

a 12-month Master of Arts in International Higher Education, an initiative of CIHE to provide a strong international program combining education, research, and field experience, using blended learning with on-site faculty and scholars from around the world, including our partners in GCIHES.

THE SHANGHAI STATEMENT OF 2013

The Shanghai statement of 2013 was a product of a roundtable initiated by CIHE. As a follow-up, the center made an inventory of research centers in higher education around the world, published under the title *Worldwide Higher Education Inventory*, and now available as an interactive map on the CIHE website.

The creation of the two global networks in higher education research, the new Master in International Higher Education and the expansion of “International Higher Education” illustrate the growing importance of higher education research and dissemination in a global context. Where higher education research was in the past limited and mainly focused on national and regional aspects, like the sector itself, the shift is now towards international higher education. This is an important development. ■

National Policies for Internationalization—Do They Work?

ROBIN MATROSS HELMS AND LAURA E. RUMBLEY

Robin Matross Helms is associate director for research, Center for International Higher Education and Engagement, American Council on Education. E-mail: rhelms@acenet.edu. Laura E. Rumbley is associate director at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu. This article is based on a report by the authors, “Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs,” published by the American Council on Education in October 2015 and available at <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Insights.aspx>.

In response to the demands and opportunities of an ever-globalizing world, governments in a wide range of countries are introducing policies and programs to promote higher education internationalization. These initiatives are underpinned by a variety of academic, economic, political, social, and cultural motivations; sometimes higher education internationalization is an explicit goal, while in other

cases, the focus is more specifically on a discrete activity, or on broader national policy goals.

A recent study by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) took a close look at the content of such policies—an overview, including a wide assortment of specific examples, is the basis for our recent report, *Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs*. Our analysis revealed five main categories of policies in place around the world, based on their primary focus:

Type 1: Student mobility. Policies designed to encourage and facilitate student mobility stand out as the most common focal point for policymaking related to internationalization of higher education. A broad array of nationally funded student mobility scholarship programs—from Saudi Arabia to Chile, Kazakhstan to Brazil, among many others—are the prime manifestations of this policy focus.

Type 2: Scholar mobility and research collaboration. Policy activity in this area is being undertaken by many countries around the world, as well as by key regions—notably Europe, where the European Union is investing heavily in this area under the Horizon 2020 initiative, and specifically through such mechanisms as the Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions. Common types of initiatives in this category include support for visiting scholars, programs, and grants to send faculty abroad, policies to repatriate faculty living in other countries, and project-based research grants.

Type 3: Cross-border education. Whether involving branch campuses and other kinds of physical “outposts,” or virtual (or hybrid) forms—such as MOOCs—national policy and program activity in this realm include initiatives to foster partnerships for capacity building, create educational “hubs,” encourage domestic institutions to establish campuses and programs abroad, and more effectively regulate cross-border activity in practice.

Type 4: Internationalization at home (IaH). IaH is a nascent but rapidly emerging critical focal point for internationalization. Few policy documents currently address it overtly. The European Commission’s 2013 strategy for internationalization, *European Higher Education in the World*, is a notable exception. But this is surely an important space to watch for future policy developments.

Type 5: “Comprehensive internationalization” policies. We see a small number of initiatives that present a rather sweeping set of rationales, action lines, focus areas, and/or geographic orientations, rather than being singularly focused on specific action lines. Again, the European Com-

mission's policy vision for internationalization stands out, but so does Canada's 2014 "International Education Strategy" and Malaysia's 2011 "Internationalization Policy for Higher Education Malaysia," among others.

GAUGING EFFECTIVENESS

With national-level internationalization policies and programs proliferating in a variety of contexts and configurations, the question of effectiveness comes front and center. Do these policies positively impact the direction and progress of internationalization in their respective higher education systems? In the longer term, do they succeed in furthering the academic, economic, political, social, and/or cultural goals they set out to achieve?

As is often the case when it comes to education-related issues, determining the effectiveness of internationalization policies is challenging. Often, efforts to do so focus on easily measured, clearly quantified outputs. Did country A's policy achieve its goal of recruiting X number of new international students to the country's universities in the specified timeline? In addition to participant numbers, financial analyses—another easily quantified measure, and one that often appeals to policy-makers—may come into play as an evaluation tool.

Policies designed to encourage and facilitate student mobility stand out as the most common focal point for policy-making related to internationalization of higher education.

When it comes to the more nebulous, longer-term outcomes, and impact of such policies, studies by the British Council/DAAD and the HEFCE (the Higher Education Funding Council for England), the European Commission, and the International Association of Universities have made some inroads in delineating impacts of different policies, using various methodologies. Overall, though, specific data and clear answers about issues of impact are fairly scarce. In part, this is due to the newness of many of the internationalization policies now in place around the world—it is simply too soon to tell what their ultimate impact will be. In many other cases, evaluation of impact simply appears not be built into policy implementation structures.

Having examined a large number of such policies and the available data on effectiveness, however, it is clear that there are a number of key factors—both inherent to the

policies themselves, as well as external factors impacting implementation—that affect policy effectiveness (positively or negatively).

Funding is of primary importance. Not surprisingly, policy effectiveness may be directly affected by issues such as the level at which policies are funded, the ways in which funding is distributed, and the degree to which funding is sustained over time.

