ACE® American Council on Education®

CIGE® Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement®

Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide

National Policies and Programs

ACE® American
Council on
Education®

Leadership and Advocacy

American Council on Education®

Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement®

The Boston College Center *for* International Higher Education

Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide:
National Policies and Programs

Robin Matross Helms
Associate Director for Research
Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement
American Council on Education

Laura E. Rumbley
Associate Director
Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Lucia Brajkovic
Senior Research Associate
American Council on Education

Georgiana Mihut
Research Assistant
Boston College Center for International Higher Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Motivated by a variety of academic, economic, political, and social goals, governments around the world are implementing policies and programs designed to spur higher education internationalization. While reports of such initiatives often appear in the media, typically they are presented on a case-by-case basis—that is, without much reference to how each newly emerging national policy compares with other national policies around the world, and what the landscape of policy initiatives worldwide looks like. The purpose of this study is to **better understand public policies and programs for internationalization of higher education in a comparative context**, examine issues of effectiveness, and consider the future and impact of such initiatives going forward.

Before examining the policies themselves, we **take stock of the variety of national and regional government bodies and other entities that instigate and implement them**. In many countries, a ministry of education or related office is the primary player. Other government offices and sub-agencies may also be involved—particularly at the implementation stage—along with quasi-governmental and independent organizations. A variety of other stakeholders also impact the operationalization and outcomes of such policies, including higher education associations, regional university networks, institutions themselves, and more broadly, students, taxpayers, and employers.

In terms of their primary focus, the policies and programs themselves comprise **five broad categories**:

- Type 1: Student mobility
- Type 2: Scholar mobility and research collaboration
- Type 3: Cross-border education
- Type 4: Internationalization at home
- Type 5: Comprehensive internationalization strategies

Although it is difficult to draw many conclusions about global policy trends, the examination of a broad range of policies, across all regions of the world, suggests three main insights worth considering:

- The continuing **central role of national government** entities in the policy context.
- The less easily measurable, yet nonetheless **crucial role of "other influencers"** in the shaping and implementation of internationalization policy.
- The ongoing primacy of **mobility as an essential building block** for internationalization policies.

Determining the effectiveness of internationalization policies is a formidable challenge, but also a matter of some urgency in an era of increasing emphasis on assessment in higher education, and in a context of rising interest in the notion of data-driven decision making. However, we still have a great deal to learn about the results of national and regional policies for internationalization of higher education, and how best to gauge their effectiveness. Among the key questions deserving of deeper consideration here, we note the following:

- **Does scope matter?** When it comes to issues of effectiveness and impact, is it preferable to take a narrow approach on policies, and focus exclusively on one or two main "action lines" (e.g., mobility—as is the case for many current policies)? Or does a wider, more encompassing policy agenda make sense?

- **Where do access and equity considerations fit in?** How do we make sense of the effects of internationalization policies and programs on the vulnerable and/or underrepresented populations in our society? To what extent should policymaking for internationalization of higher education be concerned with the dynamics of social and cultural inequity?

- **How best to measure the "uncountable"?** How do we faithfully measure the many dimensions of internationalization that may be put into motion as a result of national and regional strategies for internationalization, which (to complicate matters) themselves do not operate in a controlled environment?

- **How do we deal with failure?** As policy initiatives are tested out, some goals and objectives will be met; others, inevitably, will not. Sifting through aims not achieved and targets not met may be crucial for developing the next round of policy initiatives that can yield appreciable results.

The effectiveness of internationalization policies may turn on such variables as funding, specific approaches to policy implementation, shorter- versus longer-term commitments to policy, the interplay and alignment between different policies, and the intersection between policy objectives and institutional interests, among other factors. Overall, however, **clarity, commitment, flexibility, and buy-in by a broad spectrum of actors** may be crucial ingredients for policy effectiveness.

Meanwhile, our future choices for policy and practice should be informed by the following insights:

First, **we are not alone.** Around the world, an enormous amount of time, energy, and resources is being devoted to the development of higher education internationalization policies and programs. Policymakers and institutional leaders everywhere would be wise to pay careful (and ongoing) attention to the experiments being undertaken by colleagues across the globe.

Second, there is a clear need to ensure that **policies, programs, and strategies for internationalization are themselves effectively "internationalized."** While approaches to internationalization of higher education should be firmly rooted in the needs of each country's particular higher education system and squarely focused on advancing our own specific institutional and national objectives, it is also vital that national conversations on internationalization not occur in a vacuum.

The internationalization of higher education should be broadly understood as an **unquestionably global undertaking**. This applies not only to the ways in which we consider developing and implementing our approaches, but also in terms of the focus areas that command our attention. Notably, there is **a fundamental need to shift the focus of internationalization toward the non-mobile majority of students**: "Global competence for all" has the potential to anchor a vital new generation of internationalization policies and programs rooted in the reality of the (still largely non-mobile) higher education experience.

Ultimately, **national and institutional policies and practices need to find purchase in a set of core values—such as quality, equity, and accountability**—that resonate with the higher education institutions and stakeholders who will carry them out. At the same time, all relevant stakeholders must commit to collaborating regularly and effectively to advance an agenda of "intelligent internationalization." Ensuring that higher education around the world benefits from the best of what comprehensive, sustained, values-driven internationalization has to offer will take a great deal of creativity, substantial resources, and sheer hard work.

Introduction

Higher education has long been recognized as a key driver of economic and social development worldwide. As countries have become more interconnected, and business, industry, and organizations increasingly operate across borders, higher education, too, has by necessity become a global enterprise. In order to prepare their citizens to live and work in the globalized world of the twenty-first century, and to bolster their countries' competitiveness on the world stage, governments around the world are implementing **national- and regional-level policies to promote the internationalization of their higher education systems**.

Such policies are announced in the media with some regularity, but are **typically presented on a case-by-case basis—that is, without much reference to how each newly emerging national policy compares with other national policies around the world.** So, Country X, for example, announces that it will provide a certain amount of money for scholarships with the goal of attracting a specified number of new international students to its universities by a particular year. While all of these policies fall under the broad umbrella of higher education internationalization, the motivation and goals, scope, content, focus, and timeframe for these policies vary substantially, as do the amount of funding associated with them, the government agencies or other bodies from which they originate, and the process by which they are implemented.

In order to make sense of this complex policy landscape, the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global and Engagement (CIGE) and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) undertook a comparative analysis of the array of government-initiated higher education internationalization policies and programs in place around the world. Our hope is that the results of this analysis, as presented throughout this report, will **provide a framework for policymakers and institutional leaders** to better understand existing initiatives, think critically about their own policies and practices in light of the broader global context, and identify synergies among policies that provide opportunities for collaboration.

The report begins with a discussion of the **motivations and goals** underpinning government higher education internationalization policies, and an overview of the relevant **policymaking bodies** worldwide. We then set forth a **typology of policies and programs** that categorizes initiatives according to their primary focus areas and activities; representative examples from a variety of geographic areas are included to provide specific illustrations of the program and policy types under discussion.

Next, we look across the typology as a whole to consider key **trends and comparisons** among the policies presented. A discussion of the **effectiveness and impact** of government-initiated policies and programs follows, in which important questions related to the achievement of policies' intended outcomes are explored. In the conclusion, we consider **future directions for policies and programs worldwide**, and how governments and institutions can best realize the goals—and full potential—of higher education internationalization on a global scale.

A central finding of our examination of national and regional policies for internationalization is that, although much is happening in this arena in many corners of the world, we believe our examination of these developments is **just the beginning of the story**. A great deal of research and analysis remains to be undertaken with regard to how and why national policies for internationalization

are developed, what they focus on, how they are implemented, and what they yield in terms of impact in the short term and long term. The companion report to this global overview (see box below) provides an in-depth examination of the U.S. experience with policies for international-ization of higher education; however, many national stories remain to be told. In the appendix to this report, therefore, we offer a more detailed examination of the internationalization policy experience of one other country—Japan—as a way of stimulating interest among researchers around the world in the development of additional national stories of internationalization policy development and evolution, from which we can all learn.

U.S. PERSPECTIVES

Select examples of internationalization-related policies and programs introduced by the U.S. government are included in the appropriate categories of the typology presented below. For a more comprehensive overview of U.S. initiatives in this realm, readers are encouraged to refer to the companion piece to this publication, *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Current Policies, Future Directions*.

A NOTE ON DEFINITIONS

While the terms "internationalization," "policy," and "programs" are commonly used and it can be argued that practitioners and policymakers in the higher education field share a general understanding about these notions, there are varying interpretations of their actual meaning and scope. In terms of "internationalization," as a framework for this report, we are guided by a broad definition proposed by Jane Knight in 2003:

> Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education (2).

Often, "policy" is taken to mean government action that sets forth broad goals and general intent, while "program" refers to specific activities and initiatives. However, definitions for the term "policy" also sometimes refer specifically to "plans," as in the following examples:

- "A high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures especially of a governmental body."[1]
- "A set of ideas or a plan for action followed by a business, a government, a political party, or a group of people."[2]
- "A course or principle of action adopted or proposed by a government, party, business, or individual."[3]

Taken together, these definitions suggest that policies have both an ideological element (general goals, a set of guiding ideas) and a practical element (a plan for action, influencing specific decisions).

In terms of internationalization, the latter typically consists of programs and activities intended to operationalize and achieve the former; programs, therefore, are arguably an integral part of policies themselves. And when governments implement discrete programs that are national in scope and involve substantial government funding—even if they are not part of a broader, formal policy—they clearly reflect governmental policies and intent, and in essence are setting de facto policy.

In sum, policies and programs are integrally intertwined, and the definitional line between them can be quite blurry. Rather than focusing on this distinction, therefore, in this report we use both terms, and explore a wide range of national- and regional-level, government-initiated activities and initiatives as part of the analysis.

Finally, per Knight's definition noted above, we have identified policies and programs worldwide that entail activities that "integrate an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education." These include initiatives to encourage student mobility, spur research collaborations, and establish institutional partnerships, among other activities.

However, there is variation in the extent to which the instigating governments themselves connect these targeted initiatives to a broader vision for the internationalization of higher education as a whole. In some cases, the term "internationalization policy" is used directly and/or higher education internationalization is stated as an explicit goal; in other cases, the focus is more specifically on the discrete activity at the heart of the initiative, or on other national policy goals. In short, "internationalization" is *our* characterization of these policies, not necessarily or explicitly that of the instigating government bodies.

---

1   *Merriam-Webster,* s.v. "policy," http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/policy.
2   *Cambridge Dictionaries Online,* s.v. "policy," http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/american-english/policy.
3   *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "policy," http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/policy.

Policy Goals and Motivations

In his 2002 book *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe*, Hans de Wit outlined **four categories of rationales** driving country-level efforts toward higher education internationalization: **academic, economic, political, and social/cultural**. While these categories undoubtedly are interconnected and may overlap in terms of characterizing particular goals (e.g., "expanding higher education capacity" arguably fits in both the "academic" and "economic" categories), they are a useful starting point in understanding the reasons behind governmental policies and programs. Examples of specific goals and objectives within each of these categories are described below; instances in which a particular goal may be seen as part of multiple categories are noted.

ACADEMIC

- **Expanding higher education capacity.** In countries where the demand for higher education is greater than the supply, or where quality is a concern, scholarships for study abroad may be implemented as a way to extend the reach of the existing higher education system to a larger proportion of the population.

- **Improving higher education quality.** Policies and programs that focus on scholar mobility and research collaborations, and those that incentivize multifaceted institution-level partnerships, are often aimed at improving domestic higher education quality through developing faculty capacity and expertise, and garnering best practices from peers abroad.

- **Prestige and rankings.** In some cases, internationalization policies are tied to initiatives to create "world class" universities, generally raise the visibility and stature of the national higher education system on the world stage, and improve the status of a country's institutions in global rankings. Policies that deal with cross-border education and partnerships may be seen as contributing to these objectives.

- **Knowledge creation and advancement.** Along with higher education capacity development, internationalization policies and programs that target scholar mobility and research collaboration may be motivated by the broader goal of creating and advancing knowledge—a key function of the higher education enterprise.

ECONOMIC

- **Short-term economic gain.** The direct economic contributions of international students—to individual institutions through tuition, and to the communities in which they live—are one of the reasons behind policies that focus on international student recruitment.

- **Workforce development.** National and regional policies of various stripes have been prompted by globalization; many governments have recognized that in order to remain (or become) economically competitive on the world stage, a workforce that is able to operate across borders is needed. Higher education internationalization is seen as a means to build global competence among students, in order to prepare future workers for this reality. In some countries, policies

to attract international students may also be seen as a way to build a skilled labor force when international graduates stay and gain employment.

- **Long-term national economic development.** Given the link between higher education capacity and quality and economic development, a number of the academic goals behind higher education internationalization can also be seen, in the long term, as a way to spur national economic development. Workforce development, too, contributes to this broader goal.

POLITICAL

- **Public diplomacy and "soft power."** In many countries, higher education internationalization policies and programs are part of public diplomacy efforts that aim to establish relationships abroad—between individuals as well as institutions—and build a positive national image and "brand" among the international community. Such efforts in turn allow governments to assert "soft power," which uses the "power of ideas and culture to influence the friendship, disposition, and action of others" (Nye 2004).

- **National security.** Policies and programs that provide opportunities for students to develop linguistic and cultural competence may be seen as a way of preparing future government leaders and other officials to manage foreign policy matters, and to detect and mitigate national security threats.

- **International development.** Mirroring the focus on internationalization as a means to promote higher education and economic development at home, in some cases government policies and programs are implemented with the purpose of spurring such development in other countries or regions of the world. These policies may take the form of agreements between the governments of two more countries with a shared historical or geographic connection; activities include institutional and faculty capacity-building initiatives, workforce development programs, and projects that contribute to wider economic and social goals. Political goals, such as public diplomacy and "soft power," may also be underlying motivations for policies with an international development focus.

SOCIAL/CULTURAL

- **Addressing global problems.** For issues and problems that are global in scope (such as those outlined in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals,[1] now morphing into the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals[2]), multiple geographic and cultural perspectives are needed in order to find solutions that are also global in scope. Tied to the "knowledge creation and advancement" goal noted above, higher education internationalization policies—particularly those in countries with a highly developed research enterprise—may include the "greater good" value of pooling knowledge by bringing together top scholars in critical areas as a goal of their internationalization policies.

- **Global citizenship.** As noted above, global competence among graduates is desirable from a national economic standpoint in terms of workforce development; more broadly, the activities

---

1   http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/
2   https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/sustainabledevelopmentgoals

promoted by internationalization policies can help students see themselves as global citizens, with a responsibility to participate in and contribute to society at the global level.

- **Mutual understanding.** Direct experience of other countries and cultures, shared experiences, and ongoing collaborative endeavors can increase tolerance for differences and appreciation of diversity among students, faculty, and others with whom these stakeholders interact—necessary building blocks in minimizing conflict and moving toward a more peaceful world. Though mutual understanding is often not the primary motivating factor for higher education internationalization policies and programs, it may be recognized among the longer-term goals and potential impacts of such initiatives.

In terms of individual higher education internationalization policies and programs, motivations **vary substantially by country and context**, and are integrally tied to economic and social circumstances, as well as the state of the higher education system. Motivations are also likely to shift over time, as these circumstance change and policies evolve. The variety of ways in which the rationales and goals outlined here are operationalized in real-world policies and programs are explored throughout the subsequent sections of this report.

Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs

Many Actors, Many Influences

Various agencies and organizations are involved in formulating and implementing government internationalization policies and programs around the world. Three main categories comprise this array:

- **Regional government entities.** At the regional level, some higher education internationalization policies and initiatives originate from formalized governmental coalitions with a wide scope of activities and a broad development-focused agenda. Membership is at the country level, with involvement by agencies and sub-agencies of each member nation's government; higher education internationalization and collaboration are of interest to these entities as a means to increase capacity and promote economic development throughout the region. Often, there are designated units or subcommittees within the organization that focus on higher education internationalization-related goals. Regional government entities may also reach out beyond their own regional contexts to forge collaborative relationships with other national or regional government entities elsewhere in the world.

- **National government agencies.** At the national level, most often it is the government body charged with oversight of higher education—the ministry of education or a similarly named entity—that officially initiates and implements internationalization policies. Depending on the focus areas and activities of such policies, however, other ministries or agencies may take the lead or be actively involved in policy and program design and/or implementation. Examples include government bodies that deal with foreign affairs, immigration, and trade, as well as economic and social development. Particularly for initiatives related to research, agencies overseeing science and technology, including those that manage government-sponsored grants, may be integrally involved.

- **Some countries have also established sub-agencies or other dedicated government units with a specific focus on higher education internationalization activities.** Still others house these efforts in government units or sub-agencies with a wider focus on the promotion of international cooperation and building cultural ties more broadly. While policy formulation may still take place at the ministerial level or higher, these units are responsible for developing programs and operationalizing policy goals.

- **Quasi-governmental organizations.** In a number of countries, quasi-governmental and independent (often nonprofit) organizations play a key role in higher education internationalization policy implementation and programming. The closeness of the affiliation between these organizations and the government varies, and can be difficult to ascertain from websites and other official information. The defining characteristic of organizations in this category, however, is that they receive government funding to develop and administer government-sponsored programs and initiatives. In some cases they are also supported by outside funds, including from institutional members and donors. While headquartered in the home country, many of these organizations also maintain offices abroad.

EXAMPLES: REGIONAL AND NATIONAL POLICY ACTORS

Regional Government Entities

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). ASEAN is a political and economic organization of 10 Southeast Asian countries, which was formed in 1967 by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. Since then, membership has expanded to include Brunei, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar (Burma), and Vietnam. Its aims include accelerating economic growth, social progress, and sociocultural evolution among its members, protecting regional peace and stability, and providing opportunities for member countries to constructively discuss differences.[3]

ASEAN's education work is overseen at the ministerial level by the ASEAN Education Ministers Meeting, which is held annually. Responsibility for implementation of education-related policies rests with the ASEAN Senior Officials on Education (SOM-ED) unit, which reports to the ASEAN Education Ministers Meeting; the unit's goals include "strengthening ASEAN identity through education; building ASEAN human resources in the field of education, and strengthening ASEAN university networking."[4]

European Union (EU). The EU is an economic and political partnership between 28 European countries. The groundwork for what would eventually become the EU was laid in the aftermath of the Second World War, and the initial objective was to foster economic cooperation across the region. Since then, a huge single market has been created. A single European currency (the euro) was introduced in the late 1990s, which most (although not all) EU member states have since adopted. Despite its initial emphasis on almost purely economic matters, the EU has evolved into a supra-national entity spanning multiple policy areas, including political, social, and cultural dimensions.[5] It is important to note, however, that although education (including higher education) is an area in which the EU is deeply interested and runs a number of programs, responsibility for setting educational policy remains squarely in the hands of the member states. Still, the EU exercises significant influence in the European context in policy discussions about higher education, including—and particularly—in relation to matters of cooperation, coordination, and internationalization. In practical terms, the EU's influence can be seen in its ambitious and far-reaching programs focused on higher education in the form of the Erasmus+ initiative (described later in this report), as well as in the research arena, under the extensive umbrella of the Horizon 2020 scheme,[6] and in an array of capacity-building activities and programs.[7]

The Bologna Process—launched in 1999 and culminating in 2010 with the declaration of the establishment of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA)—is often mistakenly referred to as a European Union initiative, but this is not the case. Instead, the EHEA is a voluntary process outside of the EU framework, agreed upon by the governments of 47 countries, all of which are also signatories to the 1954 European Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe.[8] In addition to the 47 national members, the EU is also a formal member of the EHEA,

---

3   http://www.asean.org/asean/about-asean/overview
4   http://www.asean.org/communities/asean-socio-cultural-community/category/asean-education-ministers-meeting-ased
5   http://europa.eu/about-eu/index_en.htm
6   http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/
7   http://ec.europa.eu/education/opportunities/international-cooperation/capacity-building_en.htm
8   http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=3

and there are additionally eight "consultative members": the Council of Europe, UNESCO, the European University Association (EUA), the European Students' Union (ESU), European Association of Institutions for Higher Education (EURASHE), the European Network for Quality Assurance (ENQA), Education International, and BUSINESSEUROPE.[9]

These actors come together through a structured set of periodic meetings. Ministerial meetings are convened every two to three years "in order to assess the progress made within the EHEA and to decide on the new steps to be taken."[10] The Bologna Follow-Up Group provides various mechanisms for members of the EHEA to engage in discussions and consultative activities, with the goal of advancing specific agendas (for example, in relation to structural reforms, quality, or mobility and internationalization) under the EHEA umbrella.[11] The main goal of the Bologna Process/EHEA was originally, and remains, "to ensure more comparable, compatible and coherent systems of higher education in Europe."[12]

Nordic Council. Formed in 1952, the Nordic Council is the official inter-parliamentary body in the Nordic region, and is composed of representatives from Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, the Faroe Islands, Greenland, and Aland (an autonomous region of Finland).[13] The organization's education work is led by the Nordic Council of Ministers for Education and Research,[14] and includes a number of agreements among member countries to promote mobility and other collaboration.[15] The council also administers an array of scholarships and grants funded by the participating governments.[16]

