



International Briefs *for* Higher Education Leaders

Higher education leaders today recognize the urgency of developing an international strategy for their institutions but often lack the knowledge and perspective needed to inform good decisions. Students are graduating into an increasingly integrated international environment that, while offering exciting opportunities, also presents many challenges. Institutions must create educational environments where students will begin to appreciate the complexity of global integration but also develop skills to navigate it successfully. Faculty are seeking opportunities to collaborate with colleagues in other countries, to develop globally-attuned academic programs, and to expand research networks and collaborative projects. International outreach and initiatives enrich institutional culture but must be based on good information and analysis.

This series reflects a strategic collaboration between the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College. Each *Brief* is designed to provide a succinct overview of current issues in international higher education and features articles written by leading scholars, policymakers, and practitioners. Ultimately, this series is designed to help senior leadership develop cumulative knowledge to inform institutional strategy.

This issue sponsored by



Navitas accelerates the internationalization of university campuses, providing greater opportunity and access to high-quality learning experiences and bringing global perspectives to the university community.

MAPPING INTERNATIONALIZATION GLOBALLY: *National Profiles and Perspectives*

2. **Introduction**
Robin Matross Helms, Laura E. Rumbley, and Lucia Brajkovic
4. **Internationalization in the United States: Data, Trends, and Trump**
Robin Matross Helms and Lucia Brajkovic
6. **Australia's Cosmopolitan Campuses Count Their Blessings**
Christopher Ziguras
9. **The State of Internationalization in Canada: Strategic and Innovative**
Grace Karram Stephenson
11. **Internationalization of Higher Education in Colombia: From Fragmentation to a Comprehensive Policy**
Jeannette Vélez Ramírez
14. **Internationalization in India**
Lakshmi Iyer
18. **Internationalization in German Higher Education**
Hans-Dieter Daniel
21. **Mapping Internationalization of Japanese Universities: Goals, Strategies, and Indicators**
Hiroshi Ota and Yuki Watabe
24. **Internationalization of Higher Education in Mexico: Progress and Challenges**
Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila
28. **Internationalization of South African Higher Education—An Overview**
Nico Jooste
30. **The UK at an International Crossroads**
Raegan Hiles
33. **Disparities and Parallels in Internationalization: The Ethiopian Experience**
Wondwosen Tamrat and Damtew Teferra
35. **Emerging Paradoxes of Internationalization in Higher Education**
Hans de Wit and Laura E. Rumbley
37. **Mapping Internationalization Worldwide: Selected Surveys and Research**
Lucia Brajkovic
38. **Contributors**

Introduction

Welcome to the 7th edition of International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders. We selected the current topic, *Mapping Internationalization Globally: National Profiles and Perspectives*, to celebrate the release of the fourth iteration of ACE's *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* study in June 2017. Conducted every five years by ACE's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), Mapping assesses the current state of internationalization at American colleges and universities, analyzes progress and trends over time, and identifies future priorities. It is the only comprehensive source of data and analysis on internationalization in US higher education, and includes two- and four-year, public and private, degree-granting institutions.

While the *Mapping* data provide an excellent overview of how internationalization is progressing inside the country, they do not address how the US experience relates to higher education internationalization globally. In a joint report released by ACE and the Boston College Center for International Higher Education in 2015, *Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs*, we commented on the need to “internationalize internationalization,” stating, “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 continue to believe that it is “vital that national conversations on internationalization not occur in a vacuum.”

Our goal in this installment of the Briefs series, therefore, is to add both depth and breadth to the global conversation on higher education internationalization. Written by higher education scholars and experts, country-focused articles explore existing policies and activities, key challenges, and emerging opportunities for internationalization in a variety of unique national contexts. One synthesizing article, “Emerging paradoxes of internationalization in higher education,” provides a meta-analysis of the country specific information, identifying global trends and areas that require our collective focus going forward.

As a starting point for the country articles, authors were asked to address the aspects of internationalization delineated in the CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization. Just as internationalization unfolds in



different ways in different places, so too did the authors' articles; some closely follow the structure of the CIGE Model, while others highlight different aspects of internationalization that are particularly germane to their country contexts. The availability of data on internationalization also varies significantly; the authors did an excellent job of marshalling existing research and resources, a number of which we compiled into the summary table on page 37 for ease of reference.

We hope this Brief will serve as a useful resource for institution leaders—in the United States and around the world—who are seeking to internationalize their campuses and increase their global engagement. A view of how other countries “do” internationalization can help leaders identify particular opportunities and synergies that might facilitate collaboration, as well as good practices from other contexts that could amplify internationalization efforts at home.

Robin Matross Helms

*Director, Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement
American Council on Education*

Laura E. Rumbley

*Associate Director and Assistant Professor of the Practice
Boston College Center for International Higher Education*

Lucia Brajkovic

*Senior Research Specialist, Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement
American Council on Education*



ACE/AIEA Internationalization Collaborative Leading in a World of Growing Complexity



**February 17, 2018, 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Washington, DC**

How do we align emerging structures, policies, and processes with our internationalization goals?

Who is responsible for the alignment?

Are there risks to a more coordinated approach to managing internationalization? How do we encourage innovation? How do we ensure that decisions include all relevant stakeholders?

Working in partnership with the [International Education Administrators Association](#) (AIEA), ACE co-hosts this annual event for faculty and administrators to come together as a learning community to address challenges, share ideas and help one another implement comprehensive internationalization strategies at our member institutions.

Register now at www.acenet.edu/events



Internationalization in the United States: Data, Trends, and Trump

Robin Matross Helms and Lucia Brajkovic

The American higher education enterprise is extremely large and diverse, encompassing over 4,700 degree-granting institutions and enrolling more than 21 million students. In terms of policy actors, what sets the United States apart from most other countries is the lack of a ministry of education or other agency that holds overall responsibility for higher education nationwide, and in many cases, drives the internationalization agenda at the national level and substantially influences institutional efforts.

Rather, a number of federal agencies—including the Departments of State, Education, Defense, and Commerce—Independently administer programs that promote student and faculty mobility, research collaborations, and other internationalization activities. Typically, the goals of these initiatives are tied to the mandates of the administering agencies (such as diplomacy, national security, etc.); the internationalization of US higher education per se is not an explicit objective. Overall, there is little coordination among administering agencies around their internationalization-related programs, and compared to many other countries, funding is scant.

The lack of central coordination of the higher education system as a whole, and the dearth of federal support for internationalization-related programs mean that internationalization truly is an institution-driven endeavor, in terms of funding as well as strategy, priority setting, and program administration. While calls have been made for a unified national policy for internationalization, the size and diversity of the US higher education system mean that internationalization must—and does—play out very differently on different campuses; formulating a national policy that has enough specificity to be meaningful and go beyond generalities, but is still broad enough to be applicable across all institutions, would be a formidable challenge.

In lieu of a single national policy, the American Council on Education (ACE) has called for better coordination among federal agencies and more explicit policy and funding support for internationalization-related programs (Helms, 2015). Given the policy orientation of the Trump administration and proposed budget cuts to existing internationalization-related programs, however, the onus for advancing internationalization is likely to remain with institutions themselves for the foreseeable future.

Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses

Because institutions are the locus of US internationalization efforts, they are also the most important source of related data. In order to understand internationalization trends and identify priorities going forward, every five years, ACE administers its *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* survey to colleges and universities around the country. Conducted first in 2001 and most recently in 2016, the *Mapping* study is the only comprehensive source of data on internationalization in all sectors of US higher education (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). In terms of content and areas addressed, the survey is structured around the six pillars of ACE's Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (ACE, n.d.): an articulated institutional commitment; administrative leadership, structure, and staffing; curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; and collaboration and partnerships.

2016 Survey Findings

At the broadest level, the 2016 Mapping data indicate that internationalization is gaining traction among US colleges and universities. Regarding the pace of progress, nearly three-quarters (72%) of respondents indicated that internationalization accelerated in recent years, compared to 64% in 2011.

As in 2011, “improving student preparedness for a global era” is among institutions’ most compelling reasons for internationalizing, followed by “diversifying students, faculty, and staff at the home campus,” and “becoming more attractive to prospective students at home and overseas.” Revenue generation holds the number four spot, indicating an increased (or at least more overt) focus on this as a goal compared to 2011. Largely in line with these objectives, outbound and inbound student mobility are first and second, respectively, when it comes to priority activities for internationalization, followed by developing partnerships with institutions and organizations abroad.

Looking beyond perceived progress and stated priorities, finer-grained data on the practice of internationalization—as operationalized through policies, programs, and activities—shed additional light on the realities of how internationalization is unfolding on campuses, and paint a more complex picture when it comes to progress and trends over time.

Articulated institutional commitment

Approximately half (49%) of responding institutions’ mission statements specifically refer to internationalization or related activities (e.g., international or global activities); a similar proportion of institutions (47%) have included internationalization or related activities among the top five priorities

in their strategic plans. A sizeable proportion of institutions have launched a dedicated fundraising campaign to support internationalization, and many are tapping alumni, other donors, and foundations for support. Somewhat surprisingly, given overall commitment levels and resource allocations, the percentage of institutions reporting that they had formally assessed their internationalization progress or impact in recent years declined from 37% in 2011 to 29% in 2016.

Administrative structure and staffing

The 2016 data indicate that on many campuses, internationalization is becoming an increasingly centralized and administrative endeavor. At 58% of institutions, a single office now leads internationalization activities or programs—compared to just 36% of institutions in 2011. The senior international officer (SIO) now occupies the number two slot when it comes to catalysts for internationalization—ahead of the chief academic officer, faculty, and other administrative leaders. At doctoral universities, the SIO is in fact seen as the top catalyst for internationalization, ahead of the president.

Curriculum and co-curriculum

Internationalization of the curriculum and/or co-curriculum ranks #4 in terms of internationalization priorities—behind recruiting international students, increasing study abroad, and developing international partnerships. Despite this relative lack of explicit emphasis, however, 2016 saw positive movement when it comes to operationalizing on-campus student global learning. In the last five years, more institutions have implemented globally focused general education requirements and student learning outcomes, and—for the first time since the Mapping survey was initially administered in 2001—the percentage of institutions with foreign language requirements is on the rise, if modestly.

Globally focused co-curricular programming is increasing, as well. However, in 2016, as in past iterations of the survey, the most ubiquitous co-curricular programs (e.g., international festivals and events and a meeting place for students interested in international topics) were those that require the least sustained and intensive engagement by students. Ongoing programs and those with a more intensive educational component, though offered by a growing proportion of institutions, are still much less common.

Faculty policies and practices

The 2016 survey saw modest gains in the percentage of institutions that factor international experience and activity into hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions, and in the proportion that recognize faculty contributions to internationalization

through awards. Although faculty professional development is seen as a relatively low priority area for internationalization, opportunities of this type expanded somewhat over the last five years—with an emphasis on funding and mobility, as opposed to on-campus workshops and curriculum-focused activities.

In spite of these gains, however, the faculty-related data, when taken together and compared to data in other areas, raise concerns about overall status and recognition of faculty members' key role in the internationalization process.

Student mobility

While student mobility has long been a cornerstone of internationalization efforts, the 2016 data indicate an increasingly sharp emphasis in this area relative to other aspects of internationalization. In order to spur inbound mobility, nearly half (48%) of institutions now have an international student recruiting plan in place—either for the institution as a whole, or for one or more schools/colleges. Over 80% of these plans specify numerical enrollment targets for undergraduates, graduate students, or both. For those with geographic targets, top countries include China, India, and Vietnam.

At the broadest level, the 2016 Mapping data indicate that internationalization is gaining traction among US colleges and universities.

About two-thirds of respondents reported that the number of students studying abroad from their institutions increased (45%) or remained the same (27%) in the last three years; participation rates for other types of education abroad—such as international internships, service opportunities, and research abroad—have grown less dynamically in recent years. Just over half of colleges and universities provide institutional funds, such as student scholarships, for education abroad.

Although the total number of students going abroad is currently at an all-time high, it is important to note that still only about 10% of all US undergraduate students will study abroad before obtaining their degree (Institute of International Education, 2016).

Collaboration and partnerships

The 2016 data indicate that international engagement and collaboration are garnering increased attention, energy, and support on many campuses. However, there is still a wide

spectrum in terms of activity levels, as well as the extent of planning and intentionality surrounding institutional relationships abroad. Nearly half of responding institutions reported that they have begun to develop international partnerships (13%), or have expanded the number of partner relationships (36%) in the last three years. Many have established a formal strategy for partnership development, as well as campus-wide guidelines for partnerships. Top countries of interest for expanded partnership activity in the future include China, India, Brazil, Mexico, Vietnam, and South Korea.

Conclusions and recommendations

The 2016 *Mapping* data for the individual pillars of the ACE's Model for Comprehensive Internationalization are for the most part encouraging. However, a broader comparison of overall percentages across categories indicates that, for many institutions, internationalization efforts are still focused first and foremost *externally*. Not only do institutions explicitly identify student mobility in both directions and international partnerships as their top internationalization priorities; these areas are at the forefront when it comes to funding, human resources, and programs. On-campus internationalization efforts ("internationalization at home"), such as internationalization of the curriculum/co-curriculum and faculty professional development, are lower on the priority list—both in terms of rhetoric and practice.

While an external orientation for internationalization efforts is an issue in many countries around the world, the lack of attention to on-campus activities is especially problematic in the United States, given its persistently low study abroad rate. When institutions report that "improving student preparedness for a global era" is their number-one goal for internationalization, presumably they mean all students—not just the small percentage that study abroad. Going forward, more efforts are needed to ensure that students at US institutions have opportunities to acquire global competence through their coursework, co-curricular activities, and interactions with internationally oriented faculty. In light of intensified recruiting efforts, support for international students and maximizing their contributions to the global learning environment are also critical to on-campus efforts, and to furthering progress toward truly comprehensive internationalization.

The Trump Effect

In looking toward the future of internationalization, it is impossible to ignore US political developments in the last year. The *Mapping* survey closed in December 2016—following the election of President Donald Trump, but prior to his inauguration. Since then, the Trump administration has issued a series

of executive orders and policy statements related to immigration and foreign relations that will likely impact, perhaps dramatically, student mobility—the aspect of internationalization delineated clearly by the data as the top priority for US colleges and universities.

Initial data and anecdotal reports from US campuses, as well as sources abroad, indicate that the current political environment is indeed factoring into international students' decisions about where to study. Yet, the long-term effect on student mobility numbers—and broader internationalization efforts—is difficult to predict. The impact of these developments will undoubtedly vary by institution and sector.

In light of new policy hurdles and a charged political climate, some colleges and universities may indeed turn away from internationalization activities. For others, though, momentum will continue, perhaps with different activities and emphases coming to the fore. Some institutions may turn their internationalization focus inward, with increased attention and resources devoted to on-campus curricular, co-curricular, and faculty development initiatives—vital activities, in fact, to advance progress toward comprehensive internationalization in ways that an exclusively external orientation and on-going emphasis on mobility will not allow. Time—and the 2021 *Mapping* survey—will tell.

References

- Helms, R. M. & Brajkovic, L. (2017). Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses. American Council on Education. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Mapping-Internationalization-on-U-S-Campuses.aspx>.
- Helms, R. M. (2015). Internationalizing U.S. higher education: Current policies, future directions. American Council on Education. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Internationalizing-U-S-Higher-Education-Current-Policies-Future-Directions.aspx>
- Institute of International Education. (2016). Open Doors 2017: Report on International Educational Exchange. New York: Author. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/fi-FI/Research-and-Publications/-/link.aspx?_id=422DF2E80E7C4ADEA7198F67282186D9&_z=z.

Australia's Cosmopolitan Campuses Count Their Blessings

Christopher Ziguras

Already one of the world's most internationalized higher education systems, Australia is again experiencing rapid growth in incoming international student numbers. Unlike similar growth phases in the past, where the mobility was one-directional, Australian universities are also experiencing a boom in outbound mobility. After two earlier

phases that were dominated by an international aid philosophy (1950s to 1985) and then by commercial imperatives (1986 to early 2000s), Australian university leaders consider themselves to be deep into a third phase of internationalization, in which their efforts and priorities align significantly with the key dimensions of ACE's model of comprehensive internationalization. So, how is internationalization in Australia progressing in relation to the six pillars of ACE's model for comprehensive internationalization?

Australian universities continue to have a high level of institutional commitment to internationalization, and this orientation has now become embedded in the character of nearly all institutions. For several decades, the vast majority of Australia's 43 universities have recruited globally and, as a result, international students now comprise more than a quarter of all students in Australia's higher education system (Department of Education and Training, 2017). Most have offered transnational programs abroad for decades, with around a quarter now having campuses outside Australia, accounting for a significant proportion of the world's largest international branch campuses (Garrett et al., 2016). Nearly all have explicit commitments to global and intercultural engagement in their statements of graduate attributes, and actively promote learning abroad and international research collaboration.

