

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

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

SPECIAL ISSUE ON INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Global Perspectives

- 2 International(ization of) Higher Education at the Crossroads
Hans de Wit and Fiona Hunter
- 3 Idealism and Utilitarianism in Internationalization of Higher Education
Roger Y. Chao, Jr.

Internationalization at Home

- 5 Internationalizing the Curriculum and all Students' Learning
Betty Leask
- 6 Graduate Employability and Internationalization of the Curriculum at Home
Elspeth Jones
- 8 The Missing Link in Intercultural Competence Development: The University's Organizational Capability to Deliver
Jeanine Gregersen-Hermans
- 10 Internationalizing Students in the Home Country—Dutch Policies
Adinda van Gaalen and Renate Gielesen

Countries and Regions

- 12 Ideological Shift in Indian Higher Education Internationalization
Mona Khare
- 14 Internationalizing Research in Saudi Arabia: Purchasing Questionable Privilege
Manail Anis Ahmed
- 16 New Directions for Internationalization of Tertiary Education in Latin America and the Caribbean
Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila
- 17 Institutional Engagement in Internationalizing Higher Education: Perspectives from Kazakhstan
Aisi Li and Adil Ashirbekov
- 19 Internationalization of Japanese Universities: Learning from the CAMPUS Asia Experience
Miki Horie
- 21 Consolidating ERASMUS Mobility in Spain During the Economic Crisis
Adriana Pérez Encinas

Branch Campuses

- 22 When is an International Branch Campus?
Nigel Healey
- 24 International Branch Campuses and Institutional Control
Robert Coelen

Departments

- 25 News of CHEI and CIHE
- 26 New Publications

International(ization of) Higher Education at the Crossroads

HANS DE WIT AND FIONA HUNTER

Hans de Wit is Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy, and Professor of Internationalization of higher Education at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences. E-mail: j.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl. Fiona Hunter is Research Associate at the Center in Milan, coeditor of the Journal of Studies in International Education and consultant, trainer, and researcher in higher education. E-mail: fionajanehunter@gmail.com. They are the editors of this annual special issue on internationalization of higher education for International Higher Education, a collaboration between CHEI and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education. .

International higher education is best described as the study of higher education in its international and global context. Globalization, the increasing importance of knowledge in economy and society, massification and internationalization have moved higher education from being primarily national in orientation to the international forefront. *International Higher Education*, the Center at Boston College that publishes this newsletter and in particular its director, Philip G. Altbach, is closely associated with this field, if not the founder of it. It is a topic of wide interest and growing policy relevance. As Altbach has described it in 2013: “Globalization has brought the international role of universities to prominence and has greatly expanded the scope of campus internationalization.” With this statement, he brings the two fields, international higher education and internationalization of higher education, together. Where international higher education broadly analyzes international developments in higher education at the system level, internationalization can be seen as a subcategory of this work—focusing more specifically on the international rationales, approaches, strategies, activities; outcomes of higher education at the regional, national; and institutional level, and (where possible) in a comparative perspective.

It would take too much space and debate to set clear demarcating lines between the two fields, given that the two are more than ever now intertwined. *International Higher Education*, as well as other higher education journals and books, increasingly include contributions on internationalization of higher education, while those which focus more specifically on the latter, such as the *Journal of Studies in International Education*, address internationalization more broadly in a systematic, international, and global context. Why, then, a special issue of *International Higher Educa-*

tion dedicated specifically to internationalization, instead of continuing to include contributions on this topic in the regular issues—something that will also happen in the future in any case?

While it is indeed a fact that internationalization has become a key pillar both in higher education in practice and in scholarship in the field, the focus is still predominantly on some of its components and aspects, in particular the mobility of students and scholars as well as, more recently, programs and projects, also described as transnational education or cross-border delivery of education. There is another dimension to internationalization: the curriculum, teaching and learning and learning outcomes, sometimes also described as internationalization at home, which is receiving less attention, along with the relation between mobility and the “at home” aspects. This special issue seeks to

This Special Issue seeks to highlight new and innovative dimensions in internationalization.

highlight new and innovative dimensions in internationalization. It also gives space to developments in internationalization of higher education in regions and countries that are less known than English-speaking countries and western Europe. And it illustrates the increasing importance and diversity of internationalization (in terms of concepts and “lived realities”) in modern international higher education. The contributions to this first special issue are a manifestation of these rationales.

As editors of the special issue and as director and research associate of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalization at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy, we are looking forward to this collaboration between our two Centers in this publication and invite you to propose contributions for its next annual issue. ■

Idealism and Utilitarianism in Internationalization of Higher Education

ROGER Y. CHAO, JR.

Roger Y. Chao, Jr. holds a PhD on Asian and International Studies from the City University of Hong Kong, and currently an international consultant in higher education for UNESCO. E-mail: rylimchao@yahoo.com.

Internationalization of higher education is increasingly becoming a key policy directive across nation states and regions, as a result of the increased interdependency brought about by the twin processes of globalization and regionalization. Thus, higher education is increasingly becoming a production line for the global competence and skilled human capital required by the global knowledge-based labor market.

Internationalization of higher education has become a broad term meaning several (and at times overlapping or contradicting) ideas and activities—in particular, academic and student mobility, international research collaboration, cross-border and transnational education, offering programs in English, and using international curricula and textbooks. The establishment of the global higher education market, financing challenges of higher education institutions, reconceptualization of higher education as a private good, and the increased demand and massification of higher education, have all encouraged its utilitarianism.

These developments are taking place within a changing world order that has reshaped the relationship among nation states and their respective higher education systems, established new transnational/supranational governance structures, and facilitated diversity in the delivery of public services, including higher education. This article highlights the two extremes, idealism, and utilitarianism, of internationalization of higher education within a changing world order, in order to provide a basis for understanding its multiple meanings and functions.

THE CHANGING WORLD ORDER

The end of the Second World War saw a rapidly changing world order, including global and regional peace-building initiatives and the establishment of new nation-states and regions. Most of the silos between nation-states have disappeared and been replaced by increased interdependency between nation-states, the establishment of regions and their respective regional institutions. As such, the world order is increasingly shifting into a world of regions and will continue evolving into another form in the future. This

shift in the world order has been made possible with the advancement of information and communications technology (ICT), the advent of cheap travel, the end of the Cold War, increased political and economic interdependency, and the demographic challenges of the developed world. Developing Asia's demographic premium not only supplies human capital to the world but also serves as a major market for international higher education.

This changing world order has impacted higher education, changed the higher education environment, and shifted the meaning and nature of internationalization of higher education. Higher education has now become a policy instrument to support sustainable economic development. The global race for talent emphasizes students as future laborers rather than being citizens of nation-states, regions, and the world. These developments have led to higher education being viewed as a private good. Its massification, decreased public-sector financing, and multilateral initiatives have redefined education as a tradable commodity and established the global higher education market.

As the increasingly interdependent world order necessitates, higher education curricula need to be internationalized but not to the extent of reducing local knowledge and culture into one homogenized international standard.

SHIFTING AND MULTIPLE MEANINGS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

The changing world order and the establishment of the global higher education market have set the tone for the shifting and multiple meanings and nature of internationalization of higher education. Advancement in ICT, reduced trade barriers, and an increased openness to labor mobility due to demographic challenges and the shortage of skilled and competent labor in developed nation states also play a role in pushing for the utilitarian function of internationalization of higher education.

In spite of the university's international nature, internationalization of higher education is a recent phenomenon of the 1980s and 1990s, where the focus was on social and political rationales. The changing world order, however, has greatly impacted the meaning and nature of internationalization of higher education, with the last 25 years focused on more economically driven rationales. Aside from the preparation of globally competent human capital,

it has predominantly become a commercialized endeavor with its potential to help finance higher education institutions, serve as a gateway for immigration, and a filtering mechanism for host nation states.

Global labor and student mobility, however, has increasingly shifted from the traditional South-North dynamic to South-South engagement and, to a lesser extent (and primarily in relation to credit mobility) a North-South direction, given the global production chain, outsourcing of production and various other processes, and the advent of multinational corporations. Cross-border and transnational programs have been established in part due to financing challenges of higher education institutions in the Global North, but also due to the growing demand for higher education in emerging economies, particularly in Asia and the Middle East.

Nation-states' sovereignty over higher education has increasingly been challenged as their respective higher education institutions and systems embrace internationalization by introducing international "English medium" programs and curricula, undertaking joint programs, and inviting foreign higher education institutions into their territory and national higher education systems. This enhances the commercialization of higher education and the increasing focus of internationalization of higher education's utilitarianism.

Internationalization of higher education has become a broad term meaning several (and at times overlapping or contradicting) ideas and activities.

IDEALISM AND UTILITARIANISM

The higher education sector, however, is not limited to its utilitarian function of producing human capital for national and regional economic development. The universities' traditional roles as ivory towers for societal development, knowledge production, and eventually molding global citizens and the world's future leaders, simply conflict with this utilitarian function. In fact, civic engagement, addressing global social problems, and millennium goals should be incorporated into universities' core missions.

Internationalization of higher education has political, socioeconomic, cultural and academic rationales, and is simultaneously a top-down and bottom-up process. Furthermore, internationalization occurs within and outside of national higher education systems. As such, it goes beyond the increased and seemingly institutionalized focus on international faculty and student mobility, cross-border

and transnational education, and research collaboration. It should incorporate an ongoing dialogue and negotiation of national, regional, and global knowledge, skills and competencies requirements, and national, regional, and global needs within a changing world order.

Ideally, internationalization of higher education should not only take into account the changing world order and its economic rationale, but also the political, cultural, and academic rationales, which include identity formation, societal betterment, and the development of global citizens. As the increasingly interdependent world order necessitates,

Higher education has now become a policy instrument to support sustainable economic development.

higher education curricula need to be internationalized but not to the extent of reducing local knowledge and culture into one homogenized international standard. The diversity across regions and nation-states requires internationalization from above and below to mold global citizens who are culturally adept and competent to contribute to the various grand challenges of the changing world order, such as human rights, poverty alleviation, environmental protection, and sustainable development.

Idealism and utilitarianism are present in internationalization of higher education across the world. Internationalization of higher education, its meanings and functions, actually represent a hybrid of idealism and utilitarianism which differs based on the political, socioeconomic, cultural and historical development of a nation state or region. In spite of top down pressures brought about by globalization and regionalization, the bottom up pressures located within nation-states influence how internationalization of higher education is defined and utilized.

Internationalization of higher education should be seen holistically with its multiple dimensions (including political, socioeconomic, cultural, and academic), across multiple levels (global, regional, and national), and within the processes of globalization and regionalization. Each block of this matrix would offer slightly different meanings and functions of internationalization of higher education, but falls within the two extremes of idealism and utilitarianism. ■

Internationalizing the Curriculum and all Students' Learning

BETTY LEASK

Betty Leask is Executive Director of Learning and Teaching at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia. She is editor in chief of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*. E-mail: B.Leask@latrobe.edu.au.

Recently there has been a resurgence of interest in internationalization of the curriculum in theory and in practice. Essentially, this is because internationalization of the curriculum has the potential to connect broader institutional agendas focused on internationalization with student learning. All students will live in a globalized world, as professionals and citizens, and this is a common rationale for internationalization. Hence, university policy statements contain many well-intentioned, often bold, and certainly visionary statements focused on graduates with international and global perspectives, ready and able to make a positive difference in our increasingly interconnected yet divided world.

