A Guide to
Internationalization
for
CHIEF
ACADEMIC
OFFICERS

By Barbara A. Hill
and Madeleine F. Green

ACE

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
The Unifying Voice for Higher Education

A Guide to
Internationalization
for
CHIEF
ACADEMIC
OFFICERS

By Barbara A. Hill
and Madeleine F. Green

A⫶E AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
The Unifying Voice for Higher Education

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

This essay draws on the work of many institutions and many chief academic officers, especially those selected to participate in the Internationalization Forum for Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) (see Appendix A). In developing institutional networks and multi-institutional projects, ACE has sought to develop communities of shared interest and mutual learning. The CAOs who participated in the Forum did the difficult work of developing and implementing internationalization strategies, and they shared with their colleagues in other institutions and with ACE both the satisfaction of their achievements and the frustration of their setbacks. Their collaboration and their candor provided the authors with unique opportunities to observe their campuses and learn from their experience.

ACE is grateful to the Henry Luce Foundation for its support of the Internationalization Forum for Chief Academic Officers, the resulting CAO internationalization web site (www.acenet.edu/programs/international/caoguide), and this publication. We are especially grateful for former Luce vice president Terry Lautz's encouragement to include an Innovation Fund as a feature of the Internationalization Forum. Its effect was to foster even more campus learning than we anticipated. The CAOs whose institutions received Innovation Fund awards were especially helpful in enabling us all to understand how CAOs can target small amounts of funding to leverage internationalization. We would especially like to thank them for their persistence and candor: Connecticut College, Grinnell College, Lewis and Clark College, Northern Virginia Community College, Oakland Community College, and Wagner College.

Several members of the Internationalization Forum of Chief Academic Officers were helpful in presenting the stories of their institutions' internationalization journeys at meetings of professional organizations. Thanks are due to Sona Karentz Andrews, Boise State University; John Dever, Northern Virginia Community College; Nancy Marlin, San Diego State University; and Devorah Lieberman, Wagner College.

We also thank our perceptive readers who gave us feedback on the draft: Sona Karentz Andrews, Peter Eckel, William B. Lacy, Christa Olson, and Christopher Picard. We are especially grateful to Kim Koch for reviewing the draft and helping finalize the manuscript. And finally, thank you to the ACE publications team for their help in the production of this essay.

Note to the Reader

This publication covers a broad range of issues that readers may want to explore further. It has an accompanying web site—www.acenet.edu/international/caoguide—that includes targeted resources for CAOs. In addition, this essay references a number of other ACE publications that provide more in-depth treatment of many of the issues raised in the ensuing pages. Readers are encouraged to consult these resources to pursue specific areas of interest.

Preface

This publication is the culmination of a three-year project, the Internationalization Forum of Chief Academic Officers, funded by the Henry Luce Foundation. The project convened 50 CAOs from different sectors to discuss their leadership role in internationalization and provided funding for the member institutions to undertake projects that would enhance campus internationalization, including an Innovation Fund, inter-institutional learning visits, and peer consultation visits (see Appendix A). Related material for implementing internationalization, particularly addressing the needs of CAOs, can be found at the Center for International Initiatives (CII) section of the ACE web site (www.acenet.edu).

A subset of Forum members discussed the contents of this publication at a meeting in February 2008. The attendees were all new to their positions, having replaced CAOs who participated in earlier Forum meetings. The two questions they addressed were: (1) how do you understand internationalization at your institution? and (2) what information do you, as a CAO, need to address this issue? Their advice to ACE was to focus on key strategic issues in a way that would lead CAOs to assess their own institution's situation and to offer commentary that would give them the benefit of the lessons ACE has learned working with a wide variety of institutions. The participants agreed that guiding CAOs to ask the right questions was crucial for helping them be effective leaders.

The Internationalization Forum, and the contents of this *Guide*, also built on many initiatives and publications of CII aimed at helping campuses advance internationalization. The Internationalization Laboratory, the Internationalization Collaborative, and the Leadership Network for International Education are ongoing ACE activities that have provided rich sources of learning about the issues campuses face in undertaking this work. The Global Learning for All and the Promising Practices projects, and the Project on Assessing International Learning, now concluded, also provided important foundational insights for CII's work. The ACE publications that capture our learning from over the years and that inform this publication are noted throughout the text.[1]

This *Guide* is arranged by topics, formulated as questions. The goal is to give a CAO, new or veteran, ways to assess the institutional context for internationalization and to choose appropriate leadership strategies to effect positive change. The subject matter of this essay is framed so that the CAO of any institution, regardless of sector, size, or affiliation, can find useful advice about the processes and content of internationalization.

---

1 Visit the ACE web site for more information on CII's programs and publications: www.acenet.edu/programs/international.

Introduction: Why an essay about internationalization for chief academic officers (CAOs)?[2]

Why is internationalization a key issue in higher education today?

The realities of the 21st century and of globalization, as well as the growing literature on internationalization, point to many valid reasons for institutions to internationalize. Higher education institutions must be actively engaged in the world around them—through partnerships, providing a global perspective in the education they provide, and connecting the local and the global. Goals for internationalization include academic goals (strengthening liberal education, producing globally competent graduates, enhancing the quality of research), economic and entrepreneurial goals (preparing students for careers, contributing to local economic development, developing new revenue streams), social goals (contributing to social justice, contributing to the development of institutions in other countries), and national security and foreign policy goals (producing language and area studies experts, producing experts in global issues, engaging in public diplomacy). Most institutional leaders espouse all or some of these goals, but they have very different ideas about the importance of achieving them or their centrality to the academic enterprise.

For many institutions and their CAOs, internationalization is a set of programs and activities scattered around the campus, with study abroad, international students, international partnerships, and internationalization of the curriculum (if that is even on the horizon) a series of disconnected activities. Some or all may be strong initiatives, but on most campuses, they do not form a coherent, strategic whole. ACE's ongoing work with many campuses over nearly a decade has highlighted the importance of a comprehensive approach to internationalization. By that we mean not simply adding a few programs or courses here and there or increasing the numbers of students going abroad or of international students—that is doing more of the same thing or doing the same things in a slightly different way. *Comprehensive internationalization*, our term of choice, describes a more ambitious and intentional approach, in which internationalization ultimately pervades the institution, affecting a broad spectrum of people, policies, and programs as well as institutional culture. It is a highly visible, strategic approach that seeks to affect all aspects of an institution. While comprehensive internationalization requires vigorous leadership from the CAO and president, leadership for internationalization must be dispersed throughout the institution.