Fortunately for the country's institutions and their students, Australia has so far not seen the rise of nationalist and xenophobic political movements on the same scale as the United States and the United Kingdom. Internationalization of education continues to enjoy bipartisan support at the federal level and among state governments, providing a supportive policy environment that is focused on making Australia an attractive destination for scholars, and encouraging Australian students to learn abroad, particularly in Asia.

The Vanishing International Office?

The deepening of international engagement has had an interesting effect on administrative leadership, structure, and staffing in recent years, with a trend to integrate international education leadership and service provision into mainstream operations.

In the 1980s, when the Australian government ended subsidies and restrictions on enrollment numbers for international students, many universities established new units catering to international students, from marketing and recruitment to accommodation and careers counselling, all overseen by a deputy vice-chancellor (DVC) international—a level equivalent to a vice-president in the US higher education context. As the scale of international activity has increased, and in recogni-

tion of the duplication that dedicated international services often involved, universities have for the past decade been integrating these services. This has been sometimes controversial on campuses, as staff who work in the international units, and sometimes also international student groups, have portrayed “mainstreaming” as a reduction of support to international students.

Universities have usually countered that by integrating these units, international students will have access to a wider suite of services, and that with a large proportion of the domestic population coming from migrant backgrounds, there is extensive overlap in service needs. This leaves DVCs international with a much smaller portfolio, consisting of direct management of study abroad and international relations offices, and an overarching role in international strategy through coordinating the activities of senior leaders responsible for academic affairs, research, recruitment, student services, and so on.

Support for Teaching, Learning, and Research

With such significant international student populations, coupled with a highly internationalized economy and a high rate of immigration, Australian universities expect faculty to develop curricula, co-curricula, and learning outcomes that prepare students for international and intercultural practice. Doing so is easier in Australia than in some other countries since a high proportion of faculty are themselves migrants and most textbooks and curriculum materials are imported, although almost exclusively from the Global North.

Faculty policies and practices remain supportive of international engagement by faculty, and especially international research collaboration. Because global university rankings such as those produced by QS and Times Higher Education are taken so seriously in Australia, universities encourage faculty to develop a wide range of teaching, research, and service linkages that might raise the university's profile among the international scholarly community and employers.

Mobility with Asia is Booming

As noted previously, in relation to student mobility, Australia is experiencing rapid growth in both incoming and outbound student numbers. On the outbound side, there has been a concerted effort on the part of universities over the past decade to increase the proportion of students learning abroad. This ambition has bipartisan political support and, since 2013, successive Australian governments have been providing, and increasing, funding for outbound mobility to Asia in order to enhance young people's familiarity with the region. Universities have steadily expanded their semester exchange opportunities in Asia, though the bulk of students on such

programs are still studying with North American and European partners. The majority of growth, however, has been in faculty-led study tours, overseas work placements, and short courses offered by, or in collaboration with, overseas partners—particularly in Asia, where Australian universities are keen to deepen their engagement and where students are open to travel due to the relative proximity, affordability, and their growing cultural familiarity with the region.

Universities have been willing to support the massification of mobility because such study options are attractive to prospective and current students, promote deep student engagement with peers and faculty, and are attractive to employers (especially when linked to professional skills development). Also, more than a quarter of Australia's universities have campuses abroad, most of which are in Asia, and these universities are increasingly promoting mobility between their campus locations and integrating their offshore campuses into their global exchange and study abroad partner university networks.

Unlike similar growth phases in the past, where the mobility was one-directional, Australian universities are also experiencing a boom in outbound mobility.

The combination of institutional prioritization and government support has been spectacularly effective. By 2015, there were 38,000 students learning abroad, up from just 7,000 a decade earlier, and fully 45% of outbound students are now studying in Asia. Nearly one in five Australian undergraduate students now undertakes learning abroad during his or her studies (Harrison & Potts, 2016; Potts, 2016). This is a higher rate of mobility than that seen in the United States, United Kingdom, Canada and most other countries. If the rate of growth continues as expected, Australia's mobility levels will, within a few years, be on par with those of Germany, the Netherlands, and Singapore (Gribble & Tran, 2016).

This growth in mobility provides several opportunities for US colleges: more Australian exchange students going to the United States allows for more reciprocal places for US students in Australia, and in Australian branch campuses around the world; credit-bearing courses offered as part of a summer school in July in the Northern hemisphere are attractive to Australian students who wish to escape the Southern winter during the July break; and Australian universities are keen to run collaborative, faculty-led study tours

with students and faculty from partner universities.

When it comes to inbound mobility, Australia made headlines a few years ago when a “perfect storm” involving a tightening of visa conditions for students and migrants, several highly publicized attacks on Indian students, and a high Australian dollar led to a marked decline in enrollments between 2010 and 2012. The rebound, however, has been impressive. Enrollments have grown by over 10% per year for four years in a row, according to data from the Commonwealth Provider Registration and International Student Management System, and the 554,179 international students in Australia in 2016 in fact represented more than one in 50 people living in the country (Australian Trade and Investment Commission, 2017). Now, Australia's main challenge is to maintain the quality of international students' experience of living and studying in the country in a period of rapid growth in scale (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2017).

Fortunately, current government regulations facilitate, rather than hinder, institutions' ability to attract international students and provide a well-rounded educational experience. Like Canada and New Zealand, Australia maintains much more welcoming migration and student visa policies than the United States and United Kingdom. In Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, students are allowed to work part-time during study periods and full-time during breaks; international graduates are permitted to remain and work for several years after graduation, and many are able to obtain permanent residency and then citizenship.

In large part, the enthusiastic internationalization of the student population has been possible on such a scale because the societies in which this is occurring are already profoundly ethnically diverse. Overseas born residents account for 32% of the population of Sydney, while 58% of Melbourne's population have at least one parent born overseas. The incidents of a few years ago notwithstanding, Australia generally provides a culturally open and welcoming environment.

Flatlining Offshore, Building Support at Home

Nearly all Australian universities have extensive international collaboration and partnerships, the most significant of which are collaborative teaching and research programs offshore. Many of these are long-standing partnerships, but the scale of transnational enrollments has begun to decline in recent years (Department of Education and Training, 2016), mainly due to the growth of quality local providers in Southeast Asia, the restrictions on foreign providers in China and India, and competition from UK universities that are seeking to expand abroad in response to shrinking international enrollments on home campuses.

The biggest risk facing the international education sector is that economic inequality between urban and rural electorates could result in the election of nationalist populist parties that then limit (both temporary and permanent) migration, thus restricting student mobility, as has occurred in the United States and Britain. So far, though, Australia has enjoyed bipartisan support for internationalization of higher education, and key stakeholder organizations and policy influencing bodies continue to work to build continued support for international engagement at the political level, as well as among the student community and broader society.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017, September 27). Australian demographic statistics, Mar 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/0/D56C4A3E41586764CA2581A70015893E?Opendocument>
- Australian Trade and Investment Commission. (2017). International education data. Retrieved from <https://www.austrade.gov.au/Australian/Education/education-data>
- Department of Education and Training. (2016). Transnational education in the higher education sector. Retrieved from https://internationaleducation.gov.au/research/Research-Snapshots/Documents/Transnational%20education_HE_2015.pdf
- Department of Education and Training. (2017, February 14). Higher education statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.education.gov.au/higher-education-statistics>
- Garrett, R., Kinser, K., Lane, J. E., & Merola, R. (2016). International branch campuses: Trends and developments, 2016. London: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- Gribble, C., & Tran, L. (2016). International trends in learning abroad. Melbourne, Vic.: Universities Australia and IEAA.
- Harrison, L., & Potts, D. (2016). Learning abroad at Australian universities: The current environment. Canberra and Melbourne: Universities Australia and the International Education Association of Australia.
- Potts, D. (2016, December 20). Leading the way for learning abroad - International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.ieaa.org.au/blog/leading-the-way-for-learning-abroad>

The State of Internationalization in Canada: Strategic and Innovative

Grace Karram Stephenson

“Internationalization has become a central pillar in the quest for excellence in Canadian education” (Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2016).

In Canada, higher education is the jurisdiction of 10 provincial and two territorial governments. Each province relates in a unique manner to its institutions and it is often difficult to identify the specific features of a Canadian system of

higher education. For this reason, internationalization takes different forms across different institutions and in policy priorities at different levels of government.

Institutions are more likely than government agencies to prioritize ACE’s “Pillars of Comprehensive Internationalization.” Recent surveys suggest that Canadian institutions are actively developing an articulated institutional commitment to international education, internationalized curriculum, global partnerships, and student mobility. In contrast, the main international education policies of the federal and provincial governments emphasize the development of a “Canadian brand” for the recruitment of foreign students and the acquisition of skilled labor. At the same time, there is a noticeable imbalance between the large number of foreign students who enroll at Canadian institutions and the low numbers of Canadians heading abroad. The following brief provides the details of these trends and reflects on the limitations of Canada’s strategic focus on talent acquisition.

Federal Strategy

In recent years, international education has become a priority of Canada’s federal government and is one of the few areas in which a pan-Canadian strategy has been developed in higher education. In 2011, the government of Canada’s *Economic Action Plan* designated funding for the creation of a comprehensive International Education Strategy to guide the often independent actions of provinces and institutions. This step was welcomed by provincial governments, whose ministers of education had called for Canada-wide recruitment and branding strategies in their 2011 report *Bringing education in Canada to the world, bringing the world to Canada* (Council of Ministers of Education, 2011). By 2013, international education was listed in the government’s *Global Markets’ Action Plan* as one of 22 areas in which Canada has a competitive advantage.

The primary focus in federal policy, up to this point, relates to the acquisition of skilled labor through the recruitment of international students. Since 2005, the number of foreign students studying in Canada has quadrupled, with more than 336,000 long-term students studying in Canada in 2015 (Guhr, Furtado & Yyos, 2016). The most recent report on international education released by Global Affairs Canada in 2014 highlights the importance of international students for Canada’s economy. It states:

...total annual expenditure of international students including their visiting families and friends, contributed almost \$11.4 billion to economic activities in Canada in 2014. This translates to \$9.3 billion in GDP contribution to the Canadian economy...The amount of overall annual spending by international students translates to

122,700 jobs (equivalent to 104,100 FTE) supported in the Canadian economy (Kunin, 2016, p.III).

Beyond their economic contributions, foreign students are also seen as essential for Canada's "long-term capacity for research and innovation" (Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development [DFATD], 2014, p.9), areas that are threatened by Canada's aging population and shortages in professional fields.

The main policy agenda for the federal government is maximizing Canada's brand. Research indicates that the Canadian brand is among the most trusted in the world and international students are aware of an "integrated offer" when they come to Canada: the ability to study, pursue student employment, and move toward immigration (DFATD, 2014). The first major branding campaign, Edu-Canada, took place between 2007 and 2012. Canada dramatically increased its presence at global recruitment activities and championed the

Institutions are more likely than government agencies to prioritize ACE's "Pillars of Comprehensive Internationalization."

slogan, "Imagine Education au/in Canada." During that time, the number of international students to Canada increased by 51%. Currently, the federal government prioritizes five countries and one region as key markets from which to recruit international students: Brazil, China, India, Mexico, North Africa and the Middle East, and Vietnam.

The third area of federal involvement relates to the immigration pathways of international students. Under the previous, Conservative, federal government, international students were grouped in the same category as other skilled applicants, making it more difficult for them to attain permanent residency. The current government is taking action to amend the application process to favor those who have attained a Canadian degree. An in-depth look at immigration policy highlights the profit-driven approach that often characterizes the recruitment of international students.

Provincial Strategy

Provincial governments, like their federal counterparts, strongly emphasize foreign student recruitment in their strategic planning. Although provincial bodies have lobbied for nationwide strategies, the provinces are the main parties responsible

for higher education policy and have significant autonomy to determine how internationalization is enacted in their jurisdiction. Provinces set priorities and, when needed, draw on specific supports from the federal government in areas such as visa acquisition and naturalization.

Despite the autonomy of the provinces, one finds several common themes in recent international education strategy documents. The importance of recruiting foreign students continues to be the top priority, but this is matched by the related commitment to ensuring the quality of students' degree experience. There is consensus that maintaining a high quality educational experience is essential for the long-term stability of Canada's foreign student inflows.

Across Canada, different provinces tend to prioritize partnerships with different countries. For example, while all provinces focus on China, provinces in Western Canada tend to place a higher priority on India, while British Columbia also has a distinct relationship with the Asia-Pacific community. Overall, provincial governments contribute stability and cohesion to the foreign student recruitment aspect of the education sector of each province.

Institutional Strategy

While prioritizing foreign students, most Canadian institutions have broadened their approach to internationalization and strive for a more comprehensive strategy. The 2014 survey of institutional internationalization, conducted by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), found that 82% of their members placed "internationalization and/or global engagement [as] among the top five priorities of the strategic plan or long-term planning documents." Furthermore, 72% of institutions are currently working on internationalizing their curriculum, up from only 41% in 2006 (AUCC, 2014). Following student mobility, the two main internationalization priorities for institutions are academic research collaborations and strategic partnerships with institutions for degree offerings. This broad range of internationalization activities at institutions affirms Knight's (2004) suggestion that "it is usually at the individual, institutional level that the real processes of internationalization is [sic] taking place," (Knight, 2004, pp. 6-7).

One area of concern for institutions is the low rate of outbound mobility. Despite concerted efforts to promote study abroad, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) found that "a mere 2.3% of university students went abroad for a credit or not-for-credit experience in the 2014-2015 academic year. This suggests that participation has declined since the 2012-2013 academic year when an esti-

mated 3.1% of university students went abroad” (CBIE, 2016 p.7). This number remains close to the 2006 rate of 2.2%, a minimal increase, considering that 74% of institutions list outward mobility in their top five internationalization priorities (AUCC, 2014). These low numbers are also a stark contrast to the consistent inflow of foreign students into Canada. Despite a strong institutional focus on developing economies, outwardly mobile Canadian students still choose traditional destinations such as Europe or Australia for their stay abroad.

Although institutions are free to pursue their own collaborations and partnerships, the 2014 AUCC report notes that “China is overwhelmingly the top focus of almost all facets of Canadian universities’ internationalization activities” (p.5). Following China, institutions also prioritize international activities in Brazil, India, the United States, France, Mexico, and Germany. Institutional activities in China go beyond foreign student recruitment: China is also the site of the majority of dual or double degrees offered in partnership with Canadian institutions (19%).

At the faculty level, Canadian professors have high levels of global partnerships. In 2012, 43% of Canadian publications were co-authored with an international partner, twice the world average (AUCC, 2014).

The Way Forward: Collaboration and Evaluation

In summary, Canadian internationalization can presently be described as strategic rather than comprehensive. Institutions and government agencies are focusing on target areas that promise the most for the country’s relatively small higher education sector. While Canada has established a comparative advantage in recruiting foreign students, there is growing concern that Canada’s international education activities are mainly driven by economic or commercial rationales. The recruitment of foreign students is still a top priority for both government and institutions as fiscal austerity measures require the revenues and talents of high-skilled immigrants.

Fortunately for Canada, the recent push for effective evaluation of internationalization offers a way forward. The AUCC 2014 survey found that “59% of Canadian universities track the implementation of their internationalization strategies within their quality assessment and assurance procedures, and just over three-fifths assess their success in supporting international students” (p.4). For countries and institutions that wish to collaborate with Canada on internationalization initiatives, an institution-to-institution approach is most likely to expand opportunities outside of student mobility.

References

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). (2014). Canada’s universities in the world: AUCC internationalization survey,

2014. Retrieved from Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada website: <https://www.univcan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/internationalization-survey-2014.pdf>

Canadian Bureau for International Education. (2016). Canada’s performance and potential in international education. Retrieved from CBIE website: <http://net.cbie.ca/download/World-of-Learning-2016-EN.pdf>

Council of Ministers of Education. (2011). Bringing education in Canada to the world, bringing the world to Canada: An international education marketing action plan for provinces and territories. Ottawa: Council of the Federation.

Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD). (2014). Canada’s international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity (FR5-86/2014). Retrieved from DFATD website: <http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf>

Guhr, D. J., Furtado, N. D., & Vyas, A. J. (2016). 2016 British Columbia international education intelligence report (14/2016). San Carlos, CA: Illuminate Consulting Group.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31. doi:10.1177/1028315303260832

Kunin, R. (2016). Economic impact of international education in Canada – 2016 update. Vancouver, BC: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Internationalization of Higher Education in Colombia: From Fragmentation to a Comprehensive Policy

Jeannette Vélez Ramírez

According to the National Information System of Higher Education (known by its acronym in Spanish as SNIES), in January 2017 there were 289 higher education institutions (HEIs) in Colombia: 62 public, 208 private, and 19 that are governed under a special rule/ regime—i.e., they are higher education institutions but each of their legal personalities depends on other public institutions (Law 30 1992, art. 137; IESALC-UNESCO, 2002). Universities comprise 84 of the country’s 289 HEIs, including 31 public, 52 private, and 1 special regime institution. Key variables that affect the depth and scope of internationalization among this diverse set of institutions include institutional type, regional location, and budget allocated to internationalization.