Organization of American States (OAS). Originally established in 1890 as the International Union of American Republics, the purpose of the Organization of American States (known by its current name since 1951) is to "achieve among its member states an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence." Today, the OAS "brings together all 35 independent states of the Americas and constitutes the main political, juridical, and social governmental forum in the Hemisphere."[17]

Within OAS, education policy is the purview of the Inter-American Committee on Education, which is composed of the member countries' ministers of education.[18] The OAS Department of Human Development and Education administers scholarships and other programs to promote student mobility and facilitate collaboration among higher education institutions in the region.[19]

9   http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=5
10   http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=5
11   http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=5
12   http://www.ehea.info/
13   http://www.norden.org/en/nordic-council
14   http://www.norden.org/en/nordic-council-of-ministers/council-of-ministers/nordic-council-of-ministers-for-education-and-research-mr-u
15   http://www.norden.org/en/theme/education-and-research-in-the-nordic-region/nordic-agreements
16   http://www.norden.org/en/resources/funding-schemes-and-scholarships
17   http://www.oas.org/en/about/who_we_are.asp
18   http://www.oas.org/en/sedi/dhdee/cie.asp
19   http://www.oas.org/en/sedi/dhdee/DOCs/One%20pager%20-%20DHDE%20-%20English.pdf

National Government Agencies

CIMO (Finland). An agency of the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, CIMO promotes the internationalization of Finnish higher education by providing services to facilitate mobility and cooperation. CIMO coordinates exchange programs; administers scholarships funded by the Finnish Government, the Nordic Council of Ministers, and the European Union; supports the teaching of Finnish language and culture in universities outside Finland; and aims to raise the overall profile of Finnish education.[20]

Education New Zealand. The purpose of Education New Zealand, which was established in 2011, is to market New Zealand as an education destination for international students. With a clear focus on economic growth, the agency has been tasked to double the economic value of the country's international education industry by 2025. Education New Zealand's activities include market research and development of country-specific recruiting strategies, and administration of scholarships and institutional grants to support incoming student mobility.[21]

Indian Council for Cultural Relations. With numerous offices in India and abroad, the India Council for Cultural Relations' mandate is to "actively participate in the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes pertaining to India's external cultural relations; to foster and strengthen cultural relations and mutual understanding between India and other countries; [and] to promote cultural exchanges with other countries and people." In the higher education realm, the agency administers numerous scholarship programs, organizes academic conferences, and promotes Indian studies and related academic disciplines around the world.[22]

Swedish Institute. The overarching goal of the Swedish Institute is to create mutual relationships with other countries around the world; the agency "seeks to establish cooperation and lasting relations with other countries through strategic communication and exchange in different fields." Focus areas include culture, society, research, higher education, business, innovation, democracy, and global development. The Swedish Institute manages a number of government-funded exchange programs, and administers scholarships and institutional grants to promote mobility and institutional collaboration.[23]

Quasi-governmental and Independent Organizations

British Council. Akin to the Swedish Institute and the India Council for Cultural Relations, the scope of the British Council's work extends beyond higher education internationalization. As a "registered charity incorporated and governed by a Royal Charter [that] is operationally independent from the UK government," the British Council "engages in cultural relations creating international opportunities for the people of the UK and other countries, and building trust between them worldwide."[24] The organization manages government scholarship and exchange programs, coordinates education fairs to attract international students to the UK, conducts research, and administers UK-based academic examinations worldwide; fees

20   http://www.cimo.fi/cimo_in_brief
21   http://www.enz.govt.nz/about-enz/our-role
22   http://iccr.gov.in/
23   https://eng.si.se/about-si/
24   http://www.britishcouncil.org/organisation/facts/what-the-british-council-does/relationship-uk-government

charged for the examination services provided by the British Council account for a substantial proportion of the organization's income (British Council 2014).

CampusFrance. Under the oversight of the French Ministries of Foreign and European Affairs and Higher Education and Research, CampusFrance "promotes French higher education programs throughout the world, offering international students a pathway to success through postsecondary study in France. CampusFrance's role extends from home country to host country and from answering prospective students' first inquiries to helping them plan their stay in France and their return home."[25] CampusFrance "works in partnership with all French institutions of higher education, with a special focus on those institutions that have joined the agency as members."[26]

Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE). A "national, not-for-profit membership organization dedicated to the promotion of Canada's international relations through international education," CBIE "promotes the special interests of the international learner, both the foreign national studying in Canada and the Canadian studying abroad, through educational exchanges, scholarships training awards and internships, technical assistance in education and other related services."[27] Along with Canadian government-sponsored scholarships and programs, CBIE manages grants and opportunities funded by foreign governments and foundations.[28]

China Scholarship Council (CSC). A "non-profit institution with legal person status affiliated with the Ministry of Education," the objective of the CSC is "to provide, in accordance with the law, statutes and relevant principles and policies of China, financial assistance to Chinese citizens wishing to study abroad and to foreign citizens wishing to study in China." In terms of funding, the CSC is "financed mainly by [government] appropriations for scholarship programmes. At the same time the CSC accepts donations from the personages, enterprises, social organizations and other organizations at home and abroad."[29]

EP-Nuffic (Netherlands). With a focus on primary and secondary as well as higher education, EP-Nuffic is, according to its website, "the main expertise and service center for internationalization in Dutch education." The result of a merger between the European Platform and Nuffic, "two organizations with a long-standing commitment to internationalization,"[30] EP-Nuffic administers scholarships on behalf of the Dutch government and other national governments, promotes Dutch higher education worldwide, and helps Dutch institutions establish partnerships with institutions abroad.[31]

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). A "private, publicly funded, self-governing organization of higher education institutions in Germany," DAAD is also, according to its website, "the German national agency for the support of academic cooperation." DAAD receives funding from various ministries of the German government; its activities include awarding schol-

---

25   http://www.usa.campusfrance.org/en/page/about-campusfrance
26   http://www.usa.campusfrance.org/en/page/campus-france-and-frances-institutions-higher-education
27   http://www.cbie.ca/who-we-are/
28   http://www.cbie.ca/what-we-do/scholarship-management-services/
29   http://en.csc.edu.cn/About/c309df7fb3fa40b3a179a7ad93f11988.shtml
30   http://www.epnuffic.nl/en/about-ep-nuffic
31   http://www.nuffic.nl/en

arships, as well as "promoting German studies and the German language abroad, assisting developing countries in establishing effective universities, and advising decision-makers on matters of cultural, education, and development policy."[32]

Other Influencers

Beyond the government bodies that directly formulate and implement policy and organizations that receive government funds to administer programs, a variety of other entities and stakeholders influence the direction of national policies—and impact their effectiveness—through advocacy, programs, and other internationalization activities. Of particular note are three types of organizations:

Regional and national nonprofit associations whose specific focus is international education and internationalization-related activities. Membership in such associations is often composed of university administrators and faculty, as well as researchers and other professionals. Usually, these organizations are overseen by officers elected by their members, and maintain administrative offices and staff to manage their work and coordinate member engagement and contributions to programs and initiatives.

Typical activities for these associations include scholarly conferences, research, and advocacy for higher education internationalization—both formal government lobbying and general promotion to the academic community and the public. For example, the website of the Asia-Pacific Association for International Education (APAIE) states that the organization "seeks to promote and facilitate communication, networking and professional development, exchange and mobility of students, staff and scholars, and the advancement of academic collaboration inter-regionally. It strives to provide a channel for benchmarking for the advancement of members and their institutions, to recommend good practices and policy in cooperation with various institutions and agencies, and to effectively represent the views of its membership with regard to international education."[33]

Other organizations of this type with a regional focus include the European Association for International Education (EAIE),[34] and the African Network for Internationalization of Education (ANIE).[35] At the national level, examples include the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA),[36] the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA),[37] and the Mexican Association for International Education (AMPEI).[38]

National higher education associations. In addition to associations that specifically focus on internationalization, national higher education associations with a broader mandate also engage in internationalization advocacy and programming in some countries. ACE's activities are illustrative; examples include sponsoring internationalization-related conferences and programs, producing and disseminating research, representing the home country's higher education system in international forums, and advocating (through formal lobbying as well

---

32   https://www.daad.org/
33   http://www.apaie.org/about/?PHPSESSID=347f951aeabacefc57692983946906db
34   http://www.eaie.org/home.html
35   http://www.anienetwork.org/index.php/en/
36   http://www.ieasa.studysa.org/
37   http://www.ieaa.org.au/
38   http://www.ampei.org.mx/Eng/default.html

as broader public venues) on behalf of key internationalization issues. Other examples of such organizations include the Association of Indian Universities,[39] Higher Education South Africa (HESA),[40] Universities Canada,[41] Mexico's National Association of Universities and Institutions of Higher Education (ANUIES),[42] and the German Rectors' Conference (HRK).[43]

Regional university associations and networks. Sometimes initiated by or affiliated with regional governing bodies, these groups of institutions promote intra-regional higher education collaboration in order to increase capacity, enhance quality, facilitate research, and contribute to the overall social and economic development of the region. By nature, they are engaged in higher education internationalization; specific activities in this vein may include student and faculty exchange, international conferences, seminars and training programs, and mutual recognition of qualifications, among others.

Examples of such associations and networks include the Association of African Universities (AAU), described on its website as "the apex organization and forum for consultation, exchange of information and co-operation among institutions of higher education in Africa,"[44] as well as the Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA),[45] the European University Association (EUA),[46] the Association of Arab Universities (AArU),[47] the ASEAN University Network (AUN),[48] the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU),[49] the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC),[50] and the Association of Universities Montevideo Group (AUGM).[51] The International Association of Universities (IAU)[52] serves a similar function for a global membership.

More broadly, individual **universities, students, taxpayers, and employers**, among other parties, all have interests at stake as policy decisions are made and initiatives are implemented; national and regional policies are, to varying degrees, shaped by and reflect the priorities and needs of these stakeholders. In some countries, **provincial/state and local governments** play an active role as well.

While all of these "other influencers" are an important part of the overall higher education internationalization landscape worldwide, their specific policies, programs, and activities are outside the scope of this report, and are not included in the typology presented in the next section.

39   http://www.aiuweb.org/index.asp
40   http://www.hesa.org.za/
41   http://www.univcan.ca/
42   http://www.anuies.mx/index.php
43   http://www.hrk.de/home/
44   http://www.aau.org/page/about-aau
45   http://www.iucea.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1&Itemid=529#
46   http://www.eua.be/Home.aspx
47   http://www.aaru.edu.jo/Home.aspx
48   http://www.aunsec.org/
49   http://apru.org/
50   https://www.conahec.org/
51   http://grupomontevideo.org/sitio/
52   http://www.iau-aiu.net/

Policy Typology and Examples

The policies presented in this section are categorized based, in almost all cases, on their **primary area of focus**. Many entail sub-activities and components that cut through various policy topics. At the same time, not all national policies that may impact higher education internationalization are covered here; we have excluded various types of policies with a scope that is substantially beyond higher education per se. National language policies, for example, are not included in the typology, although clearly there may be an intersection between such policies and a given country's internationalization agenda. Trade agreements represent another category not treated in the typology, despite the fact that there may be aspects of such agreements with implications for the internationalization of higher education.

For each policy type, an effort is made to provide specific examples to illustrate the ways that policies in a given category may be articulated in different national and regional contexts. The examples introduced are not exhaustive; rather, we try to provide **a diverse and informative snapshot of representative initiatives that inform each policy category**. For some policy types—for example, internationalization at home—the list of examples is limited, given the relative newness of the focus area in question. Most of the initiatives included are relatively recent—implemented in the last 15 years—though older, ongoing policies and programs are referenced when particularly noteworthy within a given category.

For each policy introduced, we note the initiator of the policy and the actor(s) responsible for its implementation (if different from its initiator). Most (although not all) policy initiatives outlined here have funding attached to them and, where possible, information about funding levels is also provided. For the most part, the examples presented draw on information taken directly from official (governmental) websites, with secondary sources used for triangulation purposes.

Five broad categories comprise the typology; each includes a number of subcategories, the details of which are discussed below. The categories are:

- **TYPE 1: STUDENT MOBILITY**
- **TYPE 2: SCHOLAR MOBILITY AND RESEARCH COLLABORATION**
- **TYPE 3: CROSS-BORDER EDUCATION**
- **TYPE 4: INTERNATIONALIZATION AT HOME**
- **TYPE 5: COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES**

TYPE 1. STUDENT MOBILITY

Whether fostering mobility from north to south, from west to east, or within or across continents, policies designed to encourage and facilitate student mobility are ubiquitous. They focus both on attracting international students and on promoting and incentivizing outward student mobility. They often include concrete targets to be achieved with respect to the number of outbound or inbound students; targets may also be articulated with regard to the destinations or origins of mobile students, or in relation to specific student profiles (undergraduate versus graduate students, for example).

Student mobility largely consists of two main types: "degree mobility" and "credit mobility." Degree mobility involves the international movement of students in pursuit of a full degree at an institution in the receiving country. Credit mobility occurs when students take courses—and typically earn credits for their home country degree—from an institution in the host country, but generally are mobile for a shorter time, and do not earn a full degree.

Economic rationales figure prominently among the goals and motivations for mobility-related policies. As noted above, governments recognize that international students contribute financially both to their host institutions (through tuition payments) and to the local communities in which they live (through personal spending), while students studying abroad gain new skills and knowledge that they can apply in the workforce when they return; in some contexts, encouraging outbound mobility is also seen as a way to relieve the pressure on the local higher education system to meet growing demand. Goals related to public diplomacy and mutual understanding may also underpin mobility initiatives.

A. INBOUND MOBILITY

Government policies and programs to promote inbound student mobility are typically composed of monetary and non-monetary incentives for individual students. Such initiatives may be targeted toward degree mobility or credit mobility, and include:

- **Grants and scholarships.** Policies and programs of this type are ubiquitous, and variations abound—in terms of degree level (undergraduate versus graduate), funding level, academic field, and study period (credit versus degree mobility). Some countries offer a full suite of scholarship opportunities designed to reach a broad range of students.

- **Visa policies.** Immigration laws and the visa policies that support them have a significant impact on international students, regulating international mobility (both credit and degree mobility) in many places around the world. Whether for security, economic, or other reasons, some countries have in recent years tightened student visa regulations. The United Kingdom, for example, introduced stricter regulations in 2015 in order to "stop immigration cheats abusing publicly-funded colleges" (Dathan 2015). Other countries, however—as well as the EU at the regional level—are taking steps to ease regulations and minimize red tape with the explicit intent of attracting international students. Measures include streamlining the application process and extending the post-study work period, among others.

- **Preferential admission policies**. Designed to ease entrance barriers for degree-seeking international students, policies of this type are most feasible in contexts where a centralized admission

system exists. Measures include modifications to examination requirements and intra-regional agreements to facilitate admissions reciprocity.

- **"Study in" initiatives**. Around the world, many countries work to attract international students through "study in" campaigns, which are focused on providing clear and compelling information to prospective students about the advantages of studying and living in a particular country. "Study in" efforts are frequently undertaken by governmental agencies and supported by public funding, although this may not always be the case (for example, in Poland[53]). Generally, the objective is to encourage inbound degree mobility. The examples below represent but a tiny fraction of the broad range of countries engaged in such initiatives funded by the government.

POLICY EXAMPLES

Scholarships

China. The Chinese government provides approximately 20,000 scholarships annually to international students for the purpose of studying in China (Bhandari, Belyavina, and Gutierrez 2011); both degree and credit mobility are supported. The China Scholarship Council[54] administers a number of these scholarships, including some designated for students from particular world regions.[55] The Chinese government also provides scholarships through the China Education Association for International Exchange,[56] including through an agreement with selected Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in the United States.[57]

Estonia. The Estonian government offers scholarships to international students, irrespective of nationality, for short courses, exchange programs, and degree studies under the "National scholarship programme for international students, researchers and academic staff."[58] Scholarships for short courses, exchange programs, and degree studies at the bachelor's degree-level support activities related to the study of Estonian language and culture. Master's and doctoral level scholarships are available to support participation in exchange programs and degree studies at Estonian institutions; the guidelines do not specify a particular field of study for grants at this level.

India. Several scholarships for international students are offered through the Indian Council for Cultural Relations.[59] The General Cultural Scholarship Scheme (GCSS) targets students at all educational levels in 54 countries, and represents one of the most inclusive scholarship funds offered by India. Additional scholarships target key neighboring countries in the region, such as Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal.

New Zealand. The International Doctoral Research Scholarships[60] cover full tuition at eligible universities across the country, in any discipline, and offer a living stipend and medical insurance to students for three years of degree study. Citizens of any country except New Zealand,

---

53   http://www.studyinpoland.pl/en/index.php/about-us
54   http://en.csc.edu.cn/
55   http://www.csc.edu.cn/laihua/scholarshiplisten.aspx?cid=97
56   http://en.ceaie.edu.cn/
57   http://www.howard.edu/newsroom/releases/2014/20140709ChineseGovernmentSignsMOUwithHowardHBCUsinBeijing.html
58   https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/national_scholarship_programme_estonia.pdf
59   http://iccr.gov.in/content/many-other-schemes
60   https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en/for/international-students/is-scholarships-loans-and-funding/is-new-zealand-international-doctoral-research-scholarships.html

Australia, and Fiji are eligible to apply. The program is sponsored by the New Zealand government and administered by Education New Zealand; in 2015, somewhere between one and 10 doctoral research scholarships are expected to be awarded.[61]

Turkey. Through its Türkiye Scholarships program,[62] the Turkish government offers scholarships for international students at all levels of education and in all fields of study, both for full degree programs and short-term studies. Turkey aims to attract 200,000 international students by 2023 and 96 million USD[63] has been allocated for this purpose (*Daily Sabah* 2014).

United States. The U.S. Department of State currently administers over 50 programs to fund incoming mobility, mostly for short-term stays. A number of these are open to youths and professionals as well as (or in lieu of) university-aged students, and many are part of the legislatively mandated Fulbright Program, the "flagship international educational exchange program sponsored by the U.S. government."[64] Examples include the Fulbright Foreign Student Program, which funds "graduate students, young professionals, and artists from abroad to research and study in the U.S. for one year or longer at U.S. universities or other appropriate institutions,"[65] and the Global Undergraduate Exchange Program, which targets undergraduate students in particular world regions.[66]

Visa Policies

European Union. In response to a growing sense that the region's competitiveness in terms of attracting international talent has been undermined by extensive and uneven bureaucratic hurdles relating to visa issuance and intra-regional mobility for non-EU students and academics, a proposal was introduced by the European Commission in March 2013 to streamline and coordinate visa procedures, intra-EU mobility rules, and employment opportunities for students and scholars. Following discussion and agreement by the European Parliament and the Council of the EU, the hope is that these new rules will be in effect by 2016.[67]

Australia. In 2011, Australia commissioned the Strategic Review of the Student Visa Program. The report aimed at making long-term recommendations that would support the economic, educational, and migration interests of the country (Knight 2011). Following the review process of the report, finalized in 2013, the Australian government committed[68] to eight distinct student visa reforms, including creating a streamlined visa process for selected educational providers considered to qualify as "low immigrant risk" enrollers of international students, simplifying the immigration risk categories from five to three, and reducing financial requirements for high-risk visa applicants (Australian Government 2013a). Additionally, Australia has loosened its language certification policy by accepting multiple English language proficiency tests, not just the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) (Australian Government 2013b).

---

61   Personal communication with Alan Johnston, New Zealand International Doctoral Research Scholarships (May 7, 2015).
62   http://www.turkiyeburslari.gov.tr/index.php/en/turkiye-burslari/burs-programlari
63   Unless otherwise noted, dollar amounts are in U.S. currency.
64   http://eca.state.gov/fulbright
65   http://exchanges.state.gov/non-us/program/fulbright-foreign-student-program
66   http://exchanges.state.gov/non-us/program/global-undergraduate-exchange-program-global-ugrad
67   http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-275_en.htm
68   http://www.immi.gov.au/study/pages/review-student-visa-programme.aspx#sub-heading-0

France. In May 2013, the government of France formulated the Circulaire du 31 Mai,[69] aimed at introducing visa restrictions for international students. The proposal failed to pass and, since then, new visa-related measures have been introduced as part of a national attempt to increase the number of inbound international students to 20 percent of total higher education enrollments by 2025 (up from 12.3 percent in 2012) (Custer 2014). Such measures include extending the post-study work possibilities for international students (Custer 2014), and easing the visa application process for highly qualified applicants.[70] Additionally, student visas are now valid for the entire duration of study, meaning students are no longer required to renew their visas yearly (Thomas 2013).

Sweden. In 2014, Sweden relaxed its post-study regulations for international students. Students with a residence permit who have completed at least two semesters of full-time study at a Swedish university are now allowed to stay in Sweden for up to six months in order to find a job or open a business.[71] Moreover, PhD students who have lived in Sweden for four of the prior seven years are eligible for a permanent residence permit in the country. Previously, students were required to leave the country 10 days after the completion of their studies (Smith 2014).