Many of these policy statements either explicitly or implicitly link the vision of internationally, interculturally, and globally competent graduates to all students. However, exactly how these statements are connected with student learning in the disciplines through internationalization of the curriculum is not clear. For example, in some universities the focus of internationalization of the curriculum is primarily on outbound student mobility which, for pragmatic reasons, involves a small percentage of students. In some universities the focus is on teaching in English but rarely all programs, and the connection between teaching in English and the achievement of international and intercultural learning outcomes is not clear. In other cases the focus of internationalization of the curriculum may be primarily on content through the inclusion of specialized optional international modules, and in others on increasing student diversity in the classroom and on campus, without considering how this will internationalize student learning. Individually and collectively these approaches are insufficient. In summary, internationalization of the curriculum in policy and practice is too often focused on inputs rather than outcomes. Internationalization of the curriculum must become more directly connected to all students' learning.

DEFINING INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM

As there is often confusion about what the term internationalization of the curriculum actually means and how it is connected with student learning, I will first define the term and then describe two key characteristics of internationalization of the curriculum focused on student learning. In 2009, in an article in the *Journal of Studies in International Education*, I defined an internationalized curriculum as one that will "engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity and purposefully develop their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens."

This definition emphasizes the active involvement (engagement) of students in the learning process and through this the systematic (purposeful) development of international and intercultural learning outcomes. The definition highlights the need to move beyond approaches to internationalization of the curriculum based on content alone or isolated, optional experiences and activities for a few students that do not provide evidence of learning outcomes.

The focus of internationalization of the curriculum in policy and practice is currently more on what students will experience than on what they will learn and how they will demonstrate their learning.

It is useful to distinguish between the *product*, an internationalized curriculum, as defined above, and the *process* of internationalization of the curriculum. The following definition of the *process of internationalization of the curriculum* from the same article focuses attention on teaching, learning, and assessment, as well as content: "internationalization of the curriculum is the incorporation of an international and intercultural dimension into the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching, learning, and assessment arrangements and support services of a program of study."

This distinction between product (an internationalized curriculum) and process (internationalization of the curriculum) helps to distinguish between the *end* and the *means*, an enduring source of confusion as evidenced by, for example, statements that claim mobility programs as evidence of internationalization of the curriculum. Mobility programs are a possible means by which a small number of students

might achieve desired international and intercultural learning outcomes.

In summary, the process of internationalization of the curriculum must consider learning outcomes as well as learning inputs.

AN INTERNATIONALIZED CURRICULUM FOCUSED ON STUDENT LEARNING

An internationalized curriculum focused on student learning is defined by two key characteristics. First, it will occur within the context of the different cultures and practices of knowing, doing, and being in the disciplines. Second, faculty who do not have the experience, skills, or knowledge required to internationalize the curriculum will be supported by expert facilitators in the process of defining intended internationalized learning outcomes and assisting all students to achieve them.

An internationalized curriculum will engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity, and purposefully develop their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens.

Disciplines have distinct cultures and values and will often have different rationales for internationalizing the curriculum. Faculty will need to be clear about why they think internationalization of the curriculum is important for their program. Program teams, as distinct disciplinary communities, will need to engage in discussions and debates on the international and intercultural learning outcomes that their graduates will require to be effective professionals and citizens in a globalized world. If students are to achieve the intended learning outcomes faculty will need to develop a clear and systematic plan to support their students' learning. Learning activities in different modules/subjects/courses at all year levels of the program will need to be designed to incrementally develop students' international perspectives and intercultural skills. Students will need formal and informal feedback on their international and intercultural learning and advice on how to improve their performance at different levels of the program.

Faculty who do not have the experience, skills, or knowledge required to internationalize the curriculum will

need to be supported by expert facilitators in the process of defining intended internationalized learning outcomes and assisting all students to achieve them. Facilitation and support is important because faculty who are not prepared are likely to adopt a narrow focus. This will have serious consequences for the international strategy of the university and student learning.

Facilitators may come from outside the discipline or the university. They will include experts in teaching, learning, and internationalization, who can provide guidance and advice as well as practical support. There will be an emphasis on building capacity for the future to address critical issues and key questions associated with internationalization of the curriculum across disciplines and across the institution over time. In this way internationalization of the curriculum becomes an ongoing process focused on student learning, in which faculty are deeply engaged.

Approaches to and interpretations of internationalization of the curriculum will inevitably vary across disciplines. What is important is that, regardless of the discipline, the focus of the process of internationalizing the curriculum is focused on student learning. This puts faculty and the disciplines at the center of internationalization of the curriculum. ■

Graduate Employability and Internationalization of the Curriculum at Home

ELSPETH JONES

Elsbeth Jones is Emerita Professor of the Internationalization of Higher Education at Leeds Metropolitan University, UK and Honorary Visiting Fellow at the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan. E-mail: ej@elspethjones.com.

Over the past two decades and more, frequent surveys of employers have found that, while graduates may have the technical skills required for a given role, they often lack the so-called soft skills that are key to effective working. Sometimes called employability skills, these include team-working, negotiation, and mediation, problem-solving, and interpersonal skills, flexibility, organization, and good communication. These surveys have been conducted in a wide array of countries from Australia to Zambia, and similar

sets of requirements have been found repeatedly across the world.

Academics are often oblivious to such calls from employers, perhaps believing that the intellectual rigor of their program may be compromised by a focus on “mere skills.” Indeed, it is undeniable that education is about much more than getting a job at the end of the process. Yet, global dimensions in working environments are no longer limited to multinational corporations and are now integrated into professions and roles, which had previously been seen as more locally based. It could be argued, therefore, that we are failing our students unless we prepare them effectively for contemporary employment, and a range of scholars have urged that university curricula should be better aligned to employer needs. The ability to interpret local concerns within a global context and to judge the impact of global issues on one’s personal and professional life should surely be an attribute of all graduates in contemporary society.

EDUCATION ABROAD AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS

What is remarkable is that many of the skills required are precisely those which studies have found to be developed through international experience of study, work, volunteering, or service learning. It has been demonstrated that even short periods of such activity, if students are effectively prepared and guided through the experience, can achieve these results, along with the many other benefits offered through international experiences. Studies in several countries have identified profound transformational learning in various geographical locations. The research covers a range of activity which challenges the student to a greater or lesser extent. Results show clearly that exposing students to alternative perspectives and cultural contexts can result in a questioning of personal identity, values, beliefs, and mindsets, and can offer significant results in terms of personal growth, self-efficacy, and maturity and enhance students’ intercultural competence.

Proponents of experiential learning may argue that it is the physicality of the experience which results in such transformation, nevertheless the international/intercultural element seems to play a role. Furthermore, it could be argued that those students who already possess some of these skills, or who have a propensity to develop them, are particularly attracted to the opportunity of studying, working, or volunteering abroad. These points give pause for thought but still the findings are both significant and repeated in one study after another.

IMPLICATIONS FOR UNIVERSITIES

This has a number of implications for policy and practice within institutions. First, the link between international experience and the development of employability skills is not widely recognized at the institutional level. This means that, secondly, its importance is not transmitted to students either in encouraging more of them to take part in education abroad, or in helping them understand the skills they have developed as a result of doing so. Thirdly, this link is not communicated to employers; note that they call for more soft skills, not for more students with international experience.

The ability to interpret local concerns within a global context and to judge the impact of global issues on their personal and professional lives should surely be an attribute of all graduates in contemporary society.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, there is a lack of exploration of what this means for the curriculum of all students, not simply the mobile minority. If education abroad can support employability in this way, can internationalization of the curriculum at home offer similar benefits for the static majority? As yet, there is insufficient evidence of student learning outcomes from internationalized curricula in the domestic setting to indicate the full potential of this approach.

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM AT HOME

It has been argued that the real benefit of international experience for the kind of transformational learning noted above comes through the many “disorienting dilemmas” a student is faced with outside the comfort zone of their home environment. A number of academics are seeking to offer virtual mobility through technological means in order to share differing national and cultural experiences. But other opportunities are closer to home; cultural “otherness” comes in many forms and there are different kinds of comfort zones. Students in a contemporary university are likely to include people from differing religious, national or ethnic backgrounds, of different sexual orientations, or with differing physical abilities. If “otherness” is understood as anybody whom you perceive as different from yourself, cul-

tural others are not merely those from different countries or language groups.

Sharing perspectives across this alternative cultural divide means that, with imagination, creative “intercultural” opportunities can be used within a domestic curriculum. For example, if international community volunteering can result in personal transformation, could the same be true for local “intercultural” volunteering such as with different religious or faith groups, drug addiction centers, shelters for homeless people, women’s refuges or homes for mentally or physically challenged individuals?

The answer is that we do not know whether internationalization (or “interculturalization”) of the curriculum “at home” can be as successful as education abroad, including in the development of transferable employability skills. What is clear, however, is that we have yet to make the most of the diversity in our universities and local communities to support intercultural learning in domestic settings. However, if we accept that transformational learning, of the kind identified in the literature on international mobility, relates to the intercultural and experiential dimensions of that international experience, it is likely that replication in domestic intercultural contexts may offer some equivalence, at least.

We have yet to make the most of the diversity in our universities and local communities to support intercultural learning in domestic settings.

In order to achieve this, international and intercultural must be understood as complementary aspects of the broader notions of equity, diversity, and inclusion within our institutions, something not yet accepted in all universities. Relevant intercultural learning outcomes will need to be incorporated into curricula for all students—not simply opportunities for international mobility—and innovative assessment tasks developed which measure whether the outcomes have been achieved.

The assumption that study abroad offers the golden remedy must be challenged. The demands of today’s global professional contexts require us to offer an internationalized curriculum for all our students not simply the mobile few. Perhaps more importantly, the enhanced perspectives that result can help the development of more just and tolerant societies. ■

The Missing Link in Intercultural Competence Development: The University’s Organizational Capability to Deliver

JEANINE GREGERSEN-HERMANS

Jeanine Gregersen-Hermans is director of Student Recruitment at the University of Hull, UK. She is pursuing her PhD studies at the Centre for Higher Education Internationalization at the Università Cattolica, Milano, Italy. E-mail: j.gregersen@hull.ac.uk.

One can state comfortably that internationalization is an established reality at most continental European universities and that it has become an integral part of institutional strategies for education and research. Most universities in one way or another have adopted an international dimension in their strategies, either as core to and fully integrated in the overall institutional strategy, or as a separate pillar and action line.

The academic discourse around the rationales for internationalization of higher education at institutional, governmental, and supragovernmental levels typically includes cultural awareness and developing mutual understanding. Indeed, intercultural competence is a traditional rationale that over the years has retained its validity. However, the underlying values have shifted from contributing to “a better, more peaceful world”; to recruiting and attracting talents in the context of the knowledge society; and from “creating global citizens” to increased opportunities for employability and “obtaining knowledge useful of the internationalized professions of the post-industrial era.” The problem is that beyond statements that “internationalization is also about relating to diversity of cultures” or “celebrating cultural difference,” these rationales offer little clarity on how higher education institutions that aspire to enhance intercultural learning and competence development have progressed in this regard.

