Center for International Initiatives. Address: ACE, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036, USA. E-mail: kim_koch@ace.nche.edu.

Faced with unprecedented economic integration and globalization, one might expect to see higher education institutions redoubling their efforts to internationalize their campuses. In reality, internationalization efforts at US colleges and universities are uneven at best.

In May, the American Council on Education (ACE) released a report that summarizes the findings of a 2006 survey of US

colleges and universities on their policies and practices in furthering internationalization. Titled *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2008 Edition* and written by Madeleine F. Green, Dao Luu, and Beth Burris, the report is the second in a series, following a 2001 study. These reports are the only comprehensive source of data on internationalization in US higher education institutions. In 2006, ACE surveyed 2,746 institutions and received an overall response rate of 39 percent. The report highlights the 2006 data, comparing it with information gathered in 2001 when possible. The publication reports the findings for all respondents as well as by institutional type (doctorate-granting universities, master's colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, and associate's colleges). The data emerging from the study were often surprising and suggested the need for campus leaders to refocus their efforts toward internationalization, although a few encouraging trends emerged.

LOW PRIORITIES ON MOST CAMPUSES

The survey data indicate that formal institutional commitments to internationalization are lackluster. In 2006, just 39 percent of institutions made a specific reference to international or global education in their mission statements, and 34 percent listed it among their top five strategic priorities (although that is up from 28% in 2001). Forty-four percent had a task force that worked solely on advancing internationalization efforts, and slightly more than half (52%) reported that they assigned a visible role to internationalization by highlighting international or global education programs and opportunities in their recruitment literature. Only 23 percent had a separate plan that addresses institutionwide internationalization. Although mission statements and strategic plans are only one piece of internationalization efforts, the articulation of explicit goals and development of reinforcing strategies to meet those goals are critical to affecting broad and deep change.

LIMITED REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATES

In the past five years, the intensification of global trade and heightened attention to national security have raised awareness in the United States about the need for more Americans to be able to speak a language other than English. Despite this imperative, ACE's study found that required language study is far from universal. Only 23 percent of all institutions surveyed had a foreign-language admissions requirement, an increase of only 2 percent from 2001. Institutions were also less likely to have undergraduate foreign-language graduation requirements for all or some students in 2006 (45%) than in 2001 (53%). Less than one in five (16%) had a foreign-language graduation requirement for all undergraduate students in 2006.

Furthermore, ACE found that fewer institutions required a course with an international or global focus as part of their general education requirements in 2006 (37%) than in 2001 (41%). Among institutions with such a requirement, the proportion with a “non-Western” course requirement dropped

from 62 percent in 2001 to 50 percent in 2006. It is important to note, however, that there are major differences in these findings by institutional type. More than half of doctorate-granting, master's, and baccalaureate institutions had such general education requirements; and 50 percent of doctorate and master's colleges and universities with such a requirement required two or more courses with an international focus.

The survey data indicate that formal institutional commitments to internationalization are lackluster.

LOW NUMBERS OF BRANCH CAMPUSES AND PROGRAMS

Despite expanded media coverage on the establishment of high-profile branch campuses in the Middle East and the implementation of degree-granting programs with partners in China and India, few US institutions actually offer such programs. The ACE survey found that 8 percent of all responding institutions offered such programs abroad, with doctorate-granting institutions being the most likely to do so. Approximately two in five of those institutions with programs abroad offered some or all of them through branch campuses. The majority of degree programs abroad were offered in China (40%) or Western Europe (30%); and in the field of business/management (64%).

IT'S NOT ALL BAD NEWS . . .

From 2001 to 2006, ACE saw a dramatic increase in the proportion of institutions that offer study-abroad opportunities—from 65 percent in 2001 to 91 percent in 2006. More institutions are also offering internships abroad (31%, 9% increase from 2001), international service opportunities (24%, 11% increase from 2001), and field study abroad (29%, 7% increase from 2001). Additionally, ACE found that institutions are signaling their support for education abroad by creating guidelines to ensure that undergraduate students can participate in approved education-abroad programs without delaying graduation. Sixty-six percent of institutions had such guidelines in 2006, up from 56 percent in 2001. Still, the proportion of students participating in such programs remained low. Twenty-seven percent of institutions reported that no students who graduated in 2005 had participated in study abroad, and 46 percent indicated that less than 5 percent of their 2005 graduating class had done so.

Institutions are also increasing opportunities and funding for international research and travel for faculty members. In 2006, 58 percent of institutions supported faculty to lead study abroad programs, compared with 46 percent in 2001. Similarly, the proportion of institutions supporting faculty travel to meetings abroad rose from 40 percent in 2001 to 56 percent in 2006. Appreciably more institutions offered funding

for faculty to study or conduct research abroad in 2006 than in 2001 (39%, compared with 27%). More institutions offered opportunities for faculty to increase their foreign-language skills (36% in 2006, up from 16% in 2001). Both ACE's experience working directly with institutions and the literature on internationalization show that faculty play a leading role in driving campus internationalization. Institutional investments in faculty international experiences, therefore, can have a significant impact on internationalizing the curriculum.

The data show that US institutions are making slow and uneven progress toward comprehensive internationalization. Although survey data present an incomplete picture, there is ample evidence that institutional policies and practices have not yet caught up with the rhetoric of internationalization. Overall, internationalization does not permeate the fabric of most institutions; it is not yet sufficiently deep nor as widespread as it should be to prepare students to meet the challenges they will face. ■

The Private Nature of Cross-Border Higher Education

JASON E. LANE AND KEVIN KINSER

Jason Lane is assistant professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, SUNY. Kevin Kinser is a PROPHE collaborating scholar and associate professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, SUNY. E-mail: jlane@albany.edu; kkinser@albany.edu.

IHE devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/>.

Many observers have noted that the relatively easy international mobility of students, faculty, and curriculum facilitates the growth of cross-border higher education. Equally important, new foreign providers are encouraged in many countries by a policy environment that supports private-sector involvement in education. Private higher education institutions, especially for-profit providers, are clearly interested in the cross-border market. Still, public-sector institutions have been and continue to be significant participants in cross-border higher education. When abroad, however, these public institutions nearly always operate and are legally recognized as private entities. Indeed, most foreign operations are supported primarily through tuition and fees and typically do not receive funding from either the home or the host governments.