At the national level, policy makers see great potential for Colombia to become a key player in global higher education, as do outside observers (Bothwell, 2016). They also recognize the importance of internationalization to realizing this potential, and the need for a public policy on the subject; indeed, such a policy—the result of an interdisciplinary and inter-institutional working group established in 2016—is currently

under review by the Ministry of Education (MEN) (National Council for Higher Education, 2013).

To date, however, there is no existing national policy or strategic plan that gives guidelines, defines focus areas, or integrates the various actors needed to improve the international activities of individual institutions or of the Colombian higher education system as a whole. Certain initiatives and programs have been implemented, but there has been a lack of continuity over the years.

Internationalization Strengths, Weaknesses, and Priorities

Colombia's HEIs speak regularly about comprehensive internationalization. However, there is no common definition for this concept, nor any indication of how it applies to the daily life of HEIs in terms of coordinating the work of the relevant actors or achieving institutional goals.

Still, various sources of information on internationalization (Nupia, 2014) show significant results and advances by Colombian HEIs with respect to the six pillars of the American Council on Education's (ACE) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization. This does not mean that all HEIs are developing comprehensive strategies, but they are actively pursuing, at least to some extent, internationalization in the key areas of education, research, and service.

Various studies (Jaramillo, 2003; Rodriguez Pinto & Cardoso Arango, 2007; Nupia et al., 2013) have been carried out in order to gauge the level of internationalization at HEIs. However, their methodologies and instruments have been evolving, which makes it difficult to make comparisons between them. The data listed below come from the study conducted in 2013 in the agreement between the MEN and the "Colombia Challenge Your Knowledge" (CCYK, see below) initiative (Nupia et al., 2013).

Management models

Nearly all (96%) Colombian HEIs have implemented some type of management model for internationalization (e.g., establishing an international office); however, on closer inspection, it is clear that there is still much to be done in this area. Effective leadership for internationalization includes not only the design of policies, but also concrete and quantifiable actions that enable the institution to meet objectives and goals in a coordinated manner. Examples include increasing budget allocations, improving physical and administrative infrastructure, and developing information management systems and tools. These operational aspects of internationalization management are still lacking at many Colombian institutions.

Curriculum and co-curriculum

Just under half (48%) of Colombia's HEIs state that they have a policy for the internationalization of curricula – though it is noteworthy that while a majority of private institutions (54%) say they are active in this area, only 28% of public institutions are similarly engaged in this work.

At institutions nationwide, there are numerous examples of programs and activities aimed at "touching" the curriculum and the co-curriculum. Many of these initiatives are innovative, but there is a lack of effort to measure their impact, or to determine how academic units might be involved in supporting them. Better evaluation of these activities is needed to understand if and how they contribute effectively to the development of globally competent students.

Today, countries such as Ecuador, Argentina, and Peru are looking to Colombia as a model for how to pursue higher education internationalization in the Latin American context.

Research

Colombian HEIs place special emphasis on the internationalization of research. This priority is reflected in the new "Colombia Científica" program, launched in 2016, which allocates resources and defines key research areas—i.e., food, health, sustainable energy, society, and bio-economy—for the country (Colombia Científica, 2017). Only high quality accredited HEIs can be leaders of the projects chosen for inclusion in the program, which encourages collaboration with international HEIs, local companies, and governments, as well as with less developed Colombian HEIs.

Community engagement

Service to local, national, and regional communities is also an important aspect of internationalization for many Colombian institutions. Examples of initiatives to facilitate such engagement include UTOPIA, the Scientific Park of Social innovation of UNIMINUTO, CAPAZ German-Colombian Peace Institute, CACAO FOR PEACE, and the mathematics Olympiads created for schools by Antonio Nariño University, among others.

Overall, while Colombian HEIs are conceptually committed to internationalizing, their degree of progress varies due to factors such as lack of commitment of some actors, lack of resources, and lack of professionalization across entire institutions, including, but not limited to, international offices.

Going forward, priorities include increasing academic mobility, transforming the culture of internationalization within institutions, and furthering the internationalization of research. Measuring the impact of internationalization policies is another key concern.

Networks and Recent Initiatives

Since the 1990s, the Colombian Network for Internationalization (known by its acronym in Spanish as RCI) has been promoting international collaboration, exchange, training, and studies (RCI, n.d.). In 2007, RCI undertook the first-ever nationwide study on the state of Colombian internationalization, and developed a program to assist universities in strengthening their internationalization capacities. RCI was also a key organizer of the Latin American and Caribbean Higher Education Conference for Internationalization (LA-CHEC) in 2008, an event that, since that time, has brought together each year representatives from institutions in more than 30 countries in Latin America, the Caribbean, Europe, and occasionally the United States—with participation of up to 500 people (ASCUN [Colombian Association of Universities], n.d.).

Also in 2008, Colombian universities that were accredited by the MEN joined forces to promote Colombia as a producer of quality education and research. The resulting CCYK initiative engaged not only individual institutions, but also the MEN; the Colombian Institute of Educational Credit and Study Abroad (ICETEX); the Administrative Department of Science, Technology and Innovation (Colciencias); ProColombia (which focuses on exports, tourism, and branding); and the National Accreditation Council (CAN).

Since the CCYK was created, Colombia's visibility as a viable destination for student mobility and a source of partner institutions for international research collaboration has increased considerably—for example, in the context of the European Union's Horizon 2020 funding schemes. These positive developments were possible due to the improved economic and security conditions of the country from 2004 onward, but also as a result of the fact that the participating institutions within the CCYK initiative formed an unprecedented network of allies, sharing a common purpose.

In agreement with the MEN, the universities and other entities involved in CCYK carried out *The Study on the Internationalization of Higher Education in Colombia and the Modernization of Internationalization Indicators in the National System of Higher Education* in 2013 (Nupia et al., 2013); published five *Manuals for the Internationalization of Higher Education* (CCYK, n.d.b); and produced the *Inbound Mobility of US Students to Colombia*:

CCYK® Report 2016 (CCYK, n.d.c). Since 2011, these universities have also offered a peer coaching program, in coordination with the MEN, designed to build capacity at HEIs that are just beginning to internationalize (Longhurst, Duran, & Parra, 2014).

Recently, both the RCI and CCYK have been working with the vice-minister of higher education, proposing legal reforms to create a favorable framework for the development of internationalization in relation to areas such as visas, curricular flexibility, degrees recognition, definition of relevant indicators, and the creation of a public policy agenda and national strategy for internationalization. Today, countries such as Ecuador, Argentina, and Peru are looking to Colombia as a model for how to pursue higher education internationalization in the Latin American context.

Since the CCYK was created, Colombia's visibility as a viable destination for student mobility and a source of partner institutions for international research collaboration has increased considerably.

Implications for US–Colombia Engagement

Relationships between Colombian and US HEIs have been expanding in recent years for several reasons, notably as a result of improved safety conditions in Colombia and the implementation of programs on both sides—such as 100,000 Strong in the Americas, Colombia Científica, and Nexus Global (Colciencias, 2017)—as well as national and international funding for initiatives aimed at strengthening the Colombian peace agreement signed on November 24, 2016 and addressing key issues such as agriculture, sustainable energy, and water management. In this context, there is clear and growing potential for transformative agreements between US and Colombian institutions, focused on these areas and others.

Colombian HEIs have always worked toward ensuring that cooperation is reciprocal in every sense. This implies that there is an interest in brokering partnerships where there is a real and measurable benefit for those involved in the relationship that allows for the construction of transformative alliances on equal terms, while limiting merely “transactional relationships.” Thus, US institutions looking to engage with Colombian partners should carefully consider their ability and willingness to commit to mutuality in these arrangements.

References

- ASCUN (Colombian Association of Universities). (n.d.). LACHEC 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.ascun.org.co/noticias/detalle/lachec-2017>
- Bothwell, E. (2016, November 24). TACTICS: The new smart set of rising HE powers. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/tactics-the-new-smart-set-of-rising-higher-education-power>
- CCYK - Colombia Challenge Your Knowledge. (n.d.a). Retrieved from <http://www.challengeyourknowledge.edu.co/>
- CCYK - Colombia Challenge Your Knowledge. (n.d.b). Guías para la Internacionalización de la Educación Superior. Retrieved from <http://www.challengeyourknowledge.edu.co/interna.php?id=295>
- CCYK - Colombia Challenge Your Knowledge. (n.d.c). Inbound Mobility of US students to Colombia - CCYK report. Retrieved from <http://www.challengeyourknowledge.edu.co/interna.php?id=297>
- Colciencias. (2017). Nexo Global. Retrieved from <http://www.colciencias.gov.co/portafolio/mentalidad-cultura/vocacion/nexo-global>
- Colombia Científica. (2017). Retrieved from <http://colombiacientifica.gov.co/colombia/>
- IESALC-UNESCO. (2002). *La educación superior en Colombia*. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001315/131598s.pdf>
- Jaramillo, I. C. (2003). *La internacionalización de la educación superior y su dinámica en Colombia*. LCSHD Paper Series, No. 82. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/558071468018838614/La-internacionalizacion-de-la-educacion-superior-y-su-dinamica-en-Colombia>
- Longhurst, S., Durán, J., & Parra, L. (2014). *Fomento a la Internacionalización de la Educación Superior: Aprendizajes desde la Experiencia de Colombia*. Retrieved from http://redes.colombiaaprende.edu.co/ntg/men/pdf/For-tealecimiento_de_capacidades_institucionales.pdf
- National Council for Higher Education. (2013). *Acuerdo por lo superior 2034*. Retrieved from http://www.dialogoeducacionsuperior.edu.co/1750/articles-319917_recurso_1.pdf
- Nupia, C. M. (Ed.). (2014). *Reflexiones para la política de internacionalización de educación superior en Colombia*. Bogotá: Ministerio de Educación Nacional. Retrieved from http://www.cna.gov.co/1741/articles-186502_Reflexiones2014.pdf
- Nupia, C., Moreno, J., Villareal, N., Pinzón, A., Sierra, D., Mendez, L., Galvis, N., Villa, N., Betancourt, W., Anzola, G., Cañón, J., Vélez, J., Toro, S., & Cruz de Medina, V. (2013). *Informe Final - Estudio sobre la Internacionalización de la Educación Superior en Colombia y Modernización de Indicadores de Internacionalización del Sistema Nacional de Información de la Educación Superior (SNIES)*. MEN - Colombia Challenge Your Knowledge (CCYK). Retrieved from http://aprende.colombiaaprende.edu.co/ckfinder/user-files/files/INFORME_FINAL.pdf
- RCI - Red Colombiana para la Internacionalización de la Educación Superior. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://rcicolombia.jimdo.com/>; <http://www.ascun.org.co/red/detalle/red-colombiana-de-internacionalizacion-rci>
- Rodríguez Pinto, C. & Cardoso Arango, X. (2007). *Informe Final - Estudio Estado del Arte de la Internacionalización de la Educación Superior en Colombia*. Retrieved from <http://bibliotecadigital.cin.edu.ar/bitstream/123456789/2160/1/ASCUN%20INTERNACIONALIZACION.pdf>; http://www.uptc.edu.co/export/descargas_autoevaluacion/d3.pdf

Internationalization in India

Lakshmi Iyer

By 2030, India will be the youngest nation in the world (EY, n.d.). When it comes to higher education, India already faces a demand–supply gap, which is set to increase with the rise in population. India’s Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) of 23.6% (Business Standard, 2005) stands well below the global average of 30% (Roy, 2014). While the government has set a target of 30% by 2020 (Business Standard, 2005), reaching this goal will be a significant challenge given the limited existing capacity. Quality is a serious concern. Curricula lack rigor and relevance, and, as a result, almost 80% of Indian college graduates are not considered employable (Wheelbox, 2016). Overall, there is a shortage of well-qualified faculty, even at relatively prestigious institutions such as the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) and Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs). Over 35% of IIT faculty positions are currently vacant (Gohain, 2017).

Internationalization is seen as a potential means by which Indian higher education can address the supply–demand gap, remedy the low quality of teaching and learning that plague Indian institutions, accelerate research and innovation, and prepare students to be competitive in the global labor market. Individual institutions are motivated to internationalize in order to fulfill their educational missions, remain academically relevant, and enhance their profiles internationally and domestically.

Improving the international ranking of Indian institutions is also emerging as an internationalization priority. Currently, only two Indian higher education institutions (HEIs), the Indian Institute of Science (IISc) Bangalore and IIT Delhi, feature in the top 200 global institutions (Shihabudeen, 2017). Interest in rankings is increasing at both government and institutional levels and, going forward, is likely to factor into internationalization efforts and strategies.

Resource levels at HEIs in India vary greatly, as do approaches to internationalization, which are also influenced (positively and negatively) by an array of government policies. Currently, the ministry of human resource and development is working on a mechanism of “graded autonomy” (University Grants Commission, 2017), which will give top institutions more freedom to devise their own internationalization strategies (Bansal, 2017).

The following overview of current status and trends—and included case examples—are based on research conducted by Sannam S4 Business Intelligence (Sannam S4, n.d.). Data sources and methods include analysis of university websites

and government policies, as well as interviews with international relations officers at public and private HEIs.

Articulated Institutional Commitment

Traditionally, internationalization has not been articulated as a priority among Indian HEIs, although, for a number of educational institutions, especially new private players, internationalization is a buzzword and a marketing strategy. Various private HEIs have used international links to brand themselves domestically; the international student presence on campuses and arrangements with foreign universities are widely publicized in advertising campaigns. National University Associations.

Most HEIs do not have a clear internationalization strategy. Some, however, mention global exposure or globalization in their mission and vision statements. Xavier Institute of Communication's (XIC) mission, for instance, states, "We believe in an education that nurtures global citizens" (Xavier Institute of Communications, n.d.). The institutional vision of FLAME University, located in Pune, includes providing global exposure to its students and facilitating global faculty exchange—though it does not have a strategy in place to fulfill these objectives.

Examples of institutions that are taking concrete steps toward strategic planning include Birla Institute of Technology, Pilani (BITS), which has a vision 2020 document focusing on internationalization and has set up a task force to draw up an actionable strategy (Birla Institute of Technology & Science, 2016). At Central University of Gujarat (CUG), internationalization is a fundamental institutional value, and CUG has become a member of the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) in order to facilitate global engagement.

Administrative Leadership, Structure, and Staffing

While many institutions of all types have an international relations officer in place, dedicated international offices are relatively less common. Not surprisingly, dedicated offices are most often found at more well-resourced, prestigious institutions; examples include Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), FLAME University, St. Xavier's College (Mumbai), the University of Madras, and the IITs.

A number of institutions have convened committees to focus on internationalization or certain aspects of it—in some cases, as a first step toward establishing a dedicated office. Ambedkar University of Delhi (AUD), for instance, has an advisory committee on international partnerships, which is likely to be converted into an international office (Ambedkar

University Delhi, n.d.). Overall, however, most Indian HEIs lack adequate leadership and staffing to drive institutional internationalization. A lack of synergy and communication between top institutional leaders, other administrators, and faculty—in general, and specifically around internationalization—makes it difficult to achieve a shared vision and coherent plan to move internationalization forward.

Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes

In line with many HEIs' focus on quality improvement as an internationalization priority, efforts to internationalize the curriculum often mean bringing course content and teaching methods up to global standards. Indian HEIs have an advantage in that the medium of instruction is English; this allows for easier adoption of materials and content available in the global academic marketplace, and assessment of existing resources against accepted exemplars.

Resource levels at HEIs in India vary greatly, as do approaches to internationalization, which are also influenced (positively and negatively) by an array of government policies.

Some institutions are focusing on providing cutting-edge experiences to students that will set them apart in the global workforce. CUG, for example, prioritizes student research and foreign language learning. It offers a variety of research-intensive subjects and has invested in elaborate language labs and infrastructure: most notably, in a Central Instrumentation Facility that houses instruments for chemical, biological, and environmental sample analysis. NIIT University (NU) recruits faculty from industry as well as academia, in order to better equip students with knowledge of current developments in their fields and make them job ready for the global labor market (NIIT University, n.d.).

A number of institutions supported by large philanthropic trusts or private endowments have emerged recently, including Ashoka University, Azim Premji University, Jindal Global University, and Shiv Nadar (SNU) University. Often, these have ambitions of being "global institutes"—not just in terms of international presence, but also in cultivating a global outlook among their students. Programs and course content reflect this orientation. Ashoka University, for example, offers the Young India Fellowship (YIF), a yearlong postgraduate diploma in liberal studies. The YIF curriculum is delivered by In-

dian and international faculty from several institutions abroad (Ashoka University, n.d.).