How policies are implemented, and by whom, is also crucial. It is common knowledge that "one size fits all" is not a useful way to think about internationalization policy or practice. So, national policies may be implemented in a wide variety of ways—for example, involving many actors or just a few. The ways that policies are implemented can have a major effect on issues such as efficiency, and raise important questions about the capacity of policy implementers to advance their agendas and manage their work well.

Looking beyond individual policies themselves gives rise to the issue of policy interplay and alignment. For most countries, the national policy environment is complex and interlocking. Initiatives undertaken in one area can have a direct influence on efforts being undertaken in other policy spheres. Classic examples in relation to internationalization include the intersection between national objectives to attract international students and scholars, and visa and immigration policies that control access to the country. If policies are developed and implemented in isolation from one another, or directly at cross-purposes, policy effectiveness will suffer.

Finally, the level of convergence between policy objectives and institutional priorities impacts effectiveness of national-level initiatives. Internationalization of higher education is a phenomenon most directly experienced by higher education institutions themselves. For this reason, national policies for internationalization must be grounded in an understanding of institutional realities. National policies that fail to take into account institutional priorities, and vice versa, present major challenges for achieving successful outcomes.

INTERNATIONALIZING INTERNATIONALIZATION

Will individual countries' internationalization policies ultimately achieve their short- and long-term goals? Only time will tell. But, perhaps the more interesting question is what the overall impact of such policies will be on higher education worldwide. The growing number of countries that are committing—in very concrete, formal, and resource-intensive ways—to internationalizing their higher education systems suggests that the time is right to collectively take our efforts to the next level, and turn our attention to the "internationalization of internationalization." The impact of country-level policies will be maximized when we find

the synergies among them—i.e., when our policies are mutually supportive and reinforcing.

This is not necessarily an easy task—it requires broad awareness of policies in place, and dialogue at the national policymaking and institutional levels. As we note at the end of the ACE-CIHE report, “ensuring that higher education around the world benefits from the best of what comprehensive, sustained, values-driven internationalization has to offer will take a great deal of creativity, substantial resources, and sheer hard work.” ■

Employment Opportunity as a Driver of Student Mobility

CHRISTINE FARRUGIA

Christine Farrugia is senior research officer with the IIE Center for Academic Mobility Research and Impact at the Institute of International Education in New York, where she oversees Open Doors®. E-mail: cfarrugia@iie.org.

The opportunity to gain practical work experience is growing in importance as a driver of student mobility around the globe. For several years Open Doors® has documented the increasing numbers of US students who are engaging in work, internships, and volunteering abroad. In 2013–2014, there were more than 41,000, including those who received academic credit for their work abroad and those who pursued non-credit work opportunities overseas. International students also value work experience to complement their studies, with more than 12 percent of the nearly 1 million international students in the United States in 2014–2015 engaging in Optional Practical Training (OPT), which is a period of work available for international students who have graduated from a US college or university. While recent extensions of the OPT eligibility period for graduates in STEM fields accounts for some of this proportion, students’ willingness to stay on for work in growing numbers and for longer periods indicates how important this aspect of international education is for many students. Globally, we have seen that policies governing students’ ability to work has impacted international student numbers in countries such as Canada, Germany, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

WORK IS MORE ATTRACTIVE FOR SOME INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Work opportunities are more influential drivers of mobility for students from certain countries than from others. While many students value the ability to gain practical work experience that will help them gain jobs back home or in their host country, others may be driven by economic conditions in their home countries that push them to take advantage of study-related work opportunities in the host country.

Many students from Asia pursue OPT in relatively high numbers, including those from India, Nepal, Taiwan, and China. Indian students are especially motivated by the opportunity to work in the host country following graduation. In the United States, Indian students are the leaders in OPT participation, with 22 percent of Indian students engaged in OPT in 2014–2015. At the same time, the number of Indian students in the United Kingdom has dipped over the past several years, following policy changes restricting the availability of post-study work visas following graduation. Following the implementation of the UK policy, Indian students fell by nearly 50 percent from 2011 to 2014, while their numbers increased by 70 percent in Australia, and 37 percent in the United States over the same time period.

While many students desire the opportunity to gain practical work experience along with their overseas studies, not all do so through work following graduation. The case of Brazilian students provides one example. While fewer than 5 percent of Brazilian students in the United States engaged in post-completion OPT in 2014/2015, over 12,000 were placed in internships alongside their studies in the United States in from 2011 through 2015. These training opportunities have been incorporated into the Brazil government’s Scientific Mobility Program as a key component of the students’ academic and professional preparation so that they may return to Brazil with both academic knowledge and practical skills. Among students from some countries, work opportunities play a lesser role in their mobility patterns. For example, OPT accounts for just 2 percent of the international students from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait who were in the United States in 2014–2015. However, these low OPT rates may not be a function of low student interest in work opportunities, but may result from conditions of their governments’ scholarship programs that encourage them to return their home countries once they graduate.

It is not just where the students come from that factors into their likelihood to pursue work opportunities related to their studies; who the students are matters as well. A special study (forthcoming) on US students’ non-credit education abroad conducted by IIE as part of Generation Study Abroad found that slightly higher proportions of men engage in non-credit activities, including work, internships, and volunteering, than they do in traditional curriculum-