Preferential Admission Policies

Nordic Council countries. In October 2012, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden amended their previously existing (1996) Agreement on Admission to Higher Education to ensure that residents of these Nordic countries are regarded equally, in comparison to local applicants, when applying for university placements elsewhere in the Nordic region. The amendments stipulate that non-local Nordic students can pursue admission in other Nordic countries to "public courses of higher education on the same or equivalent terms as [local] applicants" (excluding postgraduate research studies).[72]

The agreement is accompanied by a monetary commitment of all signatory countries (with the exception of Iceland[73]) to cover the cost of their students attending university courses in a different Nordic country. Payments between the relevant countries are to be made each calendar year, and must be approved by the Nordic Council of Ministers. Additionally, the "payments from one country to another shall be settled in the form of a reduction or an increase of the share of the annual budget for Nordic co-operation levied on the relevant country."[74]

Spain. Traditionally, international students who desired to study in Spain needed to pass the country's national college entrance examination, the *Selectividad* exam. However, this requirement was reversed by a royal decree issued in July 2014,[75] consistent with the discontinuation of the *Selectividad* exam for Spanish students (as of 2017/2018),[76] and courtesy of

69   http://www.textes.justice.gouv.fr/art_pix/JUSF1314192C.pdf
70   http://www.campusfrance.org/en/page/extended-stay-student-visa-residency-permit-vls-ts
71   https://studyinsweden.se/news/new-work-regulations-from-1-july/
72   http://www.norden.org/en/om-samarbejdet-1/nordic-agreements/treaties-and-agreements/education-and-research/agreement-concluded-by-denmark-finland-iceland-norway-and-sweden-on-admission-to-higher-education
73   http://www.norden.org/en/om-samarbejdet-1/nordic-agreements/treaties-and-agreements/education-and-research/agreement-concluded-by-denmark-finland-iceland-norway-and-sweden-on-admission-to-higher-education
74   http://www.norden.org/en/om-samarbejdet-1/nordic-agreements/treaties-and-agreements/education-and-research/agreement-concluded-by-denmark-finland-iceland-norway-and-sweden-on-admission-to-higher-education
75   http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2014/06/07/pdfs/BOE-A-2014-6008.pdf
76   http://trabajo.excite.es/la-ley-wert-pondra-fin-a-la-selectividad-pau-en-el-curso-2017-2018-N42264.html

reforms introduced by country's higher education law of 2013.[77] The difficulty of this exam for international students—particularly in terms of demonstrating Spanish language proficiency in advance of studying in Spain[78]—was perceived as one of the main reasons for international students not to choose Spain as a destination for enrollment in a full degree program (Grove 2014). Spanish universities can now exercise significant direct oversight over the admission of international students, within certain parameters established by the 2014 royal decree.[79]

"Study In" Initiatives

Argentina. Study in Argentina is the name of the Argentinian government website for international students. The site urges prospective students to consider a range of benefits to studying in Argentina, including the quality of the country's universities, the low costs involved, the breadth of academic offerings, the good climate of the region, and the interesting social and cultural experiences that can be accessed. The international relevance of the Spanish language is also highlighted. Additional resources include information on the country's higher education institutions, the degree programs on offer, scholarship opportunities, and a colorful, 14-page downloadable guide—*University Education in Argentina for International Students*—published by the Argentine University Promotion Programme.[80]

Holland. EP-Nuffic[81] (described above) coordinates the Study in Holland[82] platform. The website provides information about practical matters such as housing, insurance, and visa procedures, as well as academic options and available scholarships.

Ireland. The website Education in Ireland[83] is managed by Enterprise Ireland,[84] a governmental agency responsible for the development and promotion of the Irish business sector in world markets (Bhandari, Belyavina, and Gutierrez 2011). The website blends country promotion materials with educational information for prospective students.

Malaysia. Study Malaysia Online, represented by the website StudyMalaysia.com, was launched in December 1998 by the Minister of Education of Malaysia at that time. The website provides an extensive range of information and tools to support overseas students' understanding of the Malaysian higher education landscape, including search functions by institution, course, and scholarship parameters; an online application function; a student financial aid guide; an event calendar; and a help desk, where specific queries about any aspect of Malaysian higher education can be submitted.[85]

New Zealand. Education New Zealand[86] (ENZ) owns the website Study in New Zealand.[87] The website presents comprehensive information about learning, living, and working in New

---

77   http://boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2014-6008
78   http://monitor.icef.com/2014/07/spanish-university-entrance-exam-no-longer-required-for-foreign-students/
79   http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2014/06/07/pdfs/BOE-A-2014-6008.pdf
80   http://estudiarenargentina.siu.edu.ar/usersfiles/GUIA%20EstudiarenArg_%20English.pdf
81   http://www.epnuffic.nl/en
82   http://www.studyinholland.nl/
83   http://www.educationireland.my/
84   http://www.enterprise-ireland.com/en/About-Us/
85   https://studymalaysia.com/corporate/
86   http://enz.govt.nz/
87   http://studyinnewzealand.com/

Zealand, including visa regulations and job availability details. ENZ offers the "ENZ agent program,"[88] aimed at training, selecting, and contracting promotion and recruitment agencies around the world, in an effort to attract students of high quality to New Zealand.

Sweden. The Swedish Institute[89] coordinates the Study in Sweden[90] initiative. The Study in Sweden website includes comprehensive information about admission procedures, a search engine for the English-taught programs available at universities in Sweden, and scholarships on offer to international students.

United States. The U.S. Department of State administers EducationUSA, a network of advising centers around the world that provide information and advice to students who want to study in the United States. According to the program's website, "these centers share a common goal: assisting students in accessing U.S. higher education opportunities. Advising centers are staffed by EducationUSA advisers, many of whom have first-hand experience studying in the United States." In addition to providing print and online materials at EducationUSA Advising Centers, advisers reach prospective student audiences through fairs and outreach events at local schools, universities, and other public venues."[91]

B. OUTBOUND MOBILITY

Just as there are efforts undertaken by governments to encourage inbound student mobility, there are also national schemes crafted to encourage outbound student mobility (both degree and credit mobility) from many countries. The rationales here generally relate to perceived national needs for skill-building in key areas, mostly to support economic development and vitality. Quantitative targets for outbound student mobility—either in absolute or proportional terms—are frequently articulated, with policies often complemented by funding mechanisms. Support for outbound mobility seems to take two main forms:

- **Scholarships.** As is the case for inbound mobility programs, scholarships to promote outbound mobility cover both credit and degree mobility, and are offered to students at various levels. In some cases particular academic disciplines are specified, while in others, students in any field are eligible. Funding may be provided to students directly, or take the form of grants to institutions to support study abroad (credit mobility) experiences for their students. Given the integral link between scholarship programs and national development goals, it is generally expected—or in some cases, explicitly required—that students will return home (and ultimately join the domestic labor force) upon completion of their studies abroad.

- **Financial aid policies.** Some countries provide students with a level of "portability" of government aid (grants and/or loans) that is normally used to support domestic study. Often these entail restrictions related to degree level, length of study abroad, or field of study, among other variables. Policies sometimes target either credit or degree mobility, or may be applicable to both.

---

88 http://enz.govt.nz/agents/enz-agent-programme
89 https://eng.si.se/about-si/
90 https://studyinsweden.se/
91 http://www.educationusa.info/about.php

POLICY EXAMPLES

Scholarships

Argentina. The Argentine government has begun implementing various new policies and programs designed to increase outward student mobility. One of the most prominent examples is "BEC.AR,"[92] a program that over four years aims to support 1,000 Argentines to study abroad, and includes both degree and credit mobility components. The scholarships are focused on graduate students and professionals in scientific and technological domains, and other areas relevant to sustainable development. Eligible programs include master's courses, specialization courses, working visits at information and communications technology companies, and study abroad periods completed as part of a PhD awarded in Argentina.

Australia. The Study Overseas Short Term Mobility Program provides funding to Australian universities to support their students to undertake group-based short-term international mobility experiences (Bhandari, Belyavina, and Gutierrez 2011).

Brazil. The Brazil Scientific Mobility Program[93] (formerly called Science Without Borders) offers scholarships for Brazilian students enrolled in national universities to participate in one-year exchanges in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, at universities in the United States and other countries. After completion of the academic year, scholarship recipients are required to return to Brazil to finish their degrees. In 2011, the Brazilian government pledged 1.7 billion USD over four years[94] to fund its students to study through this initiative (Perna et al. 2014).

Chile. The Becas Chile[95] program was initiated by the Ministry of Education of Chile and aims at contributing to the development of human capital in the country. It provides funding for students to undertake full degrees, including master's and doctoral degrees and specialized degrees in the field of education. Additional professional development programs and exchanges in the field of English teaching are supported through the program. Annually, 100 million USD is allocated to the program (Alsina 2014).

Germany. DAAD[96] offers a number of grants for higher education institutions to support internationalization initiatives, including a new mobility program that offers universities the possibility to apply for scholarship funding to support study abroad. The program aims to give more students the opportunity to study abroad, following the priorities of higher education institutions and their specific internationalization strategies.

New Zealand. Established in 2013, the Prime Minister's Scholarships for Asia[97] support New Zealand citizens to study in ASEAN countries—as well as in China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Turkey, and Sri Lanka—for periods between six weeks and two years. The purposes of the program are to strengthen ties with Asia and build international skills among New Zealand students. Opportunities exist for participation in exchange programs (i.e., involving study at overseas institutions currently included in the exchange portfolio of the student's home insti-

---

92 http://bec.ar/que-es-becar_p199
93 http://www.iie.org/Programs/Brazil-Scientific-Mobility
94 http://www.cienciasemfronteiras.gov.br/web/csf/metas
95 http://www.conicyt.cl/
96 https://www.daad.de/hochschulen/de/
97 http://www.enz.govt.nz/how-we-work/scholarships/pmsa

tution) and non-exchange programs (where students pursue study opportunities at overseas institutions not considered part of the exchange portfolio of their home institution). The entire scholarship fund amounts to NZD 9 million (USD 6.43 million[98]) over five years.[99]

Russia. The Global Education Program (GEP)[100] was signed into law in December 2013. The scheme awards scholarships to graduate-level students for degree study outside Russia, and requires them to work for the Russian government immediately after completing the program. The fellowships connected to the GEP can be used for study only at one of 227 "leading foreign higher education institutions" selected by the Russian government based on their inclusion in at least one of the following international rankings: Academic Ranking of Word Universities, *Times Higher Education* World University Ranking, or QS World University Ranking.[101]

Saudi Arabia. Started in 2005, the King Abdullah Foreign Scholarship Program[102] offers financial support to Saudi nationals to study overseas in selected countries. The scholarships support all levels of postsecondary education in fields of interest for the country, and aim at consolidating the human capital of Saudi nationals. As of 2014, more than 200,000 recipients of the scholarship recipients had received their degrees. For 2015, the Saudi Government allocated SAR 22.5 billion (approximately USD 6 billion) for the program.[103]

United States. The U.S. Department of State sponsors 52 programs for outbound (credit) mobility for U.S. citizens, including the Fulbright U.S. Student Program, which offers fellowships for U.S. graduating college seniors, graduate students, young professionals, and artists to study, conduct research, or be an English teaching assistant abroad for one academic year.[104] The Department of Education[105] and the Department of Defense[106] also administer scholarships for U.S. students to study abroad with a focus on foreign language and area studies.

Financial Aid Policies

European Union. In mid-2015, the European Union aims to begin the gradual roll-out across the Erasmus+ program countries of the Erasmus+ Master Loans[107] scheme.[108] Loans for up to EUR 12,000 (USD 13,539) for a one-year master's program, or EUR 18,000 (USD 20,309) for a two-year program, will be made available to students who have been accepted into a full master's program offered in an Erasmus+ program country. Established in cooperation with the European Investment Bank group, the loans, in short, will "allow students to apply for support for their master's studies abroad. Loans will be offered by participating banks and student loan agencies on favorable conditions to mobile students, including better than market inter-

---

98   All non-U.S. currency has been converted into USD using June 2015 conversion rates.
99   http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/pm%E2%80%99s-scholarships-asia-announced
100   http://educationglobal.ru/en/
101   http://educationglobal.ru/en/overview/
102   http://www.mohe.gov.sa/en/studyaboard/King-Abdulla-hstages/Pages/default.aspx
103   http://www.saudiembassy.net/latest_news/news12251403.aspx
104   http://exchanges.state.gov/us/program/fulbright-us-student-program
105   http://www2.ed.gov/programs/iegpsddrap/index.html
106   http://www.nsep.gov/content/david-l-boren-fellowships
107   http://ec.europa.eu/education/opportunities/higher-education/masters-loans_en.htm
108   The Erasmus initiative—the flagship educational mobility program of the European Union—was introduced in 1987. Today, Erasmus+ serves as the EU's umbrella initiative for the period 2014–20, encompassing an array of programs focused on education, training, youth, and sports, designed to boost skills and employability.

est rates and up to two years to allow graduates to get into a job before beginning repayment."

Australia. OS-HELP[109] is a policy that allows students to take their government financial aid abroad. Initially designed for undergraduate studies, it has been extended to graduate students. Students enrolled for a full degree at a foreign institution are not eligible to apply for an OS-HELP loan, as the scheme is designed for overseas exchanges only (credit mobility). Students undertaking an exchange to Asia are eligible to borrow up to AUS 7,500 (USD 5,769), and an additional AUS 1,018 (USD 783) if they participate in an Asian language course. Students who study elsewhere are eligible to borrow AUS 6,250 (USD 4,807).

Ireland. As a general financial aid policy, Irish, EU/European Economic Area, and Swiss Federation citizens are eligible to apply for student grants via the Student Universal Support Ireland scheme.[110] Undergraduate students may be eligible for two types of grants: The first type covers academic/study fees (such as tuition), and the second type is for "maintenance" support (i.e., living expenses and the like). Postgraduate students are eligible only for academic/study fees grants (not maintenance grants).

In terms of mobility, undergraduate "students whose course of study includes a compulsory period of study abroad, and those registered in participating higher education institutions who elect to take part in a period of study or work on Erasmus, will continue to receive their maintenance grant payments, where applicable."[111] Undergraduate students are also eligible to apply for funding to cover the maintenance costs associated with a full degree program outside of Ireland. To do so, students must pursue an educational program that meets the following criteria: It must be located at an institution in an EU member state (or at one of four approved institutions in Northern Ireland); be a full-time program of at least two years' duration; lead to a "major" education or training credential, and be in line with Ireland's National Framework of Qualifications.[112] At the postgraduate level, grants (to cover academic/study fees exclusively) are portable only in the case of Irish nationals pursuing approved courses in Northern Ireland.

Netherlands. Broadly, the Netherlands offers student loans to full-time university students under the age of 30. The loans are available to Dutch citizens and other nationals who hold the same rights as Dutch citizens, as determined by their residence permit or nationality. In 2015, students were eligible to receive up to 1,016 euros per month[113] for up to seven years in order to complete a four-year degree.[114]

These student loans may be used for study outside of the Netherlands if three criteria are met: the education abroad is of sufficient quality; the student will does not receive a grant from the host country government; and the student has a demonstrable link with the Netherlands. The third criterion of a link with the Netherlands may be waived in some cases, and can be determined in a variety of ways, depending on various circumstances.[115]

109 http://studyassist.gov.au/sites/studyassist/helppayingmyfees/os-help_overseas_study/pages/os-help-loans-and-study-overseas
110 http://susi.ie/
111 http://susi.ie/eligibility/student-studying-outside-the-state/approved-institutionscourses-for-students-studying-outside-the-state/
112 http://susi.ie/eligibility/student-studying-outside-the-state/approved-institutionscourses-for-students-studying-outside-the-state/
113 http://duo.nl/particulieren/studievoorschot-engels/english.asp
114 http://duo.nl/particulieren/international-student/student-finance/how-does-it-work.asp
115 http://www.ibgroep.nl/particulieren/student-hbo-of-universiteit/extra-voorwaarden-buitenland

C. BILATERAL OR REGIONAL MOBILITY

Although increasing the number of internationally mobile students writ large is frequently identified as a governmental goal for institutions and national systems of higher education, it is also not uncommon to find policies and programs that express a more tightly defined set of geographic priorities or objectives. Such initiatives can reflect important political, economic, or cultural dynamics between particular individual countries or across entire regions.

Indeed, "regionalization" of higher education is a concept that has gained considerable attention in recent years, particularly in light of the Bologna Process (later giving way to the European Higher Education Area), and other measures across the globe to stimulate tighter engagement through mobility between specific dyads or groups of countries. Efforts in this direction include:

- **Networks, consortia, and exchange agreements.** Various structures, arrangements, and programs have been established specifically to facilitate mobility throughout a broad region, or between a limited number of specific countries. In some cases, these are initiated and maintained by regional governing bodies, while in others they are ad hoc agreements between the governments of individual countries. Often, while mobility is the key target activity, the hope is that other additional—and sustained—collaboration among higher education institutions in the participating countries will also result.

- **Intra-regional scholarships.** Often funded by participating governments but facilitated by regional entities, scholarships and grants to support intra-regional credit and/or degree mobility may be part of broader regional cooperation, development, and capacity-building initiatives.

POLICY EXAMPLES

Networks, Consortia, and Exchange Agreements

European Union. The European Commission launched the Erasmus Mundus[116] (EM) program in 2004. The original program contained three action lines. Action 1 focused on financing joint master's programs, Action 2 promoted cooperation and mobility between European countries and third countries, and Action 3 aimed at promoting Europe as an educational destination. Following the success of its first iteration, EM was renewed in 2009 in an almost identical form. With the launch of Erasmus+ in 2014 (more information appears in the section immediately below), the main actions of EM were once again renewed, with the important innovation of now adding in opportunities for institutions from outside of the European context to participate, and a refinement of the program name to Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees.[117] While the program has a global reach—and is increasingly oriented to drawing in non-European partners—it aims fundamentally at advancing regional (European) development goals and attracting international talent to Europe. Mobility is a cornerstone activity of the EM program, but—as in all of the programs under the Erasmus+ umbrella—there is a clear interest in developing increasing levels of transnational cooperation and a wider array of international partnerships.

China, Japan, South Korea. In 2012, funded by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan, the governments of these three countries jointly launched CAMPUS Asia[118] (Collective Action for Mobility Program of University Students in Asia). This initiative has been characterized as something of an Asian version of Europe's Erasmus program. CAMPUS Asia has formed a consortium of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean universities to allow for the exchange of students for short-term mobility and full-degree programs. The objective of the scheme is to establish a higher education network among universities in these countries in order to improve the competitiveness of the region in the worldwide academic market and to nurture the development of future leaders who can succeed in the global community.

ASEAN countries. The ASEAN International Mobility for Students[119] (AIMS) program was designed to create student mobility opportunities within Southeast Asia. The program emerged from an initial pilot project involving Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand that was initiated in 2009, and has now been opened to additional countries in the region.[120]

United States-Mexico. In 2013, President Obama and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto established the U.S.-Mexico Bilateral Forum on Higher Education, Innovation, and Research (FOBESII), which aims to "expand student, scholar, and teacher exchanges, promote language acquisition, increase joint research, promote workforce development and share best practices between the two countries." In support of Mexico's Proyecta 100,000, which aims to send 100,000 Mexican students to the United States and to receive 50,000 U.S. students in Mexico by 2018, FOBESII convenes institutional leaders, brings university delegations back and forth between the U.S. and Mexico, offers student scholarships, and promotes institutional part-

---

116   http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/about_erasmus_mundus_en.php
117   http://ec.europa.eu/education/opportunities/higher-education/joint-master_en.htm
118   http://www.grips.ac.jp/campusasia/en/
119   http://www.rihed.seameo.org/programmes/aims/
120   http://www.rihed.seameo.org/programmes/aims/

nerships.[121] In March 2015 the two governments signed an additional memorandum of understanding to create a new U.S.-Mexico Intern Program.[122]

Intra-Regional Scholarships

European Union. Erasmus+[123] is the EU program for education, training, youth, and sport that covers the period 2014–20. It is aimed at boosting skills and employability, and supporting the modernization of systems of education, training, and youth development. The seven-year program will have a budget of EUR 14.7 billion[124] (USD 16.6 billion), which is 40 percent higher than the funding allocated by the EU for its predecessor initiative, the Lifelong Learning Programme, in the period 2007–13. It is expected that Erasmus+ will support the mobility of more than 4 million individuals through educational mobility schemes, staff mobility opportunities, volunteer and youth exchanges, and institutional partnerships within Europe and beyond.

Nordic Council countries. Under the Nordplus[125] framework, the Nordic Council of Ministers offers funding for educational programs aimed at mobility in the Nordic region. The Northplus Higher Education Programme[126] supports mobility among Nordic and Baltic higher education institutions, including student mobility. The Finnish-Russian Student and Teacher Exchange (FIRST) Program,[127] funded by CIMO (the Finnish Centre for International Mobility), also supports cooperation within the Nordic region, specifically between Finnish higher education institutions and counterparts in northwestern Russia.