Faculty Policies and Practices

Government regulations prohibit Indian HEIs from hiring foreign faculty on a permanent basis. However, bringing in international faculty to teach on a short-term basis and provide international training to domestic faculty is an important aspect of internationalization and quality improvement at many institutions. To encourage such arrangements, the federal government's Department of Science and Technology recently launched the Visiting Advanced Joint Research (VAJRA) faculty scheme, which allows overseas researchers to work as adjunct faculty for a specific period of time at a publicly funded Indian institution (VAJRA, n.d.). Institutions of national importance like the IITs and IIMs have also been able to bring international perspectives to campus by hiring foreign-educated Indian faculty.

In terms of research and teaching collaborations, most Indian academics either do not have international connections or lack funding for international projects. In recognition of the potential benefits of global engagement by Indian faculty, however, the government of India's ministry of human resource development created the Global Initiative of Academic Networks (GIAN, n.d.) in November 2015, to enable partnerships between international scientists and entrepreneurs and faculty at Indian institutions (Verma, 2015). As a follow up to GIAN, the government has launched the Global Research Interactive Network (GRIN) to fund research collaborations (Press Information Bureau, 2015).

Student Mobility

India sends about 350,000 students abroad (Sannam S4, n.d.) and receives around 30,000 international students (Ministry of Human Resource Development, India, 2012). It is the second largest source market for study abroad students, but hosts only 0.6% of the global population of students studying outside their home countries (Sharma, 2017). The top source countries for international students in India in 2015 were Nepal, Afghanistan, Malaysia, and Nigeria (ICEF Monitor, 2017); however, the overall number of international students in India has dropped from 31,126 in 2015 to 30,423 in 2016 (British Universities' International Liaison Association, 2017). There is an attempt to increase the number of international students in India by reserving 25% of seats for international students at the 20 world-class institutes or institutes of eminence that the government plans to create in the coming years (Sharma, 2017).

Until recently, transfer of credits from foreign institutions to

Indian institutions was not recognized. This prevented semester abroad and joint program exchanges. In 2015, however, India migrated to a credit-based transfer system in a bid to move from the single discipline approach, institute parity across institutions within India and abroad, and enable greater student mobility (Confederation of Indian Industry & Deloitte, 2015). A number of leading institutions have also recently opened their entrance examinations to foreign students, which will likely boost incoming student numbers going forward.

Despite these developments, many challenges still constrain student mobility. Due to limited funding, outgoing student mobility is generally limited to either the privileged or the brightest. On the inbound side, few institutions provide English language training or other pathways for students from non-Anglophone countries, which decreases the pool of possible applicants. There is a lack of appropriate infrastructure and facilities at Indian institutions to support international students—though some private institutions are building such facilities. For example, FLAME University has an air-conditioned international hostel and IIT Bombay houses international students in newer facilities.

Collaboration and Partnerships

In its 2016 Foreign Education Bill, the government relaxed previous restrictions on foreign academic collaborations, and began allowing Indian higher education institutions to enter into "twinning" arrangements with foreign partner institutions. Under the new guidelines, courses taken at foreign institutions can be recorded on students' transcripts and used to fulfill degree requirements.

The loosening of regulations has increased the overall interest in international partnerships among Indian institutions, including those that previously were not active in this area. In some cases, relationships with a limited scope (e.g., focusing solely on short-term student exchange) are now being expanded to include joint degree programs and other kinds of deeper engagement. One example is a double degree master's program offered by Manipal Institute of Technology and Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany (Manipal University, n.d.).

Some larger institutions that are particularly active with regard to international partnerships are establishing administrative systems to manage their relationships abroad. Jawaharlal Nehru University, for example, is in the process of creating an online system to make its partnerships process more efficient. Like counterparts around the world, it is not uncommon for Indian institutions to have partnership agreements in place with little actual activity. Research by Sannam

S4 suggests that Indian institutions' most successful and sustained international partnerships include short-term visits by faculty from the partner institution to the Indian institution, careful mapping of the curriculum for students participating in exchanges or joint academic programs, and tuition agreements that do not require Indian students to pay additional fees beyond what they would pay at home.

In addition to international partnerships, some private Indian HEIs' global engagement activity also includes establishing offshore campuses. S.P. Jain Institute of Management and Research has campuses in Dubai, Singapore, and Sydney. BITS has a campus in Dubai, and Amity University is present in Dubai and London. Manipal University has a presence in Dubai and so does the Institute of Management Technology, Ghaziabad (IMT). Among public sector institutions, Mumbai University is actively looking into setting up an offshore campus in the United States in order to form linkages with US institutions and offer international courses (India Today, 2017).

Conclusion

Both the government of India and an increasing number of Indian institutions are realizing the benefits of internationalization. Currently, internationalization is more common in private institutions and in top universities in India. The government is actively taking steps toward creating globally recognized institutions, which will provide more opportunities for foreign collaborations and attract foreign students. However, it is unlikely that this opportunity will extend to middle-range institutions, due to restrictions embedded in the regulatory framework, inadequate funds, and lack of appropriate infrastructure.

References

- Ambedkar University Delhi. (n.d.). Collaborations. Retrieved from <http://www.aud.ac.in/research/collaborations>
- Ashoka University. (n.d.). Young India Fellowship. Retrieved from <https://www.ashoka.edu.in/YIF>
- Bansal, A. (2017, August 20). Plan to replace UGC, AICTE with HEERA on hold. *The Economic Times* [New Delhi].
- Birla Institute of Technology & Science. (2016). *Members of the board of governors*. Retrieved from http://arcd.bits-pilani.ac.in/imp_documents/Bulletin_2016-17.pdf
- British Universities' International Liaison Association. (2017, August 14). Indian international student body shrinking – AIU report. Retrieved from <https://www.buila.ac.uk/news/2017/indian-international-student-body-shrinking-aiu-report>
- Business Standard. (2005, December 22). Gross enrolment ratio in higher education zooms. *Business Standard* [New Delhi]. Retrieved from http://www.business-standard.com/article/current-affairs/gross-enrolment-ratio-in-higher-education-zooms-115122200006_1.html
- Confederation of Indian Industry, & Deloitte. (2015). *Annual status of higher education of states and UTs in India, 2015*. Retrieved from <https://www2.deloitte.com/in/en/pages/integrated-market-offerings/annual-status-of-higher-education-of-states-and-uts-in-india-2015.html>
- EY. (n.d.). *India's Vision 2030 – A state-focused roadmap*. Retrieved from <http://www.ey.com/in/en/industries/india-sectors/education/ey-indias-vision-2030-a-state-focused-roadmap>
- GIAN. (n.d.). Global Initiative of Academic Networks (GIAN). Retrieved from <http://www.gian.iitkgp.ac.in/>
- Gohain, M. P. (2017, August 20). 35% of faculty posts vacant in IITs, 53% in central universities. *The Times of India* [New Delhi]. Retrieved from <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/35-of-faculty-posts-vacant-in-iits-53-in-central-universities/articleshow/60138942.cms>
- ICEF Monitor. (2017, August 16). Indian higher ed enrolment skyrocketing but foreign numbers remain modest. Retrieved from <http://monitor.icef.com/2017/08/indian-higher-ed-enrolment-skyrocketing-foreign-numbers-remain-modest/>
- India Today. (2017, March 3). Mumbai University to establish offshore campus in US. *India Today* [New Delhi]. Retrieved from <http://indiatoday.intoday.in/education/story/mumbai-university/1/895763.html>
- Manipal University. (n.d.). Double degree: Master's program in print & media technology. Retrieved from <https://manipal.edu/mit/programs/program-list/double-degree-masters-program-print-and-media-technology.html>
- Ministry of Human Resource Development, India. (2012). *Status of international students in India for higher education*. New Delhi: MHRD.
- NIIT University. (n.d.). Faculty. Retrieved from <https://www.niituniversity.in/faculty>
- Press Information Bureau. (2015, November 7). *Three-day Visitor's Conference at Rashtrapati Bhavan* concluded yesterday. Retrieved from <http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=130310>
- Roy, S. (2014). *India lagging behind with 20% gross enrollment ratio (GER) in higher education worldwide*. Retrieved from <http://ireport.cnn.com/docs/DOC-1108407>
- Sannam S4. (n.d.). International market entry & business solutions | Sannam S4. Retrieved from <https://www.sannams4.com/>
- Sharma, K. (2017, August 16). Centre plans 25% 'foreign quota' in 20 new world-class institutes. *Daily News & Analysis India*. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/india/report-centre-plans-25-foreign-quota-in-20-new-world-class-institutes-2531212>
- Shihabudeen, K. S. (2017, March 8). QS world university rankings 2017: IISc Bangalore, IIT Delhi in top 200. NDTV [New Delhi]. Retrieved from <https://www.ndtv.com/education/qs-world-university-rankings-2017-iisc-bangalore-iit-delhi-in-top-200-1667644>
- University Grants Commission. (2017). *Public notice (F.1-1/2017(Secy))*. Retrieved from https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/9837591_Public-Notice-regarding-draft-Regulations-and-Guidelines.pdf
- VAJRA. (n.d.). VAJRA India. Retrieved from <http://www.vajra-india.in/>
- Verma, P. (2015, November 20). GIAN to help improve rankings of institutes like IITs; international faculty members to teach in India. *The Economic Times*. Retrieved from https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/industry/services/education/gian-to-help-improve-rankings-of-institutes-like-iits-international-faculty-members-to-teach-in-india/articleshow/49852543.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst

Wheelbox. (2016). *India skills report 2016*. Retrieved from <https://wheebox.com/logo/ISR-2016-small.pdf>

Xavier Institute of Communications. (n.d.). The Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.xaviercomm.org/about-xaviercomm/default.htm>

Internationalization in German Higher Education

Hans-Dieter Daniel

Internationalization has been a topic of considerable interest for German higher education in recent years, due in part to the Bologna Process, but also because of various European Union (EU) programs and a general desire to play a competitive role in the global knowledge economy.

Recent policies implemented by the federal government and the 16 *Länder* (states) underscore this interest. In 2013, for example, the federal ministry of education and research and the 16 state ministries of education and research launched a joint strategy for the internationalization of higher education in Germany. In that strategy, they defined nine fields of action and developed joint policy goals for each field within the framework of their respective constitutional remits and respecting the autonomy of higher education institutions (HEIs) (Joint Science Conference, 2013). The nine fields of action are:

- Promoting strategic internationalization by individual institutions
- Improving the legal framework for internationalization
- Creating a culture of welcome
- Establishing an internationally oriented campus (e.g., courses and classes taught in English or other foreign languages; inclusion of international content in curricula)
- Increasing the international mobility of German students
- Enhancing Germany's international attractiveness as a study destination
- Attracting excellent (young) academics from abroad
- Expanding international research cooperation
- Delivering transnational education courses

Building on the 2013 policy, in February 2017, the federal government launched a new strategy for the internationalization of education, science, and research, which focuses on further

strengthening Germany's position as an internationally attractive place for studies and research (Federal Ministry of Education and Research, 2017).

While government policies provide a broad framework for internationalization efforts in Germany, institutional autonomy is at the forefront. It is up to HEIs to craft their own internationalization agendas, pursue funding, and decide whether to participate in programs and initiatives offered by the German government, the European Union, and other entities.

Even with this emphasis on institutional autonomy, national-level data on higher education internationalization is relatively abundant in Germany, particularly compared to many other countries. Data comes from various sources—particularly the German Rectors' Conference (HRK) and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)—providing insight into the shape and scope of institutional efforts nationwide, and allowing for identification of key issues and trends.

Articulated Institutional Commitment

According to the federal government and the *Länder*, internationalization should be seen as a horizontal task that affects all areas and units of an HEI. Internationalization strategies, however, must be customized and take into account the specific features of each individual university and the regional context in which it is embedded (German Rectors' Conference, 2012). Two recent government-funded initiatives are designed to help German institutions develop their own strategies, affirm their commitment to internationalization, and determine how best to operationalize that commitment on their own campuses.

With funding supplied by the federal ministry of education and research, the HRK administers an "Internationalization of Universities" Audit, which helps HEIs assess and (further) develop their internationalization strategies. Conducted by a team of internationally experienced experts and HRK staff, the Audit is tailored to each university's needs; it is holistic, voluntary, and confidential. Since the project's launch in 2009, one in three German universities has applied for participation. So far, 76 HEIs have completed the Audit process. All in all, there has been a tremendous response to the Audit, and the universities' feedback on the benefits of the Audit is very positive.

A new project, also funded by the federal ministry of education and research and administered by the HRK under the name HRK EXPERTISE Internationalization, will focus on the integration of international and intercultural components into study programs, further internationalization of university staff, expansion of structured forms of cooperation with overseas partners (including the use of digital teaching and learning),

and development of an international profile. Information on how institutions can participate in the project will be available in late 2017.

Administrative Leadership, Structure, and Staffing

German universities are convinced that internationalization needs to be professionally managed by university leadership. The president or a vice-president is usually responsible for the strategic governance of internationalization; he or she is typically supported by an academic council of internationalization experts and an international office.

A key task of the internationalization office is to manage the institution's participation in government-backed initiatives such as those described in the previous section, and to secure access to other government funding—a substantial amount of which is earmarked as part of the federal budget. Often, this means liaising with intermediary organizations such as the HRK and the DAAD, which provides government-funded scholarships to support both inbound and outbound student mobility.

Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes

Recent data available through the *Hochschulkompass* (Higher Education Compass) (<https://www.hochschulkompass.de/en.html>), an information portal maintained by the HRK, provide insights on international degree programs offered by Germany universities, a key focus of curriculum internationalization for many HEIs.

In 2015, 1,959 international degree programs were listed in the *Hochschulkompass* database, and were offered by nearly two-thirds of German universities. There is no formal definition of international degree program. The programs are typically bilingual or fully taught in English and offer special services for international students. The data reflect a significant push toward English-language instruction in Germany in recent years; from 2007 to 2013 English-taught master's programs, for example, increased from fewer than 100 to more than 700.

According to the *Hochschulkompass*, 640 of the 1,959 international degree programs included in the database in 2015 were international dual degree programs. In three-quarters of the dual degree programs, the participating partner institutions were located in Europe; partner institutions in North America participated in 7.7% of these programs (Maiworm, 2016, p. 57).

Very little is known about international elements of study programs offered in the German language, or programs focusing on international competencies. According to the HRK, internationalization of the curricula should be strengthened in the future (German Rectors' Conference, 2017), because 63% of all students at the bachelor and master's levels in Germany graduate without a study-related stay abroad (DAAD, 2015, p. 8).

Faculty Policies and Practices

The internationality of teaching and study at HEIs in Germany is measured not least by the internationality of the academic staff. The Federal Statistical Office of Germany has recorded nationality/citizenship in its personnel statistics since 2006, which makes it possible to determine how many persons with foreign passports are working at German HEIs. In 2014, there were 41,010 such academic and artistic staff and professors

While government policies provide a broad framework for internationalization efforts in Germany, institutional autonomy is at the forefront.

(Maiworm, 2016, pp. 65–73), i.e., 10.8% of the total number. Looking at professors only, there were 3,004 persons with foreign passports, or 6.6% of the total number of professors at HEIs in Germany, up from 5.5% in 2006. Almost 80% of the foreign professors were nationals of a European country; 62% were from the European Union, and 17% were from other European countries. Ten percent of all foreign professors were from North America.

In 2014, more than 9,000 German postdocs and academics/university teachers received funding, mainly from the DAAD and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, to support short-term international mobility. The United States was the most popular destination country; 13.8% of all funded postdocs and academics/university teachers went to the United States for research/teaching.

Student Mobility

In 2014, Germany's federal government established a goal of 350,000 international students studying in German institutions by 2020. In 2015, as many as 321,569 degree-seeking foreign students were enrolled at German institutions—an increase of 7% or about 20,000 students compared to the year

before. Europe is the most common region of origin of these students, followed by Asia. Though numbers are smaller, representation from North America is increasing; 5,632 North American students were enrolled in German institutions in 2015, compared to 4,000 in 2005 (DAAD/DZHW, 2016, p. 15). If overall upward trends continue, Germany is on track to meet, and likely exceed, the government's 2020 target.

In addition to degree-seeking students, Germany hosts a substantial number of international students for short-term stays, primarily through the Erasmus program. In 2014, 30,964 Erasmus participants spent time at German institutions, 2% more than in the previous year. France, Italy, and Spain are the main countries of origin.

On the outbound mobility front, for the first time since 1994, the number of degree-seeking Germans enrolled abroad in 2013 fell slightly compared to the previous year—from 138,500 to 134,500. The figures for Great Britain and the United States increased slightly. Overall, Austria, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Switzerland were the four most popular host countries (DAAD/DZHW, 2016, pp. 37–39).