---

2 Portions of the introduction were adapted from or previously published in Green, M. & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

As with any major academic change, the faculty must be at the helm, with the CAO providing support and incentives.

ACE's view is that internationalization is a key element of a high-quality education and institutional relevance, and that CAOs play a central role in advancing it. However, not all institutional leaders subscribe to this concept of internationalization. Although this *Guide* will be helpful to CAOs who do not want to go down the path of comprehensive internationalization, it is written especially for those who embrace this goal, and who are convinced that a high-quality institution incorporates internationalization into its outlook and into the education it provides to students.

Where does internationalization fit in the complex role of the CAO?

Internationalization is one of many issues in the CAO's overall portfolio of responsibilities. In colleges and universities, both large and small (and in between), CAOs have many concerns and responsibilities related to the academic enterprise. While they are key players in internal institutional change, CAOs also have external duties. The list of demands on their daily attention is long and it is easy to see why internationalization may not rise to the top of the list.

For the last several years, ACE has conducted an Institute for New Chief Academic Officers, which focuses on leadership challenges, provides perspectives from colleagues with different experiences, and explores how common issues and challenges play out in different types of institutions. Each year, the participants are asked to identify the top two primary challenges of their new positions. The cumulative list of three years' worth of concerns is vast, spanning budgets, accreditation, curricular change, personnel issues, enrollment management, governance, program development, internationalization, and a host of others.

While it is encouraging to note that internationalization was one of the concerns cited by CAOs, internationalization is qualitatively different from many of the other items because it involves a way of thinking that can affect decisions about all these other concerns. Internationalization is a cross-cutting dimension of all these other issues; it can undergird them all, thereby giving an institution coherence and focus. A truly internationalized campus infuses internationalization throughout its academic and co-curricular programs, and sees global learning, discovery, and engagement as central to the definition of a high-quality education. For many institutions, this ideal remains far away and the leadership challenges involved in achieving it are considerable.

Thus, this essay aims to assist CAOs, new or veteran, in leading their institutions into this challenging, and perhaps new, terrain.

What is the role of the CAO in leading internationalization?

This essay emphasizes both the leadership role of the CAO in encouraging internationalization and the centrality of faculty and administrators throughout the institution in making it a reality. CAOs, along with their administrative team, the president (see How does the CAO work with the president on internationalization on page 1), deans and their associates, and department chairs, lead internationalization in several ways.

First, CAOs articulate the importance of internationalization. Institutions that succeed in internationalization have leaders who frame the agenda in positive ways and provide compelling reasons for undertaking internationalization. These leaders recognize that key constituents must see a real need for action before they willingly participate. They connect the need for change with important institutional and individual values—improving student learning, increasing academic excellence, and becoming more socially responsible. They position the change that internationalization requires as essential to a *better* future, not simply a different one.

Second, CAOs support faculty and staff in conceptualizing and implementing internationalization. They catalyze faculty dialogue to develop a shared understanding of internationalization in that institutional context and to develop an implementation strategy that is appropriate for the institution's goals and mission. (See "A Word About Terminology" on the importance of language.) Depending on the institution's mission, internationalization will affect curriculum, student life, research, outreach, and community engagement.

CAO Leadership Tasks

- Make the case for internationalization.
- Give legitimacy and focus to internationalization.
- Identify/create champions for internationalization.
- Create a process to achieve internationalization.
- Ensure that campus processes support internationalization.
- Link internationalization to the institution's strategic plan.
- Oversee the development of an action plan.
- Provide adequate resources.
- Hold deans, department chairs, and other administrators accountable for outlining and achieving their internationalization objectives.
- Celebrate successes.
- Remember that some actions take time.
- Evaluate internationalization activities and strategies regularly.

Adapted from a presentation by Sona K. Andrews, Provost, Boise State University, 2008.

A third leadership role for the CAO lies in developing a strategy to turn rhetoric into reality. A gap may lie between the value of internationalization asserted in many institutional mission statements and the reality of actual institutional practices and priorities as revealed by strategic plans and resource allocation. Encouraging alignment between institutional goals and institutional realities is also part of the CAO's leadership challenge. Closing these gaps is not a trivial undertaking, nor does it involve simply adding a few internationally focused programs or strengthening existing ones. Although many institutions offer a diverse mix of international learning opportunities, few do so with much intentionality. The result is often a hodgepodge of programs and activities that are not sufficiently integrated to create maximum institutional impact or to advance learning. Without a clear set of goals and a strategy to connect disparate activities and create synergies among them, internationalization may be confined to a set of marginal activities affecting a

A Word About Terminology

Perhaps because internationalization and globalization have received so much attention in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001, or because the concepts are complex, confusion abounds in the use of certain terminology. ACE's work with campuses suggests that different groups and individuals can assign different meanings to a particular term, and institutions working seriously on internationalization should attempt to come to an internal understanding about definitions.

These different meanings may signal different underlying philosophies, which in turn drive different approaches to internationalization. There is no single term that covers all the concepts encompassed by the words *international*, *global*, and *intercultural*, and people most often choose one of the three as a marker for a bundle of concepts. The first thing a CAO must do, then, is to listen carefully to the language of various constituencies regarding international matters and discern what they mean when they use terms such as *globalization*, *internationalization*, *international education*, or *multicultural education*. In helping stakeholders define their terms, the CAO can help them see where there is agreement about the goals of internationalization and activities that the institution should undertake to achieve them.

ACE uses Knight's definition of *internationalization*, "the process of integrating an *international*, *intercultural*, or *global* dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of postsecondary education."[3] Although this definition does not encompass the terms international, intercultural, or global, it presents a dynamic concept of an ongoing process of integration, which we believe is useful to creating an action agenda. In addition, we use *comprehensive internationalization* to mean "a strategic and integrated approach to internationalization in which institutions articulate internationalization as an institutional goal (if not priority), develop an internationalization plan driven by sound analysis, and seek to bring together the usually disparate and often marginalized aspects of internationalization."[4]

For further discussion of terminology and definitions, see chapter one of Green, M., Olson, C., & Hill, B. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

3 Knight, J. (2003, fall). Updating the definition of internationalisation. *International Higher Education*. Retrieved August 29, 2008, from www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm.
4 Olson, C., Green, M., & Hill, B. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, p. vi.

self-selected group of students and faculty. Once the strategy is developed, the CAO should monitor its implementation through periodic evaluations.