OAS countries. Coordinated by OAS, the OAS Academic Scholarship Program and the OAS Special Caribbean Scholarships Program fund degree study at all educational levels.[128] The focus is on human capital development toward the achievement of the Strategic Plan for Partnership for Integral Development for citizens of OAS member states. Programs may involve physical mobility within the Americas or other parts of the world, and may feature online delivery.

121 http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2015/01/235641.htm
122 https://acewebmail.nche.edu/r/pa/prs/ps/2015/03/,DanaInfo=.awxyCwyg0mIqz7+238902.htm
123 http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm
124 http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/discover/index_en.htm
125 http://www.nordplusonline.org/
126 http://www.nordplusonline.org/Who-can-apply/Nordplus-Higher-Education
127 http://www.studyinfinland.fi/what_to_study/exchange_programmes/first
128 http://oas.org/en/scholarships/

HARMONIZATION

Perhaps most prominently in Europe, but also in select other regions of the world, there has been a move in recent years to cultivate approaches to cooperation in higher education that are rooted in a vision of "harmonization." Harmonization here may be understood as a process whereby different institutions or national systems of higher education agree to align their approaches to various aspects of the higher education enterprise in order to realize mutual benefits.

In the context of internationalization, harmonization represents a unique, and particularly comprehensive, approach to regional engagement, in light of the various goals that undergird its implementation. For example, facilitating student mobility (both credit and degree) is a cornerstone purpose of harmonization initiatives, which may entail standardizing academic calendars and degree structures, developing common quality assurance procedures and criteria, and establishing credit transfer systems, as well as mutual recognition of qualifications. More broadly, harmonization may be seen as a mechanism that contributes to the overall strengthening of quality and coherence of higher education across the region in question, with important implications for the region's internal dynamics as well as its attractiveness and competitiveness in a global economic and education context. Examples of such initiatives include:

- **East Africa.** In 2011, the Inter-University Council for East Africa[1] published the Rolling Strategic Plan 2011/12–2015/16. The plan aims at harmonizing higher education in East Africa through the implementation of common quality assurance standards,[2] a common qualifications framework, credential recognition, and a credit transfer system. The East African Community (EAC) and the ministers responsible for education, science and technology, sports, and youth affairs in the EAC endorsed the harmonization agenda.[3] The end goal of these attempts is to create the East Africa Common Higher Education Area.[4]

- **Europe.** The Bologna Process,[5] developed outside the framework of the European Union, grew out of a series of ministerial meetings and agreements between European countries. First the 1998 "Sorbonne Joint Declaration on Harmonization of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System,"[6] then the 1999 Bologna Declaration[7] crystalized the goals of enhancing compatibility of, and mobility between, higher education systems across Europe.

  Various agreements through the years further served to improve intelligibility among the higher education systems in Europe and beyond, for example through the creation of common quality assurance standards, promotion of diploma recognition procedures, and modification of degree programs to conform to a common vision for two cycles of degree study: undergraduate and graduate. In 2010, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)—the ultimate aim of the Bologna Process—was officially launched. The European Commission has been widely involved both in the Bologna Process after its inception, and in the development of EHEA.

- **Nordic Council countries.** In 2004, under the Reykjavik Declaration,[8] the Nordic Council of Ministers created the Nordic Declaration on Recognition of Degrees, Diplomas and other Qualifications in Higher Education, aimed at mutual recognition of degrees and examinations. The declaration is meant as an additional framework to the 1997 Lisbon Convention (formally named the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region),[9] and acts as yet another tool of cooperation between the Nordic countries.

---

1   http://www.iucea.org/index.php
2   http://iucea1.org/qawp/?page_id=208
3   http://www.eac.int/education/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=77:ministers-endorse-plan-for-harmonization-of-eac-educa-tion-systems-&catid=34:press-rleases&Itemid=48
4   http://www.iucea.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=110:statementes&catid=81: about-the-iucea
5   http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=3
6   http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/SORBONNE_DECLARATION1.pdf
7   http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/BOLOGNA_DECLARATION1.pdf
8   http://www.norden.org/en/om-samarbejdet-1/nordic-agreements/treaties-and-agreements/education-and-research/recognition-of-qualifica-tions-in-higher-education-2013-the-201creykjavik-declaration201d
9   http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/165.htm

TYPE 2. SCHOLAR MOBILITY AND RESEARCH COLLABORATION

While student mobility is often considered the bedrock of internationalization, scholar mobility and research collaboration represent rich aspects of international engagement by higher education institutions and systems, both historically and in the contemporary context. Motivations in this area include the desire to build higher education capacity—particularly in terms of research and an interest in stimulating knowledge creation in a global knowledge context, but also in relation to new approaches to teaching and learning. Policy activity in this area is being undertaken by many countries around the world, as well as by key regions—notably Europe, where the European Union is investing heavily in this area under the Horizon 2020 initiative, and specifically through such mechanisms as the Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions (described below).[129]

Specific initiatives in this category include:

- **Funding for visiting scholars.** A number of governments around the world provide opportunities for foreign academics, researchers, teaching staff, artists, intellectuals, and others connected to higher education communities abroad, to spend time (essentially on a non-permanent basis) in the host country for professional purposes. A range of motivations may undergird such programs. Some receiving countries may wish to showcase the specific opportunities their higher education systems or research communities can provide to visiting scholars, to capitalize on the specific expertise that visiting scholars can share with a host country, or simply to generate international goodwill through public diplomacy channels. In other cases, the receiving countries may be motivated by a capacity-building agenda whereby their aim is to specifically support political, economic, social, and/or academic development in the sending countries. There may also be multi-pronged approaches to such initiatives, as well as specific bilateral objectives turning on an expressed desire for mutual benefit between the sending and receiving countries.

- **Programs and grants to send faculty abroad.** Perhaps best understood as the "outbound" corollary to the visiting scholar initiatives mentioned above, official policies and programs exist around the world to support temporary sojourns abroad for faculty and researchers. Here, policies and programs may exist for the purpose of building up the academic capacity of the sending country, sharing professional and intellectual resources with the receiving country, or some combination of these objectives.

- **Policies to repatriate faculty living in other countries.** As the stakes for engagement (or failure to engage) with the global knowledge economy have become increasingly high, the desire by countries to assemble a critical mass of highly skilled researchers and adept university teaching staff has become acute. One strategy undertaken by a range of countries—as diverse as China and Peru—to build up local capacity in these areas is to offer incentives to faculty and researchers from their respective diasporas abroad to return to the home countries. Such incentives may range from salary benefits to attractive research grants and related support to preferential employment contracts. In practical terms, it is important to note, however, that academics returning to their home country may not always end up working in universities, but instead may find employment in other sectors. Furthermore, the "repatriation" facilitated by official programs may not be permanent or even long-term.

---

129   https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/marie-sklodowska-curie-actions

- **Project-based research grants.** In some contexts, policies support internationalization through the award processes for research grants. Here, national or regional entities may make access to specific funds contingent on the fielding of international research teams. For example, a great many research projects sponsored by EU agencies and entities require multinational teams or international collaboration as a fundamental component of project design. Indeed, the EU's evolving effort to establish a European Research Area is predicated on five key priorities, of which three are "optimal transnational co-operation and competition," "an open labour market for researchers," and "optimal circulation and transfer of scientific knowledge."[130] In the United States, the National Science Foundation offers some specific opportunities for awards that bring together international teams, and also entertains applications with an international dimension for a number of its programs that are not overtly geared toward international agendas.

The numbers of participants involved in these activities are unquestionably smaller than what is seen in relation to student mobility. However, the "multiplier effect" of investing in faculty is perceived to be greater than that of investing in students, given the longer-term connections scholars are expected to maintain with their home and host institutions, their network of collaborators, and the generations of students with which they come into contact.

POLICY EXAMPLES

Funding for Visiting Scholars

Finland. CIMO Scholarships[131] are awarded to students, researchers, and teachers who have already completed their master's degree. CIMO's aim with its scholarship programs is to support "the internationalisation of teaching and research by forging links and encouraging academic mobility between institutions of higher education in Finland and abroad."[132] CIMO Fellowships,[133] a subset of the scholarships provided by CIMO, are available only for doctoral studies completed in Finland, for young researchers, and for university teaching staff to conduct research or to teach in Finland.

Germany. DAAD offers scholarships for doctoral students, young academics, scientists, visiting scholars, and artists (Bhandari, Belyavina, and Gutierrez 2011). Research Stays for University Academics and Scientists[134] support postdocs and senior researchers who already occupy positions at research institutes or universities in their home country to conduct study visits to Germany of one to three months. The Research Grants for Doctoral Candidates, Young Academics and Scientists[135] are awarded for periods of one to 10 months, with possible extensions for participants who undertake full PhD studies in Germany. The Berlin Artists-in-Residence[136] program offers up to 20 grants annually to international artists focused on the visual arts, film, literature, and music for a period of six months to one year.

---

130   http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/era_communication_en.htm
131   http://www.cimo.fi/programmes/cimo_scholarships
132   http://www.cimo.fi/programmes/cimo_scholarships
133   http://www.studyinfinland.fi/tuition_and_scholarships/cimo_scholarships/cimo_fellowships
134   http://www.research-in-germany.de/en/research-funding/funding-programmes/daad-research-stays-for-university-academics-and-scientists.html
135   https://www.daad.org/gradresearch2
136   https://www.daad.de/deutschland/stipendium/musik-kunst/en/8590-daad-berlin-artists-in-residence-programme/

India. The Global Initiative of Academic Networks[137] (GIAN) is a program of the Indian Government focused on attracting U.S. scholars to India for short-term teaching assignments. The goal is to invite up to 1,000 American academics to teach at India's top universities each year. The financial packages offered to academics as part of GIAN could reach up to USD 8,000 for a two-week session and USD 12,000 for 20 days (Behal 2015).

United Kingdom. The British Council offers a series of grants for citizens of selected developing countries under the Newton Fund.[138] Specifically, the British Council Researcher Links[139] offer early career researchers from partner countries the opportunity to spend up to three months in the UK.

United States. Part of the Department of State's Fulbright suite of programs, the Fulbright Visiting Scholar Program provides grants to approximately 850 foreign scholars from over 100 countries to conduct postdoctoral research at U.S. institutions for an academic semester or a full academic year.[140] The specialized Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence program supports non-U.S. scholars through semester- and academic-year-long grants for teaching at HBCUs, Hispanic-serving institutions, and other institutions that typically "might not have a strong international component."[141]

Programs and Grants to Send Faculty Abroad

Poland. The Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education's Top 500 Innovators: Science—Management—Commercialization Program[142] sends young Polish scientists to study and research in top universities around the world. The program is aimed at bridging the gap between academia and the business sector in Poland, with a curricular focus on entrepreneurship and innovation.

United States. The Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program sends approximately 800 American scholars and professionals per year to approximately 130 countries, where they lecture and/or conduct research in a wide variety of academic and professional fields.[143] On a project basis, the Fulbright Specialist Program awards grants "to U.S. faculty and professionals in select disciplines to engage in short-term collaborative projects at eligible institutions in over 140 countries worldwide." Project length is two to six weeks.[144]

Vietnam. In order to address quality concerns in the country's system, the Vietnamese government has implemented a number of improvement measures, including Project 911, which aims to send thousands of young university lecturers to obtain PhD degrees at foreign universities. The project, initiated in 2010, aims at producing 20,000 doctoral degree holders by 2020 (Engberg et al. 2014).

Mexico. Conacyt, Mexico's National Council of Science and Technology, offers scholarship

137 https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/09/30/us-india-joint-statement
138 http://www.britishcouncil.org/education/science/newton
139 http://www.britishcouncil.org/education/science/researcher-links
140 http://exchanges.state.gov/non-us/program/fulbright-visiting-scholar-program
141 http://www.cies.org/program/fulbright-scholar-residence-program
142 http://top500innovators.org/english
143 http://exchanges.state.gov/us/program/fulbright-us-scholar-program
144 http://www.cies.org/program/fulbright-specialist-program

funding to allow for short-term research sojourns for both young researchers (recent PhD awardees) as well as mid-career researchers (for sabbatical stays).[145] For postdocs, applicants must be Mexican citizens who have received their doctoral degrees from programs of recognized quality within Mexico or abroad during the previous five years.[146] Postdoc scholarship funding consists of USD 2,000 per month for 12 months (with the possibility to renew for a second 12-month period), and an additional USD 1,000 to cover the cost of acquiring medical insurance, if needed.[147] For the sabbatical sojourn program, the objective is to encourage the strengthening of Mexican research networks. Eligible applicants must hold a doctoral degree and be employed full-time at a Mexican higher education institution or research center.[148] Financial support for sabbatical stays consists of USD 2,000 per month for a minimum of six months and a maximum of 12 months, with no possibility for renewal.[149]

Policies to Repatriate Faculty from Abroad or Engage Diaspora

Argentina. RAÍCES (Red de Argentinos Investigadores y Científicos en el Exterior)—in English, the Network of Argentine Researchers and Scientists Abroad[150]—is centrally concerned with scholar migration. The network aims at connecting Argentine researchers abroad to researchers located in Argentina, as well as offering incentives for Argentine researchers to either relocate back to Argentina or to remain in the country. The Ministry of Science, Technology and Productive Innovation of Argentina started the network in 2007. Initially, the program was intended to encourage repatriation of scientists who left the country during the 2001–02 social and economic crisis, and to reintegrate them into the country's science and technology infrastructure (Fernández de Kirchner, C. et al., 2009).

China. China has a number of programs aimed at attracting overseas Chinese nationals back to the country. In 1994, it started the 100 Scholar Program, which by 2007 had recruited 1,417 scholars back to China, and the National Outstanding Youth Fund, aimed at highly qualified scholars under the age of 45. Local governments have designed additional policies to attract overseas Chinese nationals (Geng 2012).

Ethiopia. In 2013, the Ethiopian Ministry of Foreign Affairs articulated the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Diaspora Policy. The policy grew out of a perceived necessity to "efficiently respond to the need to ensure active Diaspora participation in the political, economic and social activities of the country so that it benefits from its engagement and contributes to the wellbeing of the country."[151] Diaspora engagement may not necessarily imply the repatriation of individuals, a policy that has been tested in the African context in recent years and found to be both challenging in its implementation and disappointing in its outcomes. The Ethiopian diaspora policy is not focused exclusively on the university or higher education sec-

145 http://www.conacyt.mx/index.php/becas-y-posgrados/becas-en-el-extranjero/estancias-posdoctorales-y-sabaticas-en-el-extranjero

146 http://www.conacyt.mx/index.php/el-conacyt/convocatorias-y-resultados-conacyt/convocatorias-estancias-posdoctorales-sabaticas-extranjero-1/posdoctorales-extranjero-2015/6433-convocatoria-2015-2/file

147 http://www.conacyt.mx/index.php/el-conacyt/convocatorias-y-resultados-conacyt/convocatorias-estancias-posdoctorales-sabaticas-extranjero-1/posdoctorales-extranjero-2015/6432--5/file

148 http://www.conacyt.mx/index.php/el-conacyt/convocatorias-y-resultados-conacyt/convocatorias-estancias-sabaticas/sabaticas-2015/6458-convocatoria-2015-4/file

149 http://www.conacyt.mx/index.php/el-conacyt/convocatorias-y-resultados-conacyt/convocatorias-estancias-sabaticas/sabaticas-2015/6457--377/file

150 http://en.mincyt.gob.ar/accion/raices-network-of-argentine-researchers-and-scientists-abroad-6444

151 http://www.ethiopianembassy.org/PDF/diaspora%20policy.pdf, p. 2

tor, but does relate to higher education in several specific ways. For example, one of the policy's eight major goals is that of "enhancing knowledge and technology transfer." Here, there is specific mention made of providing retired diaspora professionals with "opportunities to serve in the country's higher educational institutions and technical and vocational colleges."[152]

Peru. The Peruvian national government currently oversees a program that aims for the repatriation of up to 20 Peruvian researchers, with the goal of integrating these individuals into public or private universities in Peru, or into public research institutes in the country. The program operates under the auspices of the National Program for Competitiveness and Productivity of the Peruvian Ministry of Production, and is funded through a loan to the government of Peru from the Inter-American Development Bank.[153] Scholarships will be offered to qualified individuals for two years. During the scholarship period, the recipients should serve in the role of principal investigator for at least one research project undertaken in the sponsoring institution in Peru. Maximum scholarship amounts total USD 150,000 per researcher, with priority areas for research focused on biotechnology, material sciences, environmental sciences and technology, chemistry, physics, biology, and mathematics.[154]

Project-based Research Grants

European Union. Under the auspices of the EU's Horizon 2020 initiative—"the biggest EU Research and Innovation programme ever with nearly EUR 80 billion of funding available over 7 years (2014 to 2020)"[155]—a range of different grant programs are available, a number with a specific focus on international cooperation or mobility for researchers. A prime example of this are the Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions (MSCA), and specifically the action known as ITN: Innovative Training Networks, which "support competitively selected joint research training and/or doctoral programmes, implemented by European partnerships of universities, research institutions, and non-academic organisations," and which also allow for the involvement of non-European partners.

Brazil. CAPES—an acronym in Portuguese which in English stands for Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel—is a foundation of the Brazilian Ministry of Education,[156] and is considered to be Brazil's "graduate education agency" (Knobel 2014, 13). Its international cooperation activities are focused on promoting joint research projects between Brazilian research groups and research groups abroad, through a series of (mostly) bilateral university partnerships in approximately two dozen countries.[157]

United States. The National Science Foundation's Partnerships for International Research and Education (PIRE) program "supports high quality projects in which advances in research and education could not occur without international collaboration." In 2012 (the last year for which information is available on the website), 12 projects received funding of approximately USD 3 million to USD 5 million each. All projects involve faculty from multiple U.S. institutions.[158]

152 http://www.ethiopianembassy.org/PDF/diaspora%20policy.pdf, p. 13
153 http://www.fincyt.gob.pe/site/3-formacionint/741-concurso-para-becas-de-reinsercion-de-investigadores-peruanos
154 http://www.fincyt.gob.pe/site/3-formacionint/741-concurso-para-becas-de-reinsercion-de-investigadores-peruanos
155 http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/what-horizon-2020
156 http://www.capes.gov.br/historia-e-missao
157 http://www.capes.gov.br/cooperacao-internacional
158 http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=505038

TYPE 3. CROSS-BORDER EDUCATION

In a 2007 report published jointly by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank, Jane Knight put forward a concise yet comprehensive definition of cross-border education: "**Cross-border education** refers to the **movement of people, programmes, providers, curricula, projects, research and services across national or regional jurisdictional borders**." Furthermore, she noted that "cross-border is a term that is often used interchangeably with other terms such as transnational, offshore, and borderless education," but that the "preferred term is cross-border education given the importance of jurisdictional boundaries when it comes to policy frameworks and regulations" (Vincent-Lancrin 2007, 24).

Cross-border education may take a number of forms, including branch campuses and other kinds of physical "outposts" (Kinser and Lane 2012); or the phenomenon may present in virtual (or hybrid) forms, such as via various distance learning modes and massive, open, online courses (MOOCs). Cross-border education activities may be undertaken by individual providers, or they may reflect partnership arrangements between one or more providers, and can range from franchise configurations to articulation or twinning programs to joint and/or synchronous delivery—for example, in the context of joint or dual degrees. Finally, cross-border education may be offered in a "stand-alone" fashion, or may involve the involvement of providers in an organized "hub" initiative, bringing various stakeholders together in something of a collective enterprise to offer various kinds of non-local educational offerings in a shared physical setting.

Just as there are different ways of organizing and delivering cross-border education, so too are there different motivations or objectives for such initiatives. Among other motivating factors, the impetus for engaging in cross-border education may include an interest in facilitating cooperation for development, cultivating "soft power" and enhancing public diplomacy efforts, providing academic exchange opportunities, and/or providing avenues for revenue generation.

National policy and program activity in this realm includes initiatives to:

- **Foster partnerships for capacity building.** Cooperation for development—whether from the perspective of an exporting country sending resources and expertise to countries in need, or an importing country seeking guidance and support for the development of key sectors—is a dimension of foreign policy engagement that, for some countries, has existed for decades. With higher education now central to the objectives of many nations seeking to modernize their economies and/or strengthen their political and social infrastructures, cross-border education offers new avenues for engagement with resources from around the world that may support these capacity-building agendas. For provider countries, delivery of cross-border programming with a focus on cooperation for development may build up "soft power" reserves, enhance national image and reputation abroad, and provide invaluable opportunities to develop the domestic knowledge base when it comes to strategically important countries or regions of the world.

- **Create educational "hubs."** An educational hub is a "planned effort to build a critical mass of local and international actors strategically engaged in education, training, knowledge production, and innovation initiatives" (Knight 2011, 233). Hubs may play various roles and emphasize different priorities. Some may be focused on attracting foreign institutions to provide an

expanded array of educational opportunities primarily to local students. Others may be particularly concerned with positioning themselves as a destination of choice for internationally mobile students from across the region in which they are located. These and other motivations, alone or in combination, may serve as the impetus for hub creation and development.