At present, approximately 37% of German students go abroad for at least 3 months on study and practicum visits. A significant increase in temporary study-related visits abroad is required, however, if the goal of 50% set by the federal government, the federal states, and the DAAD is to be achieved (DAAD, 2016).

Collaboration and Partnerships

According to the HRK's *Hochschulkompass*, in 2016, there were more than 32,000 instances of international cooperation arranged by 301 German HEIs, with almost 5,300 HEIs in 154 countries. About half of these were partnership agreements in the context of the Erasmus program and primarily focused on student exchange. HEIs in North America were involved in 17.7% of the non-Erasmus collaborations (Maiworm, 2016, pp. 60–64).

Aggregated data from the HRK's "Internationalization of Universities" Audit suggests that German HEIs signed too many memorandums of understanding (MoUs) in the past. Often, long-standing MoUs—typically based on personal connections—were found to be inactive. In many cases, auditors have recommended that HEIs centralize the coordination of partnerships, and designate certain cooperation agreements as strategic or privileged partnerships.

Looking Forward: Challenges and Opportunities

German universities are actively committed to providing education and further training to the growing number of refugees

in Germany, many of whom obtained a higher education entrance qualification in their home country, and had started (or even completed) their studies prior to leaving (vbw, 2016, pp. 203–232). In a recent survey of the 16 Rectors' Conferences in the German Länder carried out by the HRK, over 70 universities reported activities and services designed to support and integrate refugee students, including information events, legal advice, German language classes, psychosocial support, and help with finding accommodation. While their commitment is strong, this will require significant resources and ongoing attention and efforts in the coming years.

Another important component of Germany's internationalization landscape going forward is the European Union's Erasmus+ program, which was introduced in 2014 and runs through 2020, with a total budget of EUR 14.7 billion. With an emphasis on collaboration outside of Europe, the program focuses on international mobility agreements, strategic partnerships, and joint degree programs, and presents opportunities for Germany HEIs to expand and deepen their engagement with counterparts in the United States and other areas of the world.

References

- DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service). (2015). *Jahresbericht 2015*. Bonn, Germany.
- DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service). (2016). „Ja“ zu Studienaufenthalten im Ausland. Gemeinsame Pressekonferenz mit dem Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung. Bonn, Germany.
- DAAD/DZHW (German Academic Exchange Service/German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies). (2016). *Wissenschaft weltweit 2016: Facts and figures on the international nature of studies and research in Germany*. Bielefeld, Germany: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.
- Federal Ministry of Education and Research. (2017). *The Federal Government's strategy for the internationalization of education, science and research*. Bonn, Germany.
- German Rectors' Conference (HRK). (2012). "German universities in the world and for the world": International strategy of the German Rectors' Conference (HRK)—Principles and guidelines, Resolution by the 4th General Assembly of 18 November 2008. *Beiträge zur Hochschulpolitik*, 2, 19–30.
- German Rectors' Conference (HRK). (2017, 9 May). Recommendations of the 22nd General Assembly of the HRK on Internationalization of Curricula. Berlin/Bonn, Germany.
- Joint Science Conference. (2013). *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 on 12 April 2013)*. Retrieved from <http://docplayer.net/3105179-Strategy-of-the-federal-and-lander-ministers-of-science-for-the-internationalisation-of-the-higher-education-institutions.html>
- Maiworm, F. (2016). *Internationalität an deutschen Hochschulen: Siebte Erhebung von Profildaten 2016 (Vorabversion)*. Studie im Auftrag der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung (AvH), des Deutschen Akademischen Austauschdienstes (DAAD) und der Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (HRK). Kassel, Germany: Gesellschaft für Empirische Studien bR, Maiworm & Over.

vbw (Bavarian Industry Association). (Eds.). (2016). *Integration durch Bildung: Migranten und Flüchtlinge in Deutschland*. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.

Mapping Internationalization of Japanese Universities: Goals, Strategies, and Indicators

Hiroshi Ota and Yuki Watabe

Higher education internationalization has long been recognized as a priority by the Japanese government, as well as by Japan's colleges and universities. In recent years, a series of national policy initiatives have promoted internationalization, with a particular focus on student mobility, educational partnerships, and international rankings. Key examples include the 300,000 International Students Plan, Global 30, Go Global Japan, the Inter-University Exchange Project, and the Top Global University program, which, collectively, entail three major quantitative targets:

- Increase the number of international students studying in Japan from 135,000 in 2013 to 300,000 by 2020
- Increase the number of Japanese students studying abroad from 60,000 in 2010 to 120,000 by 2020
- Situate 10 Japanese institutions among the top 100 universities in the world within 10 years, i.e., by 2024

Given their time horizons, it is still too early to judge whether these policies will succeed in accomplishing their goals. Progress thus far, however, suggests that the established numeric targets are likely to be a stretch. As of 2014, for example, the number of Japanese students studying abroad had actually declined to 54,000, and currently, only two Japanese universities rank among the top 100 in the world. As of 2016, 240,000 international students were studying in Japan, indicating that the goal of 300,000 by 2020 is perhaps the most likely of the three to be realized.

Beyond such quantifiable indicators, neither the government nor other organizations have undertaken national-level assessments of Japanese higher education institutions' internationalization efforts and progress. In order to begin to fill this gap, in 2014 a group of researchers at Hitotsubashi University, Tohoku University, and the National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education administered a survey to 141 Japanese universities that addressed these institutions' internationalization goals, strategies, priorities, and assessment mechanisms.

Internationalization Goals

As a framework for understanding Japanese institutions' reasons for internationalizing, the 2014 survey identified and adapted five commonly-cited internationalization goals from the Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internationalisation (IMPI) project in Europe (IMPI, n.d.). These included:

- Enhance the quality of education
- Prepare students effectively for life and work in an intercultural and globalizing world
- Enhance the quality of research
- Enhance international reputation and visibility
- Provide services to society and foster community engagement

Respondents were asked to rate how important each of these goals was to their institution on a four-point scale (1 = not important at all, 4 = very important).

Outward-facing goals focused on institutions' external reputation or engagement beyond the campus were considered less critical. One caveat, though, is that large, research-intensive universities (those with enrollments of 10,000 or more) rated "enhance international reputation and visibility" as significantly more important than did their smaller counterparts. These same universities compose the majority of institutions selected to participate in the Top Global University project, which again indicates an alignment of institutional and national policy goals, and suggests that government policies are an important driver of institutions' own internationalization objectives.

Strategies for Internationalization

To provide further insight into why and how Japanese institutions are pursuing internationalization, respondents were asked to consider how four possible approaches to internationalization factored into their own institutional internationalization strategies. Adapted from the Higher Education Institution's Responses to Europeanisation, Internationalisation and Globalisation (HEIGLO) project in Europe (van der Wende, et al., 2005), the four strategic approaches included in the survey were:

- Competition with elite institutions: Aiming for world-class university status
- Cooperation and networking with foreign universities: Strengthening the international profile of the institution in order to be seen as an attractive partner/collaborator by foreign universities

Table 1. Importance of Internationalization Goals to Selected Japanese Universities

Internationalization Goals	Mean Response
Enhance the quality of education	3.87
Prepare students effectively for life and work in an intercultural and globalizing world	3.77
Enhance the quality of research	3.65
Enhance international reputation and visibility	3.29
Prepare students effectively for life and work in an intercultural and globalizing world	3.77
Provide services to society and community social engagement	3.28

Source: Ota, Watabe, & Noda, 2016.

Table 2. Strategic Approaches to Internationalization of Selected Japanese Universities

Strategic Approach (presented in order of frequency cited as the first or second priority by respondents)	Number of respondents that chose the approach as the 1st or 2nd priority	Characteristics of Institutions Prioritizing This Approach
Domestic visibility	99 1st: 53 2nd: 46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small- and medium-sized private universities • Total enrollments: (a) less than 5,000 and (b) 10,000 -14,999 • International students: (a) fewer than 150 and (b) 300-499
Cooperation and networking	92 1st: 37 2nd: 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cited by institutions of all types
Survival	49 1st: 23 2nd: 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-medium-sized universities • Total enrollments: 5,000-9,999 • International students: fewer than 300
Competition	22 1st: 16 2nd: 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-scale national universities • Total enrollments: 15,000 or more • International students: 500 or more

Source: Ota, Watabe, & Noda, 2016.

- Domestic visibility: Raising the institution's profile within the country in order to recruit high-quality domestic students
- Survival: Recruiting international students as means of ensuring institutional survival and/or maintaining competitiveness in education and learning.

Most respondents indicated that multiple approaches were accounted for by their institution's strategies. "Cooperation and networking" and "Domestic visibility" seemed to resonate most strongly with the sample institutions; about two-third of respondents ranked these as either their first or second priority.

Like the data on internationalization goals and strategies, the assessment-related data suggest that Japanese government policies are significantly impacting institutions' internationalization priorities and activities.

As illustrated in Table 2, however, different types of institutions prioritized different approaches. For example, consistent with the data on internationalization goals noted previously, the "Competition" approach was most often cited by large, research-intensive universities; overall, though, it was the least likely among the four approaches to be considered an institutional focus.

Priority Activities and Assessment

Finally, the 2014 survey asked respondents for information about internationalization assessment – in particular, how effective they considered an array of commonly recognized indicators of internationalization. Effectiveness was defined as the extent to which the indicators were seen as useful and/or relevant for universities to assess their efforts and progress toward the specific internationalization goals and objectives of their own institutions. What institutions consider important to assess likely reflects what they are doing, and/or what they aspire to do moving forward; thus, the patterns revealed provide additional insights into internationalization priorities and activities at Japanese institutions.

Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of 152 distinct indicators, adapted from a list of 489 indicators included in the IMPI Toolbox (IMPI, n.d.), which provides resources for

institutions to use in designing internationalization assessments. The 152 indicators comprised eight categories:

- Students (21 indicators): International student demographics and domestic students' participation in international activities
- Staff (23 indicators): Academic and administrative staff demographics, skills, international activities, and internationalization-related professional development opportunities
- Administration (16 indicators): Internationalization and international affairs policy, administration, and management
- Funding and finance (14 indicators): Funding and resources for international activities
- Curricula and academic services (31 indicators): Internationally-focused curriculum content (including language study) and learning support
- Research (19 indicators): International collaborations, larger scale cross-border research activities, publications, and citations
- Promotion and marketing (7 indicators): International outreach activities, marketing materials, websites, and overall institutional visibility
- Non-academic services, and campus and community life (21 indicators): Support services for international students and study abroad students

Of the 152 indicators included, 101 were seen as "effective" (i.e., received a rating of at least three on a four-point scale). Indicators in the "non-academic services" and "administration" categories were considered most effective, while "staff" and "research" indicators were regarded as least effective.

Like the data on internationalization goals and strategies, the assessment-related data suggest that Japanese government policies are significantly impacting institutions' internationalization priorities and activities. The overall interest in "non-academic services" indicators, for example, likely reflects the policy emphasis on inbound student mobility articulated through the 300,000 International Students Plan (and the 100,000 International Students Plan that preceded it). A strong sense of effectiveness around "administration" indicators is likely related to the fact that these indicators are similar to the selection criteria and objectives of the Top Global University project and other government initiatives and funding programs.

The perception of "staff" indicators as less effective suggests that Japanese universities are still not fully attuned to the im-

portance of cultivating globally-minded faculty and administrators who are well prepared to carry out internationalization efforts. Institutions are relatively unconcerned about the international profiles of academic staff, the global dimensions of their teaching, their international activities, or their professional development. Attention to the international skills (e.g., foreign language ability) and professional development of administrative (non-academic) staff is also lacking.

While “research” indicators were perceived as relatively less effective overall, there was an important distinction between those universities that prioritized the “competition” approach to internationalization and those that focused on the other approaches described in the previous section (“cooperation and networking,” “domestic visibility,” and “survival”). The former are, as noted previously, mostly major public research universities at which research already is a top priority in general, so it is not surprising that it is a focus for internationalization, as well.

For the majority of universities in Japan, particularly the private institutions that comprise 80% of the country’s higher education system, research tends to be seen as a matter of individual faculty or research units, rather than of the institution as a whole. Many of these institutions cannot afford to engage in international research, so it makes sense that research-related internationalization indicators would not be particularly effective for them.

Looking Forward

Overall, the results of the 2014 survey highlight the impact of major national policy initiatives on the internationalization goals, strategies, and priorities of Japanese colleges and universities, and indicate a fairly close alignment between government and institutional objectives. Student mobility and global learning are at the forefront for much of the sector, while international visibility and research are key priorities for a subset of universities, whose international activities in these realms are supported by targeted government policies.

When it comes to assessing internationalization outcomes – both at the national and institutional levels – Japan still has a long way to go. Quality assurance in general is a relatively new concept to Japanese higher education, with a mandatory accreditation scheme in place only since 2004. Assessment of internationalization is even newer, and is not typically done by institutions with any consistency; of the 152 indicators included in the 2014 survey, there were only 19 for which more than 50% of respondents reported that they collect data on a regular basis.

Building on the 2014 survey, more data is needed on the out-

comes and effectiveness of national policies and institutional internationalization efforts – not only to understand the impact of initiatives and activities in retrospect, but to drive decisionmaking, resource allocation, and program development going forward. Given the clear priority of student engagement and learning at both the national and institutional levels, assessing the impact of internationalization initiatives on the student experience – beyond numbers of participants – will be particularly critical.

References

- IMPI (n.d.). Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internationalisation. Retrieved from <http://www.impi-toolbox.eu/>
- Ota, H., Watabe, Y., & Noda, A. (2016). *Assessment of University Internationalization: A Case Study of Japan*. Retrieved from http://www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/apeid/HigherEdu/Indicators-Nov2016/2-HiroshiOta-HitotsubashiUniversity.pdf
- Van der Wende, M., Coate, K., Kontigiannopoulou-Polydorides, G., Luijten-Lub, A., Papadiamantaki, Y., Stamelos, G., et al. (2005). International comparative analysis. In J. Huisman & M. Van der Wende (Eds.), *On cooperation and competition II: Institutional responses to internationalisation, Europeanisation and globalisation* (pp. 201-233). Bonn, Germany: Lemmens

Internationalization of Higher Education in Mexico: Progress and Challenges

Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila

Mexico is the world’s 11th largest economy and is considered an upper middle-income country in transition to a “stage of development driven by innovation” (World Economic Forum, 2016). Mexico has the potential to become an international trade hub (it is already a top global exporter of some commodities), but its persistent low growth rate (2.8%) over the last two decades (World Bank Group, 2016) contrasts with the economic development of nations like Chile, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, or Malaysia¹. Major gaps between Mexican states in terms of competitiveness, productivity, income, and opportunities among regions, economic sectors, and social groups seem to account for this paradoxical situation. While some competitive states in Mexico contribute 42% to the national gross domestic product, others contribute only 22%. And while 10% of the industries are increasing in productivity, the remaining 90% are declining. This situation has prompted Mexico to be perceived as one country running at two different speeds (Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad (IMCO), 2016).

Mexico ranks 57th on the World Competitiveness Index, be-

hind Chile (33rd) but ahead of Brazil (81st) and Argentina (116th) (World Economic Forum, 2016). Adverse factors like extensive inequality, poverty, insufficient educational attainment, weak law enforcement, and high levels of corruption are some of the reasons for this situation. Additionally, low performance in the 2015 Program for International Students Assessment (PISA) shows that one of Mexico's highest needs is to strengthen basic education in order to foster the acquisition of basic, generic, and soft skills. A reform of tertiary education (TE) is also needed to encourage knowledge generation, innovation, and structural changes.

Tertiary Education in Mexico

Despite a series of public policies launched in the 1990s to improve quality, access, pertinence, and equity through funding granted on the basis of quality assurance and accountability, indicators show that Mexico has not yet achieved international standards. Deeper reforms are required to improve, in particular, learning outcomes and skills. Mexico's 30% enrollment rate is significantly below the 45% regional average for Latin America, and is heavily concentrated at the bachelor's level in the fields of law, business, and administration (41%), with a 25% unemployment rate among graduates (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2012). While the participation rate of the poorest groups in society is 16%, enrollment of the wealthiest segment is disproportionately higher, at 46%. Only one Mexican institution ranks in the 2016 Academic Ranking of World Universities among the top 201-300. The Science Citation Index indicates low performance in research compared with Brazil (the region's research and publication leader), while only 7% of faculty members hold a PhD (Brunner & Miranda, 2016).

Hence, despite progress made in the last two decades, Mexico requires further development of its tertiary sector in access, relevance, faculty professionalization, and knowledge production.

The Internationalization Process in Mexico

In a study carried out by the British Council (Ilieva & Peak, 2016), which assesses the national policy frameworks for international engagement in 26 countries, the Mexican government is ranked as one of the least supportive in the world.