And finally, CAOs provide incentives and support for internationalization, ensuring that it is adequately resourced and staffed. The CAO makes key decisions about personnel, structure, and the balance between centralization and decentralization. They also need to ensure funding for partnerships, faculty travel abroad, and other forms of faculty development if internationalization is to thrive.

In sum, internationalizing an institution requires sustained attention by the CAO and a clear set of goals and strategies. It entails the complex work of motivating and rewarding others to formulate the ideas and action plans—in short, to be sure that the internationalization agenda is widely owned by others on campus. Among the steps outlined in subsequent chapters are judging institutional readiness for change, developing widely understood goals and objectives, assessing existing efforts and capacity, recognizing the leverage points for creating change on campus, developing a strategic plan, measuring progress, and making continuous adjustments along the way. Without the active support of the CAO, internationalization is unlikely to go beyond a group of champions or a discrete set of programs. Because CAOs are positioned to affect the entire institution both directly and indirectly, they are crucial to fostering comprehensive internationalization.

Chapter 1

How does the CAO gauge and mobilize institutional support for internationalization?

How does the CAO work with the president on internationalization?[5]

The level of interest and the goals of the president will shape the CAO's role in internationalization. If the president has little interest, the CAO who is committed to internationalization will need to raise the interest level of the president and work with those faculty members who are interested. Substantive engagements with partners abroad often help raise the president's attention level.[6] Also, aligning internationalization with institutional goals, such as improving research and graduate education, will be important to communicate that internationalization advances institutional priorities, and is not simply an exotic enhancement to the educational process (or worse yet, not a serious academic endeavor).

If the president is a champion of internationalization, the CAO must understand the president's rationale and resulting goals for internationalization. They may range from enhancing institutional reputation, to generating revenue, to preparing students for global citizenship, to enhancing the research agenda, to strengthening engagement that promotes the application of knowledge. While distinct, these goals are not mutually exclusive. A university may be building its reputation through dual degrees or joint research while at the same time engaging undergraduates in deep intercultural experiences through participation in these activities. CAOs must often communicate these goals internally and help people understand how differing internationalization goals can converge. Or, the CAO might find himself or herself in the position of having to remind the president about realistic expectations in ratcheting up internationalization. Too many CAOs have wondered how the president decided that increasing the number of international students by 10 percent was an appropriate goal! In some cases, the president's vision for internationalization will far exceed the interest and capacity of the campus community, and the primary task for the president and CAO will be to build awareness, interest, and capacity. Declaring an institution to be a global university does not necessarily make it so; the faculty and administration must turn that vision into a reality.

5 For a useful resource on presidential leadership in internationalization, see National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. (2004). *A call to leadership: The presidential role in internationalizing the university*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at www.nasulgc.org/NetCommunity/Document.doc?id=32.

6 For more information on international partnerships, see Van de Water, J., Green, M., & Koch, K. (2008). *International partnerships: Guidelines for colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. Available at www.acenet. edu/programs/international/partnerships.

When it comes to internationalization, the division of labor between the president or chancellor and the CAO is no different from the partition for most other issues. That is, the president articulates the agenda to the external stakeholders, persuades policy makers and donors of its importance, and represents the institution nationally and internationally. CAOs often play some external role, but they also lead the process of engaging the deans and the faculty and turning aspirations into reality. As Mortimer and Sathre aptly put it, "Presidents tend to be more interested in outcomes and provosts in process. … Presidents typically take the lead when it comes to the overall goals to be pursued during their tenure. But it usually falls to the provost to figure out how to translate goals into actions—how to get things done."[7]

How does the CAO make the case for internationalization?

While the CAO is the most likely senior leader to make the case for internationalization internally, the presentation should be congruent with the president's case to external constituencies. This requires careful teamwork and coordination. It is important that internationalization goals support other institutional priorities, such as improving undergraduate education or strengthening research. Having good data derived from the internationalization review (see Chapter 2) can help convince skeptics and unengaged faculty members to see how valuable internationalization can be for the vitality of the institution.

How does the CAO identify supporters of internationalization and understand their goals?

A crucial early step is for the CAO to determine which constituencies are currently supporting (or better yet, championing) internationalization. Similarly, as we elaborate later in this chapter, knowing who is skeptical is also essential.

The major external constituencies include boards of trustees, state legislatures, state offices of commerce or economic development, system offices, alumni associations, and advisory boards to different schools and colleges. The president or chancellor is likely to have most of the interaction with these groups, and he or she will filter their opinions. Often, their interest in internationalization is driven by different motivations from those of faculty and students. Institutional leaders and external stakeholders may want the institution to have a "greater global presence" for the sake of reputation and competitive advantage. Those pushing for a global presence may urge the institution to set up overseas campuses or centers or to seek high-profile and prestigious partnerships with higher education institutions abroad. External stakeholders also may want the institution to engage in these same activities for different reasons—to increase student learning, enhance graduates' employability, expand faculty research and scholarship, or otherwise enhance the university's performance.

The support of internal constituencies—such as faculty, staff, administrators, international office staff, and students—is also crucial. Working with these stakeholders is the purview of the CAO. The rationales for internationalization espoused by these

---

7 Mortimer, K.P. & Sathre, C.O. (2007). *The art and politics of academic governance: Relations among boards, presidents, and faculty.* Westport, CT: ACE/Praeger Series on Higher Education.

groups often differ from those of external groups. Faculty and staff are more likely to focus on the need for the institution to educate globally prepared students or to enhance the quality of research. These goals focus the discussion about internationalization much differently, with a global presence or partnerships seen as providing students with opportunities to have an experience abroad (either in study, service-learning projects, or internships) or ensuring that faculty members are engaged in cutting-edge research and scholarship.

Usually, faculty members are the most important internationalization champions and leaders, either because of individual interests and experiences or because they are members of particular departments or programs with an international focus. Of great help to the CAO, in this case, is a deep understanding of the institution's history of internationalization efforts and global engagement. Who have been the most visible and active supporters of internationalization? Who are the most active agents of global engagement? Many institutions have found it helpful to survey faculty periodically or conduct focus groups to learn about their experiences, attitudes, interests, and international work. This information is very useful in constructing an internationalization plan that builds upon faculty interests and strengths and identifies areas for growth.[8]

Many CAOs discover that their institution's international profile and connections are the result of individual faculty members' work rather than any strategic engagement on the part of the whole institution. What are the implications of this tradition? Is there support to continue these partnerships when faculty members leave or retire? If so, who will lead the partnership in its next phase? If not, what are the implications of terminating the partnership? Are there longstanding international partnerships that involve several individuals or several departments? What has been their effect on institutional internationalization? How successful have they been over time and why?