Educational hubs have been particularly prominent in the Asian context, with countries such as Malaysia, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore leading the way (Dessoff 2012), as well as several of the Gulf States in the Middle East.

• **Encourage domestic institutions to establish campuses and programs abroad.** Motivated by an interest in demonstrating solidarity, cultivating international goodwill, showcasing expertise, and a number of other objectives, national policies for internationalization may include the establishment of campuses and programs abroad. For the most part, what we focus on in this vein are initiatives that include the physical presence of one country's higher education activities in another country. However, with the rise of digital distance and online learning, this category of activities may include virtual education initiatives as well.

• **Regulate cross-border educational activity.** A full decade ago, in 2005, OECD (in collaboration with UNESCO) put forward a set of *Guidelines on Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education* (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 2005), noting that the significant rise in cross-border delivery of education in recent years raised concerns around matters of "quality, reliability, and recognition."[159] With an interest in maintaining oversight of the higher education opportunities available to their citizens, particularly within their own national borders, some countries have moved to articulate official policies that govern the activities of foreign providers, especially as concerns those who move in (or seek to move in) to the national context to offer their programs and services.

POLICY EXAMPLES

Partnerships for Capacity Building

Netherlands. NICHE—the Netherlands Initiative for Capacity Development in Higher Education—is funded by the Dutch government and administered by EP-Nuffic. NICHE aims to facilitate the "sustainable strengthening of higher education and technical vocational education and training (TVET) capacity in partner countries, thus contributing to economic development and the reduction of poverty."[160] In keeping with Dutch bilateral cooperation policy, NICHE currently organizes its efforts around four priority areas—food security, water, security and the rule of law, and women's rights and sexual and reproductive health and rights. Fifteen partner countries are currently involved in NICHE and the program is principally concerned that the collaborations between the Dutch and non-Dutch stakeholders are oriented toward long-term partnerships.[161]

United States. Since 2010, the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs has awarded grants (funded through a special appropriation in the bureau's annual budget) to U.S. institutions to establish multi-faceted partnerships with universities in

159   http://www.oecd.org/general/unescooecdguidelinesforqualityprovisionincross-borderhighereducation.htm
160   https://www.nuffic.nl/en/library/niche-netherlands-initiative-for-capacity-development-in-higher-education.pdf
161   https://www.nuffic.nl/en/library/niche-netherlands-initiative-for-capacity-development-in-higher-education.pdf

Afghanistan and Pakistan. Partner institutions are identified by the State Department post in each country, with an eye toward capacity building in particular geographic regions or academic fields. U.S. institutions submit project proposals through an open grant competition; awards of approximately 1 million USD are made to cover each three-year project.[162]

"Hubs"

Ecuador. Ecuador is currently building the Yachay City of Knowledge,[163] the first Latin American hub of its type. Yachay will focus on five areas of inquiry: life sciences, information and communication technologies, nano-sciences, energy, and petro-chemistry. The Korean company Incheon Free Economic Zone developed the master plan of the city at the initiative of the Ecuador government. Yachay Public Company, with strong ties to the government of Ecuador, currently governs the city.

Singapore. The Singaporean government launched the Singapore Global Schoolhouse (GS) initiative in 2002. The vision of GS was to establish Singapore as an educational hub composed of both local and international institutions (including branch campuses) in order to "attract an additional 100,000 international full-fee-paying students and 100,000 international corporate executives for training."[164] An additional goal was to lift the education sector's contribution to gross domestic product (GDP) from 1.9 percent to 5 percent by 2015 (Waring 2014).

United Arab Emirates (UAE). While traditionally the federal government of the UAE has regulated higher education, several free zones have been created within UAE territories where organizations are exempt from complying with federal regulations,[165] such as the requirement of majority enterprise ownership by UAE nationals (Latham & Watkins LLP 2011). Dubai International Academic City (DIAC)[166] is the world's largest zone dedicated to higher education, stretching over an 18 million-square-foot campus. It was established in 2007 as an initiative of TECOM Investments (Knight 2011).

DIAC currently has a large selection of international branch campuses from 10 different nations, and it hosts a community of over 20,000 students representing 125 nationalities who have access to over 400 study programs. DIAC is part of the country's long-term economic strategy to develop the region's talent pool, attract foreign academics and students, and provide UAE nationals with diverse educational opportunities.

Campuses and Programs Abroad

China. Confucius Institutes[167] are nonprofit public institutions affiliated with the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China whose stated goals are to promote Chinese language and culture, support local Chinese teaching internationally, and facilitate cultural

---

162 Information provided by Richard Boyum, university partnership coordinator for Afghanistan/Pakistan, Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, U.S. Department of State.
163 http://www.yachay.gob.ec/yachay/?lang=en
164 https://www.mti.gov.sg/ResearchRoom/Documents/app.mti.gov.sg/data/pages/507/doc/DSE_ recommend.pdf
165 http://www.globalhighered.org/edhubs.php
166 http://www.diacedu.ae/
167 http://english.chinese.cn/

exchanges. Confucius Institutes operate within established universities, colleges, and secondary schools around the world, providing funding, teachers, and educational materials. The Confucius Institute program began in 2004 and is overseen by Hanban[168] (the Chinese National Office for Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language). The financial support of each Confucius Institute is shared between Hanban and the host institutions. In 2014, there were over 480 Confucius Institutes in the world. [169]

France. In 2014, France made a policy decision to increase its academic presence internationally by investing in massive open online courses (MOOCs). Eight million euros (USD 9.04 million) were assigned to this project, which includes the launch of a national MOOC platform.[170]

Germany. Germany describes its transnational education (TNE) model as essentially collaborative and based on equal partnerships between German and foreign institutions. Traditionally, the host institution abroad provides the infrastructure, but also participates in the establishment of the curriculum. The most common forms of TNE are German courses offered abroad; however, there are also German-backed universities abroad (which receive funding through DAAD) and affiliated branch campuses. Examples of some of these kinds of initiatives include the German University in Cairo in Egypt, the German–Jordanian University in Amman, the German University of Technology in Oman, the Turkish–German University in Istanbul, or the German–Vietnamese University in Ho Chi Minh City (DAAD 2014, 5–8).

Regulation

China. In 2011, the Chinese central government issued new regulations on the scope of activities of foreign universities. Foreign-owned universities are permitted to engage in for-profit but non-degree educational activities. These institutions can sign contracts, issue invoices, and hire local employees. However, a wholly foreign-owned enterprise may only be registered as a for-profit, taxable enterprise, established as a university's corporate affiliate. At present, it is not possible for a foreign university to establish itself as an independent nonprofit entity in China. To offer formal degree programs in China, a foreign university must establish a joint legal entity with a Chinese partner institution. Such programs must be approved by the Ministry of Education and subsequently operate under the ministry's supervision (Conning 2012).

Bangladesh. In 2014, the Bangladeshi government passed the "Foreign University, its branches or study centers operating Rule."[171] The new regulations allow foreign universities, or their local representatives, to engage in joint venture initiatives with any local university or investors to establish and operate branches or study centers in Bangladesh. Foreign universities or representatives have to obtain temporary permission and a certificate from the country's regulatory body, the University Grants Commission (Wadud 2014).

India. In recent years, India has debated intensely the role of international higher education

---

168 http://english.hanban.org/
169 http://www.confucius.ucla.edu/about-us/confucius-institutes-worldwide
170 http://www.france-universite-numerique.fr/18-actions.html
171 http://www.dpp.gov.bd/upload_file/gazettes/10870_52279.pdf

providers within the country. Fully independent operations (e.g., a branch campus) of a foreign institution have not been permitted; all programs and activities must be carried out in partnership with an Indian institution. Since 2010, a series of bills, such as the Foreign Educational Institutions (Regulation of Entry and Operations) Bill,[172] and the UGC (Promotion and Maintenance of Standards of Academic Collaboration between Indian and Foreign Educational Institutions) Regulations,[173] have set specific parameters for such partnerships and activities.

Notably, for example, higher education institutions, or foreign educational institutions (FEI) as defined by the law, are allowed to operate in India only if they are accredited and have been offering educational services for at least 20 years in their country of origin. The most recent round of legislation[174] further stipulates that in order to enter India, a foreign institution must be a top 400 institution in one of three global rankings: the UK-based *Times Higher Education* or Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) rankings, or the China-based Academic Ranking of World Universities.

India's new government is currently in the process of revisiting these regulations. Due in part to concerns about the lack of capacity of the Indian higher education system to accommodate demand, indications are that the current government will take measures to encourage more foreign providers to enter the Indian market. It has already been announced that foreign universities working in partnership with Indian institutions will be allowed to introduce their own curricula, bring their own teachers, and pay their own levels of salaries. The government is also considering allowing foreign universities to set up branch campuses and other independent (i.e., without an Indian partner) operations, and to repatriate profits from these operations.[175]

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

On the topic of hubs and their role in higher education internationalization, additional resources include:

The "Educational Hubs" section[1] of the website for Cross-Border Education Research Team at The State University of New York at Albany includes a list of "entities that have described themselves as current or developing education hubs." A basic description of each is provided.

International Education Hubs: Student, Talent, Knowledge-Innovation Models (Wilkins 2014) examines government motivations for creating hubs, and sets forth a typology for such endeavors. Case studies from hubs in various countries are included.

1   http://www.globalhighered.org/edhubs.php

---

172   http://www.prsindia.org/billtrack/the-foreign-educational-institutions-regulation-of-entry-and-operations-bill-2010-1139/
173   http://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/9578034_English.pdf
174   http://www.pib.nic.in/newsite/erelease.aspx?relid=101411
175   Information obtained through communication with Duleep Deosthale, co-founder and vice president, International Education, Admission Table.

TYPE 4. INTERNATIONALIZATION AT HOME

Internationalization is often conceptualized today as consisting of two main streams of activity: internationalization abroad and internationalization at home. The notion of internationalization at home (IaH) is traced to the European context of the late 1990s (Crowther et al., 2001), where a strong focus on new targets for Erasmus mobility prompted discussions of what internationalization could and should mean for the vast majority of non-mobile students. Since that time, thinking around the concept of IaH has evolved considerably, with one of the newest definitions for the phenomenon asserting that IaH should be understood as **"the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments"** (Beelen and Jones 2015).

Despite the fact that IaH is an aspect of internationalization that has the potential to affect a broad majority of students—as opposed to the typically limited proportion of students who participate in activities abroad—IaH remains a much less deeply or systematically developed aspect of internationalization in many higher education contexts are around the world. The same can be said for attention to IaH in most policy discussions. However, attention to IaH may be growing. For example, in July 2013, the European Commission released its long-awaited strategy for internationalization, *European Higher Education in the World* (European Commission 2013), in which it singled out "internationalisation at home and digital learning" as one of three key institutional priorities (just behind increased mobility for students and staff) for the higher education sector in Europe, in relation to internationalization. Key additional considerations for the IaH agenda include such matters as internationalization of the curriculum (Leask 2013, 2015); development of intercultural competencies and/or notions of "global citizenship"; and the leveraging of technology to enhance digital learning for students and global connectivity for institutions (de Wit et al. 2015).

In terms of specific policies and programs in this newly evolving area, two main focal points stand out:

- **Curricular issues**. Internationalization of the curricula has to do with bringing globally focused content and perspectives into the classroom and coursework in order to build students' global knowledge base and intercultural competency.

- **Broad institutional engagement with internationalization.** Here, we are speaking of the ways that attention to internationalization may permeate multiple levels of a higher education institution (not simply those units which have traditionally been responsible for international programs and activities); for example, in terms of the skills and sensitivity of *all* staff when it comes to interacting with international students and scholars.

POLICY EXAMPLES

Internationalization of the curriculum

United States. The Department of Education administers a number of institutional grant programs that fund the development of foreign language and area studies education.[176] Chief among these are the Language Resource Centers Program, which provides grants to higher

---

176   http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/index.html

education institutions or consortia of institutions for the purpose of establishing, strengthening, and operating a small number of national language resource and training centers to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning foreign languages.

Broad institutional engagement with internationalization

Germany. In 2013, the *Strategy of the Federal and Länder Ministers of Science for the Internationalisation of the Higher Education Institutions in Germany (Resolution of the 18th Meeting of the Joint Science Conference in Berlin)* outlined nine fields of action for promoting internationalization within German higher education institutions, with joint policy goals articulated for each field.[177] Two fields of action relate specifically to aspects of internationalization at home: "establishing a culture of welcome" and "establishing an international campus." In these specific areas, the policy document calls for ensuring that staff at all levels speak "at least" English, participate in intercultural training courses, and become acquainted with the practices of other higher education institutions around the world. German institutions should ensure that international students and scholars feel welcome in all aspects of their lives, and are as fully integrated as possible into the university and local context.[178]

---

177   http://www.bmbf.de/pubRD/Internationalisierungsstrategie_engl.Fassung.pdf
178   http://www.bmbf.de/pubRD/Internationalisierungsstrategie_engl.Fassung.pdf

TYPE 5. COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES

Indicative of what appears to be an evolving understanding of, and commitment to, the notion of internationalization as a "comprehensive," cross-cutting phenomenon—with deep implications for the quality and relevance of higher education in twenty-first century—there are a small number of policies visible on the global landscape that take a more expansive position on what can and should be undertaken and achieved in this arena. Here, we see initiatives that may present a more sweeping set of rationales, action lines, focus areas, and/or geographic orientations, providing an indication of a more holistic orientation toward the perceived scope of internationalization and its possible benefits for the policy initiator(s).

Strategies of this type appear to comprise two subcategories:

- **Global strategies.** While these policies may identify certain geographic areas as a priority for recruiting international students, study abroad, partnerships, and other activities, they are not limited in scope to engagement with a particular country or region. Typically, they are tied explicitly to domestic higher education and development goals.

- **Strategies with a specific geographic focus.** These policies and programs are aimed at establishing multifaceted connections and collaboration between higher education in the home country and another specific country or region. A number of such policies cited below entail a substantial international development component.

In terms of operationalizing these policies, there is in these broader, more multifaceted strategies clearly a significant degree of overlap with many of the themes and activities presented in the previous categories of this typology. Student mobility, partnerships, and collaborative engagement remain integral to these initiatives. However, the examples of "comprehensive" strategies singled out here provide evidence of a widening and deepening understanding regarding the possibilities of internationalization to address key concerns in the policy context with respect to the role of higher education in national and regional development. The multifaceted scope of such integrated internationalization policies reflect the full range of objectives described in the "Policy Goals and Motivations" section earlier.

POLICY EXAMPLES

Global Strategies

European Commission. In 2013, the European Commission launched its new internationalization strategy, European Higher Education in the World,[179] which aims to promote mobility and cooperation between universities, EU member states, and non-EU countries. The document suggests that individual member states and higher education institutions should work closely together on internationalization strategies for cooperation with partners in other parts of the world, not only in terms of student mobility but also at the level of strategic academic partnerships.

---

179   http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/international-cooperation/world-education_en.htm

Notably, the notion of internationalization at home, which relates to the educational experiences of stakeholders who are not mobile, receives prominent treatment in this major policy document. The commission further highlights that education is at the heart of the Europe 2020 Strategy (Europe's roadmap for economic competitiveness and social well-being), and this document should contribute to its objectives by encouraging member states, as well as individual institutions, to develop strategic partnerships to deal with global challenges. To move from strategy to implementation, the EU supports a range of programs designed to foster mobility and cross-border cooperation. These programs largely reside under the umbrella of the Erasmus+ initiative, and include such activities as learning mobility for individuals, capacity-building in higher education, and the development of strategic partnerships and "knowledge alliances."[180]

Canada. In 2014 Canada launched its first-ever International Education Strategy, designed to maintain and enhance Canada's global position in higher education. The goals set forward in this strategy include attracting more international researchers and students to Canada, deepening the research links between Canadian and foreign educational institutions, and establishing a pan-Canadian partnership with provinces and territories, including all key education stakeholders, as well as the private sector.

As approved in Economic Action Plan 2013, ongoing funding of CAD 5 million (USD 4.07 million) per year will be assigned to support the objectives of the International Education Strategy.[181] This investment will be primarily dedicated to branding and marketing Canada as a world-class education destination to audiences in six priority markets abroad. In addition, the strategy will provide CAD 13 million (USD 10.6 million) over two years to the Globalink program of Mitacs, a national not-for-profit organization that fosters innovation through research and training programs. The Globalink[182] program facilitates student mobility between Canada and Brazil, China, India, Mexico, Turkey, and Vietnam. The strategy seeks to double the number of international students in Canada by the year 2022.

Finland. The strategy for the "Internationalization of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009-2015" (Finnish Ministry of Education 2009) aims at creating an international higher education community in Finland, increasing the quality and attractiveness of Finnish higher education institutions, exporting Finnish educational expertise, supporting a multicultural society, and promoting global responsibility.

Malaysia. The "Internationalization Policy for Higher Education Malaysia" (Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia 2011) was adopted in 2011 based on consultations with 14 public and nine private institutions in the country. The policy addresses core aspects of internationalization, such as student mobility, staff mobility, academic programs, research and development, governance and autonomy, and social integration and cultural engagement. Education Malaysia Global Services[183] was contracted by the Malaysian Government to target international students, facilitate a better student experience, and provide visa counseling in a com-

---

180   http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/documents/erasmus-plus-programme-guide_en.pdf
181   http://www.international.gc.ca/media/comm/news-communiques/2014/01/15a.aspx?lang=eng
182   http://www.mitacs.ca/sites/default/files/mitacs_corporate_plan_2013-14_globalink_addendum.pdf
183   http://educationmalaysia.gov.my/index.php/about-us

prehensive and transparent way.

United Kingdom. Initially launched in 1999, The Prime Minister's Initiative (PMI) aimed to increase the number of international students present in the United Kingdom over the course of five years. The PMI was renewed in 2006 as the Prime Minister's Initiative for International Education (PMI2).[184] PMI2 also has an overt focus on international student recruitment, but extends this agenda to a broader set of concerns, including securing the UK's position as a leader in international education and sustaining the growth of UK international education delivered in the UK and overseas (PMI2, n.d., p. 8).[185]

To address these goals, the emphasis is on (among other areas) developing international partnerships between UK higher education institutions and overseas collaborators, enhancing the overall international student experience in the UK, and improving the employability picture (both in the UK and in the home country) of international graduates from UK institutions. The main outcomes of PMI2 have been a series of tools available to students—including Prepare for Success (an interactive web learning tool),[186] the International Student Calculator,[187] and the Internationalisation Toolkit for Students' Unions[188]—as well as a number of studies and reports produced by stakeholder organizations and associations.

Strategies with a Specific Geographic Focus

Australia-Indo Pacific. Initiated by the Australian government, the New Colombo Plan[189] aims at consolidating relationships between Australia and Indo Pacific region through two-way mobility opportunities for students, and creating incentives for partnerships and stakeholder links. Following the pilot of the program in 2014, the program was expanded in 2015 to include more than 35 locations,[190] and 38 in 2016.[191] A total of AUD 100 million (USD 77.5 million) over five years has been allocated to the plan.

China-Africa. In 2000, China announced the creation of Confucius Institutes in Africa and the doubling of study grants for Africans, primarily in the areas of medicine, agriculture, languages, education, economics, and management. The academic cooperation intensified in 2009 with the adoption of an action plan for 2010–12 by China and 49 African countries. This plan resulted in an increased number of Chinese government grants for African students in 2012, the establishment of 100 joint research and development projects, and the strengthening of the teaching of the Chinese language in Africa. A continuation of the action plan was signed in 2012 to cover the 2013–15 period (Makoni 2010).

Germany-Africa. In 2014, DAAD proposed a new campaign, "The Africa Strategy 2014-2018," which is organized around the principle of "Africa as a partner in education and research."

---

184   http://www.ukcisa.org.uk/Info-for-universities-colleges--schools/Policy-research--statistics/Major-projects/
185   http://www.agcas.org.uk/assets/download?file=2370&parent=946
186   http://www.prepareforsuccess.org.uk/
187   http://international.studentcalculator.org/
188   http://www.nusconnect.org.uk/internationalisation/
189   http://www.dfat.gov.au/people-to-people/new-colombo-plan/Pages/new-colombo-plan.aspx
190   http://www.dfat.gov.au/people-to-people/new-colombo-plan/2015-round/Pages/host-locations.aspx
191   http://dfat.gov.au/people-to-people/new-colombo-plan/2016-round/Pages/new-colombo-plan-2016-host-locations.aspx

The main objectives of the initiative are focused on developing collaborative mechanisms in the education, research, and industry domains in order to overcome global challenges through joint effort; create high-quality and sustainable, scientific cooperative structures; strengthen regional and continental cooperation; strengthen innovative potential and developing markets; and raise Germany's visibility in Africa as a key partner in education and research (DAAD 2014). In order to achieve these goals, the DAAD will make use of established programs, but also develop new models. German, African, and international funding organizations will provide the necessary financing for implementing the strategy.