SHIFTING FOCUS ON OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT: A STEP FORWARD

Although shifts can be observed in the discourse on internationalization—from outputs in terms of internationalization activities to outcomes of these activities in relation to intercultural competence development and how this is assessed—the question arises whether one can also comfortably state that universities actually deliver and enhance

the intercultural competence of their graduates. Recently, Hawanini, a professor at INSEAD, raised serious concerns about whether transformation toward truly global universities is actually taking place. Even though considered successful in their internationalization reach, institutions might fail to deliver in terms of richness of the international experience and student learning. The process of internationalization might be failing because of institutional grounding in a domestic setting, organizational inertia, and regulatory and institutional barriers. This analysis makes clear that any approach to internationalization must not only take into account the developments in the external national or international environment. Internal factors, such as the organizational culture or available internal resources, are of influence as well. A focus on the organizational capability of a university to actually deliver on the promise of intercultural competence development for its graduates so far seems to be a missing link in continental European universities' strategies on internationalization and receives only limited attention in the academic literature.

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY: THE MISSING LINK

Constraints in organizational capability can be identified according to three levels in a university: the institutional level, the academic disciplinary level (as organized in a faculty or school), and the level of the individual academic staff member.

THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

A disconnect can be observed in continental European universities between the strategic statements on intercultural competence development and how staff members actually include this learning outcome in their education and their daily activities, if at all. This is caused by a lack of awareness of intercultural competence development as an institutional strategic aim; a lack of an agreed-upon institutional vocabulary on how intercultural competence should be understood and how it could be developed; or a lack of the professional competence to contribute to the development of intercultural competence. An accepted university-wide approach to intercultural competence development for all students is rarely found.

How diversity is perceived in a university and included in the construction of daily activities depends on the salient approach to diversity in a specific institution. Perceptions regarding diversity and the associated level of institutional intercultural competence determine the relevance of intercultural competence and thereby the focus of the learning activities (what); the target groups (for whom); and how assessment and quality control are tailored. Many continental European universities have realized that the ability to include English as a medium of instruction is one of the con-

ditions for successfully achieving their internationalization aims. Therefore, they have included English-language competence in their human resource requirements for their staff and their systems of quality assurance. Integrated human resource requirements regarding intercultural competence, assessment of the level of intercultural competence of staff members—new and/or current—and requiring professional development of intercultural competence, can be considered rare exceptions.

Despite the evidence in the literature to the contrary, the prevalent assumption in universities is still that exposure to diversity and different international contexts will lead to the development of intercultural competence. Even when this type of exposure leads to personal transformational experiences, these are not necessarily intercultural ones. Gains in levels of intercultural competence development mostly are self-reported and the perceived levels of intercultural competence often are higher than the actual levels. This assumption is sustained through the personal experience of staff members, who themselves have spent periods abroad and, or, have been participating in an international professional or academic community.

Beyond statements that “internationalization is also about relating to diversity of cultures” or “celebrating cultural difference” these rationales offer little clarity on how higher education institutions who aspire to enhance intercultural learning and competence development have progressed in this regard

THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINARY LEVEL

A discipline and the community of scholars and students, which a discipline represents, can be described as a culture that reaches across national and cultural boundaries. The epistemology of a discipline will refer to its unique language, paradigms, and theoretical concepts. The culture of a discipline can be identified by disciplinary conventions and how these impact the interaction between its scholars and the external world. Differences can be observed between the range of academic disciplines—languages and linguistics, the social sciences, economics, medicine, and the natural sciences—which also can be understood as cultural differences. A strong academic culture can lead to constraints for intercultural competence development.

Intercultural competence, as a transferable skill, will be perceived as less relevant to effectively function within the context of an academic discipline. When students “join” the academic discipline, they are socialized toward how things are done within the discipline, both through formal and informal learning. Consequently, the impetus to develop advanced-level of competences to handle complex and controversial intercultural situations is lacking.

THE LEVEL OF THE INDIVIDUAL ACADEMIC

An individual academic is caught between the demands of the discipline and the institutional aspiration to educate graduates for a globalized labor market. Integrating intercultural competence as a learning outcome in education is perceived to take valuable time away from a focus on the academic discipline.

The past decades have seen a transformation from teacher-centered academic education to more student-centered approaches. For many academics, the role change from a teacher to facilitator is still an uncomfortable one. Adding the ability to understand cultural differences among students and within oneself, to recognize intercultural incidents, and to create an intercultural learning experience out of these, demands high levels of intercultural competence of an academic. Yet, traditionally these skills are not part of a university’s definition of the academic profile. This work demands specific pedagogic and didactical skills about which an academic may rightfully feel uncertain.

In their aspiration to develop interculturally competent graduates, university leaders need to focus not only on outputs or outcomes. Institutional work needs to be done on the missing link: the university’s organizational capability to deliver the desired results. To enhance intercultural competence development in its graduates, universities should focus on developing and implementing generic and discipline-specific learning outcomes. They should support the professional development of academic staff and enhance their ability to facilitate multicultural classrooms and intercultural competence development in students. They should also include intercultural competence as a basic requirement in all job specifications and human resource frameworks. To achieve such an ambition, a university-wide, adequately resourced change program—with a specific focus on intercultural competence development and in which a university engages actively with its stakeholders—seems to be needed. Focusing on the organizational capability to deliver is about transforming the dotted line between outputs and outcomes into a solid one. ■

Internationalizing Students in the Home Country—Dutch Policies

ADINDA VAN GALEN AND RENATE GIELESEN

Adinda van Gaalen is senior policy officer /researcher at Nuffic, Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education. E-mail: avangaalen@nuffic.nl. Renate Gielesen is senior project manager at the same organization. E-mail: rgielesen@nuffic.nl.

The internationalization of higher education is a key priority for the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Its aim is that all students in the Netherlands have obtained international and intercultural competencies upon graduation. No less than 91 percent of Dutch institutions participating in the study have an internationalization policy at the central level. Some institutions include the policy in their institutional plan, but close to 76 percent of all Dutch higher education institutions have a specific internationalization plan or are currently working to develop one. This is comparable to the global average of 75 percent in the International Association of Universities (IAU) 4th Global Survey 2014.

International and/or intercultural competencies of students are mentioned in many of the institutional strategy documents as the main goal of internationalization. Institutions tend to describe these competencies in general terms, specifying that further elaboration is to take place at the program level. Most institutions opt for a program-specific approach to international and intercultural competencies and are cautious when it comes to the implementation of a centralized institutional policy. Several policy plans explicitly mention that the context of a study program is essential in determining the relevant international and intercultural competencies. Institutions which do formulate competencies do not often distinguish between international and intercultural competencies. Examples of such competencies include (1) an attentive and inquisitive attitude; (2) intercultural effectiveness and communication; (3) knowledge of foreign languages; (4) flexibility and the ability to apply knowledge; and (5) ability to innovate according to international standards. This serves to demonstrate that—in addition to international and intercultural outcomes—internationalization can yield general learning outcomes, such as professional knowledge or personal skills.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AT HOME

These competencies cannot be achieved by all students through mobility alone. Between 2003 and 2011 a stable average of 22 percent of Dutch graduates has been inter-

nationally mobile within their study program, as opposed to 78 percent who stayed at home. Internationalization at home can potentially reach all students when structurally implemented in the curriculum:

The IAU 4th Global Survey 2014 shows that, globally, 14 percent of the participating institutions consider internationalization of the curriculum as the single most important internationalization activity. One of the main reasons for this could be that the focus on the curriculum brings internationalization to the core of education.

In the Netherlands, institutional policy plans mention many types of internationalization at home, such as inviting foreign lecturers, participating in international projects, offering intercultural skills modules and tailoring components of the study program to include different intercultural perspectives on a specific topic. In general, Dutch institutions do not regard internationalization at home as a literal alternative to mobility, but are inclined to view these approaches as complementary.

Yet, this relationship between the two sides of the internationalization coin is not reflected in policy documents. In fact, few institutions formulate a coherent and detailed internationalization at home strategy or develop monitoring tools. In addition, a lack of time or financial resources is an obstacle for implementation in many institutions. However, these are by no means the only reasons for the modest level of internationalization at home in some Dutch higher education institutions.

TEACHING STAFF

Preparation of teaching staff seems to be key in the success of internationalization strategies as teachers are essential for developing and carrying out curriculum changes. However, one of the most eye-catching results of the analysis of policy documents of all 54 publicly financed higher education institutions in the Netherlands is that teachers receive little training on internationalization of education. There is a lack of focus on the development of employee competencies required for successful implementation of internationalization at home activities. Some teachers, for instance, have difficulties integrating the various cultural backgrounds in an international classroom.

International Institutional policies devote little attention to the development of competencies of their lecturers and staff to prepare them for the implementation of the various forms of internationalization at home.

Incorporating internationalization at home as a standard component of lecturer professionalization programs such as the Basic Teaching Qualification (BKO) in the Netherlands can open teachers' minds to the possibilities internationalization offers them. Some institutions have already developed this idea a little further and developed a voluntary

extra module in the BKO framework. Such a module can offer teachers concrete tools to make internationalization support their specific teaching methods and objectives. It will help teaching staff gain insight into the potential learning experiences offered by internationalization.

GREAT POTENTIAL

In general, it seems that the concept of the international classroom in Dutch higher education institutions is aimed mainly at talented students from abroad. In some instances, it is almost seen as a side effect that Dutch students could increase their international and intercultural competencies in an international classroom.

Most institutions opt for a program-specific approach for international and intercultural competencies and are cautious when it comes to the implementation of a centralized institutional policy.

Higher levels of internationally and intercultural competent graduates can therefore be achieved if institutions consciously create controlled situations that lead to intercultural collaboration and the utilization of students' specific international knowledge. Such measures will help the institutions to make optimal use of the international classroom's added value.

Other activities that seem to offer great potential to develop international and intercultural competencies in students, and yet are mentioned only rarely in policy documents, are virtual mobility and development cooperation projects. Virtual mobility projects have been developed in many institutions over the past 5 to 10 years. Yet this is not reflected in the attention this activity is given in institutional plans. Those who are active in this area are modest in referring to them in terms of sources for building competencies of Dutch students.

A FRAMEWORK OF POLICIES

Most Dutch higher education institutions specifically mention the importance of international and intercultural competencies for their students in their institutional strategies. In addition, internationalization at home receives a fair amount of attention in these documents. However, the concept will benefit from greater clarity and possibly an institutional framework. Institutional policies could for instance include a provision specifying that all study programs must

incorporate relevant international and intercultural competencies. The appropriate method of testing these competencies should then also be specified in institutional policies. In addition, policies can be further elaborated by a clear definition of terms such as *curricular internationalization*, *internationally oriented curricula* and *international classroom*.

The Dutch government is interested in increasing the number and impact of internationalization at home activities in higher education. However, while any national framework for internationalization at home might include direction, means, and methods, but more important is that this should go hand in hand with sufficient freedom. This allows study programs to experiment and discover which forms of internationalization (at home) suit their specific program profile.

Institutional policies could include a provision specifying that all study programs must incorporate relevant international and intercultural competencies.

The focus on students' international and intercultural competencies can be intensified by the Dutch government by encouraging study programs and institutions to apply for a distinctive (quality) feature for internationalization from the Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organisation. The core of the evaluation framework for the certificate are the international and intercultural learning outcomes as defined by the program itself. The advantage of this model is that it supports and even stimulates program-specific internationalization. This allows for an optimal degree of "value added" internationalization, relevant to the unique features of a program, while still using a framework which can be applied to all programs.