This study identifies three areas where national governments can provide enabling environments to their higher education institutions (HEIs) to internationalize and forge collaborations:

- a) openness of the respective education system, measured through government-level commitment to internationalization and the provision of an enabling environment for the international mobility of students, researchers, academic programs, and university research.
- b) a regulatory environment that aims to help the international mobility of students, education providers, and academic programs—such as quality assurance practices and recognition of international qualifications.
- c) equitable access and sustainable development policies, drawing on existing infrastructure and funding to promote student and academic mobility and international research collaboration.

Under item "a", Mexico ranked "very low" (against a "high" in the case of Brazil). Under item "b", Mexico scored "very low". And under item "c", Mexico ranked "high". Mexico's overall score was "low", while emerging countries—such as China, India, Indonesia, Thailand, Turkey, and Vietnam—scored "high".

As far as academic collaboration is concerned, according to a survey conducted by the Regional Observatory on Internationalization and Tertiary Education Networks in Latin America and the Caribbean (OBIRET), the three most important regions for engagement by higher education institutions in Latin America are: Western Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), and North America (Gacel-Ávila & Rodríguez-Rodríguez, 2017).

According to Maldonado-Maldonado, Cortes Velasco, and Ibarra Cázares (2016), international student mobility rose in the region from 11,371 in 2010 to 18,281 in 2014, in terms of outgoing students; and from 7,689 to 12,789 for the same period of time, with respect to incoming students. Mobility (78%) is mainly taking place at the bachelor's degree level in the social sciences, and in the fields of business administration and law. The private sector is particularly active in relation to student mobility, accounting for 70% of all mobile Mexican students. The top five destinations for outbound

¹ Growth rates for these countries have increased from 4% to 6% in the last 25 years.

² Mexico achieved a score of 423 in reading, in contrast with the OECD average of 493 points. In mathematics Mexico scored 408 points versus the OECD average of 490; and in science, 416 against the OECD average of 493 points (OECD 2016).

³ This is the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM).

⁴ In 2013, Mexico published only 15.4% of the articles in the Science Citation Index while Brazil published.

⁵ 4.4% (Red de Indicadores de Ciencia y Tecnología Interamericana 2016).

Mexican students are Spain, the United States, France, Germany, and Canada, while the main destinations in LAC are Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Costa Rica. Thus, the most popular region of destination is Europe (8,757 students), followed by North America (4,649), and Latin America (2,967).

The regions sending the highest number of incoming students into Mexico in 2012–2013 were Europe, North America, and South America, while in 2013–2014, North America and South America switched positions (Maldonado, Cortes Velasco, & Ibarra Cázeres, 2016). Open Doors 2015 (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2015) underlined a 17% increase in Mexican students to the United States, mainly due to programs such as “100,000 Strong in the Americas”, and Mexico’s “Proyecto 100,000”; placing Mexico as the 10th most popular source country for international students in the United States.

Although these are important increases in international mobility, Mexico, like the rest of LAC, is one of the world regions with the smallest numbers of students abroad and incoming students, especially if compared with other emerging regions like Asia, and even Africa (see Table 1).

Scholar mobility is difficult to assess, given the absence of regional databases. Nevertheless, according to Open Doors 2015 (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2015), Mexican scholars hold the 14th position (1,646) in terms of the source country for international scholars in the United States, below Brazil (in 7th position, with 4,394) and ahead of Colombia (in 22nd place with 765).

With some urgency, the Mexican government should back up institutional efforts through public policies and increased funding for internationalization.

Student and faculty mobility are by far the main activities related to the internationalization of the curriculum, with an increased number of initiatives focused on improving significantly Mexican students’ English language skills (Ilieva & Peak, 2016) to enhance their mobility prospects. Mexico is a leader in the region for collaborative programs with Brazil, Argentina, and Colombia, mainly at the bachelor’s degree level in private institutions, and in areas such as administration, engineering, the humanities and social sciences, with main partners being institutions in France and Spain (Gacel-Ávila & Rodríguez-Rodríguez, 2017).

Concerning research collaboration, Mexican academics are

among the most active in the region together with the Brazilians, achieving a 40% collaboration index according to Sci-mago (2015). As a result, knowledge production has mainly increased in the past decade thanks to international cooperation with European (French, German, Spanish) and US partners (Gacel-Ávila & Rodríguez-Rodríguez, 2017).

Universities’ organizational structures related to internationalization have improved significantly in the last decade thanks to a greater importance given to internationalization by educational leaders when it comes to institutional agendas.

Universities’ organizational structures related to internationalization have improved significantly in the last decade thanks to a greater importance given to internationalization by educational leaders when it comes to institutional agendas. Nevertheless, according a recent survey conducted by OBIRET (Gacel-Ávila & Bustos-Aguirre, 2017) among members of the Mexican Association for Internationalization (AMPEI), the limited professionalization of management and institutionalization of structures are still undermining the sustainability of internationalization strategies. Indeed, the large majority of international offices (IO) (71%) occupy a second-level position on the organizational hierarchy in contrast with 60% of universities around the world where this position sits at a first level (vice-rector/vice-president) position (Egron Polak & Hudson, 2010). The relatively high turnover of heads of IO, who hold their positions for less than 4 years on average, is noteworthy.

Overall, the internationalization process in Mexico demonstrates positive trends, with an increase in mobility schemes, English language instruction, collaborative programs, research collaboration, and international visibility of knowledge production. Nevertheless, numbers are still relatively low compared with Asian countries. With some urgency, the Mexican government should back up institutional efforts through public policies and increased funding for internationalization. Institutionalization of organizational structures and professionalization of management should also be a priority, to enhance the sustainability of internationalization strategies.

Table 1. International Student Mobility by World Region

	Outbound			Inbound		
	Outbound mobile students #	Outbound mobile students Regional %	Outbound mobility ratio %	Inbound mobile students #	Inbound mobile students Regional %	Inbound mobility ratio %
East Asia and the Pacific	1,298,061	27.8	1.8	771,162	17.8	1.4
North America and West Europe	639,764	14.7	1.5	2,417,856	55.8	5.6
Central and Eastern Europe	427,342	9.7	1.8	513,153	11.8	1.5
South and West Asia	408,162	9.4	1.2	53,257	1.2	0.1
Arab States	391,977	9.0	3.1	307,373	7.0	2.7
Sub-Saharan Africa	299,991	7.0	4.9	134,137	3.0	1.7
Latin America and the Caribbean	227,819	5.2	0.9	96,682	2.2	0.3
Central Asia	219,683	5.0	5.8	39,080	0.9	2.1
Not specified	509,901	11.7	0	0	0	0
World	4,332,700	100	2.0	4,332,700	100	2.0

Source: Assembled by the author based on UNESCO, Institute for Statistics 2017.

Note: Data for outbound and inbound mobile students corresponds to 2015. Both outbound mobility and inbound mobility ratios are from 2012, the last year UNESCO reported on these indicators.

Definitions: The outbound mobility ratio is the total of students from a given country/region studying abroad, expressed as a percentage of total tertiary enrollment in that country/region. The inbound mobility ratio is the total number of students from abroad studying in a given country/region, expressed as a percentage of the total enrollment in that country/region (UNESCO Institute of Statistics 2012, 69).

References

- Brunner, J. J., & Miranda, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Educación Superior en Iberoamérica. Informe 2016*. Santiago de Chile: Universia-CINDA.
- Egron Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2010). *Internationalization of Higher Education: Global trends, regional perspectives*. IAU 3th Global Survey. (E. Egron-Polak, & H. R, Eds.) International Association of Universities.
- Farrugia, C. A., & Bhandari, R. (2015). *Open Doors 2015 Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Gacel-Ávila, J., & Bustos-Aguirre. (2017). *La Internacionalización en México*. *Educacion Global*, 21.
- Gacel-Ávila, J., & Rodríguez-Rodríguez, S. (2017). *I Encuesta Regional sobre Tendencias de Internacionalización en Educación Terciaria*. OBIRET. Guadalajara: UNESCO-IESALC.
- Ilieva, J., & Peak, M. (2016). *The Shape of Global Higher Education: National Policies Framework for International Engagement*. London: British Council.
- Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad (IMCO). (2016). *Índice de Competitividad Estatal 2016: Un puente entre dos Méxicos*. Ciudad de México: IMCO.
- Maldonado, A., Cortes Velasco, C., & Ibarra Cázeres, B. (2016). *Patlani. Encuesta mexicana de movilidad internacional estudiantil*. Ciudad de México: ANUIES.
- OECD. (2016). *PISA 2015 Results (Volume I). Excellence and Equity in Education (Vol. I)*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Red de Indicadores de Ciencia y Tecnología Interamericana. (2016). *Indicadores*. Retrieved December 9, 2016, from <http://www.riicyt.org/indicadores>
- Scimago Institutions Rankings. (2015). *Ranking Iberoamericano SIR 2015*. SIR.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2017). *UNESCO-UIS Stat*. Retrieved May 17, 2017, from <http://data.uis.unesco.org/>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2012). *Education digest 2012: Opportunities lost: The impact of grade repetition and early school leaving*. Montreal: UNESCO.
- World Bank Group. (2016). *World Development Indicators 2016*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Economic Forum. (2016). *Global Competitiveness Report 2016-2017*. Cologny: WEF.

Internationalization of South African Higher Education: An Overview

Nico Jooste

The internationalization of the South African higher education system and its universities was an unintentional activity during the period from 1948 to 1994. International mobility consisted mainly of students and scholars leaving South Africa due to its political system, to study and work outside the country. Movement was driven by the country's dual academic origins, linked to Dutch universities through the Afrikaans universities, or to universities in the United Kingdom through South Africa's English universities. Prior to 1994, international cooperation as an aspect of South African higher education was greatly restricted as a consequence of the country's political and economic isolation.

The period from 1994 to 2014 saw the transformation of a once fragmented and racially defined higher education system into a single but diverse system, serving the whole population and providing a full spectrum of academic programs. The South African Higher Education Act of 1997 established a legal framework for the reconstituted system, ensuring diversity and quality while allowing considerable autonomy for institutions to govern themselves. The National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) and a 1997 White Paper on Higher Education have also been key drivers of the redefinition of South African higher education since 1994. These policy instruments have had to address, simultaneously, South Africa's reconstruction and developmental needs, as well as its positioning to respond to the challenges of globalization. They do not, however, offer a detailed vision, or specific principles, goals, or strategies for the internationalization of higher education (Council on Higher Education, 2004, p. 213).

The first instance of a concrete governmental stance on higher education internationalization activities emerged in the early 2000s in relation to the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and transnational education. The South African minister of education stated:

Education is surely not a commodity to be bought and sold. A reductionist view of education as merely an instrument for the transfer of skills should have no place in our world-view. Education must embrace the intellectual, cultural, political, and social development of individuals, institutions and the nation more broadly. We cannot sacrifice this "public good" agenda to the vagaries of the market (Asmal, 2003, p. 47).

Also in part as a response to GATS, in a report to the minister of education issued in 2004, the Council on Higher Education (CHE) (a semi-autonomous governmental organization) distinguished between globalization and internationalization, and emphasized the need for the latter—particularly student mobility and academic collaboration—in the context of the former. The report stated:

Globalization and internationalization are viewed as distinct concepts rather than as different sides of the same coin. Globalization is one aspect of the context within which higher education operates, and which renders consideration of the international dimension of higher education important. However, internationalization of higher education does not mean a blurring of the boundaries between state, market and higher education institutions (HEIs)—as globalization does....

Internationalization is closely linked to the fact that nation-states, which have autonomous but interdependent higher education institutions, have a fair degree of control over who can provide higher education and what counts for higher education. It has essentially to do with the fact that international exchange students and staff, and international collaboration in the production of knowledge, are central to the life-world of the modern nation-state university (CHE, 2004, p. 213).

While these statements provide a general sense of the South African government's orientation toward higher education internationalization—in favor of outward-facing activities that enrich the educational experience, but denouncing a profit motive—they have not been translated into specific policies or laws that dictate the activities of institutions.

Internationalization Driven by Institutions

In the absence of a national policy, strategy, or vision on the internationalization of higher education, it is largely up to South African institutions to internationalize the system and themselves. Internationalization per se is funded through the normal budgets of universities; i.e., no specific funding is set aside at the governmental level for internationalization purposes. This practice has influenced the degree of internationalization at the institutional level, leading to an unequal development of internationalization, aligned with the historically uneven patterns of institutional development in South Africa in general.

At this stage, however, most South African universities have included some element of internationalization in their strategic plans. As part of the government's reporting system for South African public institutions, all universities are required

to submit a formal strategic plan to the South African Department of Higher Education. A study of these plans confirms that aspects of internationalization and the recognition of the institutional connectedness to the global context are present among them. Notably, a 2016 analysis conducted by Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University of the ten South African universities where most international students study and that are considered to be the furthest developed in their internationalization endeavors, reveals the following:

- Internationalization is seen to be the major enabler to enhance research and new knowledge creation.
- A comprehensive approach to internationalization enhances the development of an internationalization at home mindset that can assist with the development of global competencies in students. Most of the universities are implementing internationalization at home strategies relevant to their own needs. Outward mobility is not a major driver of internationalization, as it is out of reach for most due to financial constraints.
- Most universities have developed clear strategies to manage international students and have established the necessary infrastructure to manage international activities.
- Internationalization is still seen as a luxury by more than 50% of the institutions and, as such, the application of policies and development of capacity to support internationalization activities is uneven.
- Internationalization is seen to assist in the improvement of institutional status and, as a result, leads to improvement of positioning in world rankings.

It is clear that, due to the absence of a national strategy, institutional needs determine the internationalization strategies undertaken, not national or supranational needs. The major driver toward participation in external research and mobility programs is normally the availability of funding and not internationalization strategies.

International Students by the Numbers

International student enrollment in South African universities has increased dramatically since 1994. The number of international students more than quadrupled from 7,031 contact students (those studying on campus, as opposed to those studying via distance education) in 1994 to 40,213 in 2015; the 2015 figure represents 7% of the total student population for that year. While the growth in international student numbers is significant, it is important to note that it is occurring in a context of major growth in the higher education system as a whole; the ratio of international students to local students

has, in fact, remained constant since 2007.

Of these 40,000 international students in South Africa in 2015, about one-third were enrolled at the master's or PhD level. The South African system is very attractive to international graduate students, particularly from other parts of Africa; indeed, most South African campuses are characterized by the focus they place on graduate engagement across Africa and their robust efforts to recruit students at this level.

At the same time, South Africa is also home to large numbers of students and researchers from Europe and the United States. South Africa hosted 4,968 US undergraduate and graduate students in 2013–2014. It is not only the major destination in Africa for US students, but it also ranks among the top ten destination countries globally for US students (Farrugia & Bhandhari, 2015).

In the absence of a national policy, strategy, or vision on the internationalization of higher education, it is largely up to South African institutions to internationalize the system and themselves.

Knowledge Creation and Global Engagement

The historical ties of South African higher education to Europe and the presence of students and scholars from around the world create an interesting environment for knowledge production bringing together Western and African perspectives. Certainly, South Africa, like the rest of Africa, remains peripheral to the world's knowledge systems. Still, universities in South Africa are the most instrumental institutions in allowing South Africa to participate in the global knowledge arena on its own terms; that is, as entities able to identify African realities, taking responsibility for the production of knowledge about those realities, and infusing that knowledge into global knowledge systems.

Although the significant growth in connections with South Africa is encouraging, it should be stressed that real academic engagement by the United States and other countries with South Africa should be elaborated through formal links between universities, even if it is just to plan and facilitate a short faculty-led program. Too often, South Africa is used as if it were a laboratory that can be visited for a few weeks and then "closed" for a year or more. Real engagement with South African universities, with all their facilities, provides not only

a true international experience that speaks to comprehensive internationalization, but allows for authentic participation in a real context of social change, focused on finding real solutions to inequality and discrimination.

Possibilities and Pitfalls of a New National Policy

Looking forward, a potential game changer for the future can be seen in the April 2017 publication of the Draft Policy Framework for the Internationalization of Higher Education (National Gazette, 2017). The draft policy document indicates that its purpose is to provide high-level principles and guidelines, and a broad framework for the internationalization of South African higher education. If implemented as envisaged, it would develop a system where the principles of mutuality, complementarity, quality, and ethical behavior will form the basis for internationalization.

One of the key aspects of the future policy would be the permission given to institutions to develop their own internationalization strategies. It would also greatly enhance the offering of joint international programs and continue to regulate the role of foreign providers that intend to deliver higher education in South Africa. Ongoing oversight by the CHE would guarantee program quality.

The draft policy clearly touches on a number of important issues. However, funding and managerial capacity, which represent major barriers to equal access and implementation of internationalization, are still to be addressed, either in the final version of the policy, or through different mechanisms within the higher education funding regime. If not remedied, the lack of attention to these matters could further aggravate uneven implementation and unequal access to internationalization among South African higher education institutions. The devil, as they say, will continue to be in the details.