Norway-North America. In 2011, the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research launched the new North America Strategy for Higher Education Cooperation 2012–2015. The purpose of the strategy is to further strengthen the cooperation between Norwegian higher education institutions and their partners in the United States and Canada. The main activities under this strategy include a new call in the Partnership Program with North America, project funding, the identification of arenas for increased cooperation with Canada, increasing the mobility of students at the master's and PhD levels, and the mobility of North American students to Norway. The ministry is allocating NOK 10 million (USD 1.3 million) per year to activities included in the strategy.

United Kingdom-India. The UK India Educational and Research Initiative[192] (UKIERI) was established in 2006 with the goal of developing higher education connections and strengthening bilateral relations between the United Kingdom and India. UKIERI sponsors a number of programs in four primary focal areas: education leadership development, innovation partnerships, vocational skills development, and student mobility. For financial support and unique expertise, the initiative relies on a number of partnerships with governmental organizations and related associations, such as the British Council, the University Grants Commission, and the Indian Department of Science and Technology. To date, 208 higher education partnerships, involving over 400 institutions, have been established in order to engage in joint research, curriculum development, and program delivery. The UKIERI program has been extended for five years, from 2011 to 2016, and both governments have confirmed the continuation of funding.

---

192   http://www.ukieri.org/

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

As part of its **Internationalization of Higher Education Virtual Resource Center**,[1] established in 2015, the International Association of Universities (IAU) maintains a web page[2] with information about broad national policies and strategies for internationalization in various countries around the world, and links to related documents. A discussion of the goals and motivations for such policies is also included.

Internationalisation of Higher Education is a forthcoming European Parliament report, produced jointly by the Catholic University of Milan's Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation, the European Association for International Education, and the International Association of Universities. The report provides a concise description and analysis of key trends and issues related to internationalization activities and developments—including government policies and programs, where relevant—in 10 countries in Europe and seven countries outside of Europe.

1   http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/internationalization-higher-education-virtual-resource-center
2   http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/national-policies

GLOBAL COMPARISONS OF POLICIES AND PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION

Type		Policy/Program	Actors/Influences	Select Country/Region Examples
1 Student Mobility	*Inbound mobility*	Grants and scholarships	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	China, India, Estonia, New Zealand, Turkey, United States
		Visa policies	NGEs	EU, Australia, France, Spain, Sweden
		Preferential admission policies	NGEs	Nordic Council countries, Spain
		"Study in" initiatives	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	Argentina, Ireland, Malaysia, Sweden, Netherlands (Holland), New Zealand, United States
	Outbound mobility	Grants and scholarships	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Germany, New Zealand, Russia, Saudi Arabia, United States
		Financial aid policies	NGEs	EU, Australia, Ireland, Netherlands
	Bilateral or regional mobility	Harmonization	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	East Africa, Europe, Nordic Council countries
		Networks, consortia, and exchange agreements	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	ASEAN countries, EU, China-Japan-S. Korea, United States-Mexico
		Intra-regional scholarships	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	EU, Nordic Council countries, OAS countries
2 Scholar Mobility & Research Collaboration		Funding for visiting scholars	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	Finland, Germany, India, UK, United States
		Programs and grants to send faculty abroad	RGEs, NGEs, ORGs	Poland, United States, Vietnam, Mexico
		Policies to repatriate faculty from abroad	NGEs	Argentina, China, Ethiopia, Peru
		Project-based research grants	RGEs, NGEs	EU, Brazil, United States
3 Cross-Border Education		Partnerships for capacity building	NGEs, ORGs	Netherlands, United States
		"Hubs"	NGEs	Ecuador, Singapore, UAE
		Campuses and programs abroad	NGEs, ORGs	China, France, Germany,
		Regulation	NGEs	China, Bangladesh, India
4 Internationalization at Home		Internationalization of the curriculum		United States
		Broad institutional engagement with internationalization		Germany
5 Comprehensive Internationalization Strategies		Global strategies	RGEs, NGEs	EU, Canada, Finland, Malaysia, UK
		Strategies with a specific geographic focus	RGEs, NGEs	Australia-Indo Pacific, China-Africa, Germany-Africa Norway-North America, UK-India

Key: RGEs = Regional government entities
NGEs = National government entities
ORGs = Quasi-governmental and independent nonprofit organizations

Toward a Global Perspective: Summary and Comparisons

As illustrated in the preceding sections of this report, the global landscape of policies and programs for higher education internationalization spans a **broad array of approaches, involving a wide range of different actors**. As complex as it is to make sense of this variety worldwide, Table 1 represents an attempt to sketch the outlines of the global ecosystem of internationalization policy categories, along with the actors and influences most closely identified with their elaboration and, to a significant extent, implementation.

As noted previously, the analysis undertaken in this report by no means represents an exhaustive inventory of the national and regional policies in existence around the world today. As such, it is difficult to draw many conclusions about policy developments globally, particularly in terms of content or in relation to possible trends by region, etc. While the recent report (de Wit, Hunter, Howard, and Egron-Polak, forthcoming) produced for the European Parliament on *Internationalisation of Higher Education* points to 10 key findings that characterize the development of internationalization *in general* in Europe and elsewhere (see box below), the extensive examination undertaken here of a broad range of *policies*, across all regions of the world, suggests three main insights worth considering. These include:

- The (not surprising) **central role of national government** entities in the policy context
- The less easily measurable, yet nonetheless **crucial role of "other influencers"** in the shaping and implementation of internationalization policy
- The ongoing primacy of **mobility as an essential building block** for internationalization policies

Even in an age of profound globalization, **higher education remains an enterprise squarely situated in the national context the world over**. In some countries—such as the United States, Canada, Germany, Spain, India, and others—responsibility for higher education is even more locally situated at the sub-country level, i.e. in the hands of states, regions, provinces, and the like, as well as with individual institutions. For this reason, policymaking for higher education, broadly speaking, is rarely undertaken by supra-national entities, and the same is true for internationalization. National governments can clearly be seen as crucially important actors when it comes to agenda-setting and policymaking for higher education internationalization across the globe.

At the same time, the examination of the global landscape also makes it clear that **national government entities are increasingly sharing the policymaking space with regional government entities and a broad community of quasi-governmental and independent nonprofit organizations—as well as with higher education institutions themselves**. An enormous amount of time and energy is being expended by these non-national entities to influence the policymaking process, and to advance ideas and agendas with important policy implications. We also note that our examination of "other influences" in the context of this report is not comprehensive. There is much to explore with regard to the ways that relevant associations, advocacy groups, students, private industry, and others are engaging in different aspects of the policy process and dialogue—and how this engagement

is playing out in practical terms. Of particular interest here is the **"lived reality" of policies**; i.e., how individuals and institutions experience the direct effects of policy implementation.

Finally, when it comes to the myriad approaches to internationalization articulated by policies around the world, there is one dimension seen across the vast majority: mobility. From students to faculty, individual programs to fully fledged branch campuses, **mobility factors frequently (often heavily, if not exclusively) into all manner of policies**. Our assessment is that the emerging conversation in many circles about the need to focus more purposefully on other aspects of internationalization, or at the very least to better leverage the effects of mobility for a wider range of beneficiaries, has yet to result in the elaboration of many concrete policies aimed at addressing these concerns in comprehensive and sustainable ways.

The policy landscape for internationalization of higher education is **unquestionably dynamic**. New policy initiatives are frequently announced around the world, and a wide range of discussions is being undertaken about the need to develop and implement new and better policies to help achieve the various goals expected of internationalization. There is much to consider and to learn from these policymaking experiments from across the globe.

GLOBAL TRENDS IN INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By Hans de Wit, Director, Boston College Center for International Higher Education

In 2014–15, a study on **Internationalisation of Higher Education** (IoHE) was conducted for the European Parliament by the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI), based at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. This project was undertaken in partnership with the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the European Association for International Education (EAIE). The resulting publication (edited by Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Laura Howard, and Eva Egron-Polak) included **17 country reports**—10 from Europe and seven from the rest of the world—and identified **10 key trends** in current national strategies for internationalization:

1. Growing importance of internationalization at all levels (broader range of activities, more strategic approaches, emerging national strategies and ambitions)

2. Increase in institutional strategies for internationalization (but also risks of homogenization, focus on quantitative results only)

3. Challenge of funding everywhere

4. Trend toward increased privatization in IoHE through revenue generation

5. Competitive pressures of globalization, with increasing convergence of aspirations, if not yet actions

6. Evident shift from (only) cooperation to (more) competition

7. Emerging regionalization, with Europe often seen as an example

8. Numbers rising everywhere, with challenge of quantity versus quality

9. Lack of sufficient data for comparative analysis and decision making

10. Emerging areas of focus are internationalization of the curriculum, transnational education, and digital learning

Internationalization is now becoming **mainstreamed at the national and institutional level in most countries of the world**, and in particular in Europe. The rhetoric speaks of more comprehensive and strategic policies for internationalization, but in reality there is still a long way to go in most cases. Even in Europe, seen around the world as a best-practice case for internationalization, there is still much to be done, and there is an **uneven degree of accomplishment** across the different countries, with significant challenges in Southern Europe and, in particular, Central and Eastern Europe.

Most national strategies are still predominantly focused on mobility, short-term and/or long-term economic gains, recruitment and/or training of talented students and scholars, and international reputation and visibility. This implies that far greater efforts are still needed to incorporate these approaches into **more comprehensive strategies**, in which internationalization of the curriculum and learning outcomes, as a means to enhance the quality of education and research, receive more attention. The inclusion of internationalization at home as a third pillar in the internationalization strategy of the European Commission, *European Higher Education in the World* (2013), as well as in several national strategies, is a good starting point, but it will require more concrete actions at the regional, national and, in particular, the institutional level for it to become reality.

Assessing Policy Effectiveness

As in many areas of higher education, **determining the effectiveness of internationalization policies is a formidable challenge**. However, in an era of increasing emphasis on assessment in higher education, and in the context of rising interest in the notion of data-driven decision-making, understanding the range of results from these initiatives is a matter of some urgency. This is also true in light of the investments being made (monetary and otherwise) by governments and other key stakeholders in the elaboration and implementation of these strategies.

A first step in the process of determining the degree of "success" enjoyed by any given internationalization policy or initiative involves **reflecting upon the motivation(s) that originally spurred its creation and implementation** (a number of which are discussed in the "Policy Goals and Motivations" section above). Critical questions here include: What is the rationale behind the program or policies, and what goals or objectives was it designed to achieve? And can (or how can) progress with respect to the expected/desired changes be gauged, and over what time period? Perhaps equally important, a consideration of a range of possible **unintended consequences** of policies may also be warranted, in light of the complexity of higher education processes and activities generally, and the phenomenon of internationalization specifically.

In terms of measurement, three types of indicators come into play: **outputs, outcomes, and impact**. Outputs are understood as the more immediate (often easily quantifiable) results of policies or programs (e.g., X number of international students recruited by X date). "Impact" relates to the longer-term, wider-reaching results of internationalization efforts (e.g., a higher national GDP resulting from economic development and enhanced global competitiveness). "Outcomes" are situated somewhere in between outputs and impact, providing mid-term evidence of change as a result of policies and activities.[193] When it comes to understanding the effects of internationalization, analysts and scholars in the field note that much attention is paid to output indicators rather than to more meaningful, yet more complex, considerations of outcomes and impact.[194]

An exhaustive examination of the effectiveness of individual national and regional policies for internationalization around the world is beyond the scope of this report. However, a thoughtful consideration of some of the evidence of the effects of internationalization policies—including where that evidence comes from and the limitations of some policy assessment exercises—as well as the opportunities and challenges associated with implementing effective policy, may help us make better sense of how policies for internationalization play out in the real world.

---

193   Again, see the 2012 IMPI document "Reflections on the Impact of Internationalisation" (www.impi-project.eu).
194   See, for example, the chapter "Outcomes Assessment in the Internationalization of Higher Education" by Deardorff and van Gaalen in the SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education, edited by Deardorff, de Wit, Heyl, and Adams, 2012; Beerkens et al.'s "Indicator projects on internationalization: Approaches, methods and findings, 2010, produced for the EU-funded project known as IMPI – Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internalisation (www.impi-project.eu); and another IMPI document from 2012, "Reflections on the Impact of Internationalisation" (www.impi-project.eu).

MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

The body of evidence providing insight into the effects of national and regional internationalization policies is **heavily, although not exclusively, dominated by quantitative data.** This is understandable for several reasons. First, "countable" data are often considered easier than qualitative data to collect, analyze, and present with consistency and reliability. This makes instruments such as surveys and questionnaires—which allow for the easy quantification of responses—common tools in the effort to gather information about internationalization, particularly in terms of the ways that the phenomenon is experienced by individuals and institutions.

In addition, as discussed in the preceding section, the internationalization policy landscape is dominated by an emphasis on initiatives in which mobility plays a central role. **Participant numbers** are regularly referred to as key evidence of policy implementation, and considered carefully in relation to such issues as programmatic progress, regression, or stagnation. Because many policies are accompanied by financial investments to ensure their implementation, quantitative **financial analyses** are another important way in which policy implementation—if not always success or failure—is gauged. Finally, quantitative analysis yields the kind of information that may be **more easily received by policymakers and politicians**, who, in the context of their particular roles, must concern themselves to a significant degree with such matters as cost-benefit analyses and returns on investment of public funds.

Quantitative analyses, however, typically yield data on outputs, which as noted previously, is often the point at which assessment of internationalization policy effectiveness stops. To move beyond an assessment of outputs **to examine longer-term outcomes and broader impact of policies and programs is a much more complicated proposition** methodologically. Identifying appropriate—and measurable—indicators that address the longer term motivations and goals for internationalization is a challenge (how, for example, does one measure "mutual understanding"?). And it can be difficult—if not impossible—to definitively determine causality (for example, to what extent can a higher GDP be attributed to internationalization policies, as opposed to a myriad of other factors that may play a role?).

Qualitative analyses—involving such approaches as program- or country-level case studies, and drawing data from such methods as interviews and document analysis—are sometimes employed in the effort to gather evidence of impact from internationalization policies. These approaches, however, are time consuming and resource-intensive, so not unexpectedly, they seem much less prevalent in comparison to quantitative studies and analyses, or even mixed-methods approaches.

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS

Given the measurement challenges entailed, evidence of the impact of existing internationalization policies and programs worldwide can be hard to come by. Reflecting this reality, a 2014 British Council/DAAD study on government-funded scholarship programs for outward mobility in 11 different countries around the world noted that "there seems to be little debate about the value of investing in

the overseas education of a small number of citizens," however there are **"enormous gaps by country in terms of documented proof of the tangible outcomes** of these significant investments" (vi).

There are, though, contexts around the world where evidence of effectiveness has indeed been made manifest. Policy and program effectiveness in terms of number of participants has been especially **evident in some contexts where there has been a significant infusion of resources into the launch of a new initiative**—as seen, for example, with the Brazilian Mobility Scholarship Program or the King Abdullah Scholarship Program in Saudi Arabia (described in the typology above).[195] Indeed, spikes in the numbers of students coming to the United States in the last several years from Brazil and Saudi Arabia have been correlated with the development of these major government initiatives.[196] An increase in inbound student numbers into the United Kingdom from Brazil has been attributed to these same policy dynamics (Higher Education Funding Council for England 2014).

Providing an additional example related to mobility but focusing on visa policies, a 2014 study conducted by HEFCE, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, found that an "increase in student numbers from Malaysia, following previous declines, among other factors appears to follow the introduction of a simplified student visa application process for students seeking study at universities with 'highly trusted sponsor' status in 2012" (10). And, in considering the situation of competitor countries, the 2014 HEFCE report further noted the importance of Australia having introduced in March 2012 "a streamlined visa processing service which means that university applications are considered as 'low risk' irrespective of students' countries of origin. Along with other factors, this is believed to have positively affected demand for higher education in 2013" (12).

Evidence of policy and program effectiveness may be **easier to assess in the context of longer-running initiatives**, given that more large-scale and/or longitudinal approaches can be taken to examining participation rates (outputs), as well as participant experiences post-mobility and other indicators that can get at longer-term outcomes and broader impact. The EU's Erasmus program, for example, recently conducted a study that examined the program's impact on student employability and the internationalization of higher education institutions which concluded, among other findings, that Erasmus students are in a better position than nonparticipants to "find their first job and to enhance their career development," and are more likely to live abroad (European Commission 2014). Many of the higher education internationalization policies and programs in place worldwide, however, are still too new to draw conclusions about outcomes and long-term impacts.

Some studies have also approached the question of effectiveness based on **perceptions**, rather than documented "realities." For example, in 2013, the International Association of Universities' *4th Global Survey* gathered responses on questions related to the institutional experience with internationalization from 1,336 universities worldwide. The survey found that, overall, government policies (national, state, provincial, municipal) were considered to be the top external driver of internationalization for the institutions included in the study (followed by business and industry demand). By geographic region, government policies were ranked either first or second by institutions in every area except North America; in Europe, regional policies ranked second to government policies.

---

195   For more information, see http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/britishcouncil.uk2/files/e002_outward_mobility_study_final_v2_web.pdf.
196   http://www.iie.org/en/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2014/2014-11-17-Open-Doors-Data

POLICY CHECK-IN: How Is It Going?

Because our focus in the typology above is recently implemented national and regional policies, in most cases the project time horizon and end dates for goals are several years in the future, and it is too soon to gauge their ultimate success. Checking in on a few cases for which relevant data are available, however, provides a snapshot of how some individual policies are faring. For example:

- **Finland.** The government's strategy for the "Internationalization of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009-2015" includes an enrollment goal of 20,000 non-Finnish degree students enrolled in Finnish institutions by 2015.[1] According to data from the Institute of International Education's Project Atlas, the actual number for 2013–14 was 19,886—just over 100 students short of the 2015 goal.

- **Malaysia.** As of the end of 2014, Malaysia's international student enrollment was 135,502, which represented an increase of 16.5 percent from 2013. A ministry of education official indicated that current trends indicate the country is on track to achieve its goal of 200,000 international students studying in Malaysia by 2020.[2]

- **Singapore.** A 2014 article on Singapore's Global Schoolhouse initiative cites various statistics indicating that the policy was making notable progress toward its enrollment and economic goals. The author cautions, however, that "while on metrics alone the policy has been successful, there is evidence of growing concern at some of its consequences." In particular, he notes, given the emphasis on attracting international students:

> Some Singaporeans now wonder whether such a warm embrace of globalization has restricted opportunities for them and their children. . . . There appears to be a prevailing sense of frustration with the government's perceived efforts to attract international students while not providing sufficient places for local students. (Waring 2014, 880)

As a result, the author predicts a number of modifications to the initial policy in the coming years in order to address these and other concerns.

1   http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/liitteet/opm23.pdf?lang=en
2   http://www.thesundaily.my/news/1314991

FACTORS THAT MAY LIMIT OR ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS

While examining the overall effectiveness of specific internationalization policies and programs is important, from a policy development standpoint, understanding the array of factors that may affect policy effectiveness (positively or negatively) is also critical. Evidence suggests that a number of such factors—both those inherent to the policies themselves, as well as external factors that impact implementation—are at play when it comes to higher education internationalization policies and programs. These include:

- **Funding.** Financial support is cited as both a key barrier (when perceived to be absent or insufficient) and a key enhancer (when available and accessible). For example, the IAU's *4th Global Survey* points to the lack of funding as the greatest barrier to internationalization efforts; notably, this finding has held steady through last two iterations of the survey (from 2009 and 2005). Similarly, the European Students' Union's *Bologna with Student Eyes 2012* report indicates that insufficient funding is the most frequently cited obstacle affecting student access to mobility opportunities in the European Higher Education Area. Meanwhile, however, when 175

institutional respondents to a 2013 European University Association (EUA) study were asked to rank the effects of EU tools and programs as contributors to enhancing their institutions' internationalization, "they provide funding for student mobility" emerged as the leading factor (European University Association 2013).

- **Implementation approaches.** As discussed in the "Many Actors, Many Influences" section and illustrated by the examples presented in the typology above, government-initiated internationalization policies and programs are, in practice, implemented by a number of entities with varying degrees of connectivity to the national government. Having multiple cooks in the kitchen raises questions of capacity and efficiency. In countries where the government goes it alone in terms of implementation, does the Ministry of Education or other unit in charge have the internal expertise and human resources necessary to achieve the often-aggressive goals and numerical targets set forth in internationalization policies? Conversely, when outside organizations are charged with program implementation, is there duplication of effort that may ultimately lead to wasted resources? The most effective approach and division of labor in a given country will likely depend on a variety of contextual factors, including government structures and funding mechanisms, the composition of the government workforce, and the broader role of government in society.

- **Policy interplay and alignment.** In countries with multiple internationalization-related policies and programs, efforts (or lack thereof) in one area can support (or hinder) efforts in another; policies that are not directly related to internationalization may come into play as well. For example, a scholarship program designed to recruit international students or scholars to the country may be hindered by overly restrictive visa and immigration regulations, or, conversely, may be more likely to succeed if such restrictions are eased. Similarly, efforts to attract foreign institutions to establish branch campuses are potentially impacted (both positively and negatively) by trade policies and regulations, while policies related to intellectual property and licensing are relevant in terms of research collaborations.