In a society where higher education institutions have a high level of autonomy, as is the case in the Netherlands, national internationalization policies need not only reflect national economic objectives, but foremost the core tasks of higher education institutions, in order to be effective. ■

Ideological Shift in Indian Higher Education Internationalization

MONA KHARE

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

India's booming economy in recent years has been supported by a fast growing service sector, increasing share in global markets, a rapidly growing middle class and an exploding youth population. With the college-age cohort in India projected to reach 400 million by 2030, the international community is viewing India as an important partner in education development. The global sentiment is supported by the focus of the ongoing Twelfth Five Year Plan, in making India a regional educational hub by fostering greater international collaborations. This is the obvious outcome of increasing globalization and internationalization of education worldwide, as well as India's desire to emerge as a regional education hub, as part of its strategy to strengthen its regional presence both economically and politically.

INCREASING EXCHANGE AND COLLABORATIONS—SHIFTING IDEOLOGY

The opening up of the economy under financial constraints in the 1990s was a landmark shift in India's ideology from "protectionism" to "liberalism" and is reflected in its approach to educational development planning. Although educational services are still not freely tradable under the General Agreement on Trade in Services framework, various forms of connecting with the international academic community have emerged rapidly during the last decade or so. While there is no explicit strategic plan to act as a guiding force in this regard, a shift in internationalization practices is becoming evident. India no longer wants to be identified as a "recipient nation," but rather to emerge as an equal partner. India's movement from a North-South recipient nation to a partner in South-South, North-South, and triangular cooperation is seen as a major indicator of this ideological shift. This movement can be understood by way of several key changes in recent years.

CO-CREATORS

The newer modes of international education cooperation consist of co-innovation and co-creation in both South-South and North-South directions, and well defined long-term as well as thematic partnerships. Philanthropy in

international educational cooperation is being replaced by more systematic and broadly based intergovernmental collaborations, which are being consolidated after prolonged policy dialogue between different stakeholders on mutually agreeable terms and mutually beneficial domains. The Singh-Obama Knowledge Initiative with the United States, the UK India Education and Research Initiative, the Indo-German Meta Universities, the India-New Zealand Education Council, and the India-Israel Research Initiative, are all examples of this shift.

India no longer wants to be identified as a “recipient nation” but rather to emerge as an equal partner.

INCREASING PRIVATE PARTICIPATION

The traditionally prevalent form of research collaborations that have largely been the forte of public institutions of high repute is changing slowly, with private universities entering into memorandums of understandings to promote joint and dual degree programs in recent years. Examples here include the agreements between Delhi University and Massey University, New Zealand, and Jawahar Lal Nehru University and Victoria University, New Zealand. Although there is increasing participation of both public and private universities/institutions in developing collaborations, the private institutions are taking a lead in doing so, particularly for teaching programs. Also, these arrangements are skewed in favor of professional and technical courses, thus bypassing the majority of institutions offering general academic programs. Manipal University with Hochschule Bremen University of Applied Sciences in Germany; Institute of Hotel Management, Aurangabad with University of Huddersfield, UK; and, Shiv Nadar University with Carnegie Mellon University, Annenberg School of Communication are a few examples among many. A shift from research and training to teaching will allow for global exposure to a larger student community. However, with private institutions leading the race, these opportunities are likely to remain restricted to an elite few. Moreover, the fear that private education providers may explore greener pastures for profiteering via unregulated collaborative practices, ignoring quality and equity, is not unfounded.

EMPHASIS ON KNOWLEDGE SHARING

India is not just keen to learn from the best practices outside the country but also seeks to exploit its own compara-

tive advantage in indigenous science, art, and cultural heritage. It is also now actively engaging in sharing knowledge and expertise with respect to such global challenges as the energy crisis, food security, biopharma and biosciences developments, environmental degradation, and health and livelihood issues. Vocational education and skill development, institutional leadership, multilingualism and foreign-language capacity building are also emerging areas of interest. Evidence of these developments can be seen in the Australia-India industry/sector skill council partnerships, along with the emerging interest in the US community college model.

The scope of these initiatives is likely to widen with umbrella institutions like the Association of Indian Universities gaining membership in similar umbrella associations of other nations (e.g., the University Mobility in Indian Ocean Region, the Global University Network for Innovation, Cataluña, Spain; the International University Sports Federation; the Asian University Sports Federation) in order to foster greater synergy and promote cooperation in a wider array of new areas, such as innovation, sports, mutual recognition of qualifications, university management, etc.

Strategic government intervention to provide distinct directions and measurable deliverables for all these collaborative ventures is a must.

REGIONAL FOCUS

India's desire to emerge as a regional education hub is evident from the fact that of the 12 national-level education exchange programs/memorandum of understandings signed during the last three years, 8 are focused on the Asian and African regions. Available data reveal that, of the 28,000 foreign students from about 140 countries studying in India, a large number is from the developing South. India is also reaching out in the region through its distance education network. India's largest open university, Indira Gandhi National Open University, has almost 300 study centers in 38 countries, mostly located in Africa, Central Asia, and the Persian Gulf region. Deserving of special mention here is development of regional education multicountry universities/centers, like the South Asian University—set up by South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation member nations and the Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development, and designated as a Category I institute of UNESCO in the Asia-Pacific region—as well as the India-Africa Virtual University. The

purpose of such institutions is to work jointly on issues and concerns of common interest in a more integrated fashion providing a multilateral, multicultural platform for both students and faculty of the neighboring countries.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Both the number and the dimensions of international collaborations have increased, with India adopting a more open approach after the 1990s. However, in the newfound frenzy to internationalize higher education and the “brand status” attached to a foreign degree in Indian society, a number of substandard (even unaccredited) foreign universities have already found their way onto Indian soil. Strict monitoring and governance, with strategic government intervention to provide clear directions and measurable deliverables for all these collaborative ventures, is a must. India’s desire to emerge as an equal partner is subject to quality parameters. Decreasing quality of higher education in India is likely to

A shift from research and training to teaching will allow for global exposure to a larger student community but with private institutions leading the race it is likely to remain restricted to an elite few.

act as a major deterrent for top brand universities and institutions to collaborate with India. Domestically, as well, the quality gap across a range of higher education providers may lead to further polarization, as only good and highly ranked institutions would be able to reap the benefits of internationalization. This can have long-term implications of societal divide arising out of “global academic impoverishment.”

The visible intentions of fast tracking India’s internationalization process now require a clear-cut policy direction. With the much-debated 2010 Foreign Education Institutions (Regulation of Entry and Operations) Bill still waiting to see the light of the day, coupled with changes in the ministry, ambiguity clouds the future. However, one thing is for sure: there is no looking back, but only making the best of newfound opportunities, as both domestic needs and aspirations are high. Strategizing internationalization at three levels—global, national, and institutional—backed by a rigorous competency-building drive to translate it into practice, can go a long way in taking this march forward. ■

Internationalizing Research in Saudi Arabia: Purchasing Questionable Privilege

MANAIL ANIS AHMED

Manail Anis Ahmed is a higher education management professional. She currently serves as Senior Grants Specialist at the Research & Consultancy Institute at Effat University, a private university for women in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: manailahmed@gmail.com.

As part of its ambition to create a “knowledge economy” and ultimately diversify revenue sources, Saudi Arabia has been working aggressively to boost research production. The Kingdom is young and its university and higher education system even more so. Focusing initially on building schools and later tertiary teaching facilities, it was not able to establish scholarly research production until very recently. However, research activity has been given a massive push over the past few years. The country has made great strides in this regard with the building of many higher education institutions and research facilities.

THE ROLE OF RANKING

Accompanying the race toward the creation of new universities and other educational institutions has been the pursuit of quality. Whereas robust national systems of quality assurance (such as the National Commission for Academic Accreditation and Assessment) have come into existence, there is also a need to benchmark against more global and publicly visible systems. As global university rankings have gained widespread acceptance and become the dominant form of consumer-oriented information producers, Saudi universities have been preoccupied lately with being featured in these lists.

In the report—“Global University Rankings and Their Impact” by Andrejs Rauhvargers—commissioned by the European University Association in 2011, it says: “One problem or ‘unwanted consequence,’ as rankers sometimes call the negative impacts of rankings, is that both society and policy makers are tempted to judge all higher education in the world by the standards that rankings use to detect the top research universities, rather than applying one of the core principles of quality assurance—the ‘fitness for purpose’ principle.” And he continues: “Thus, one ‘unwanted consequence’ of global league tables is that higher education institutions with other missions than that of being top research universities may have to re-justify their profile at a time when mission differentiation is at the top of higher education agendas across Europe.”

GENEROUS FINANCIAL INCENTIVES AT THE EXPENSE OF THE LOCAL RESEARCH ENTERPRISE

This problem becomes immediately apparent in the case of Saudi universities. Whereas the first university in the country was established as late as 1957; and whereas there is a huge and pressing need to educate a fast-growing population of youth to effectively enter the workforce and become productive members of society, there is also a pressure on the country's institutions to produce publishable research output in English that can be leveraged for the various different international university ranking systems.

Perhaps what would be best advised would be a more comprehensive internationalization of research at Saudi universities, placing more value on local knowledge and indigenous methods of knowledge production and transmission.

BENEFITS, RISKS, AND CONTROVERSIES

In such a situation, a default internationalization of research has come about, perhaps a faster internationalization than was possible, or even desirable, in the development of the rest of the Saudi academy. This internationalization has reaped huge rewards with regard to boosting the country's research production. In fact, three Saudi public universities have been featured in various international rankings over the past decade—and others, large and small, are making their way there now.

An interesting aspect of this research-based internationalization is that it has so far been focused in the areas of the life, natural, information and engineering sciences—the humanities are nowhere to be seen, and the social sciences are few and far behind. But the most problematic aspect of this internationalization is that institutions, both large and small, are allocating—and paying out—substantial proportions of their research budget to invite highly cited international researchers to publish with the paying institution listed as the researcher's secondary affiliation. This practice was highlighted in a controversial article in *Science Magazine* in December 2011 and has since been widely debated in both local and global fora as being problematic. The contracts offered to these “visiting researchers,” “research fellows,” or “international partners” generally require a minimum number of publications per each contract period, and

only a nominal requirement of physical presence at the host institution.

THE PRICE OF “ACADEMIC CAPITALISM”

Whereas some academics deride the practice of paying others to make it seem like one's own institution did the work, others think of it as merely another aspect of capitalism—being able to buy the best global talent by paying top dollar for it and in the process deriving credit for research production. The practice of hiring prolific, highly cited international researchers in order to boost the research reputation of any given institution remains a contested one. However, this debate does bring into focus the problems associated with the urgent internationalization of research in a country like Saudi Arabia.

The more widely accepted desirable outcomes of higher education internationalization—i.e., the exchange of people, knowledge, ideas, and research production systems across boundaries—have in this case been supplemented by a too-easy prepared solution with regard to research production and development. It is one thing to invite foreign scholars and researchers to help build an indigenous, vibrant, and sustainable research culture that can eventually thrive independently of any outside help. It is entirely different to supplant local research production and to co-opt foreign resources that have little vested in the research development of the host institution or country beyond co-authorship. Thus, the internationalization of research in Saudi Arabia is not devoid of controversy.