Of great help to the CAO . . . is a deep understanding of the institution's history of internationalization efforts and global engagement.

Students may also be supporters of internationalization. What avenues does a CAO have for listening to student voices? It is useful for the CAO to know patterns of student interest by identifying which courses and programs attract students and from what sectors of the student population. Although students vote with their feet, their desires are not always self-evident. Does the student affairs unit have regular interaction with the CAO? Does that unit have an interest in collecting student opinions about international experiences and classroom learning? Does the CAO also have access to the interests and concerns of international students?

---

8 For examples of faculty surveys and focus group questions used by colleges and universities conducting an internationalization review, please see ACE's online internationalization toolkit, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/toolkit.

Some institutions use student focus groups to learn more about their interests. At one institution, the focus groups, composed mainly of adult students in the military, expressed an interest in increased language instruction in less commonly taught languages. Because the institution was not offering such courses, it had no way to assess student interest through increased enrollments. The CAO had to determine whether the institution could address this demand in light of resources or whether this was a student interest that the institution could not pursue. At another institution, student focus groups revealed that the students perceived no connection between their study abroad experiences and the curriculum at the home institution. This led the faculty, encouraged by the CAO, to work on greater integration of internationalization at home and abroad.

If student interest in internationalization is expressed by increased demand for study or service learning opportunities abroad, the CAO must assess the capacity of the international programs office to handle such growth. Similarly, if faculty-led study abroad is a growth area, the CAO will want to know that these programs are of high academic quality and that the institution is managing risk properly. What is the role of the office of international programs for these curricular initiatives? Does the office have the responsibility for risk management for education abroad? Does it have the authority to insist on faculty compliance with institutional guidelines? Answering these questions requires the CAO to have good oversight of the international programs office, and an understanding of its scope and capacity. (See Chapter 3 for further discussion of the international programs office.)

Finally, the international programs office itself may be the most prominent champion of internationalization. (This issue is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3). It should come as no surprise to the CAO that often the chief international officer (CIO) and other international education professionals are the most vocal and active supporters of campus internationalization. As we note in Chapters 2 and 3, the CAO will want to consider carefully the climate for internationalization and support from campus stakeholders in responding to the CIO and the international education staff. Of utmost importance is keeping the entire campus, not just one office, involved. After all, the international programs office should not own internationalization—rather, it should be a core value and direction embraced by the entire institution and its leaders.

The divergent interests and goals for internationalization expressed by the various stakeholders can create challenges for the CAO. If the president is most interested in reputation and the faculty is most interested in global citizenship, the CAO must figure out where the commonalities of interest lie, so that the institution can create or enhance initiatives that satisfy both sets of goals. Divergent goals can also be found within a particular set of stakeholders. Faculty members, for example, are hardly uniform in their interests. One group may be interested in pursuing issues of global social justice; others may be interested in enhancing their research. The CAO must deal with these differences of interests and motivations. For internationalization to be comprehensive, all parts of the institution must see a role for themselves, and those roles and the goals they achieve can and will differ. The CAO must devise processes (note the plural here) to engage all constituencies

in determining what internationalization means, the range of initiatives that can and should be undertaken, and the time frame for implementation.

How does the CAO create supporters and engage with skeptics?

On many campuses, the problem is less one of divergent views of internationalization among different groups of supporters than lack of interest, concern about costs, or other priorities. Boards and legislators may see little need for internationalization when the institutional focus is on serving the local community. Similarly, some faculty members do not see the connection between their disciplines and international learning, or they believe that because they present papers at conferences abroad, they are "international." Finally, students may be focused on securing their first job out of college and see learning about other cultures or studying world languages as unimportant to their career goals. Or, an institution may not connect internationalization with its ongoing work and quality enhancement. For example, an institution may want to focus on growing its graduate programs and developing a stronger research profile but fail to see how enhancing the global dimensions of research can help meet those goals. The CAO, then, can help others see how international activity can contribute to achieving institutional goals ranging from workforce development to improving research.

Sometimes, internationalization encounters downright opposition. For example, some stakeholders, both inside and outside the institution, may believe that

<div style="border:1px solid #000; background:#e6e6f0;">

Laying the Groundwork

To lay the groundwork for internationalization, a chief academic officer should:
- Listen to many stakeholders inside and outside the institution, those both for and against internationalization.
- Listen carefully to the skeptics.
- Analyze the implications of the language of stakeholders, including the skeptics.
- With the president, articulate a comprehensive vision for internationalization.
- Find areas of agreement for action.
- Keep the conversations ongoing.

</div>

internationalization is a "frill" that detracts from the real business of providing students with "the basics" or essential content and skills. Some see internationalization as conflicting with the domestic agenda of promoting diversity or multicultural education. Fearing that internationalization will compete with other priorities for resources and attention with the multicultural education agenda, some on campus see scholarships for international students as a threat to funding for underrepresented U.S. groups. This issue is complex, and many institutions struggle with it.[9]

It is important for the CAO to be aware of the reasons for various stakeholders' or individuals' skepticism or opposition, and to address these reasons whenever possible, either personally, through word and deed, or by providing opportunities for the doubters to engage with the champions. The internationalization review, described in the following chapter, provides an excellent opportunity to engage the skeptics, either as members of the review committee or to have the committee consult with them as it proceeds.

---

9 For more information on this issue, see Olson, C., Evans, R., & Shoenberg, R. (2007). *At home in the world: Bridging the gap between multicultural education and internationalization*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Chapter 2
How can the CAO learn about the effectiveness of the institution's existing internationalization efforts?

To decide what activities will advance internationalization at the institution, the CAO must know, as comprehensively as possible, what the institution, in all its units, is currently doing and how well the current initiatives are working. At most colleges and universities, information about international activities is scattered throughout the institution, and as a result, no single officer will be able to report on the whole of the activity. Even if the institution has a chief international officer who coordinates or facilitates internationalization activities across the campus, it is nearly always the case that many programs and initiatives are unknown to the international office. This is especially true of large, complex institutions, where individual colleges and schools have a high level of autonomy. (See Chapter 3 on developing an internationalization strategy in a decentralized institution.)

What is an internationalization review and how can it be useful?[10]

The most effective way for the CAO to get a handle on the scope and quality of internationalization is to undertake an audit or review of internationalization activities—a process for taking stock of the international/global initiatives on campus. A review engages a campus group—usually formed specifically for this task—in collecting and analyzing information; identifying strengths, weaknesses, gaps, and possibilities for synergy; and engaging people across the institution in a discussion of internationalization. The review then provides a sound basis for the development of an internationalization plan.