- **Convergence between policy objectives and institutional priorities.** Chief among the "other influencers" that impact policy implementation and outcomes are higher education institutions themselves, whose interests and priorities may or may not align closely with national policy objectives; when it exists, however, such alignment can have a mutually beneficial and reinforcing effect.

Findings from the 2013 EUA study cited previously illustrate the perceived power of convergence between national policies and institution-based internationalization efforts; in the study, "91% of respondents felt that there would be an added value to an EU strategy for internationalisation, particularly in promoting internationalisation to university leadership, national bodies and to the wider university community" (7).

Conversely, where there are disconnects between the priorities established by policy and the interests of the actors "on the ground," policy effectiveness may be challenged. For example, the Canadian government's *2014 International Education Strategy* (described in the typology above) identified six "priority education markets": Brazil, China, India, Mexico, North Africa

and the Middle East, and Vietnam. In December 2014, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (now called Universities Canada) published *Canada's Universities in the World: AUCC Internationalization Survey.* Based on an 80 percent response rate from AUCC's 97 member institutions, the survey found, "Fully 86% of Canadian universities identify geographic priorities for their international activities. Of those that do, China, Brazil, India, the U.S., France, Mexico and Germany (in descending order) are most often given overall priority" (12).

There is extensive overlap between the priority countries identified by the government's strategy document and the AUCC's survey, and there is certainly no evidence that the discrepancy between the two lists has resulted in reduced impact of Canada's strategy for international education. However, it is interesting to note that there are differences between the priority countries and regions identified by the national policy and those identified by Canada's colleges and universities, which raises legitimate questions about issues of convergence between policy and practice.

To be sure, it is unfair to single out any one country with regard to alignment between national-level policy and stakeholder-level realities. However, the matter of alignment between policy and practice is an important one in any consideration of the effectiveness of policies for internationalization.

- **Shorter- versus longer-term commitments.** A 2014, 11-country comparison of publicly funded outward mobility scholarship programs, commissioned by the British Council and DAAD, found:

> Noteworthy is the general lack of effort spent on return and re-entry support. In most of the case countries, scholars who have completed their study programmes are simply expected to return home, and no attempts are made to aid their transition back into society or help in utilising their new skills and abilities. (59)

The value of maintaining longer-term commitments to program initiatives focused specifically on mobility may be somewhat obvious, particularly when these initiatives involve public funding and are explicitly aimed at supporting national development and/or human resource capacity building. However, the question of sustaining attention to internationalization policies—and the decisions made with respect to projected timelines for such policies—are important considerations in the conversation about policy effectiveness and impact.

- **Investment in students rather than in faculty or institutions.** Given that student mobility is the main focus of internationalization policies and programs seen around the world, it seems safe to assert that many more individual students—as opposed to individual faculty members/scholars or institutions—are the recipients of support (particularly, financial) for internationalization activities. There is, of course, evidence that mobility can have an important impact on the personal lives and professional trajectories of students. However, when considering the value of policies and programs specifically designed to internationalize the higher education enterprise, students may not necessarily be able to offer the same kinds of "multiplier effects" as faculty and institutions. This is due to the fact that individual students do not remain within the

higher education context over the long term, and their sphere of influence in that context may be somewhat limited.

A 2009 examination of the effect of the United State's Fulbright Scholars Program, however, noted key benefits to institutions provided by returned Fulbright faculty, including the creation of new courses and programs; the incorporation of new materials and perspectives of an international nature or provenance into existing courses; the ability to serve as a magnet for the recruitment of international students and scholars to the home campus; and the capacity to encourage and facilitate connections between local faculty and students, on the one hand, and overseas (or internationally oriented) NGOs or partner universities, on the other (Blumenthal and Gutierrez 2009).

These benefits come as a result of the fact that faculty "serve as models of international collaboration to students, colleagues, and professional organizations as they bring their international experience to bear in their teaching and research, as well as in the advising roles they play on and off campus" (Blumenthal and Gutierrez 2009, 38). As the drivers of the on-campus curriculum, faculty are critical in advancing and sustaining efforts toward internationalization at home, and ensuring that all students—not only those who are internationally mobile—have opportunities to gain global competence. By investing in direct support for students' international experiences over those of faculty or the broader institution, the results obtained—while qualitatively rich for the individual participants—may fail to deliver longer-term effects in relation to teaching and learning, research, and even branding and reputation for the higher education institutions or systems involved.

- **Global policy trends.** The proliferation of national and regional higher education internationalization policies and programs will likely have ramifications for their effectiveness. For example, while current projections indicate that the overall pool of internationally mobile students is likely to grow in the coming years (Helms 2015), as more countries set numeric targets for inbound mobility, the competition (particularly for students with financial means and high academic qualifications) is likely to intensify—perhaps making it more difficult to attain the desired policy outcomes. Conversely, with more countries actively focusing on and devoting resources to higher education internationalization, national policies become mutually reinforcing; there are likely to be opportunities for one country to tap into and take advantage of another's policies and programs in order to further the internationalization agenda in both countries.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

We have a great deal more to learn about the results of national and regional policies for internationalization of higher education, and how best to gauge their effectiveness. Among the key questions deserving of deeper consideration, we note the following:

- **Does scope matter?** When it comes to issues of effectiveness and impact, is it preferable to take a narrow approach on policies, and focus exclusively on one or two main "action lines" (e.g., mobility—as is the case for many current policies)? Or, does a wider, more encompassing policy agenda make sense? Many advocates for internationalization would surely argue for the latter. But can broader policies for internationalization be successful in the face of major challenges to document complex, multi-faced results, extending well beyond mere quantitative measures?

- **Where do access and equity considerations fit in?** Several recent studies (Engberg et al. 2014; Perna et al. 2014) focused on outward mobility scholarship schemes around the world have raised concerns about the way in which mobility opportunities perpetuate social inequality. How do we make sense of the effects of internationalization policies and programs on the vulnerable and/or underrepresented populations in our society? To what extent should policymaking for internationalization of higher education be concerned with the dynamics of social and cultural inequity?

- **How best to measure the "uncountable"?** The academic enterprise the world over is struggling to make sense of how best to assess what it produces across all of the dimensions in which it operates (teaching, research, service, etc.). Internationalization is deeply implicated in this assessment movement and faces the same fundamental challenges when it comes to making sense of complex changes that take place over time, affecting both institutions and individuals. How do we faithfully measure the many dimensions of internationalization that may be put into motion as a result of national and regional strategies for internationalization, which (to complicate matters) themselves do not operate in a controlled environment? Determining cause and effect when it comes to policy, implementation, and results will require sustained and thoughtful attention in the coming years.

- **How do we deal with failure?** As policy initiatives are tested out, some goals and objectives will be met; others, inevitably, will not. Making sense of failure may be one of the most important stages in the life of a less-than-successful policy, providing insight into faulty forecasting, exposing weaknesses in the framework of expectations guiding planning and implementation, and reframing objectives in starker, more realistic terms. Sifting through aims not achieved and targets not met may be crucial for developing the next round of policy initiatives that can yield appreciable results.

Ultimately, the effectiveness of internationalization policies seems to derive from a starting point that is unequivocally rooted in three key notions: **clarity, commitment, and flexibility**. A clear rationale and realistic vision provide the roadmap, outlining specific objectives in plausible terms. The stakeholders involved must possess the will to engage with the policy as implementers and advocates. Commitment also implies the provision (or cultivation) of necessary resources (human and otherwise) to sustain the effort. And finally, as issues and challenges arise, the policy framework and the stakeholders who are implicated in the effort to advance it must prove themselves able to respond with some degree of agility to a range of unexpected developments. This is a complex set of dynamics, providing clear evidence that the process of developing, implementing, and carrying policies for internationalization through to successful completion is delicate and difficult work.

Conclusion

Higher education around the world has a vested interest in effectively meeting the complex array of challenges and opportunities presented by the globalized context of the twenty-first century. Crafting coherent approaches to the internationalization of the higher education enterprise sits at the heart of this matter. Armed with an understanding of the unique challenges and opportunities of our time, the global higher education community must now collectively and energetically embrace the fundamental question of how best to respond to the call to internationalize in ways that are coherent and mutually reinforcing across the large and diverse landscape of higher education institutions and stakeholders around the world. The information and ideas from this report suggest several key considerations that may serve to inform our future choices for policy and practice.

Perhaps the most important takeaway from this analysis is that **we are not alone.** Around the world, an enormous amount of time, energy, and resources is being devoted to the development of higher education internationalization policies and programs. Policymakers and institutional leaders everywhere would be wise to pay careful (and ongoing) attention to the experiments being undertaken by colleagues across the globe. We are all seeking innovative and sustainable ways to improve higher education—as an academic enterprise and as a key driver of economic development and social well-being—through internationalization initiatives.

Certainly, we operate in an era of intense competition for all manner of resources, and all signs point to an ongoing global dynamic in which competition is a given. However, international collaboration is also a hallmark of our time, with the potential to deliver enormous dividends. As ACE's Blue Ribbon Panel on Global Engagement noted in its 2011 report,

> Inherent in the global interconnectivity that is the reality of our era is abundant promise and opportunity, not just for colleges and universities in the United States but indeed for institutions of higher learning around the world. Now is the time for leaders in higher education, and the institutions they serve, to do all they can to seize those opportunities. Now is the time for all institutions of higher learning to collaborate and cooperate toward common goals that capitalize fully on the rich possibilities of global engagement and that, ultimately, will help build a better world for all. (27)

In parallel with the notion that no country is alone in its aspirations to capitalize meaningfully on the promise of internationalization of its higher education sector, there is a clear need to ensure that **policies, programs, and strategies for internationalization are themselves effectively "internationalized."** Without question, approaches to internationalization of higher education should be firmly rooted in the needs of each country's particular higher education system and squarely focused on advancing our own specific institutional and national objectives. However, it is also vital that the national conversations on internationalization being undertaken not occur in a vacuum. Insularity in this area would be particularly self-defeating and counterproductive. Awareness about the ways that internationalization is being discussed and operationalized around the world should be complemented by a genuine openness to weaving good practices from beyond our borders into our own policies and programs.

In addition, it may be time for higher education broadly to embrace a more expansive notion of internationalization as a phenomenon that transcends the institutional and the national, and instead situates itself as an **unquestionably global undertaking**. Susan Buck Sutton and Darla K. Deardorff raise key questions in this vein in a 2012 publication of the International Association of Universities:

> What would it mean to conceive internationalization as a global, as well as an institutional, process? What might happen if institutions understood their actions as functioning within an emerging global system of higher education? How might this change institutional strategies and goals? Might it be time to re-conceive "comprehensive internationalization" as requiring a more internationalized form of internationalization, one that positions global engagement, collaboration, goals, and responsibilities at its core? (16–17)

Higher education institutions and systems are still essentially "national" in organization and character, but a strong sense has emerged in recent years that these discrete actors operate in an arena that is increasingly interconnected and "global" in nature. With these developments, the internationalization of higher education in individual countries must also be increasingly situated in a global context. This applies not only to the ways in which we consider developing and implementing our approaches, but also in terms of the focus areas that command our attention. For example, major cross-border issues—such as population developments, natural resource management and climate change, safety, and security—should ideally play a key role in framing the internationalization discourse (Deardorff 2013).

Ultimately, **national and institutional policies and practices need to find purchase in a set of core values** that resonate with the higher education institutions and stakeholders who will carry them out; in this vein, it is important and exciting to realize that a **commitment to such values as quality, equity, and accountability** is increasingly on the agenda for many countries and international actors involved in higher education internationalization.

For example, the International Association of Universities' 2012 statement *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action*, aims to alert higher education institutions worldwide "to the need to act to ensure that the outcomes of internationalization are positive and of reciprocal benefit" to all concerned, and that a series of common values are upheld in the process of international engagement. Similarly, the 2014 Nelson Mandela Bay Declaration on the Future of Internationalization of Higher Education articulates a similar vision for those actively engaged in internationalization activities around the world to "commit themselves to promote international higher education and research that recognises the richness and diversity offered by all regions for a global higher education agenda which is equitable, ethical, socially responsible, accessible and accountable" (MacGregor 2014).

ACE has echoed the call for U.S. higher education to build purposefully on core values when engaging internationally, and to **consider internationalization as something distinctly different from a zero-sum game.** Indeed, ACE has urged:

Whether a collaboration across borders is encouraged by home countries or originates as a self-designed initiative, the need for transparency and clearly stated goals will be essential. As with all sustainable relationships, the character of the parties and the ethical framework in which they operate are all-important. Countries and institutions have an obligation to consider the benefits not merely to themselves but also to their partners. This will be in the best spirit of international diplomacy and internationalization of higher education. If done well, it will be a rising tide that lifts all ships. (Peterson and Helms 2013, 6)

Ultimately, ensuring that higher education around the world benefits from the best of what comprehensive, sustained, values-driven internationalization has to offer will take a great deal of creativity, substantial resources, and sheer hard work. It will require what some have termed "intelligent internationalization" (Rumbley 2015), which requires that the full range of stakeholders—researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and academics—work closely together, on an ongoing basis, to make sense of the imperatives and opportunities, possibilities, and pitfalls inherent in this complex but crucially important agenda for higher education the world over in the twenty-first century. As noted previously, there is also **a fundamental need to shift the focus of internationalization toward the non-mobile majority of students**. The notion of "global competence for all" has the potential to anchor a vital new generation of internationalization policies and programs rooted in the reality of the (still largely non-mobile) higher education experience.

The future for internationalization of higher education holds considerable promise and opportunity. However, a sustained commitment to expanding and enhancing meaningful, workable policies and programs in this area is most urgently required.

Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs

References

Alsina, Nuria. 2014. "International Academic Mobility in Chile." *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders* 4: 20–22.http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/International-al-Briefs-2014-April-SouthernCone.pdf.

American Council on Education. 2011. *Strength Through Global Leadership and Engagement: U.S. Higher Education in the 21st Century*.http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/2011-CIGE-BRPReport.pdf.

Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services and National Association of Student Employment Services. *Prime Minister's Initiative for International Education 2: Employability Projects Final Report*.http://www.agcas.org.uk/assets/download?file=2370&parent=946.

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. 2014. *Canada's Universities in the World: AUCC Internationalization Survey*. Ontario, Canada: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.http://www.aucc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/internationalization-survey-2014.pdf.

Australian Government. 2013a. *Review of the Student Visa Assessment Level Framework 2013*. *h*ttps://www.border.gov.au/ReportsandPublications/Documents/reviews-and-inquiries/review-student-visa-assessment-level-framework-2013.pdf.

Australian Government. 2013b. *Review of the Implementation of Alternative English Language Proficiency Tests in the Student Visa Programme*.https://www.border.gov.au/ReportsandPublications/Documents/reviews-and-inquiries/report-english-test.pdf.

Bhandari, Rajika, Raisa Belyavina, and Gutierrez. 2011. *Student Mobility and the Internationalization of Higher Education: National Policies and Strategies from Six World Regions*. Institute of International Education.

Beelen, Jos, and Elspeth Jones. 2015. *Redefining Internationalisation at Home*. Bucharest, Romania: Bologna Researchers Conference.

Behal, Suchitra. 2015. "Obama Agrees to Send 1,000 Academics a Year to India." *University World News,* January 30.http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20150130070048327.

Blumenthal, Peggy, and Robert Gutierrez, eds. 2009. *Expanding Study Abroad Capacity at U.S. Colleges and Universities*. IIE Study Abroad White Paper Series, Issue 6. New York: Institute of International Education.http://www.iie.org/~/media/Files/Corporate/Membership/StudyAbroad_WhitePaper6.ashx?la=en.

British Council. 2014. *Annual Report 2013–14*.http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/britishcouncil.uk2/files/d554_annual_report_final.pdf.

Conning, Andrew Scott. 2012. "Planning a Physical Presence in China." *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders* 1: 18–20.https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/International-Briefs-2012-April-China.pdf.

Crowther, Paul, Michael Joris, Matthias Otten, Bengt Nilsson, Hanneke Teekens, and Bernd Wächter. 2001. *Internationalisation at Home: A Position Paper*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: European Association for International Education.http://cdigital.uv.mx/bitstream/123456789/31163/5/iah.pdf.

Custer, Sara. 2014. "France Extends Post Study Work, Aims for 20% Foreign Enrolments." *The PIE News*, March 4.http://thepienews.com/news/france-extends-post-study-work-aims-20-foreign-enrolments.

Daily Sabah. 2014. "Turkey Aims to Boost Popularity for International Students." *Daily Sabah*, July 10.http://www.dailysabah.com/education/2014/07/10/turkey-aims-to-boost-popularity-for-international-students.

Dathan, Matt. 2015. "Foreign Students Will Be Banned from Working in the UK and Forced to Leave as Soon as They Finish Course Under Theresa May's Tough New Visa Rules." *The Independent*, July 13.http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/foreign-students-will-be-banned-from-working-in-the-uk-and-forced-to-leave-as-soon-as-they-finish-course-under-theresa-mays-tough-new-visa-rules-10385232.html.

de Wit, Hans. 2002. *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

de Wit, Hans, Fiona Hunter, Laura Howard, and Eva Egron-Polak. 2015. *Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Brussels, Belgium: European Parliament.http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/540370/IPOL_STU(2015)540370_EN.pdf.

Deardorff, Darla K. 2013. "Beyond Ourselves: Embracing Our Global Responsibilities." *IIE Networker*, fall.http://www.nxtbook.com/naylor/IIEB/IIEB0213/index.php?startid=37#/36.

Dessoff, Alan. 2012. "Asia's Burgeoning Higher Education Hubs." *International Educator*, 1: 16–26. http://www.nafsa.org/_/file/_/ie_julaug12_asia.pdf.

Government of Canada. 2014. *Canada's International Education Strategy*.http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf.

Egron-Polak, Eva, and Ross Hudson. 2014. *Internationalization of Higher Education:*

Growing Expectations, Fundamental Values; IAU 4th Global Survey. Paris, France: International Association of Universities.

Engberg, David, Gregg Glover, Laura E. Rumbley, and Philip G. Altbach. 2014. *The Rationale for Sponsoring Students to Undertake International Study: An Assessment of National Student Mobility Scholarship Programmes*. British Council and German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/britishcouncil.uk2/files/e002_outward_mobility_study_final_v2_web.pdf.

European Commission. 2013. *European higher education in the world*.http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/NOT/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0499.

European Commission. 2014. *Effects of Mobility on the Skills and Employability of Students and the Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of

the European Union.http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/study/2014/erasmus-impact_en.pdf.

European Students' Union. 2012. *Bologna with Student Eyes 2012*. Brussels, Belgium: European Students' Union.http://www.esu-online.org/asset/News/6068/BWSE2012-online1.pdf.

European University Association. 2013. *Internationalisation in European Higher Education: European Policies, Institutional Strategies and EUA Support*. Brussels, Belgium: European University Association. www.eua.be/Libraries/Higher_Education/EUA_International_Survey.sflb.ashx.

Federal Ministry of Education and Research. 2014. *The Africa Strategy 2014–2018: Africa as a Partner in Education and Research*. Berlin, Germany: Federal Ministry of Education and Research.http://www.bmbf.de/pub/Afrika-Strategie_2014-2018_englisch.pdf.

Fernández de Kirchner, C. et al. 2009. *Ruptura y Reconstrucción de la Ciencia Argentina*. Buenos Aires: MECyT-SECTIP.http://www.raices.mincyt.gob.ar/documentos/Ruptura_y_reconstruccion.pdf.

Geng, Yiqun. 2012. "China's Policies on Overseas Faculty Recruitment." *IIE Networker*, spring.http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/naylor/IIEB0112/index.php?startid=45#/46.

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). 2014. *Transnational Education in Germany*. DAAD Position Paper.https://www.daad.de/medien/hochschulen/projekte/studienangebote/1_phb_tnb_postionspapier_englisch.pdf.

Grove, Jack. 2014. "Bienvenidos a España." *Inside Higher Ed*, July 31.https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/07/31/spain-seeks-attract-more-foreign-students.

Helms, Robin Matross. 2015. "Going International." *The Presidency*, winter.http://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/Going-International.aspx.

Heslop, Lynn. 2014. *Understanding India: The Future of Higher Education and Opportunities for International Cooperation*. British Council.http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/british-council.uk2/files/understanding_india_report.pdf.

Higher Education Funding Council for England. 2014. *Global Demand for English Higher Education: An Analysis of International Student Entry to English Higher Education Courses*. Bristol, United Kingdom: Higher Education Funding Council for England.https://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/HEinEngland/HEFCE2014_08a.pdf.

International Association of Universities. 2012. *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action*. Paris, France: International Association of Universities.http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/Affirming_Academic_Values_in_Internationalization_of_Higher_Education.pdf.

Kinser, Kevin, and Jason E. Lane. 2012. "Foreign Outposts of Colleges and Universities." *International Higher Education* 66: 2–3.

Knight, Jane. 2003. "Updating the Definition of Internationalization." *International Higher Education* 33 2–3.http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/IHEpdfs/ihe33.pdf.