A MIDDLE WAY

Perhaps what would be better to advise a more gradual, comprehensive internationalization of both teaching and research at Saudi universities. This would involve an openness toward traditional models of research production (such as the documentation of oral histories and the acknowledgment of verifiable “chain-based” historic research resources) and the placing of more value on local knowledge and indigenous methods of knowledge production and transmission. The kingdom could also benefit far more from diverting resources to support research produced locally: by providing rigorous training in international research methods, sponsoring the translation of Arabic research output into English, and in the process educating Saudi researchers about the importance of peer review, academic influence through citation, and ultimately the production of high-quality research to an international standard.

By doing the above, Saudi Arabia would be able to build a gradual and robust local research culture, creating a valid space for research production that acknowledges differences in international research methods, while incorporating best practices from academia worldwide. Given strong state

support, and keeping in mind the potential inherent in the country's nascent research enterprise, a research culture of its own is surely not too far in the Saudi future. ■

New Directions for Internationalization of Tertiary Education in Latin America and the Caribbean

JOCELYNE GACEL-ÁVILA

Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila is a Researcher of the Mexican National Research System, Professor of the Doctoral Program on higher education, Associate Dean for Social Sciences and Humanities at the University of Guadalajara, and currently President of AMPEI, Mexico. E-mail: jgacelav@gmail.com.

For Latin America and the Caribbean, like other regions, internationalization is a key strategy for the transformation and improvement of tertiary education, in terms of educating graduates with the cognitive and intercultural skills needed by an increasingly globally connected society and economy. The key question is if internationalization is actually being used to help the region make the transformations of tertiary education needs. The main findings of the 2014 Global Internationalization Survey, carried out by the International Association of Universities (IAU) in 2014, give some indications.

BALANCE, PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

The IAU survey shows some interesting new trends in Latin America and the Caribbean. In particular on external drivers for internationalization, *government policies* were ranked first ahead of *business and industry demand*, in tune with global findings. This stands in opposition to the 2010 survey, where the latter was ranked first, and reflects how weak government support was perceived at that time, as collaboration between industry and spending on tertiary education is notably low in the region. An increase in governmental support and funding has also been reported, showing a change in trends, as in the 2010 survey of Latin American and the Caribbean government funding turned out to be the lowest in the world. Both developments are definitely positive and confirm an increasing public inter-

est to foster tertiary education internationalization. Another new element—mainly due to the development of national and regional rankings—is that *international rankings* are acknowledged as among the top three drivers, of internationalization in Latin American and the Caribbean. In the past, the region traditionally ignored this phenomenon.

That part of the world is the only region reporting *increased international networking by faculty/researchers* as the main benefit of internationalization. This confirms earlier findings, as in the 2005 World Bank study on higher education internationalization, which that academic community still feels rather disconnected from the rest of the world.

At the institutional level, participating institutions consider their main risk to be that *international opportunities* are accessible only to students with financial resources, followed by *difficulty in regulating locally the quality of foreign program offerings*. For society, the main risk perceived is *unequal sharing of benefits* of internationalization and *growing gaps* among higher education institutions within countries. Both responses suggest internationalization is perceived

Although priorities seem to shift over the years, the results express a concern about the potential disconnect between the role of higher education as a public good and as a tradable commodity.

as a factor of increased inequity among individuals and institutions within a region already showing high levels of concern for these matters. A further concern is expressed toward foreign providers, which are on the rise in the region because of insufficient access provided by the public sector. In 2010, brain drain was ranked as the principal risk, while in 2005 the loss of cultural identity was reported as the main threat. Although priorities seem to shift over the years, these results express a concern about the potential disconnect between the role of higher education as a public good and as a tradable commodity.

As far as internal and external obstacles to internationalization are concerned, the *language barrier* is ranked higher than in other regions, a fact which coincides with the reality of low levels of foreign-language skills among students and the population overall in the region.

Regarding regional priorities for partnerships, Europe and North America are ranked first on an equal footing, Latin American and the Caribbean itself second and Asia

third. The region was chosen as second in importance by North America, but not among the top three priorities of Europeans. As occurred in the former IAU survey, this part of the world was not chosen as a first priority by any region, including itself. This reflects earlier findings, which is more focused on North America and Europe than on its own region and the rest of the world.

The highest priority for the internationalization of the curriculum is *language learning*, a logical consequence of the deficiency in this area. Latin America and the Caribbean also appears as the region with the smallest number of *joint and double-degree programs*. Although this is a modality in full growth around the world, just 29 percent of these institutions report having joint degree arrangements, and 34 percent double-degree programs, in contrast to the world average of 41 percent and 44 percent, respectively. Noteworthy are the region's *insufficient strategies for recruiting international students and scholars*, resulting in one of the world's smallest percentage of international students and scholars.

This region is reported with the smallest percentage of institutions having *internationalization policies* in place (6% lower than the world average); and, consequently, it has the highest percentage of institutions currently preparing internationalization policies/strategies (6% higher than the world average). This confirms a growing awareness that efforts should be made toward this end. The region also reports having the least institutionalized and professionalized *international offices*, something in line with other studies, such as the 2011 report on international cooperation between the European Union and Mexico. This situation might limit the potential and viability of internationalization strategies.

These highlighted findings definitely show a positive trend in Latin America and the Caribbean internationalization processes. Progress has been achieved in student and faculty mobility. Large-scale scholarship programs for international postgraduate studies and networking for scholars are top priorities. Language learning, after being reported for years as one of the main barriers, has become a top priority. Governments have increased support and funding, and institutions are in the process of improving or creating their organizational structures for internationalization.

Nevertheless, if compared with other developing regions, Asia or even Africa, the region is still lagging behind in terms of financial support, student, and faculty mobility, curriculum internationalization, organizational structures, and staff professionalization. But our main concern for the future is that efforts are mainly focused on individual strategies (mobility) and not enough on systemic strategies (curriculum, research and faculty profiles. Without denying the positive and transformative value of such actions, they have nevertheless been proved not to be sufficient to

make a decisive contribution to the sector's transformation. This could suggest a lack of conceptualization from decision makers of the transformative potential of *comprehensive internationalization*, in terms of innovation, quality, and relevance. Furthermore, an important handicap to internationalization might also lie in the political culture and management styles both at the institutional and sector level. Here, short-term strategies and actions are generally privileged, whereas internationalization requires medium- and long-term planning. In addition, other areas—such as increasing access, equity, quality, relevance, and knowledge production—are also in urgent need of support at all levels. ■

Institutional Engagement in Internationalization of Higher Education: Perspectives from Kazakhstan

AISI LI AND ADIL ASHIRBEKOV

Aisi Li is a postdoctoral researcher at the Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan. E-mail: li.aisi@nu.edu.kz. Adil Ashirbekov is a junior researcher at the same school. E-mail: aashirbekov@nu.edu.kz.

Internationalization has become increasingly important in national and institutional higher education development strategies. Kazakhstan is no exception: since the 1990s, the country has entered a period of reform, with internationalization representing a vital component of this process. In 2010, Kazakhstan became a full member of the Bologna process, signaling a new phase of the internationalization of its higher education system. These new developments, initiated from the top, were not necessarily received at the institutional level with open arms. Various challenges have emerged in the past few years, ranging from the lack of capacity at individual institutions to the disjunction of strategies at the national and institutional levels.

In order to generate insight into the level of engagement of individual institutions with the internationalization of higher education in Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education is conducting a three-year research project, funded by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Although the project is only in its first year, the initial findings are indicative of several key issues for internationalizing Kazakhstan's higher education sector.

QUANTITY OVER QUALITY

Reforms invite results—yet, how to measure the results is often not clear. Similarly, how to assess the degree of internationalization and its success (or failure) poses a difficult question. It is not surprising that Kazakhstani policymakers and institutional leaderships have opted for statistically quantifying the results of internationalization, since statistics are assumed to provide solid answers when it comes to auditing.

Student and faculty mobility lies at the center of Kazakhstan's internationalization strategy, with a national target of 20 percent of students being mobile by 2020, as articulated in the Strategy for Academic Mobility in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2012–2020 and financially supported by the country's Academic Mobility Scholarships. However, in reality, different parties can interpret mobility differently. As pointed out by a senior university leader, going abroad is often associated with sightseeing, not with acquiring knowledge and skills. Furthermore, it was previously discovered that some universities used the government funding to send students abroad merely for language courses or campus visits, just to fulfill the ministerial quota for student mobility. The Kazakhstani government has learned a lesson from this and subsequently created the Center for

Student and faculty mobility lies at the center of Kazakhstan's internationalization strategy, with a national target of 20 percent of students being mobile by 2020.

International Programs for monitoring and quality control of these scholarships.

In addition, the majority of survey respondents from the international offices cited the number of international partnerships and foreign faculty members as successful examples of internationalization at their institutions. However, our interviews with university rectors showed that not all international agreements were executed, and many of them fell dormant with the absence of an explicit road map. Impressive as some of the figures may seem, the actual impact of these factors remains unknown.

TO CENTRALIZE OR NOT TO CENTRALIZE

In Kazakhstan, the pressure to internationalize comes from the top. During our interviews, university leaders complain about the constraints imposed by the government on practices of internationalization, ranging from centralized

budgets, centralized time frames, to centralized aims. They blame poor cooperation with the ministry for obstructing international projects, as well as the lack of autonomy. Paradoxically, these same leaders calling for more autonomy also criticize the government for not providing sufficient step-by-step guidance for the implementation of internationalization strategies. Thus, while asking for autonomy from the government, at the same time higher education institutions habitually look to the top for comprehensive regulation and direction.

SHORTAGE OF QUALIFIED PROFESSIONALS

Closely related to the dependence on governmental guidance is the lack of qualified internationalization professionals in higher education institutions. Our research shows that while most universities have offices dedicated to internationalization, some lack professionals specializing in international activities, and some universities' international offices do not possess the necessary skills to initiate or sustain international cooperation. Even common activities, vital to fulfilling their core role, such as writing formal business e-mail in English, present obstacles for many international offices. It is evident that more training opportunities, domestically or internationally, are needed for staff in the international offices.

There are highly qualified professionals in the Kazakhstani employment market. However, as pointed out by the respondents in our study, higher education institutions often lose out in the fierce competition against other sectors. Regional institutions face an even more dire situation when it comes to human resources. One respondent mentioned that regional institutions do not provide academic programs related to internationalization (e.g., international relations), thereby further restricting the supply of qualified professionals in the local job market. Combined with the fact that young people tend to seek employment in metropolitan areas, such as Astana and Almaty, regional institutions are severely disadvantaged in recruiting qualified candidates able to promote internationalization.

DISTANCE MATTERS

Distance matters when it comes to international partnerships, at least in the case of Kazakhstan. Our study shows that there is a disjunction of internationalization strategies between the governmental and institutional levels. The government expressly leans toward the broader Europe, as reflected in Kazakhstan's participation in the Bologna process. Although university leaders indicated to us that they would ideally prefer to partner with European or American institutions, they also note that the current reality is that student and faculty mobility, as well as cross-border part

nerships, is strongly concentrated on Russia, other post-Soviet countries, and neighboring countries.

At the same time, Kazakhstan's universities are aware of their comparative advantage in higher education provision among Central Asian countries. The respondents in our study mentioned that the recruitment of foreign students should not exclusively focus on European countries. Instead, more attention should be paid to attract more students from neighboring countries. Whether this institutional demand fits into the national strategy, and thus gains support from the government, remains to be seen.