An internationalization review can be more or less detailed, depending on the institution's timeframe, goals, and available resources. Whatever the scope, an effective review will raise questions and guide institutional strategy. Thus, the emphasis in the review process should be on analysis rather than description. In considering

the information gathered about the areas listed in the Internationalization Review Checklist, the following questions can help shape an action agenda emerging from the review:

- How well is this area currently working?
- How do we know how well it is working?
- What changes might we make in the short term?
- What changes should we consider for the longer term?

It is important for the CAO and the members of the committee or task force that will actually conduct the review to envision how the results of this work will be used and why such an undertaking is worth the effort. Without this understanding, an internationalization review risks becoming a time-consuming exercise whose results languish on a shelf. This is a guaranteed way to produce cynicism and anger among the faculty and staff members who devoted time and energy to the work, and will send signals to the campus that internationalization is not serious business.

An important benefit of an internationalization review is that it engages the campus community in a discussion of internationalization. Because internationalization information is often dispersed, gathering it involves many people who ordinarily do not collaborate on internationalization activities. The review process helps identify and tap potential advocates across campus and provides opportunities for them to engage with one another. A review can also build support; engaging a broad group of stakeholders in the review will promote ownership and commitment to the ideas that emerge. The review presents an ideal opportunity to engage the skeptics. A process that engages only the true believers will be flawed indeed.

Another important use of a review is to gather in one place information from around the campus, as a factual basis for analysis, evaluation, and planning. Without knowing what is currently in place, an institution cannot determine if it is meeting its goals or if it is making progress over time.

Finally, a review can help align internationalization with other institutional programs and structures. For example, a review may highlight how the general education curriculum can be more effectively internationalized, or how internationalization can be more fully integrated into the institution's overall strategic planning process. The more internationalization is integrated into the core academic functions and the ongoing business of the institution, the more likely it is to flourish.

Internationalization Review Checklist

An internationalization review should gather information about:
- Institutional commitment (mission, goals, and vision).
- Institutional environment for internationalization.
- Structures, policies, and practices affecting international activities.
- Desired student learning outcomes.
- Curriculum and co-curriculum.
- Education abroad (study abroad, field work, internships, and service learning).
- Faculty and staff knowledge, experience, and interest.
- Student knowledge, experience, and interest.
- Engagement with institutions in other countries.

All this information should be analyzed to develop recommendations for future action.

What does articulating student learning outcomes add to the internationalization review?[11]

An institutional review of programs and activities looks at the inputs to internationalization. ACE's work with institutions has demonstrated that it is also useful to consider the learning *outcomes* that they are trying to achieve through the learning opportunities they provide. Thus, it is helpful to encourage the review team to articulate desired student international learning outcomes as part of the internationalization review process. Because many of an institution's international activities may have resulted from the interests of individual faculty members and departments, most campuses have no overall framework for internationalization. Stating student international learning outcomes as an institutional goal provides this needed direction as a corrective to the ad hoc approach that characterizes most institutions' approaches to internationalization. Learning goals offer a guide for aligning curriculum and other learning opportunities (inputs) with desired student learning outcomes. Used effectively, the goals can encourage a culture of quality improvement in courses and programs.

Learning outcomes can also help prioritize activities in an internationalization plan. While an institution might choose to do many things internationally, articulating outcomes provides a way to measure the potential impact of any particular choice and guide strategic investment of resources. Finally, articulating outcomes and assessing for them can help both accrediting agencies and stakeholders understand the effectiveness of international activities.

What should be the composition of the review team and who should lead it?

As we have noted, the review process is a useful vehicle for starting a broad conversation about the institution's internationalization goals. The CAO should ensure that the review team has broad campus representation to encourage this conversation. While each institution undoubtedly already has faculty and other internationalization champions, the team could also include those whom the CAO would like to engage internationally.

> While an institution might choose to do many things internationally, articulating outcomes provides a way to measure the potential impact of any particular choice and guide strategic investment of resources.

In forming an internationalization team, the CAO will want to follow a process that is legitimate and customary at the institution. In some institutions, the president or CAO will appoint a team to conduct the review; in others, it may be perceived as more legitimate to charge an existing committee, such as a subgroup of the academic senate or a standing international committee. A standing committee has the advantage of continuity, but it may not have the right membership for all phases of the internationalization review (goal setting, conducting the review, and creating an internationalization plan). If an existing committee will undertake

---

11 For more information on learning outcomes, see *Building a strategic framework*, pp. 9–12; *Handbook*, chapter 2; and ACE's online Guide to Assessing International Learning, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/assessmentguide.

the review, adding members to ensure adequate representation and expertise may be useful. This group should represent the broad campus community and include faculty, administrators, staff, and students.

However the team is constituted, it must gain support from all areas of the campus community. Strong faculty membership on the review team is vital to achieving general agreement about goals, and identifying needs and problems and connecting the work of the review to ongoing academic discussions. The

ACE strongly recommends that the primary team chair be a well-respected member of the tenured faculty because so many aspects of the review will deal with the curriculum and other academic matters.

CAO also should ensure representation of some areas traditionally less involved in internationalization (for example, some professional schools and some administrative units such as advancement). While board and community members can also make important contributions and add weight to the review team's findings and recommendations, committee membership may be too time-consuming for their participation. Consulting them on important issues may suffice. Many institutions also include students on the review team or on its subcommittees.

If an institution is divided into colleges and schools, it is helpful to have all of them represented on the review team, unless its size becomes too unwieldy. Although representation is important, it should not override expertise and interest as the primary selection criteria. Size also contributes to a team's effectiveness. If representation is the overwhelming criterion for team membership, a committee may find itself with 25 members, too many to facilitate decision making or reach consensus on difficult issues. If a large team is deemed essential, then it will have to do most of its work in smaller groups or subcommittees, using the whole group or the subcommittee chairs as a coordinating mechanism. Additional members, chosen for their expertise, can be added to subcommittees. Institutional research officers are important resources for the committee and its subcommittees. If subcommittees are formed, it is important to be clear about the range of their responsibilities. In one institution, subcommittee members incorrectly assumed that they were members of the core review team; the CAO had to support subcommittee leaders as they clarified the roles of those involved in the larger process.