Knight, Jane. 2011. "Education Hubs: A Fad, a Brand, an Innovation?" *Journal of Studies in International Education* 15 (3): 221–240.

Knight, Michael. 2011. *Strategic Review of the Student Visa Program 2011 Report*. Australian Government.http://www.border.gov.au/ReportsandPublications/Documents/reviews-and-inquiries/2011-knight-review.pdf.

Knobel, Marcolo. 2014. "Chile: An Overview." *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders* 4: 18–19.

Lam, Queenie K.H., and Danja Oste, with Irina Ferencz and Bernd Wächter. 2013. *Portable State Grants and Loans: An Overview and Their Contribution to Outgoing Student Mobility*. Brussels, Belgium: Academic Cooperation Association.http://www.aca-secretariat.be/?id=750.

Latham & Watkins LLP. 2011. *Doing Business in the United Arab Emirates*.http://www.lw.com/upload/pubcontent/_pdf/pub2783_1.pdf.

Leask, Betty. 2013. "Internationalising the Curriculum in the Disciplines—Imagining New Possibilities." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 17 (2): 103–118.http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/17/2/103.

Leask, Betty. 2015. *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ministry of Education, Finland. 2009. *Strategy for the Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions in Finland 2009–2015*. Helsinki, Finland: Ministry of Education, Finland.http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2009/liitteet/opm23.pdf.

Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. 2011. *Internationalization Policy for Higher Education Malaysia 2011*. Putrajaya, Malaysia: Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia.https://www.academia.edu/2257039/Internationalisation_policy_for_higher_education_Malaysia_2011.

Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. 2011. *North America Strategy for Higher Education Cooperation 2012–2015*. Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research.https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kd/vedlegg/uh/internasjonalt/kd_northamerica_201011_nettpublisering.pdf.

Nye, Joseph S. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2005. *Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Perna, Laura W., Kata Orosz, Bryan Gopaul, Zakir Jumakulov, Adil Ashirbekov, and Marina Kishkentayeva. 2014. "Promoting Human Capital Development: A Typology of International Scholarship Programs in Higher Education." *Educational Researcher* 43 (2): 63–73.http://edr.sagepub.com/content/43/2/63.

Peterson, Patti McGill, and Robin Matross Helms. 2013. *Challenges and Opportunities for the Global Engagement of Higher Education*. CIGE Insights: Global Higher Education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/CIGE-Insights-2014-Challenges-Opps-Global-Engagement.pdf.

Rumbley, Laura E. 2015. "'Intelligent Internationalization': A 21st Century Imperative." *International Higher Education* (80): 16–17.http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/6146/5384.

Sutton, Susan Buck and Darla K. Deardorf. Internationalizing Internationalization: The Global Context. *IAU Horizons*, February/March 2012. www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/IAU_Horizons_Vol17_3_18_1_EN.pdf

Thomas, Dan. 2013. "France Eases Non-EU Student Visa Restrictions." *The PIE News*, July 12.http://thepienews.com/news/france-eases-visa-restrictions-for-non-eu-students.

Smith, Beckie. 2014. "Sweden Extends PSW, Improves PhD Route to Residence." *The PIE News*, April 4.*h*ttp://thepienews.com/news/sweden-extends-psw-improves-permanent-residence-access-foreign-phds/.

MacGregor, Karen. 2014. "International HE Associations Call for Global Equity." *University World News,* January 18. *h*ttp://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140118132339578.

Makoni, Munyaradzi. 2010. "Africa: Confucius Institutes Grow Chinese." *University World News*, September 5.http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20100905072629973.

Vincent-Lancrin, Stéphan, ed. 2007. *Cross-Border Tertiary Education: A Way Towards Capacity Development.* Organisation for Economic Co-operation and The World Bank.https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/6865/Cross-borderTertiaryEducation.pdf?sequence=5.

Wadud, Mushfique. 2014. "Rule Opens Higher Education to Foreign Universities." *University World News*, June 12.http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140612092446500.

Waring, Peter. 2014. "Singapore's Global Schoolhouse Strategy: Retreat or Recalibration?" *Studies in Higher Education* 39 (5): 874–884.

Wilkins, S. 2014. International education hubs: student, talent, knowledge-innovation models, edited by Jane Knight . *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management 36* (3): 355–357.

Appendix

Internationalization Over Time: Policy Evolution in Japan

Ariane de Gayardon, Research Assistant, Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Yukiko Shimmi, Assistant Professor and International Education Advisor, Graduate School of Law, Hitotsubashi University

Hiroshi Ota, Professor, Center for Global Education, Hitotsubashi University

The policies outlined in this report are each a snapshot of current activity in different countries or regions. While internationalization-related policies are a relatively new development in many national contexts, some countries have been active in this realm for many years. Japan is one such example, particularly in terms of policies to attract international students. Here we provide a brief history of Japan's governmental internationalization initiatives, in order to illustrate how such policies and activities evolve over time to respond to changing national circumstances and priorities.

Before the 1980s: Post-war Mobility

Nascent internationalization efforts in Japan focused on student mobility. Under U.S. occupation (1945–51), Japanese students were sent to the United States to expose them to American democratic values and to help them develop skills and expertise that would be useful for the rebuilding of post-war Japan. These students were sponsored through scholarship schemes, such as the U.S. government's Government Aid and Relief in Occupied Areas (GARIOA) program (1949–51) and the Fulbright Program (1952–present).[1]

In 1954, the post-war Japanese government became active in this arena, creating the **Japanese Government Scholarship Program for Foreign Students**. The aims were to pay de facto compensation for war damage, support the social and economic development of developing countries—particularly in Southeast Asia—through the cultivation of human resources, and to promote a better understanding of Japanese culture.[2]

1980–99: Attracting International Students

The year 1983 marked a significant moment for Japanese internationalization policies. At that time, the government established an official goal of attracting 100,000 foreign students to Japan by 2020 (**Plan to Accept 100,000 Foreign Students**). Motivations for the policy included improving Japanese higher education, developing understanding and cooperation between Japan and foreign countries, fostering human resource capital in developing countries, and internationalizing the economy of Japan.

A number of measures were taken to support this ambitious numerical goal. Graduate courses in English were made available at national universities for the first time; the government also stipulated that doctoral theses could be submitted in English and accepted as such. **Eliminating the**

---

1   http://www.fulbright.jp/eng/keikaku/index.html
2   Unless otherwise noted, information in this section is drawn from three sources: Ninomiya, Knight, and Watanabe 2009; Horie 2002; and Umakoshi 1997. Full citations are provided in the references list.

language barrier was seen as a major step toward improving the accessibility of Japanese higher education and thereby increasing the number of foreign students coming to Japan.

Direct government **financial support for international students** also increased. The 1983 plan included a reform to the existing scholarship system: The number of foreign students receiving financial support was to increase from 2,000 in 1983 to 10,000 in 2000. Additionally, tuition reductions were offered at national universities for foreign students who were not scholarship recipients.

While mobility was squarely in the policy limelight during the 1980s and 1990s, some other aspects of internationalization also received attention. In 1982, for example, foreign nationals gained the right to become full-time employees at national universities. Though they still could not become civil servants like domestic faculty, their status and working conditions were significantly improved from their previous status of foreign lecturers. In the late 1980s, the internationalization of research came to the fore, with the creation of the **International Academic Research** award to fund scholars who initiated international cooperation activities.

National efforts during this 20-year period also targeted exchanges between Japanese universities and foreign institutions. For example, the Japanese government and the Japanese International Cooperation Agency launched an initiative aimed at developing partnerships with universities and colleges in developing countries. Japanese experts were sent abroad, while trainees were brought to Japan. In 1987, the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Sciences initiated the **Core University System program**, which matched universities in Japan and developing countries and funded scholar exchanges. And in 1991, the **University Mobility in Asia Pacific program** was established—with Japan as one of the original founders—in order to create a zone where student exchanges would be facilitated via credit transfers.

Mixed reports on the success of Japanese internationalization efforts in the 1990s led the government to intensify its efforts in the final years of the century. Starting in 1995, the government began funding institutions to develop **short-term programs in English** specifically for international exchange students, usually for a period of one year (Ota 2008). And to reach international students lacking proficiency in either English or Japanese, the government sponsored Japanese language instruction in China and Malaysia (Kudo, Kamibeppu, and Ota 2014). In addition, the government began dedicating specific funds to **increase and improve housing options for international students**, the lack of which was a persistent issue.

Overall, the internationalization of higher education in Japan was gradually improved over this 20-year period, if inbound mobility is used as the main criterion for judgement; though the goals of the plan to accept 100,000 foreign students were not fully achieved by 2000, its numerical target was met shortly thereafter (in 2003). Looking beyond the numbers, however, it is important to note that the main approach to internationalization during this time was still that of **an "island" or "add-on" model**, in which so-called international programs were not necessarily integrated into the other existing programs and curricula.

2000–10: Quality and Depth

The advent of the new century and the end of the 1983 initiative led to a number of policy changes in Japan. Fuelled by growing concerns about declining higher education enrollments among domestic students due to demographic shifts, inbound mobility again took center stage. **Visa requirements**

and restrictions were reformed in the early 2000s in order to attract more international students; getting a visa to enter Japan as a college student became simpler, flexibility toward off-campus part-time work (work permission) was increased, and the duration of foreign student visas was doubled (as cited in Kudo, Kamibeppu, and Ota 2014).

Though numbers remained a focus, government policies also began to emphasize considerations around the quality of international students and depth of internationalization. To this end, the **Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities (SIH)** was introduced in 2005. Nineteen universities and an inter-university research institution received five-year grants to develop a comprehensive—rather than exclusively mobility-focused—approach to internationalization. The SIH focused on nine aspects of internationalization, including institutional goal-setting, action plans, and evaluation systems (Ota 2014). A key intended outcome of the program was the sharing of good practices with institutions outside the SIH program.

In 2008, the government announced another ambitious inbound mobility plan—this time with a target of 300,000 international students enrolled in Japanese universities by 2020 (**300,000 Foreign Students Plan**) (MEXT 2008). In support of this goal, the government launched the **Global 30 Project**, which would identify 30 Japanese universities to receive funding (from the project's budget of USD 38 million) to support institutional efforts to attract foreign students and send Japanese students abroad.[3] However, due to a policy change when a new political party took office, only 13 universities were ultimately chosen to participate.

The selected 13 universities were required to offer degree-granting programs in English, make application possible from overseas, provide instruction on the Japanese language and culture, and create or improve support structures dedicated to international students.[4] Better monitoring of the attendance and achievements of foreign students were also mandated, thereby putting an emphasis on the academic quality of incoming international students and their experiences.

2010–Present: Global Engagement

With the arrival of the 2010s, the Japanese government began to shift its internationalization policy focus from inbound mobility to two-way exchanges and developing collaborative education programs with universities abroad. In 2011, for example, the government launched the **Re-Inventing Japan Project**,[5] which focused on the creation of collaborative networks between Japanese universities and foreign universities. Initially, an open call was made for universities interested in setting up collaborative networks with North America, Europe, Australia, and East and Southeast Asia, resulting in the selection of 25 programs to receive funds. In 2012 and 2013, 21 collaborations with institutions in the ASEAN region were funded; in 2014, nine programs with Russian and Indian universities received support through the project.

In recent years, outbound student mobility has also become a key focus for Japanese government policy, due to concerns about significant decreases in the number of students studying overseas— particularly in the United States—since the mid-2000s. The **Go Global Japan project (The Project for Promotion of Global Human Resource Development)** started in 2012, and focused on three

---

3   http://chronicle.com/article/A-Slow-Start-for-Japans-Ef/124346/
4   http://www.uni.international.mext.go.jp/global30/
5   http://japanest-nippon.com/en/feature/detail.php?id=43

objectives: for Japan to overcome "youth's inward-looking tendency," to educate global talent, and to internationalize Japanese universities (Aruga 2013). Two types of grants were awarded as part of this project, both for a period of five years. So-called "Type A" grants (11 universities) were awarded for projects carried out by whole universities, and "Type B" grants (31 universities) for projects proposed by specific schools or departments. Each university receives USD 1 million to USD 2 million per year (depending on the size of the institution) for the grant period.

Building on these efforts, in 2013, the government set an **official goal to increase the number of Japanese students who study abroad to 120,000 by 2020** (The Office of the Prime Minister of Japan 2013). Subsequently, in 2014, the MEXT launched a new scholarship program called Japan Public-Private Partnership Student Study Abroad Program, or **"*Tobitate*! Young Ambassador Program"** to provide grants for Japanese students who study abroad or engage in international activities overseas (JASSO 2014).

The latest in the line of internationalization policies undertaken by the Japanese government is the **Top Global University Project**, started in 2014. It aims at enhancing the compatibility of Japanese higher education with foreign systems (global standards) and at fostering the international competitiveness of Japanese universities.[6] For 10 years, funding will be provided to 13 "type A" (Top Type) universities, which have the potential to be ranked in the top 100 of world university rankings, and to 24 "type B" (Global Traction Type) universities that lead the internationalization of Japanese society. Selected universities are expected to undertake significant reforms and efforts—including more lectures in English, improving the foreign student and faculty ratios, making changes in management, and creating double degrees—to improve the global status of their institutions.

Important Milestones in Japanese Internationalization Policies

Year	Policy Name	Main Goal	Main Means
1954	Japanese Government Scholarship Program for Foreign Students	Promote a better understanding of Japanese culture	Scholarships for inbound mobility
1983	Plan to Accept 100,000 Foreign Students	Host 100,000 international students by 2000	Scholarships and subsidies for tuition reductions for international students
2005	Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities	Develop internationalization strategies at selected higher education institutions	Grants to reform institutional governance and management of internationalization, qualitative evaluation
2008	300,000 International Students Plan	Host 300,000 international students by 2020	Scholarships, deregulation and streamlining of visa process, support for job placement of international students

---

6   http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/26/09/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2014/10/07/1352218_02.pdf

2009	Global 30	Develop a core group of internationally focused universities in support of the 300,000 International Students Plan	Grants available for universities to develop degree-granting programs fully taught in English and to improve international student recruitment and admissions process; quantitative evaluation
2012	Re-Inventing Japan Project	Create collaborative networks between Japanese universities and foreign universities	Grants available for universities to develop collaborative education programs with partner institutions abroad
2012	Go Global Japan project	Increase the number of Japanese students studying abroad	Grants available for universities or schools/departments to develop study abroad programs
2014	Public-Private Partnership Student Study Abroad Program (*Tobitate! Young Ambassador Program*)	Foster intercultural competence of Japanese students through studying abroad	Providing scholarships for students who study abroad or engage in activities overseas
2014–2023	Top Global University Project	Improve the international competitiveness of Japanese universities and enhance the compatibility of Japanese higher education with global standards	37 universities are to receive funding for 10 years (total of JPY 7.7 billion, i.e., about USD 62 million)

Policy Actors

The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and Technology (MEXT) is the main actor and the omnipresent creator, supporter, and funder of most of the milestone policies described above.

Over the years, several other entities have supported the implementation of internationalization policies. Notable among these are:

- **Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO):** A government agency under the auspices of the MEXT, JASSO oversees student services and administers scholarships for international students enrolled in Japanese higher education institutions, as well as Japanese study-abroad students. JASSO also provides information for prospective students seeking to pursue international mobility (both inbound and outbound).[7]

- **Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA):** Under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, JICA is responsible for supporting international cooperation as well as fostering the development of the Japanese and global economy, particularly by helping developing countries.[8]

---

7   http://www.jasso.go.jp/about_jasso/index_e.html
8   http://www.jica.go.jp/english/about/organization/index.html

- **Japan Foundation**: Another agency under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Japan Foundation promotes cultural exchange between Japan and other countries. It also administers Japanese language education and Japanese language proficiency tests outside Japan.[9]

- **Japanese Society for the Promotion of Sciences:** This government agency is responsible for the development of science in all fields, and supports international collaboration between Japanese universities and foreign universities.[10]

- **Central Council for Education**: This entity within the MEXT focuses on educational policy issues.[11] It hosts temporary committees when needed by the government, such as the Special Committee on Foreign Students, which is developing an action plan to reach the 300,000 goal by 2020 (Ninomiya, Knight, and Watanabe 2009).

Higher education institutions are, of course, also essential actors in Japan. Particularly in the last decade, when government policies have focused on providing funding to institutions (rather than individual students, for example) to spur internationalization, buy-in and commitment at the institutional level are crucial to policy success.

Conclusion

The Japanese government has been heavily implicated in the internationalization of higher education in Japan, as exhibited by the plethora of policies that have been initiated in the past 30 years. Until recently, Japan has mainly been focused on student mobility, especially inbound mobility. The repetition of similar objectives for different policies in the past 30 years shows, however, that **mobility alone cannot succeed in internationalizing a national system of higher education**. The new approach currently being undertaken in Japan is more comprehensive, including regional exchanges as well as global linkages, inbound and outbound mobility, and expanding the focus from students only to other university human resources as well as education and learning programs. This approach is more in line with what recent research suggests internationalization should focus on, especially concerning internationalization of the campus.

The number of institutions getting funds for each project is also limited, perhaps making internationalization of Japanese institutions an **elitist project**. One might raise the question of whether the system will become more internationalized as a result of these efforts, or if only a small cluster of universities will get to play a serious role on the international higher education scene.

The recent competitive government projects for internationalization typically have a fixed funding period, which makes it **difficult for institutions to make a long-term commitment** to the internationalization after the funding period ends. The lack of stability in financial resources for those projects also created a situation where staff and faculty members who are specially hired for these projects operate under mostly fixed-term and nonrenewable contracts, with unstable working conditions.

The legitimacy of the top-down approach to internationalization in Japan can also be questioned, as the government continues creating policies at a quick pace. Indeed, problems of micro-management from the government, homogenization among top universities, and the limitation of funding

---

9   https://www.jpf.go.jp/e/about/index.html
10   http://www.jsps.go.jp/english/aboutus/index2.html
11   http://www.mext.go.jp/english/organization/1303054.htm

to a small number of top universities have already been highlighted (Shimmi and Yonezawa 2015). As internationalization of Japanese higher education seems to have been led by central government policies from early on, one wonders about the **role of institutions in the crafting of these policies and how committed they are to them**, beyond the funding opportunities they offer. The dynamic between policymakers and policy implementers may be an important consideration for Japan moving forward, as in many other countries around the world.

References

Aruga, Osamu. 2013. "Globalization of Higher Education in Japan: Unprecedented Change." Presentation delivered at the NAFSA: Association of International Educators 2013 Annual Conference and Expo.http://www.jafsa.org/uploads/nafsa/NAFSA2013aruga1.pdf.

Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO). 2014. Japan Student Services Organization Outline 2014–2015. Japan Student Services Organization (JASSO).http://www.jasso.go.jp/about_jasso/documents/e2014_01_04.pdf.

Horie, Mikie. 2002. "The Internationalization of Higher Education in Japan in the 1990s: A Reconsideration." Higher Education 43 (1): 65–84.

Kudo, Kamibeppu, and Ota. (2014). Nihon no daigaku kokusaika to ryugakusei seisaku no tenkai [The internationalization of Japanese universities and the development of international student policies]. In Nikkan daigaku kokusaika to ryugakusei seisaku no tenkai [The internationalization of Japanese and Korean higher education and the development of international student policies]. Research Center for Private Higher Education. pp. 13–52.

Ninomiya, Akira, Jane Knight, and Aya Watanabe. 2009. "The Past, Present, and Future of Internationalization in Japan." Journal of Studies in International Education 13 (2): 117–124.

Ota, Hiroshi. 2008. "Changing Policies and Practices of Japanese National Universities Toward International Students in Light of Financial and Demographic Challenges and the New University 'Corporatization.'" PhD diss. The State University of New York at Buffalo. UMI (ProQuest) 1699A (UMINo.3307622).

Ota, Hiroshi. 2014. "Japanese Universities' Strategic Approach to Internationalization: Accomplishments and Challenges." In Emerging International Dimensions in East Asian Higher Education, edited by Akiyoshi Yonezawa, Yuto Kitamura, Arthur Meerman, and Kazuo Kuroda, 227–252. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Shimmi, Yukiko, and Akiyoshi Yonezawa. 2015. "Japan's 'Top Global University Project.'" International Higher Education 81: 27–28.http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/8742/7867.

Student Exchange Office, Student Services Division, Higher Education Bureau, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (MEXT). 2008. Outline of the Student Exchange System: Study in Japan and Abroad. Tokyo, Japan: Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (MEXT).http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/ryugaku/081210/001.pdf.

The Office of the Prime Minister. 2013. Japan's Revitalization Strategy: Japan Is Back. Tokyo, Japan: The Office of the Prime Minister.http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/singi/keizaisaisei/pdf/en_saikou_jpn_hon.pdf.

Umakoshi, Toru. 1997. "Internationalization of Japanese Higher Education in the 1980's and Early 1990's." Higher Education 34 (2): 259–273.

Yonezawa, Akiyosha, and Yukiko Shimmi. 2015. "Transformation of University Governance Through Internationalization: Challenges for Top Universities and Government Policies in Japan." Higher Education 70 (2): 173–186.