THE LANGUAGE GAP

Language can also create a sense of distance: poor proficiency in foreign languages, particularly in English, is reported to be another major barrier to internationalization. Participants in our study frequently cite this as an obstacle at various levels: for instance, student and faculty mobility, research collaboration, and international office operations. This also extends to the lack of availability of English-language programs in Kazakhstani institutions, as well as qualified teaching staff. In comparison, respondents who report excelling in foreign languages see this as a strength for developing international partnerships. The rectors of those institutions lagging behind in foreign languages say that they are investing in improving language proficiency as an important step toward internationalization.

OPEN DIALOGUE AND COOPERATION

The above factors certainly do not cover every aspect of the process of internationalization of higher education in Kazakhstan, and further research in our project will look into these. Even so, one can see key areas of potential challenges that the Kazakhstani government and higher education institutions face. In the first place, there is a wide gap between Kazakhstan and more developed countries in terms of internationalization. Secondly, there is also a gap developing *within* the country between institutions, particularly between metropolitan and regional ones. The Kazakhstani government has demonstrated its ambition to internationalize its higher education institutions, as evidenced by its policies and financial support. Higher education institutions are also actively participating in the process. However, there needs to be a more open dialogue and closer cooperation between the government and institutions to align their visions and construct effective support mechanisms, in order to make further progress in internationalization. ■

Internationalization of Japanese Universities: Learning from the CAMPUS Asia Experience

MIKI HORIE

Miki Horie, PhD is associate professor at Ritsumeikan International, Ritsumeikan University, Japan. She was a visiting scholar at CHEI in Milan in the fall of 2013. E-mail: mhorie@fc.ritsumei.ac.jp.

What has internationalization brought to Japanese higher education institutions? Japanese universities experience various reforms and self-improvement processes as responses to the internationalization policies initiated by the Japanese government since 1980s. The major focus of the government before 2000 was to increase the number of international students, and from then it started to undertake multidimensional approaches to internationalization, including promotion of outbound and multilateral mobility, development of English-taught programs, and collective efforts for international student recruitment. Universities responded to requirements and expectations in various ways within the frameworks that come with the government's financial support. Through such efforts, Japanese universities have accumulated collective experience and knowledge.

One significant outcome is the increased awareness of the need to apply alternative pedagogical models—such as, experiential, active, and collaborative learning schemes—which serve students more efficiently and effectively in cross-cultural learning environments. One of the examples is the policy called CAMPUS Asia, or “Collective Action for Mobility Program of University Students in Asia,” which challenges Japanese universities to develop joint programs with Chinese and Korean counterparts for mutual understanding. This is the first joint governmental initiative between Japan, China, and Korea, to educate their youth together. The three governments jointly selected ten project proposals—in other words, ten consortia of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean universities—as grant recipients.

THE “EAST ASIAN LEADERS” PROGRAM

After one year of implementation, the government committee responsible for the interim evaluation of CAMPUS Asia gave the highest grade to one program among the 10 selected, the “East Asian Leaders” program operated by Ritsumeikan University (Japan), Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (China), and Dongseo University (Korea). Besides the interim evaluation, another sign of success lies in the fact that the participants of the program have started

to identify themselves as change-makers and peacemakers of the region and the world.

The first unique feature of this program is its strong emphasis on a cross-cultural peer-learning environment. The participants of the program, 10 from each institution, 30 in total, form a cohort group and spend 6 trimesters together as a part of 4-year BA program. They spend the first term in China, move to Japan for the second term, then to Korea for the third term, and repeat the same itinerary in the second year. They live and learn together, while some intercultural training is provided to them. For example, while sharing a small Japanese traditional house in Kyoto, they naturally started setting up common rules for peaceful room-sharing experiences beyond cultural differences in everyday details. Such an intensive setting motivated students to learn to communicate in constructive ways, instead of just complaining or blaming someone, and accept various ideas.

Second, students are expected to learn Japanese, Chinese, and Korean languages at the same time. Japanese and Korean students learn Chinese in China, and Chinese students help them learning. This host-guest relationship is flipped in Japan or in Korea. Everyone is a language learner equally, and this setting also fosters everyone to be empathetic peer teachers of the languages. English is not used in this program.

Students are expected to learn Japanese, Chinese, and Korean languages at the same time; and English is not used in this program.

Third, its core subjects are East Asian humanity studies from historic, cultural, and political perspectives. Such knowledge, in addition to the personal skills that they obtain through daily life, creates a safer and less threatening foundation to discuss existing political conflicts among the three countries. In the second term, they discuss differences in history textbooks of each country, focusing on a description of the Japanese invasion to Korea and China. Korean and Chinese textbooks illustrate various incidents around the time of Japanese invasion, but Japanese textbooks do not cover them much. This usually causes a knowledge gap and becomes a fundamental source of political dispute. The program helps students to obtain skills and attitudes to overcome emotional difficulties to discuss such sensitive issues and to reach a higher level of constructiveness in conversation.

Fourth, this program gives students the “second chance” and, thus, an extra awareness to their personal development. After finishing the first year, they go to China, Japan, and Korea again. Being for the first time in a new cultural environment is always challenging but in the second round students with their newly developed intercultural skills and attitudes try out something that they failed to handle a year ago and so become aware of what skills they gained in the past year.

CHALLENGES FOR FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION

The above-described case provides some insights for further implementation of cross-cultural joint programs. The new 2014 Japanese government grant for comprehensive internationalization encourages institutions to create joint degree programs with overseas partners, which is a big new challenge for Japanese universities. Operating quality programs requires teaching and coordinating staff who fully understand the pedagogical principles and are capable of facilitating such learning inside and outside the classroom. The director on the Chinese side in the East Asian Leaders program pointed out the importance of understanding the uniqueness of group dynamics among the students. The administration team on the Japan side says that it is crucial to pay very careful attention to group dynamics of the students and to provide them with various intercultural group communication trainings and consultations. Many of the key staff of the three institutions speak more than two of the languages. This successful model is supported by a group of teaching and administrating staff members, who are not necessarily experts of cross-cultural peer learning at the beginning but are open and willing to accept and understand the unique learning process in this context. One challenge for many Japanese universities is to find such individuals at a practical level, both from the academic and administrative side, to form a team that actually functions.

Another challenge is an examination of various measurements of learning outcomes, to illustrate the uniqueness of student development in such programs. Many different measurement tools such as the “Intercultural Development Inventory” are available and useful to understand certain aspects of students’ learning. However, we have to figure out at what level such schemes developed outside of East Asia are applicable to the East Asian students and how we can find a suitable combination of different schemes to properly communicate the outcome and the students’ characteristics to the public and to the students themselves. Moreover, there is limited knowledge in Japan about the personal and social expectations of the students of those countries and how such preconceptions diversify or not the students’ learning outcomes. Closer examination of such aspects helps to create programs that are more ben-

eficial to each individual and thus enhances the impact of the internationalization of Japanese higher education. ■

Consolidating ERASMUS Mobility in Spain During the Economic Crisis

ADRIANA PÉREZ ENCINAS

Adriana Pérez Encinas is assistant lecturer and researcher in higher education at the Faculty of Business and Economics, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain. E-mail: adriana.perez.encinas@uam.es.

The ERASMUS+ program of the European Commission, which is funded during the period 2014-2020 and includes education and training as well as youth and sport activities, is motivating thousands of European students to undertake part of their studies abroad. It has received a significant budget increase—40 percent more, in fact—over what was allocated for the previous ERASMUS program, which over the past 25 years has enabled more than 3 million students to study abroad as part of their home degree. The crisis in Spain is leading thousands of university students to decide to carve out a better future for themselves by carrying out internships, part of their studies, their whole degree in other European countries, or even on other continents. Despite the fact that the length of the ERASMUS grant has been reduced to one semester and that many families cannot easily afford this economic burden, ERASMUS mobility is being consolidated as part of the Spanish university curriculum.

ERASMUS MOBILITY WITHIN THE ACADEMIC CURRICULUM

From the students' perspective, there are four main reasons for taking part in the program during their studies: to enhance their academic program, to find a job after their studies, to improve their foreign language competences, and to acquire an international perspective and experience. All of these are related and help young graduates to enter the labor market. A study carried out among 240 outgoing students at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (with a response rate of 46 percent) found that 89 percent of the students surveyed assumed that having taken part in a mobility program would help them find a job in the future.

In many European universities, students are encouraged to complete part of their studies abroad. Under ERASMUS, students are exempt from paying fees at the host

university and the credits they earn are recognized through a learning agreement signed by the student, the home university, and the host institution(s). The European Commission has set itself a target of 20 percent of mobile students by 2020.

In Spain, as in other countries, ERASMUS mobility is not a “compulsory period abroad” in the academic curricula of most higher education institutions. Mobility windows as part of the curriculum are accessed predominantly on a voluntary basis and as a matter of student initiative, facilitated by the institution. Nevertheless, many students are keen to apply for a mobility program to enrich their CVs and to develop competences that will distinguish them from others.

ERASMUS MOBILITY AND THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

The latest statistics released by the European Commission on ERASMUS student mobility 2012-2013 reveal that a new record has been achieved, with the program becoming more popular than ever. Moreover, this increasing trend in mobility numbers is seen both for study and internship

More than 25 percent of Spanish are unemployed and 53.5 percent of Spaniards under age 25 have never worked.

purposes, with internships now part of the program. Spain has maintained its leading position as the country that both receives and sends the highest number of ERASMUS students. In the academic year 2012-2013, 39,249 Spanish students joined the ERASMUS program. Although this is 1 percent less than the previous year, the data confirm that mobility is being consolidated in Spanish higher education institutions and is an implicit but important part of their curricula, notwithstanding the economic crisis.

Spain appears to be a country that attracts international talent to its universities, companies and institutions, as well as a country full of students keen to gain international experience and improve their CVs. The main concern now is not the students' desire to go abroad and explore new horizons, but the insufficient budget they receive to cover their living costs in the host country. This means that many Spanish families have to make significant financial efforts to cover the cost of the mobility period, in order to invest in their children's future.

Additionally, unemployment is one of the main worries of Spain's youth. The population of Spain is around 47 million inhabitants; but more than 25 percent are unemployed;

and 53.5 percent of those under age 25 have never worked. From this point of view, it is not surprising that students are looking for education and work opportunities abroad that will help them find a job once back in Spain.

Even though the economy and the employment situation in Spain have not improved in the last few years, ERASMUS applications have remained stable or even grown. In other words, ERASMUS mobility has been consolidated as part of the Spanish curriculum despite economic difficulties and unemployment. These are the two key reasons that motivate Spanish students to join the ERASMUS program, whose main purpose is seen as a means to improve graduate employability. ■

When is an International Branch Campus?

NIGEL HEALEY

Nigel Healey is professor and pro-vice-chancellor (International) at Nottingham Trent University, UK. E-mail: nigel.healey@ntu.ac.uk.

For a Nottingham alumnus, driving onto the University of Nottingham's branch campus in Malaysia is a surreal experience. Surrounded by tropical rainforest, a familiar white silhouette emerges—a clock tower atop the signature Trent Building, overlooking a large lake. Despite the heat and humidity, the campus at Semenyih looks and feels like an extension of the University of Nottingham, reinforcing its “one university, three campuses” (United Kingdom, Malaysia and China) branding.