It is important that the committee not work in seclusion. Rather, an important part of its task is to engage with others on campus, seeking input into their deliberations from a broad spectrum of stakeholders and providing regular updates of its work to appropriate groups (the CAO's cabinet, deans, department chairs, faculty senate, etc.). The team should construct a communications plan to guide this aspect of the process.[12]

12 For details on constructing a communications plan, see *Handbook*, pp. 10–11.

The skill and the standing of the chair or co-chairs of the review team are critical to its success, and the CAO should give careful thought to these appointments. It is vital that the team leader(s) have the skills to organize the review team's work, promote good teamwork, and solve problems along the way. While a single chair may be sufficient at a small institution, larger and more decentralized institutions may benefit from having co-chairs or even a small core leadership group of three or four persons.

ACE strongly recommends that the primary team chair be a well-respected member of the tenured faculty because so many aspects of the review will deal with the curriculum and other academic matters. On many campuses, a team leader who is not charged with administering international programs is perceived as more credible and objective. The CAO should give the team leader release time to ensure that he or she has sufficient time to devote to this task. While some CAOs have named untenured faculty members to lead a review because of their strong interest in internationalization, they usually do not have sufficient faculty influence to be effective. In addition, internationalization may be a contentious issue on the campus, and untenured faculty may be too vulnerable to lead well or may put themselves at risk if they are strong champions of internationalization or take unpopular positions. On some campuses, the CAO has appointed the chief international officer as a co-chair of the review team. Chief international officers bring important knowledge to the group and their offices can provide staff support for the review. Having a CIO as a co-chair can also give more prominence and respect to international programs, especially if that office is marginalized on campus.

What should be the charge to the review team?

The group conducting an internationalization review must have a clear charge from the president or the CAO, specifying expected outcomes and timelines. A charge from the top leadership signals the seriousness of the review. The charge should be in writing and widely disseminated on campus to ensure that the team gains access to the information it needs. A team specifically created for the review task will be most effective if its charge comes from the president, thus signaling that senior leaders and campus constituents should take the group's recommendations seriously. If the team's charge covers only a review and analysis (but not the development of an internationalization action plan), the CAO should consider what structures and individuals should carry the work forward. Creating an internationalization plan to implement the recommendations of the review may require a team with different expertise. Some institutions have created a new group to move the effort into the next phase—often including some members of the review team for the sake of continuity. Others have proceeded with the review team moving on to the next phase of work and creating an implementation plan.[13]

---

13 For examples of internationalization review team charges, see ACE's online internationalization toolkit, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/toolkit.

Although the CAO is usually not a member of the review team, he or she must stay in close touch with its work, scheduling regular meetings with the team chair(s) to receive updates on the progress of the review. It is especially helpful for the CAO to set a reasonable timeline for the team's work. In ACE's experience, a review usually takes 12 to 16 months; dragging out the process can dissipate the

Questions to Guide the Internationalization Review

Articulated Commitment: Mission, Goals, and Vision

- Is global/international learning articulated as part of the institution's vision, mission, or goals? If so, where (for example, in the mission statement, strategic plan, or recruiting materials)?
- What are the goals for internationalization (for example, preparing students for work in a global society or connecting international and multicultural agendas)? Where are those goals articulated?
- To what extent has the institution developed student learning goals associated with the global and international dimensions of undergraduate education? What are they? Where are they articulated? Who knows about them? How consistent are goals for different programs or colleges?
- How do faculty members assess student achievement of those goals?

The Local, State, and Broader Environments for Internationalization

- Does the immediate environment from which the institution draws its students suggest a special approach to internationalization (for example, do local immigrant populations encourage ties to other countries and regions)?
- Does the institution's location facilitate certain kinds of international interactions with a particular region or regions? What local organizations or businesses have strong international ties? Are they focused on particular parts of the globe?
- What opportunities exist in the state and local environments to enhance the institution's internationalization efforts? To what extent has the institution taken advantage of those opportunities?

Strategy

- Does the institution have a strategic plan? Where does internationalization fit into the plan? If internationalization is not part of the strategic plan, where else is it outlined?
- Does the institution have an institutional internationalization strategy? If so, what are its main components?
- How does this strategy take into account the institution's mission, history, and nature of the student body?
- How does the institution assess its progress in achieving its goals?

Structures, Policies and Practice, Resources

Organizational Structure and Personnel

- Where does primary responsibility for internationalization lie? What other structures or bodies share responsibility? How effective are these arrangements?
- What are the staffing arrangements and reporting lines? How well are they working?
- What governance structures support internationalization? How well are they working?

Policies and Practices

- How does the institution promote faculty engagement in internationalization? To what extent does the institution reward or penalize faculty for international activities and internationalization of their courses, especially in the hiring, promotion, and tenure processes? What are the barriers to faculty engagement? To what extent is the institution succeeding in removing them? What is the evidence?
- To what extent are students encouraged to take courses with international content? To take language courses? To engage in education abroad? Who provides such encouragement?

energy of the internationalization review team and other campus participants. The CAO can also be helpful to the team chairs in advising them about the political process and ensuring they have access to the information they need. In addition, the CAO can help both the team, in celebrating its work, and the campus, in taking pride in what it is already doing well internationally, even as it plans to move in new, better, and more cohesive directions.

How do advisers encourage or discourage students to pursue international learning and experiences? How do departmental requirements and practices encourage or discourage international learning? To what extent is education abroad integrated into the academic major, minor, and general education requirements?

- How effective are the administrative policies and procedures pertaining to education abroad, with regard to financial aid portability and credit transfer?
- Is there differential pricing for programs in different locations? What are the implications of the current pricing structures?
- Beyond those mentioned above, what policies or practices hinder internationalization efforts at this institution?

Resources
- What financial resources does the institution provide for internationalization? What resources are available to support curriculum development; faculty international travel and research; students' study- or work-abroad opportunities; infrastructure (such as library holdings, technology, or language labs); and co-curricular programs?
- Does the institution have a fund-raising strategy for internationalization? How is it aligned with the overall institutional fund-raising strategy?
- What is the balance between internal and external funding sources for internationalization? Has this funding increased, decreased, or remained the same during the last five years? 10 years?
- How well do institutional resources align with institutional goals? What are the most important targets for future investment?

Faculty and Staff
- Does the institution collect information on the faculty's language capacity, international background, interests, and experiences? If so, where is this information available and how is it used? What is the faculty composition and experience? To what extent do faculty come from other countries, have extensive international experience, speak multiple languages, co-author with international colleagues, and take international sabbaticals?
- Does the institution gather information on the attitudes of faculty and staff toward international learning? If so, how is this information used?
- To what extent does the institution invite visiting faculty/scholars from abroad? To what extent and how does their presence contribute to institutional internationalization?
- Does the institution consider international experience in hiring faculty or in the promotion and tenure process?
- To what extent do faculty and staff perceive international learning as an important element of the educational process at the institution? What is the evidence?