References

- Asmal, K. (2003). Address to the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry on the Implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services on Higher Education (4 March 2003). Kagisano, CHE Higher Education Discussion Series. Issue No. 3 (Autumn 2003), 47-53. Retrieved from http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/Kagisano_Issue3_2003.pdf
- Council on Higher Education. (2004). South African higher education in the first decade of democracy. Pretoria: Author. Retrieved from http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/SA_HE_10years_Nov2004.pdf
- Farrugia, C & Bhandari, R. (2015). Open Doors, Report on International Educational Exchange, 2015. New York: Institute of Education.
- National Gazette. (2017). Draft Policy Framework for the Internationalisation of Higher Education in South Africa (2017). Call for public comments on the Draft Policy Framework for the Internationalisation of Higher Education in South Africa. National Gazettes. Volume 622, No 40815.

Retrieved from https://www.greengazette.co.za/documents/national-gazette-40815-of-28-april-2017-vol-622_20170428-GGN-40815

The UK at an International Crossroads

Raegan Hiles

Higher education plays an important part in the social and cultural landscape of the United Kingdom (UK), and in the past two elections has featured unusually prominently in election policy. This has brought discussions about the role of higher education in society to the fore, and with other prominent political questions focusing around immigration and globalization, the intersectionality of education and international policy has become a key issue.

Universities have been vocal in discussions about the UK's international relationships. In the 2016 referendum about European Union (EU) membership, universities were strong advocates for the "Remain" position. Universities UK, the representative Vice-Chancellors' association and the voice of UK universities, ran a high-profile campaign, called 'Universities for Europe,' in the run up to the referendum. The campaign resonated strongly with sympathetic audiences, but failed to gain traction among those already in the "Leave" camp.

The UK's education and policy landscapes are truly international, operating in multiple tiers: local (regional) to national (including the UK's four constituent nations); European (including the UK's current EU membership); and global (often referred to as 'non-EU'). Over half of the UK's university research outputs are collaboratively authored, with 13 of the top 20 collaboration partners being EU member states. Horizon 2020, the EU Research and Innovation program, includes six of the UK's top 10 research partners and the UK coordinates one in six Horizon 2020 projects.

The people leading and participating in UK higher education illustrate the value that the university sector places on international relationships. In 2015-2016, 17% of UK university staff were from the EU and 12% came from further afield; the number of EU academics in the UK has more than doubled in the last decade. Outward student mobility is also a high priority – although take-up is low compared to other countries, over 27,000 UK domiciled students went overseas to work, study, or volunteer in 2015-2016. EU links are important within that; the EU's Erasmus+ program facilitated 55% of study abroad activity in 2015-2016.

The value placed on higher education internationalization is also reflected in various government policies and priori-

ties (UK-wide and at the level of the four individual countries comprising the UK). Despite some recent resurgence of nationalist rhetoric in UK politics, and well-documented restrictions on immigration policy, government departments continue to call for a globally engaged nation. They look in particular to the education sector, and emphasize the importance of universities in leading this. Policies highlight the need for world-ready graduates, suited to the global economy and workplace. Ministries fund overseas delegations and encourage the export of higher education as a means of expanding knowledge environments. Departments commission and publish research to inform international strategy and highlight universities' role in both contributing to and benefitting from a global economy. Ministers nurture ideas of engaging with the challenges of today's society, and using higher education to find solutions – both in the UK and overseas.

The UK does not, however, have a unified international education strategy, and not all policies relating to international activity work in synergy. Moreover, what international expectations there are around education do not stipulate what universities should do or how they should act. Institutional autonomy is a key value to the success of UK higher education, and while most UK universities now have international strategies, the focus of those depends on the overall ambition and context of the individual university and its governance.

Leadership and Strategy

In recent years, the UK has seen the rise of a new cadre of university pro-vice-chancellors who have specific responsibility for international work – a role almost unheard of 5-10 years ago. Universities UK's international directorate (UUKi), which works to enable UK universities to flourish internationally, has similarly grown in scale to support the increasing emphasis on international activities. Organizations like the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education and the Higher Education Academy also play key roles in shaping institutional governance for international activity, pedagogy for curriculum development and integration, and delivery practices for staff responsible for program management 'on the ground'.

Almost all UK universities now have international strategies – again, almost unheard of 5-10 years ago. A particularly recent development is the tendency for international strategies to be explicitly linked to or referenced in the institution-wide strategy. Many have specified targets in 'new' international growth areas, e.g., outward student mobility or transnational education (TNE).

Outward Student Mobility

Work, study, and volunteer experiences abroad are recognized as having a significant impact on student and graduate success, but participation in outward student mobility in the UK is low. In 2014-2015, just over 6% of UK students spent some time overseas as part of their studies.

Three successive series of UUKi graduate cohort studies have found that those students who worked, studied, or volunteered overseas during their studies generally achieved stronger academic and employment outcomes than counterparts who were not mobile (Richard, Lowe, & Hanks, DATE needed). Correlation does not, of course, equal causality—and work and grades are not the only benefits of mobility. Nonetheless, alongside other qualitative research evidencing the life-changing impact of outward mobility, the case for positive outcomes related to student mobility is strong.

Universities have been vocal in discussions about the UK's international relationships. In the 2016 referendum about European Union (EU) membership, universities were strong advocates for the "Remain" position.

UUKi's research has repeatedly shown that the benefits of international mobility are potentially greatest for underrepresented groups. There is a drive to address this, including through initiatives such as EU funded projects. UUKi and the Irish University Association will both launch "toolkits" of good practice in December 2017 to support widening participation in study abroad. Examples include some English universities that promote participation in outward mobility for underrepresented groups via their Access Agreements with the Office for Fair Access¹. This is particularly important for institutional progress not just in terms of internationalization but also as a means of aligning university teams across departments around a common aim.

Having identified increasing participation in mobility as a priority for universities, UUKi launched a revised strategy for outward student mobility in early 2017. It seeks to double

¹ The Office for Fair Access (OFFA) is the independent public body that regulates fair access to higher education in England. It promotes and safeguards fair access to higher education for people from lower income backgrounds and other underrepresented groups. For more information, see <https://www.offa.org.uk/about/>

outward student mobility among full-time, UK domiciled undergraduate students by 2020; it also focuses on improving opportunity and participation among disadvantaged student populations. The strategy was formulated by UUKi in collaboration with the higher education sector, and UUKi is coordinating a national campaign to encourage universities to deliver the strategy (UUKi, n.d.).

Research and Development Assistance

The UK's universities already conduct collaborative research in a range of countries, both EU and non-EU. The proportion of papers with an international co-author produced in the UK increased by 76% from 2006 to 2013. Collaboration is recognized as vital for research and problem solving with global relevance.

Increasingly, research conducted by UK universities is focused on answering societal challenges, and improving the evidence base for global problem solving. This is reflected in national priorities and the government's foreign, educational, and research policies. For example, the Official Development Assistance (ODA) Aid budget aims to "create a safer and more prosperous world". One of the ways that higher education works within the ODA landscape is through the Newton Fund. Launched in 2014, the Fund is a government initiative that aims to build science and innovation partnerships with 18 partner countries. It is administered by the UK Department for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and is implemented by 15 UK delivery partners (predominately sector agencies, often research councils or learned societies). The activities offered in each partner country are chosen and developed in collaboration with local government and funders to ensure that the programs offered meet local development priorities.

With its intercultural dynamic and focus on partnerships, the Newton Fund has added to policy and practice in international research management. The first two years saw around 420 research projects funded; over 1,000 fellowships, placements, and mobility grants awarded; and some 1,750 research links between the UK and Newton partner countries.

Transnational Education (TNE)

In 2015-2016, over 701,000 students studied for UK degrees outside the UK. The trajectory for the UK's recent TNE expansion is phenomenal, with 5.3% growth in the last year, and 17% since 2012-2013. More overseas students study for UK degrees outside the UK than within its borders, with delivery

offered through a multitude of modes: from distance learning (the vast majority of TNE, at 52%) to branch campuses (at 4% a small proportion, but important for reputational impact and visibility). UK degrees are now available offshore from 83% of the UK's universities in all but 15 countries. There are 39 offshore UK university campuses – second only to the United States' 77 offshore campuses (Cross-Border Education Research Team, 2017).

It is estimated that TNE earned the UK GBP510 million in 2014-2015, with further export contributions through articulation arrangements (whereby students transfer to study for some years in the UK), and a 'halo' effect (whereby a UK university's presence in another country generates additional value, such as access to foreign research funding or promotion for the UK education sector as a whole). The UK government departments, therefore, recognize TNE as a major export opportunity, and universities are increasingly turning to TNE in their international strategies to expand their global footprint.

The financial benefits of TNE for UK higher education institutions are substantial, but the motivations and benefits are not generally monetary. Current TNE initiatives reflect a maturity in the design and set up of overseas degree programs, with greater focus on the student experience and alignment of the programs developed with local student and employer needs. Interactions between UK delivery partners and in-country hosts for new programs are more equitable than earlier arrangements. However, while the balance of accountability may be more even in terms of service delivery and support infrastructure, UK partners generally lead on curriculum, quality assurance, and assessment.

Looking ahead, four in five UK universities plan to increase their TNE activities. This is in part due to the pace of change in emerging markets where UK higher education has a good reputation. It is also a response to the pressure for institutions to continue to internationalize, as TNE partnerships often act as a means to solidify existing relationships or set the stage for future collaborations.

What and Where Next?

Government policies and programs that support UK higher education's internationalization activities are multi-layered. This might seem sometimes like being tasked with initiatives at cross purposes, with policy goals that some might suggest are extrinsic to the academic enterprise itself. TNE is often discussed as an export commodity; the Newton Fund is an

²A definition of Official Development Assistance can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/official-development-assistance-oda--2>

³Countries partnering with the UK in the Newton Fund as of September 2017 are: Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, South Africa and wider Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam. They are all on the OECD Development Assistance Committee's list of ODA recipients.

ODA mechanism with political dimensions; and outward student mobility is often framed as a route to improve graduate employability. Where is the basis of academic pursuit so intrinsic to the original purpose of education? In practice, we find that the academic imperative is very much at the heart of all these endeavors: the potential to marry the multiple global aims through education places UK universities in a strong position to meet policy agendas and advance internationally.

While the UK faces a new political future, UUKi's data and interactions with member institutions indicate that higher education institutions and their leaders remain committed to internationalization. Underpinning this is the genuine desire for equity, improved access to learning, cultural awareness, and ultimately a better world; all aspirations which demand internationally driven leadership in UK higher education institutions and global connectivity.

References

- Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT). (2017) Branch Campus Listing. Retrieved from http://cbert.org/?page_id=34
- Richard, N., Lowe, R., & Hanks, C. (2017). *Gone international: Mobility works*. London: Go International and Universities UK International. Retrieved from http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/International/GoneInternational2017_A4.pdf
- Universities UK International (UUKi). (n.d.). *Go International: Stand Out*. Retrieved from <http://go.international.ac.uk/standout>

Disparities and Parallels in Internationalization: The Ethiopian Experience

Wondwosen Tamrat and Damtew Teferra

Note: This article was originally published in *International Higher Education* (#92, Winter 2018).

Interest and involvement in the internationalization of higher education are unavoidably on the rise across both the developed and developing worlds. In both contexts, institutions are increasingly enticed to conform to this emerging trend. However, differences abound due to the influence of contextual factors such as prevailing needs, capacity, resources, institutional status, and ambitions. We examine the manners in which internationalization is realized in developed and developing countries by exploring such factors as motives, approaches, policies, strategies, and the nature of institutional relationships in the Ethiopian context. We believe that such an exercise is instrumental to plan and develop frameworks that are relevant to Ethiopian higher education,

instead of opting for wholesale adoption from elsewhere.

Higher education in Ethiopia began in 1950 with the establishment of the University College of Addis Ababa. The sector remained elitist in its orientation until the end of the 1990s—with two universities, a student population of about 38,000, and a gross enrollment ratio (GER) of 0.8 percent, which was very low even by African standards. Over the last two decades, the sector has achieved phenomenal growth. The number of public institutions has reached 36—with 11 more projected in the coming few years. There are 110 private institutions—four of which with a university status. The sector accommodates over 700,000 students—85 percent in the public sector—and has a GER of 10 percent. This fast changing landscape has increasingly brought internationalization to the fore as a major mechanism to address the numerous challenges associated with fast “massifying” systems.

Ethiopian universities are aware of the importance of internationalization in terms of perceived benefits in improving teaching and learning, student and teacher development, and standards and quality. Their dominant forms of engagement relate primarily to teaching and research collaborations and international research projects.

Disparities and Parallels

With regard to motives, the engagement of Ethiopian higher education institutions (HEIs) in internationalization has been driven mainly by emerging needs. The aggressive expansion in the sector has raised formidable challenges in terms of qualified staff availability and research output. Currently, PhD staff within the HE sector still stands at 15 percent despite government's plan to raise it to 30 percent by 2019–2020. Research output has also been rather low due to, among other factors, poor research traditions, excessive teaching loads, deficiency in skills—and of course funding constraints.

Ethiopian universities are aware of the importance of internationalization in terms of perceived benefits in improving teaching and learning, student and teacher development, and standards and quality. Their dominant forms of engage-

ment relate primarily to teaching and research collaborations and international research projects. The government further envisages enhancing such collaborations and international exchanges in the interest of advancing the effectiveness of teaching and learning and the quality of academic programs and research.

When internationalizing, universities give the highest importance to PhD and masters programs, in that order. In terms of academic disciplines, engineering and health sciences take the lead. This appears logical, given the serious shortages of highly qualified personnel at these levels and in these disciplines. As a corollary, the dominant rationales identified for Ethiopian HEIs, as in most other African countries, relate more to academic than to economic, political, and/or cultural rationales. Issues of international student recruitment and using internationalization as a source of prestige, which appear to be dominant features of HEIs in the North and are increasingly emerging in developing economies, are not yet the focus of Ethiopian institutions.

Institutions recognize the importance of national policies in shaping institutional policies on internationalization, but, to date, no such policies exist. The lack of a comprehensive policy on internationalization is acknowledged by a recent government document: *The Education Sector Development Program V*, which envisages the preparation and approval of a national policy and institutional collaboration strategy on internationalization in the period 2016–2020. Establishing a national unit or body to promote, monitor, and evaluate the internationalization of Ethiopian higher education, as well as developing and implementing a strategy to attract foreign students, is also included in the plan. However, this has yet to materialize.

A peculiar and instructive feature of internationalization in Ethiopia is the presence of regulatory regimes and frameworks that are not always available elsewhere, even in developed countries.

The lack of strategic engagement in promoting internationalization is widely discernible across universities. Most of the institutions that have initiated and managed partnerships with foreign institutions have not handled their engagements in an organized and systematic manner, due to lack of resources and clear directions. At the larger universities, initia-

tives are managed at different levels without being communicated to the higher echelons of the institute or the particular office in charge.

Equally serious is the paucity of data on many aspects of internationalization, further compounded by weak knowledge management systems that impinge on information flows at various levels. Institutions attribute these weaknesses to the excessive burden of mundane but critical issues, such as student accommodations, catering, and leisure, keeping their attention from more strategic tasks.

While the trend in Ethiopia, in terms of improved awareness and readiness toward internationalization, is upbeat, there is still an urgent need to address existing deficiencies—with regard to issues of policy, strategic direction, systems, and frameworks.

Most relationships established by Ethiopian universities are largely North–South rather than South–South, with Europe as the preferred continent for collaborations—distantly followed by North America. These lopsided partnerships are mainly attributed to the disparity in financial resources and capacity. In most cases, local institutions are mere “recipients” and the elements of reciprocity are not evident. There have also been instances of Northern partners seeking to achieve their own objectives without too much regard to the needs and aspirations of their local partners and, at times, their own funders.

A peculiar and instructive feature of internationalization in Ethiopia is the presence of regulatory regimes and frameworks that are not always available elsewhere, even in developed countries. Academic recognition and equivalence arrangements for foreign qualifications was for a long time a task of the ministry of education (MoE). Any recognition of foreign credentials within the civil service required passing through the ministry’s scrutiny. This role, and the additional responsibility of granting accreditation to cross-border higher education providers, have been transferred to the Higher Education Relevance and Quality Agency (HERQA), established in 2003. The agency uses its double mandate to keep dubious credentials and unscrupulous providers at bay.

The Way Forward

The above analysis demonstrates the need to understand

global trends, national frameworks, and institutional contexts when navigating the internationalization terrain and setting one's own agenda. While the trend in Ethiopia, in terms of improved awareness and readiness toward internationalization, is upbeat, there is still an urgent need to address existing deficiencies—with regard to issues of policy, strategic direction, systems, and frameworks. Yet, given the multitude of challenges they are constantly confronting, HEIs in Ethiopia, and many others in similar nascent systems elsewhere, will probably continue to struggle with the complexities of internationalization—for many years to come.