DEFINING INTERNATIONAL BRANCH CAMPUSES

In 2009, the Observatory for Borderless Higher Education (OBHE) famously defined an international branch campus as “an offshore operation of a higher education institution which meets the following criteria”:

- “The unit should be operated by the institution or through a joint venture in which the institution is a partner...in the name of the foreign institution and
- upon successful completion of the course program, which is fully taken at the unit abroad, students are awarded a degree from the foreign institution.”

This definition is widely cited and remains useful. Certainly, the Semenyih campus meets the criteria: the unit is operated as a joint venture between the University of Nottingham and two Malaysia property companies, Boustead

and YTL; it is branded as University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus (UNMC); and the students graduate with a University of Nottingham degree.

OBHE's American counterpart, the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at the State University of New York at Albany, similarly defines an international branch campus as “an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; engages in at least some face-to-face teaching; and provides access to an entire academic program that leads to a credential awarded by the foreign education provider.”

CHANGING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTS

A closer look at the 200 or so international branch campuses being monitored by the OBHE and C-BERT reveals that, as Jason Lane and Kevin Kinser noted in their cleverly titled article (“One definition to rule them all”), getting a clear definition “is a fairly slippery subject.” In its 2012 report on international branch campuses, the OBHE acknowledged the impracticality of having a “permanent definition,” because universities are constantly repositioning their offshore activities in the light of changing regulatory and competitive environments.

To illustrate the difficulty of defining an international branch campus, take the University of Nottingham's Malaysia Campus (UNMC) as an example. The “campus” is legally incorporated as a private Malaysian company, in which the two local partners have the majority stake. The University of Nottingham is, in effect, the minority shareholder in a private offshore company. With the exception of the senior managers, who are seconded from Nottingham, the faculty and staff are employed by the Malaysian company and managed by one of the Malaysian partner's human resources department on local terms and conditions.

UNMC is, from the perspective of the host Ministry of Education—a Malaysian private higher education institution. It is subject to oversight by the ministry, which approves its tuition fees and enrollments. Its curriculum is accredited by the Malaysian Qualifications Agency and the qualifications offered must fit within the Malaysian Qualifications Framework.

Viewed in terms of its key stakeholders, UNMC begins to look less like a UK transplant than the clock tower and the architecture of the buildings suggest. The majority shareholders are Malaysian. Most of the faculty and staff are Malaysian, and all but a handful of seconded managers are locally employed. The students, the regulators, and the companies that employ most of the graduates are all Malaysian.

EVOLVING RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE HOME CAMPUS

Does the fact that the company trades under the University of Nottingham brand and awards its degrees tie it inexorably to the United Kingdom and ensure its status as an international branch campus? In principle, both defining features could be swept away at a pen stroke. Like Middlesex and Heriot-Watt, the University of Wollongong operates a “branch campus” in Dubai. The UK universities offer degrees from the home campus under a license from Dubai’s Knowledge and Human Development Agency. In contrast, Wollongong initially set up its campus as the Institute of Australian Studies and, since 2004, the University of Wollongong in Dubai has been licensed by the federal government of the United Arab Emirates as an independent, private institution awarding local, not Australian, degrees.

Branch campuses start as dependent infants, but as they begin to develop their own personalities the bonds with their mother inevitably weaken until they are broken for good.

In conversation with faculty at international branch campuses, one of the most widely used metaphors is that of a child-parent relationship. Branch campuses start as dependent infants, reliant on the mother university for their every need. As they grow and mature, they become unruly teenagers, chafing at parental control and striving for greater autonomy. As young adults, they begin to develop their own personalities and the bonds with their mother inevitably weaken until they are broken for good.

The University of London, which nurtured constituent colleges around the world, can today claim, *inter alia*, the University of Zimbabwe, the University of the West Indies, and the University of Peradeniya (Sri Lanka) as its estranged, grown-up children. Ironically, like the Universities of Leicester and Southampton, the University of Nottingham also started life as a college of the University of London. In the United Kingdom, the country’s 45 polytechnics operated under the control of the Council for National Academic Awards, which validated their curricula and awarded their degrees. This nation-wide experiment in regional branch campuses ended in 1992, when the polytechnics were restructured into independent, degree-awarding universities.

Returning to UNMC, despite its strong Malaysian identity, there is no suggestion that it is ready to sever its

ties to the mother campus. The reason is that its current status as a branch campus gives it a valuable competitive advantage in the Southeast Asian market. As part of the University of Nottingham, it can claim a global ranking of 75th in the world (according to the QS World University Rankings 2013–2014) and a history that dates back to 1881. The commonality of the Nottingham-based and Malaysian-based curriculum guarantees students an internationally portable degree, while the exchange of leading research scientists and PhD students has accelerated the creation of an academic culture on the Malaysian campus.

UNMC is likely to remain a branch campus for as long as the reputational benefits of a close association with the mother campus outweigh the costs in terms of constraining its ability to adapt to local conditions. In an intensely competitive and sophisticated region like Southeast Asia, these benefits are likely to dominate for a number of years. In other markets, notably China where the Ministry of Education views Sino-foreign joint ventures as private Chinese institutions, the lead time to full independence may be shorter. In all host countries, higher education is regulated and policymakers—as in Zimbabwe, the West Indies, and Sri Lanka in the past—may take their own view about how long they are willing to accept foreign universities controlling parts of their educational sectors.

ASKING A DIFFERENT QUESTION

Answering the question “what is an international branch campus?” is fraught with difficulty. Different branch campuses have very different degrees of localization of the key stakeholders—notably, the owners, the managers, the faculty and staff, the curriculum, the accreditation, and the branding—and these boundaries blur in response to the strategies of the home universities and the requirements of the host market.

Perhaps the more interesting question is “when is a branch campus?” In other words, at what point are the organizational ties between the mother university and the branch campus strong enough to meaningfully regard one as the subsidiary of the other? An educational institution will choose to position itself as the branch campus of a more powerful foreign university for as long as the reputational and competitive benefits of this association outweigh the benefits of independence. How long this lasts may vary from country to country, but history suggests that international branch campuses either flourish and become independent, or fail and close. No one remains a child forever. ■

International Branch Campuses and Institutional Control

ROBERT COELEN

Robert Coelen is Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at Stenden University of Applied Sciences, in the Netherlands. E-mail: robert.coelen@stenden.com.

The development of institutional mobility has seen a rapid increase from about 20 or so international branch campuses (IBCs), at the turn of the century to about 12 times that number in 2013. Even so, the proportion of higher education institutions that has IBCs remain at only about 1 percent of the global population of higher education institutions.

Motivations for establishing international branch campuses include push and pull factors. Push factors that have been widely described include: economic, reputational, or academic opportunities, soft-diplomacy, and internationalization. Pull factors include economic rationales, additional educational opportunities, building research capability, and rapid adjustment of education to meet requirements of today's employers.

The academic rationales from the home institution include aspects such as the opportunity for home institution staff to teach in another cultural context, the codevelopment of curricula with staff from IBCs, and for students to study at an IBC within the paradigms of the education offered by the home institution. A smooth credit transfer and good integration in the home program should characterize such opportunities.

CURRICULAR CHANGES

IBCs provide a good opportunity for codevelopment of the curriculum. Issues of a practical, jurisdictional, or cultural nature will arise in the delivery of the original home curriculum. This may give rise to changes that have to be implemented. Such changes may become adopted by the home program and lead to a more robust curriculum for all delivery points.

These curricular changes highlight an aspect of IBCs, which takes a lot of resources, care, and foresight—or sometimes repair in hindsight. It is unlikely that a program can just be mobilized from the home campus to an IBC without adaptation. Even at the most basic operational level, there will be changes. This is, of course, generally accepted and understood. However, if the IBC students are to receive a degree that is indistinguishable from that of the home

campus, this can only occur if the achieved learning outcomes are of the same nature and standard as at the home campus.

FACTORS AFFECTING INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

This brings into focus the mechanisms that must be present to ensure quality control. In the development of an IBC for a particular institution this often entails the careful scrutiny and adaptation of quality control mechanisms (both internal and external) that are designed to operate in one jurisdiction (the home country) to those that will also work in the host country. The host country environment, or barriers between the two campuses, may affect the efficacy of such quality-control mechanisms.

A simple example of issues at the home campus affecting the level of control relates to the existence of these perceived campus barriers. The attention of a faculty to the program(s) under its control at a branch campus may be far less than that at the home campus. This can lead to the two deliveries becoming out of step, in terms of content or educational methods, etc. The pressures on staff may be such that the delivery of learning materials may be on time for the home campus, but too late for an orderly consideration by the branch campus to cope with even logistical changes that have to be made. Such seemingly innocuous problems may cause members of staff at IBCs to feel disenfranchised. Trust may become lost between the two groups, thereby further reducing commitment and effective communication. Undesirable changes to the delivery may go unnoticed until too late.

Balancing the perspectives of the various stakeholders in a presently expanding transnational education remains a difficult issue.

The transnational delivery of an educational program, at an IBC or in some other arrangement, subjects the delivery and the content to the laws and regulations of another jurisdiction. This may jeopardize the integrity of the program, or at least necessitate modifications to the original curriculum, which in turn could affect quality. Sometimes definition differences cause apparent problems.

An example is provided by a case where a program developed under the European standard of 60 ECTS per annum (representing 1,680 hours of total academic workload) was submitted for accreditation in South Africa. This

was locally considered to be above their standard maximum academic load. Differences in the definition of academic workload were at the basis of this problem. Careful scrutiny resolved the issue without materially affecting the program.

There are jurisdictions where the undergraduate program must contain elements that are unique to the country. Often these courses relate to issues of national identity. The easy way out would be to use the elective space in a program. This, however, does affect the students' ability to avail themselves of a wider range of elective program components that would otherwise be possible.

A much more complex situation could arise when an IBC is the result of a partnership in which the partners have different objectives. The importance of alignment on this aspect cannot be understated. There are good examples of just how calamitous a clash between academic and economic objectives can be. The conflict between the need for program viability versus academic standards may lead to the IBC's closure or a move. The insistence of upholding certain standards by the University Quality Assurance International Board caused several IBCs to be excluded from operating in Dubai. The solution in this case was to move to another emirate in the United Arab Emirates where no such quality-control method existed.

Notwithstanding carefully worked out agreements, differences in objectives of partners may also lead to tension about the need for investments in the academic process (i.e., financial control). Lack of investment may cause program delivery at an IBC to become inferior to that at the home campus, with attendant quality-assurance concerns.

TRANSNATIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

Various home and host countries have organizations in place to ensure adherence to quality standards. The United Kingdom and Australia, as sending countries, have quality agencies that include transnational delivery in their scope. In the Netherlands, this is excluded from the purview of the Dutch Flemish Accreditation Organisation. Host countries have variously created regulations to provide a measure of control. Transnational education is a relatively new phenomenon and required legislative changes lag behind.

Balancing the perspectives of the various stakeholders, in a presently expanding context for transnational education, remains a difficult issue. The divergent issues on this matter have thus far prevented India from introducing legislation covering this arena. IBCs come and go. In the risk-averse world of higher education it remains to be seen whether they will continue to expand. ■

NEWS OF THE CENTERS

CHEI

From the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) in Milan, Hans de Wit and Fiona Hunter are currently leading the *Study on Internationalisation of Higher Education* for the European Parliament, in cooperation with the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the European Association for International Education (EAIE). Fiona Hunter is coordinating an evaluation of the internationalization strategy of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore.