Students
- What is the composition of the student body? To what extent does it affect the institution's internationalization strategy?
- Does the institution collect information on the international interests, experiences, and attitudes of students? If so, how is this information used?
- What are the enrollment trends of international students? How are international students distributed among schools and colleges? Between undergraduate and graduate programs? How are international students integrated into campus life?
- What strategies are in place to help domestic students learn from international students?

Questions to Guide the Internationalization Review

The Curriculum and Co-curriculum

The Curriculum

- To what extent does the institution's general education curriculum include international or global content, perspectives, and different ways of knowing? What is the evidence?
- To what extent do academic departments attempt to internationalize majors? To what extent do they promote or impede study abroad for students? What is the evidence? To what extent is study abroad integrated into the academic major, minor, and general education requirements?
- How rich are the opportunities for students to take courses with an international or global focus? What international majors, minors, concentrations, certificates, and courses are offered? What do enrollment patterns in these courses indicate about student interest over time?
- Does the institution have a language requirement (for some or for all students)? Why or why not? Is this requirement articulated in seat time or proficiency? What do enrollment patterns in language courses reveal? What qualitative data exist about language learning at this institution? What quantitative data?
- Has the institution gathered information about alumni use of language skills after graduation?
- To what extent does pedagogy take advantage of the differing perspectives that domestic and international students bring to the campus?
- To what extent does the curriculum integrate U.S. multicultural issues with international/global perspectives and issues?

Co-curriculum and Campus Life

- How is internationalization manifested in the co-curriculum (e.g., international events, festivals, lectures, films)? To what extent do students, faculty, and staff attend these events? To what extent does the campus host international scholars, performers, and lecturers?
- What opportunities exist in the local environment to enhance internationalization efforts? To what extent has this institution taken advantage of them? To what extent are the co-curricular activities open to and attended by members of the local community?
- To what extent does the co-curriculum seek to integrate U.S. multicultural issues and international perspectives and issues?

Education Abroad

- What opportunities exist for education abroad (study abroad, internships, field work, research, service learning)?
- What are the trends for student participation in these programs during the past five to 10 years? How many students participate? What are their destinations? How much time do they spend abroad—two weeks? A summer? A semester? A year?
- What is the distribution of students who engage in education abroad by gender and race/ethnicity?
- What is the distribution of students by discipline?
- How are students financing their education abroad? Is financial aid portable? Can students tap into additional sources of aid?
- How are students prepared for education abroad experiences—a pre-departure orientation? A specific orientation course?
- To what extent does the institution integrate students into the host country? To what extent are students in "island" programs?
- What issues, if any, surround the recognition of credit for study abroad?
- What effect do education abroad students have on the home campus upon their return? Upon residence life? Upon curriculum content and classroom practice? To what extent is education abroad integrated with the curriculum on campus?

Engagement with Institutions Abroad

- Does the institution have an overall strategy for international partnerships? If so, what does it address? How well is it working?
- Does the institution regularly evaluate its partnerships? If so, what criteria are used? What have recent evaluations revealed? What actions have been taken as a result?
- Does the institution have an inventory of partnerships throughout the institution? In what form? To whom is it available? How is it used?
- Does the institution have criteria for deciding whether to pursue potential partnerships? How well do they work?
- To what extent does the institution engage in student, faculty, and staff exchange? Do the institution's study-abroad programs facilitate such exchanges?
- To what extent do faculty members engage in collaborative research and development cooperation with faculty at institutions in other countries?
- What effect do partnerships have on student international learning on campus?
- How does the institution fund its partnerships? How sustainable are the existing partnerships?

Analysis and Recommendations

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the institution's current efforts to internationalize? What opportunities exist for deepening internationalization? What are the threats to future progress?
- What are the implications of the review process for the institution's strategic priorities for the next year? For the next three to five years?
- To what extent does synergy exist among the various international activities and programs on campus? What communication channels exist, and how well are they working?
- What are the most important targets for future collaboration and connection among international programs/activities on campus?

Updated from Green, M. & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*, pp. 91–94.

Chapter 3
What options for staffing and structuring internationalization should the CAO consider?

ACE's experience in working with institutions demonstrates the importance of an adequate infrastructure to support internationalization and of having a chief international officer who plays a key role in developing and implementing an institutional internationalization strategy.[14] Our research shows that there are many different ways to staff international programs— ranging from a decentralized approach with multiple offices to a more centralized construct in which a single office oversees or coordinates initiatives such as study abroad, international students, and curricular approaches.[15] Staffing patterns also vary. International education administrators have many different titles, educational backgrounds, reporting relationships, and ranges of institutional activities that they manage. These differences in structure and staffing will affect how the institution approaches internationalization.

What is an appropriate balance between centralization and decentralization of internationalization?

No matter their size, academic institutions are under great pressures to be decentralized. At the very least, academic freedom urges faculty members to be individualistic in their pursuit of knowledge. The pressures intensify if the institution or its constituent schools or colleges encourage faculty entrepreneurship. Recently, schools and colleges have begun their own branding, including being named for a donor or developing a reputation that is seemingly independent of the host institution. Some institutions are divided into several physical campuses or maintain freestanding academic centers with clear identities and curricular strengths. Finding ways to give direction in largely decentralized institutions is one of the biggest leadership challenges for the CAO. And if internationalization is to be comprehensive, then the CAO must lead effectively from the center, no matter how decentralized the institution.

14 A particularly insightful piece for the CAO who wants to know the preoccupations of the CIO is Heyl, J.D. (2007). *The senior international officer (SIO) as change agent*. Durham, NC: Association of International Education Administrators.
15 Green, M., Luu, D., & Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, pp. 10–11.

As institutions intensify their international activities and as the external environment changes, the need for coordination of internationalization initiatives across the institution becomes increasingly evident. Unfettered decentralization leads to reinvention of the wheel; inconsistency in policies, procedures, and the attendant risks; and less efficient use of resources. Changes in the external environment require greater attention to risk management and federal regulations. For example, an institution may have study abroad opportunities scattered throughout the institution in individual courses, departments, as well as the study abroad office; risk management issues pressure institutions to have all such opportunities monitored by a central unit. Similarly, compliance issues related to homeland security require institutions to have greater oversight of the international research conducted by faculty members and students.