Emerging Paradoxes of Internationalization in Higher Education

Hans de Wit and Laura E. Rumbley

Synergies and Complexities Across a Global Landscape

In recent years, a number of surveys and studies on internationalization of higher education (De Wit et al, 2015, Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014), as well as the contributions to this Brief, provide ample evidence that internationalization has become a mainstream phenomenon. This is true at the level of programs of study, institutional policies, national strategies and schemes, as well as in terms of the actions and orientations of various organizations at the regional (for example, in Europe and across the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN]) and global levels (OECD, World Bank, UNESCO). In itself, the mainstreaming of internationalization is a positive development and a demonstration of the increased connectivity of the sector and of its importance in the global knowledge society.

It is also clear, though, that under the broad and common acceptance by educational leaders and policymakers of the relevance of internationalization, there is a great variety of rationales, approaches, strategies, and activities, with an increasing trend to move from a more cooperative orientation towards a more competitive approach (De Wit et al., 2015). Indeed, Ferencz and Wächter (2017) observe for the European Union that “countries and HEIs [higher education institutions] alike, in their pursuit of strategic internationalisation, have to more carefully consider the benefits as well as balance cooperation and competition with other HEIs” (p. 27). The contributions in this Brief confirm that this dynamic is also true for other parts of the world.

The Paradoxes of Internationalization and Nationalism

Meanwhile, there is an increasing disconnect between this notion of the relevance of internationalization, within and for the sector, and recent trends in society toward greater inward focus, manifested by anti-global and anti-international tendencies. Such developments are clearly evident in the United States under the current administration; in the United Kingdom through the Brexit vote; in the election of nationalist-populist governments in such countries as the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland; and in light of the newly prominent role of hard right political parties in governments and/or parliaments in countries like Austria, Denmark, Germany, France, Italy, Norway, and the Netherlands. Elsewhere (such as in China, India, the Philippines, Russia, and Turkey), regimes combine nationalist positions with an international agenda, unfortunately leaving little room for autonomy and academic freedom to operate in a truly open and internationally engaged or enriching way.

The paradox between increased internationalization in higher education and emerging nationalism in society is especially clear in the contributions to this Brief focused on the United States and the United Kingdom. Canada and Germany provide a different picture, although one cannot ignore the emergence of nationalist voices in these countries, as well. Meanwhile, it would be wrong to assume that this divide is only present in the developed world. Other countries are encountering similar challenges in the contradictory push for a more internationalized or internationally engaged higher education sector while facing a stronger focus on national identity.

How can we explain these paradoxes between internationalization as a collaborative endeavor and internationalization as a competitive approach; between internationalization as a key trend in higher education trend around the world and nationalization as a rising social phenomenon globally? There are no easy answers.

Parallel Universes: Institutional and National Priorities and Perspectives

Several of the contributions to this *Brief* illustrate that, under the broad concept of internationalization, there is great variety in—as well as disconnect between—national and institutional policies and strategies. Internationalization is still primarily driven by dynamics at the institutional level. National policies are often fragmented and tend to be focused on the mobility side and on matters of competition and competitive advantage, while institutional policies tend to be more coordinated and integrated, and appear to strive to combine the

dimensions of “internationalization abroad” and “internationalization at home” more intentionally.

Even in countries like Australia, Canada, Colombia, Germany, the United Kingdom, and more recently South Africa—where there seems to be a stronger connection between national and institutional policies—the picture is not that bright. In most countries—most clearly manifest in the examples in this Brief among India, Japan, Mexico and the United States— institutions feel ignored or even blocked in their attempts to be “more international.” Where it exists, national attention in all of these countries seems to be more focused toward the competitive end, i.e., the development of transnational education platforms and activities, the recruitment of international students, and the quest for more prestigious reputations and higher global rankings.

In comparison, at the institutional level, references are more regularly made to matters of internationalization at home and of the curriculum, to international and intercultural competences and learning outcomes, and to global citizenship development—although, even at the institutional level, rhetoric around these ideas is still much more clearly in evidence than strategic and sustained action. As such, several contributions to this Brief rightly charge that there is still a long way to go to match rhetoric and action. Indeed, a more inclusive and innovative approach to internationalization is urgently required—one in which different stakeholders (government agencies, the private sector, alumni, students, faculty, institutional and sector leaders) all work together to balance the needs for internationalization at home and abroad, the needs for collaboration and competition, and the needs facing both local and global contexts.

A Two-Speed Global Framework?

Periodically, European Union (EU) observers have remarked on the phenomenon of a “two-speed” or “multi-speed” Europe (Prisecaru, 2017), in which those countries moving most quickly to achieve specific benchmark positions in relation to EU objectives or levels of integration are compared to those countries that may either purposefully be pushing ahead more cautiously, or are somehow “lagging behind.” Could the same be said about the global community of countries and internationalization of higher education?

In the long run, and in some cases in the shorter term, the tension between nationalistic tendencies and the push for global engagement could have a serious impact on the evolution of internationalization in higher education. Altbach and de Wit (2017) expect that the commercial side of internationalization will continue to thrive for some time, while inter-

nationalization at home will encounter more opposition and will depend even more on institutions than on governments for development and support. Some longstanding “industry leaders”—like the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as a number of other European countries—will encounter challenges in their international efforts as a result of nationalist tendencies and other internal dynamics that dampen the appetite for international engagement. Against this backdrop, others—such as Australia and Canada, but also a number of emerging economies—will become more active players and benefit from the waning engagement of the more longstanding national powerhouses.

Several of the contributions to this Brief illustrate that, under the broad concept of internationalization, there is great variety in—as well as disconnect between—national and institutional policies and strategies.

Of course, as stated by Helms and Brajkovic in their contribution to this publication, only “time will tell” how these complex matters will play out. In the meantime, significant efforts should be expended to gain greater insight into the landscape of internationalization in higher education across the many different national, regional, and institutional frameworks in which it is manifest. To extend the foundational metaphor for this publication: mapping the terrain and navigating the political and social waters that define both rhetoric and reality continue to be crucially important activities as we seek to deepen our understanding of internationalization’s possibilities and paradoxes.

References

- Altbach, P. G. & de Wit, H. (2017). The new nationalism and internationalization of HE. University World News, Issue 474. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20170914073027157>
- de Wit, H., Hunter, F., Howard, L., & Egron-Polak, E. (Eds.). (2015). Internationalisation of higher education. Brussels: European Parliament
- Egron-Polak, E. & Hudson, R. (2014). Internationalization of higher education: Growing expectations, fundamental values. IAU 4th Global Survey. Paris: International Association of Universities.
- Ferencz, I. & Wächter, B. (2017). Research for the CULT Committee - Modernisation of higher education. Brussels: European Parliament.
- Prisecaru, P. (2017). Do we have or need a two speed Europe? Academic Journal of Economic Studies, 3(3), 54–61.

Mapping Internationalization Worldwide: Selected Surveys and Research

Lucia Brajkovic

Name	Date	Geographic scope	Respondents (to most recent iteration)	Details
American Council on Education's (ACE) Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses	2017, conducted every five years	United States of America	1164 institutions across all sectors of U.S. higher education	Assesses the current state of internationalization at American colleges and universities, and analyzes trends over time. Offers data-based recommendations for internationalization policy and practice.
International Association of Universities' (IAU) Global Survey	2014, conducted every four years	131 countries worldwide	1336 higher education institutions worldwide	Provides global- and regional-level data on internationalization trends and developments, and related policy making. Examines reasons for international engagement across countries and regions, and allows for country-level comparison of internationalization indicators
European Association for International Education's (EAIE) Barometer: Internationalization in Europe	2015, reoccurring (the second iteration to be released in 2018)	33 European countries	2411 individual internationalization practitioners in European higher education institutions	Presents an overview of the state of internationalization in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) from the practitioner perspective. Addresses developments in the field of internationalization, and tools required for further professionalization of the field.
Canada's Universities in the World: AUCC Internationalization Survey	2014, reoccurring (this is the first iteration since 2006)	Canada	Executive heads of 75 Canadian public and private not-for-profit universities and colleges	Gauges Canadian universities' level of engagement and commitment to internationalization. Includes indicators related to administration, strategic partnerships, research, student mobility, and teaching and learning.
A World of Learning: Canada's Performance and Potential in International Education 2016	2016, conducted annually	Canada	52 Canadian postsecondary institutions	Provides data on key aspects of internationalization efforts in Canadian education, including policy context, international mobility, the student experience and trends to watch.
Japanese Universities' Strategic Approach to Internationalization: Accomplishments and Challenges	2014	Japan	141 Japanese universities	Examines indicators that Japanese universities consider effective in evaluating their institution-wide internationalization efforts. Explores Japanese universities' goals and strategies for internationalization.
Gacel-Ávila, J., & Rodríguez-Rodríguez, S. (2017). <i>Internacionalización de la Educación Superior en América Latina y el Caribe: un balance OBIRET</i> . Guadalajara: UNESCO-IESALC	2017	Latin America and the Caribbean	More than 400 higher education institutions throughout the region	First survey on trends in higher education internationalization focused exclusively on Latin America and the Caribbean. Administered by the Regional Observatory on Higher Education Internationalization and Networks in Latin America and the Caribbean (OBIRET).
Gacel-Ávila, J., & Bustos-Aguirre. (2017). <i>AMPEI y La Internacionalización en México</i> . <i>Educacion Global</i> , 21 (p.43-59).	2017	Mexico	46 higher education institutions, members of the Mexican Association for International Education (AMPEI)	Examines international office structures and officer profiles, benefits of AMPEI membership, and impact of activities carried out by the Association.

Contributors



Lucia Brajkovic is a senior research specialist at American Council on Education's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement. She also serves as the executive director of the Higher Education Initiative for Southeastern Europe. Her research focuses on internationalization of higher education, as well as on political economy and higher education systems. Email: LBrajkovic@acenet.edu



Hans-Dieter Daniel holds a dual professorship at ETH Zurich and at the University of Zurich. Since 2001, he has been Director of the Evaluation Office of the University of Zurich and, since 2002, Professor for Social Psychology and Research on Higher Education at ETH Zurich. He has been a member of the International Advisory Board for the German Rectors' Conference Audit Internationalisation of higher education institutions. Email: daniel@gess.ethz.ch



Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila is a researcher and Vice Dean for Social Sciences and Humanities at the University of Guadalajara (Mexico). She is also General Coordinator of the UNESCO Observatory for Internationalization and Networks in Higher Education for Latin America and the Caribbean. Email: jgacelav@gmail.com



Robin Matross Helms is Director of the Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement at the American Council on Education. Previously, she has worked for the Institute of International Education and the University of Minnesota, and served as a consultant to the World Bank and the Institute for Higher Education Policy. Email: rhelms@acenet.edu



Raegan Hiles leads Universities UK International (UUKi) outbound mobility programs, overseeing the joint transnational education support initiative HEGlobal with the British Council and the national strategy for Outward Student Mobility. Raegan has worked across higher education, including in a university, a funding council, and a professional sector association. She holds a BA (Hons) from the University of Warwick, and postgraduate qualifications from UCL and the University of York. Email: raegan.hiles@international.ac.uk



Lakshmi S. Iyer is Executive Director and Head of Education at Sannam S4, a global market entry consulting firm. She supports over 40 universities from around the world and international government bodies in taking a nuanced approach to understanding and engaging with local markets. Lakshmi is a passionate advocate of employability as a theme in preparing returning international graduates to fit into local market conditions. Email: lakshmi.iyer@sannams4.co



Nico Jooste has been the Senior Director, International Education at Nelson Mandela University since July 2000. He is also the director of a research unit focusing on the internationalization of higher education in the developing world. Nico is the immediate past President of the International Education Association of South Africa and was responsible for organizing the 2014 Global Dialogue on the future of Higher Education Internationalization. He publishes and widely on higher education internationalization. Email: nico.jooste@nmmu.ac.za



Hiroshi Ota is Professor of the Center for Global Education at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, where he serves as Director of the Hitotsubashi University Global Education Program. His research primarily focuses on higher education policies and practices related to internationalization and international student mobility from a comparative perspective. Ota received his Ed.M. and Ph.D. in Comparative and Global Studies in Education from SUNY-Buffalo. Email: h.ota@r.hit-u.ac.jp



Laura E. Rumbley is an assistant professor of the practice at Boston College's Lynch School of Education and Associate Director at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (United States). Formerly Deputy Director of the Brussels-based Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), she serves as co-editor of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* and is Publications Committee chair for the European Association for International Education (EAIE). Email: rumbley@bc.edu



Grace Karram Stephenson is a post-doctoral fellow at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. She currently leads the Canadian chapter of the Academic Profession Survey. Grace's research on internationalization and student diversity has focused on Malaysia, the United Arab Emirates, Ecuador, Kenya and Jordan. She teaches courses on comparative higher education and is regular contributor to University World News. Email: grace.karram@utoronto.ca



Wondwosen Tamrat is associate professor and founding president of St Mary's University, Addis Ababa (Ethiopia). He is an affiliate scholar of the Program for Research on Private Higher Education (PROPHE) headquartered at the State University of New York at Albany (United States). He is also the coordinator of the private higher education sub-cluster set up for the realization of the Africa Union's Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA). Emails: pre-swond@smuc.edu.et; wondwosentamrat@gmail.com

Contributors *(continued)*



Damtew Teferra is professor of higher education, leader of Higher Education and Training Development, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, and founding director of the International Network for Higher Education in Africa. He coordinates the Higher Education Cluster of the African Union's Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA). E-mails: teferra@ukzn.ac.za and teferra@bc.edu



Jeanette Vélez Ramirez is a lawyer and socio-economist by training and currently works an international consultant in matters related to internationalization of higher education, international action of local governments, and lifelong learning. She has held senior management positions within the Chamber of Commerce of Bogotá, the Latin American Federation of Banks, and the Universidad del Rosario (Colombia), where she served as Dean of Continuing Education and Chancellor. Email: jevelez00@gmail.com



Yuki Watabe is an associate professor of the Global Learning Center, Tohoku University, Japan. She received her PhD in comparative and international development education at the University of Minnesota. She began her career in the field of international education as an international student adviser in the United States. Over the past ten years, she has been researching issues related to the internationalization of higher education and international student mobility. Email: yuki.watabe.c6@tohoku.ac.jp



Hans de Wit is director of the Boston College Center for International Higher Education and a professor in the Lynch School of Education. He is the founding director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy; the founding editor of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*; and a founding member of the European Association for International Education. Email: dewitj@bc.edu



Christopher Ziguas is President of the International Education Association of Australia and Deputy Dean, International in the School of Global, Urban and Social Studies at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT University). He has written extensively on varied aspects of the globalization of education, particularly the ways in which regulatory agencies, markets, education providers and other actors shape cross-border provision of higher education. Email: christopher.ziguas@rmit.edu.au

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE)

At the forefront of international higher education.

Subscribe

International Higher Education

<https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe>

Explore

Master of Arts in International Higher Education

<https://www.bc.edu/IHEMA>

Evolve

Graduate Certificate in International Higher Education

<https://www.bc.edu/IHECert>



The ACE Internationalization Laboratory provides customized guidance and insight to help colleges and universities achieve their internationalization goals.

Now accepting applications for the 2018 cohort. More information:

www.acenet.edu/ACELab



American Council on Education (ACE)

Founded in 1918, the American Council on Education (ACE) is the only higher education organization that represents presidents and chancellors of all types of US accredited, degree-granting institutions: community colleges and four-year institutions, private and public universities, and nonprofit and for-profit colleges. ACE represents the interests of more than 1,600 campus executives, as well as 200 leaders of higher education-related associations and organizations. Together, ACE member institutions serve 80 percent of today's college students.

ACE's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) provides in-depth analysis of critical international education issues and administers programs and services to support higher education institutions' internationalization and global engagement strategies. In doing so, CIGE contributes to ACE's goal of fostering greater collaboration and new partnerships within and outside the higher education community to help colleges and universities anticipate and address the challenges of the 21st century and contribute to a stronger nation and better world.

The Center for International Higher Education (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international and comparative perspective to the analysis of higher education. It is the conviction of the Center's staff that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes *International Higher Education* quarterly, a book series and other publications, sponsors conferences, and welcomes visiting scholars.

The Center's mission is to promote dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world based on the belief that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

Keep up with international trends in higher education.

Follow our posts collected from sources worldwide:



Center for International Higher Education



@BC_CIHE and @ACE_CIGE

Editors

Robin Matross Helms
 Laura E. Rumbley
 Lucia Brajkovic

Production

Salina Kopellas

Senior Advisor

Hans de Wit

Center for International Higher Education

Campion Hall
 Boston College
 Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 USA

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-mail: highered@bc.edu

web: www.bc.edu/cihe

American Council on Education

One Dupont Circle NW
 Washington, DC 20036-1193

Tel: (202) 939-9300

E-mail: cige@acenet.edu

web: www.acenet.edu

ISSN: 1084-0613

©2018 Center for International Higher Education