Hans de Wit is a member of the Steering Committee of the project of the International Association of Universities (IAU) and UEFSCDI in Romania concerning internationalization of higher education in Romania. Fiona Hunter is also one of the experts on this project. Hans de Wit is a member of the Scientific Committee and Editorial Board of the second edition of the Bologna Process Researchers' Conference, to be held in Bucharest on November 24–26, 2014, where Fiona Hunter will also present a paper on internationalization as a change agent, the case of Italy.

Hans de Wit is a consultant, on an initiative titled "Advancing Models of Best Practice in Internationalization of Higher Education in Kazakhstan," for the Graduate School of Education of Nazarbayev University in Kazakhstan. CHEI is

also involved in "Internationalization of Italian Higher Education," a study and analysis by Roberta de Flaviis, a fulltime doctoral student, in coordination with Fiona Hunter and Hans de Wit.

With the development of higher education internationalization as a priority for institutions around the world, the demand for expert training and research in the field has increased over the last decade. CHEI has developed a doctoral program for aspiring researchers and professionals in higher education internationalization. CHEI's doctoral program is a "1+3" program, involving one preparatory year followed by three years of research, and is exclusively focused on the internationalization of higher education. Currently, there are 5 doctoral students, two from the United States and three from Europe, participating in the program; several other students, including from Latin America and Africa, are participating in the preparatory year.

The CHEI Research Training Seminar brings together senior researchers, international education practitioners and aspiring researchers to discuss current research topics, develop research proposals and develop their methodological and analytical skills. Through the seminars, CHEI is developing a knowledge community in higher education internation-

alization which is open to anyone undertaking research in the area or contemplating doctoral study. The seminar takes place twice a year, in the fall and spring.

As part of the development of a knowledge community in higher education internationalization, CHEI supports visiting scholars through the Tony Adams Visiting Scholars Scheme. The objective of the program is to provide an international research environment in higher education internationalization that enhances the research capacity of the Centre and the scholars involved. During their stay, visiting scholars will participate in the research, training, and dissemination activities of CHEI.

Recent publications of CHEI include Hans de Wit's *An Introduction to Higher Education Internationalization* (2013, Vita e Pensiero, University Press of Università Cattolica). An e-book version of this publication is available via the CHEI Web-site. Two additional books are in preparation, to be available in 2015. These are Wendy Green and Craig Whitsed's *Internationalising the Curriculum in Disciplines: Stories from Business, Education and Health*, based on the proceedings of the CHEI Internationalization at Home Seminar, and *Global and Local Internationalisation*, edited by Jos Beelen and Elspeth Jones and based on a joint CHEI-CAREM seminar that took place in Amsterdam on June 26, 2014.

CIHE

The Center is engaged in a significant publication "blitz" at present. In cooperation with the American Council on Education, *Global Opportunities and Challenges for Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes*, has recently been released. This volume is part of our ongoing collaboration with ACE on a series of essays and webinars concerning key higher education themes. For 2015, we are planning a publication on international joint and double degrees. Further information

concerning this book can be obtained from Sense Publishers (www.sensepublishers.com).

We have also just published (with Lemmens Media) *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Research Centers, Academic Programs, and Journals and Publications (3rd Edition)*. Two versions of the book are available—full-length (358 pages) and abridged (80 pages). The full-length e-book is available for purchase (€12) from Amazon.com. A full-length version of the book is also available in PDF format (€18) directly from Lemmens (info@lemmens.de). Finally, the abridged version of the book may be purchased as a hard copy, plus a free PDF (€28); again, see info@lemmens.de.

We are in the final production phase on two additional books. *Academic Inbreeding and Mobility in Higher Education* will be published in early 2015 by Palgrave. *Young Faculty in the 21st Century: International Perspectives* will be published by SUNY Press later in 2015.

Laura E. Rumbley and Philip G. Altbach, along with Maria Yudkevich of the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia, recently facilitated a workshop in Moscow for the authors of our current joint research effort on rankings and their impact on specific universities in 11 countries. This project will result in a book as well. Center director Philip G. Altbach continues his work as a member of the 5-100 committee of the Russian Ministry of Education, and participated in a session in St. Petersburg, Russia.

Associate director Laura E. Rumbley, participated in the EAIE annual conference in Prague, Czech Republic. Philip G. Altbach also attended and both taught a workshop on research focused on internationalization.

Philip G. Altbach and Laura E. Rumbley are also actively involved in various aspects of the European Parliament's commissioned Study on Internationalization of Higher Education being coordinated by Hans de Wit and Fiona Hunter of CHEI.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Nupia, Carlos Maurico, ed. 2014. *Reflexiones para la Política de Internacionalización de la Educación Superior en Colombia*. 300 pp. ISBN 978-958-691-666-0. Bogotá, Ministerio de Educación Nacional en cooperación con el Observatorio Colombiano de Ciencia y Tecnología.

This Spanish-language book provides a comprehensive overview of internationalization in Colombia. It addresses issues of quality assurance and accreditation, indicators, mobility, internationalization at home, internationalization of research, and an analysis of the past years as well as future directions. The book is notable for its focus on perhaps the

leading country in Latin America developing a comprehensive internationalization policy at the national and institutional level.

Van Mol, Christof. *Intra-European Student Mobility in International Higher Education Circuits. Europe on the Move*. ISBN 9781137355447. Palgrave Macmillan. Palgrave Studies in Global Higher Education. 224 pp.

This book focuses on the phenomenon of international student exchanges in Europe. Strongly interdisciplinary in its focus, it addresses four main research questions empirically: who goes abroad, how students reconstruct their social network abroad, whether intra-European student mobility leads to an

increased sense of European identity, and whether participating in a European exchange program influences future migratory behavior. The text combines quantitative and qualitative data systematically, and adopts a firm international comparative approach, focusing on the cases of Austria, Belgium, Italy, Norway, Poland, and the United Kingdom. The empirical data originates from a large-scale online survey, as well as in-depth interviews and focus groups conducted with students in higher education.

Jones, Elspeth (series editor) *Internationalization in Higher Education*. www.routledge.com/books/series/INTHE/.

Books in this new Routledge series will

address key internationalization themes, written or edited by leading thinkers and authors from around the world, while also seeking to give voice to early career researchers. The series will offer theoretical perspectives and practical applications, focusing on some of the critical issues in the field as it develops. It aims to reflect contemporary concerns, with volumes geared to the major questions of our time, as internationalization matures into its next phase. Anyone interested in making a contribution as author or editor, or in suggesting a theme for a future volume, should contact the series editor at ej@el-spethjones.com. The following five books are the first in this series.

Carroll, J. *Tools for Teaching in an Educationally Mobile World*. Routledge, 2015. 204 pp. \$52.95 (pb) ISBN 978-0-415-72801-0. Website: www.routledge.com/books/series/INTHE/.

This volume examines the challenges that undergraduate and postgraduate teachers often encounter when working with students from different national and cultural backgrounds. It focuses on the consequences for interactive teaching and for course design in a world where students, ideas, and courses are mobile, using examples and experiences from a wide range of disciplines and national contexts. It not only considers Anglophone countries, including the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, but also the use of English as a language of instruction in countries where neither teachers nor students are native English speakers. This book offers ideas for adjusting and adapting teaching approaches for culturally and linguistically diverse student groups.

Hudzik, J. *Comprehensive Internationalization: Institutional Pathways to Success*. Routledge, 2015. 274 pp. \$53.95 (pb) ISBN 978-1-13-877854-2. Web site: www.routledge.com/books/series/INTHE/.

The internationalization of higher education is a global phenomenon, but with substantial variation in how it is made operational in individual institutions. The book focuses on desirable practices in institutions and their actual approaches to implement a

more integrated, strategic, or comprehensive global engagement across their core missions: teaching, research, and service. Part I of the book investigates a wide range of issues governing the internationalization of institutions. Part II offers case stories from institutions across the globe which describe varying pathways toward more comprehensive internationalization. Institutions were chosen to reflect the diversity of higher education and approaches to internationalization. An analysis of the cases uncovers similarities and differences, as well as common lessons to be learned. With contributions from mainland Europe, Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom, Latin America, Singapore, and South Africa, the global application of the book is unparalleled.

Killick, D. *Developing the Global Student: Higher Education in an Era of Globalization*. Routledge, 2015. 210 pp. \$52.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-72805-8 Website: www.routledge.com/books/series/INTHE/.

This publication addresses the question of how students of higher education can emerge from their university life better equipped to dwell more effectively, ethically, and comfortably amidst the turmoil of a globalizing world. It does this from a number of theoretical perspectives, illustrating the nature of the personal and educational challenges facing the individual student and the teaching professional. The book explores the massive social changes wrought by the technologies and mobilities of globalization, particularly how present and future generations will relate to, work with, and dwell alongside global citizens. It outlines a range of social, psychological, and intercultural perspectives on human tendencies to seek out comfort among communities of similitude, and illustrates how the experience of life in a global era requires us to transcend the limits of our own biographies and approach university education as a matter of knowledge deconstruction and identity reconstruction, rather than reproduction.

Leask, B. *Internationalization of the Curriculum*. Routledge, 2015. 224 pp. \$52.95 (pb) ISBN 978-0-415-72815-7 Website: www.routledge.com/books/series/INTHE/.

www.routledge.com/books/series/INTHE/.

Internationalization of the curriculum is a critical component of any university's internationalization strategy. It has been linked with a variety of activities including outbound mobility in the form of study abroad and exchange, the preparation of all graduates to live and work in a global society, teaching international students, the development of intercultural skills in home students, and the adaptation of curricula for transnational delivery. While much has been written about internationalization of the curriculum in general terms, the notion of it working across disciplines is poorly understood and has been a low priority in the past. This book explores disciplinary approaches to and interpretations of internationalization of the curriculum. It explores new ground and provides insights into internationalization of the curriculum in action in the 21st century world. It proposes a framework for internationalization of the curriculum that situates it within multiple contexts and facilitates an exploration of its many dimensions.

Ziguras, C. and McBurnie, G. *Governing Cross-Border Higher Education*. Routledge, 2015. 190 pp. \$53.95 (pb) ISBN 978-0-415-73488-2 Website: www.routledge.com/books/series/INTHE/.

This volume examines the role of governments in relation to three key aspects of international education: student mobility; migration of international students; and transnational provision through collaboration or branch campuses. The research for this book is informed by interviews with key stakeholders in 10 countries and extensive engagement with policymakers and international agencies. It analyses the ways in which governments are able to direct or at least influence these cross-border movements in higher education. The book explores key issues that national governments are invariably required to contend in an increasingly globalized higher education market, as well as the policy options available to them in such a climate. Alongside this, there is analysis into why states adopt particular approaches, with critical assessment of their varying success.



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

PRESORTED
FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
N. READING MA
PERMIT 258

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

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

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

CIHE WEB SITE

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of

upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

CENTRE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALISATION (CHEI)

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

OPINIONS EXPRESSED HERE DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION.

EDITORS

Hans de Wit and
Fiona Hunter

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina Kopellas

EDITORIAL OFFICE

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

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-mail: highered@bc.edu

<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>

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

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)

©Center for International
Higher Education