Internal circumstances may also drive greater centralization of internationalization activities. If study abroad opportunities are managed in different locations in the institution, there may be different practices in administering them and administrative personnel may have redundant responsibilities. As budget pressures increase at most institutions, such duplication may no longer be justified on the basis of departmental autonomy. Finally, having one central source of information and data about international activities would be helpful to a CAO, who probably has many administrators who report directly to him or her.

However, centralization has its drawbacks and resistors. Schools and colleges treasure their autonomy and resist any efforts that fetter their entrepreneurial spirit or their creativity. How, then, can the CAO balance pressures for centralization and faculty need for autonomy? If faculty members perceive benefits from centralization, they will be more likely to support (or at least tolerate) it. Faculty can usually be persuaded to give up the headaches of arranging logistics for international study in exchange for effective handling of those arrangements by some administrative unit, provided it has the requisite staff and expertise. For example, the international programs office could help develop policies and checklists for international program development; it could also serve as a clearinghouse by providing information about safety and liability abroad, best practices, and other resources to faculty members. A central office can provide valuable assistance in negotiating partnership agreements and in advising faculty on developing effective collaborations. It is important that both the motivation for centralization and the result be improved academic quality and greater service to faculty and students. When greater centralization occurs, faculty may mistakenly assume that the administration is taking greater control of functions once handled by faculty. The CAO must take care that the stated rationale is coordination, not control, and he or she should be certain that the CIO is coordinating, not controlling.

Finally, under the leadership of the CIO, the CAO should try to centralize only those aspects of internationalization that make sense given the institution's history, personnel (both faculty and administrative), and goals. The CAO must determine whether the office of international programs has the capacity necessary to manage the range of activities the institution wants.

What options does an institution have in appointing an administrator to oversee internationalization?

Increasingly, institutions with active international agendas appoint a full-time senior administrator to coordinate or oversee internationalization efforts because that individual and his or her staff also provide essential coordination and support to implement a campus-wide internationalization strategy. However, according to an ACE study conducted in fall 2006, only 44 percent of U.S. campuses had a full-time administrator to oversee internationalization. Doctorate-granting universities were the most likely to have one (85 percent), followed by master's institutions (63 percent), and baccalaureate (47 percent). Fewer than three in 10 (28 percent) of associate's institutions had a full-time administrator to oversee or coordinate internationalization activities.[16] Without such leadership and support, it is safe to predict that internationalization will have low visibility and remain sporadic and uncoordinated.

International educators refer to these individuals as chief international officers (CIOs) or senior international officers (SIOs). These individuals have different titles, including dean, director, associate or vice provost, or vice president. Research universities tend to use the titles associate provost or vice provost, vice president, or vice chancellor for international affairs. It is not always easy to tell the level of responsibility from the title, which often reflects the person's academic standing and senior status.

We use the term *CIO* to refer to an administrator whose responsibilities include oversight of a broad variety of international programs and initiatives and who reports to a senior administrator, usually but not always the CAO.[17] Based on our experience working with all kinds of institutions, we strongly recommend that colleges and universities appoint a full-time chief international officer, reporting to the chief academic officer. A capable and well-respected individual in this position, often a tenured full professor, fully supported by the president and chief

> The CAO must take care that the stated rationale is coordination, not control, and he or she should be certain that the CIO is coordinating, not controlling.

academic officer, is crucial to advancing internationalization and sends a powerful message to the campus community.

Institutions without a CIO usually have one or more people working on internationalization. Sometimes, one of those individuals will function as a CIO; other times, there will be several people scattered throughout the institution with different reporting lines. Their titles will vary. For example, a community college may not have any individual with a title that connects to international activities, but there may be someone in the student services unit who deals with international students, even if the institution has no other internationalization activities, such as

---

16 Green, Luu, & Burris. *Mapping internationalization*.
17 The ACE survey indicated that in those institutions with a full-time international education administrator, 50 percent of those administrators reported to the CAO.

study abroad. At some institutions, the primary international education administrator is the person who manages study abroad. That individual may report to a wide range of individuals, including an associate dean or associate provost in academic affairs, the chief student affairs officer, or, as we saw in one institution, a dean of continuing studies, with responsibility for all off-campus programs. In earlier decades, when study abroad was promoted primarily for improved learning of a foreign language, the person in charge might have been housed in a language department, reporting to a dean or department chair.

What is the CIO's range of responsibilities?

Although CIOs generally have oversight of a broad range of international activities and programs, the scope of the job varies from one institution to another. The areas of responsibility (either in an oversight or coordination role, depending on the area and the institution) might include study and internships abroad, international service learning, international student and scholar services; internationalizing the curriculum, recruitment of international students, instruction in English for non-native speakers; or languages across the curriculum, international partnerships, area studies, international campus programming, faculty and staff development, and in unusual cases, international studies majors or global competency certificates for undergraduates. Many CIOs have budgets that allow the office to provide seed grants for partnerships and other activities, fund faculty travel abroad, and offer relevant workshops. They also may support internationalization by providing information on faculty interests and expertise in the form of a database, or gather

other relevant data on internationalization activities. Some institutions function as a third-party provider of education abroad; other institutions or consortia and the CIO may oversee these. The CIO's range of responsibilities will determine the skill sets needed for the position, and getting the correct match of person to position is one of the CAO's most important decisions. More about the background of the CIO will be discussed in the next section.

How does the campus perceive the international programs office, and what does that imply for achieving the institution's internationalization goals?

As the institution decides what steps are needed to internationalize its teaching, learning, research, academic outreach and engagement, and service, the CAO must consider the roles the CIO and the international programs office currently play, and whether those roles should or can be expanded. For example, if the international office is considered a service unit to students and faculty, then its head may be perceived as an administrator or manager, rather than as an academic leader. If, on the other hand, the office of international programs supports the faculty work associated with internationalization, its head may be seen as closely aligned with academic matters. Paradoxically, when the CIO has oversight of a number of international programs and administrators, the price of this coordination may be that this individual is so immersed in management that he or she does not have enough time to work on academic policy and strategy. In these cases, the CIO may need additional staff to assist with day-to-day matters.

Similarly, the CAO should be especially sensitive to how the CIO is perceived on campus. The educational background of the CIO affects how he or she is perceived. If the CIO began as a faculty member whose administrative skill set moved him or her into international activities, the person may be perceived by the faculty as "one of us," that is, a person who could assist in internationalizing the teaching and learning and research. Similarly, longevity of service may positively affect the perception of the CIO as someone who can be trusted. On many campuses, even if the CIO is not a faculty member, that individual may hold a PhD, which again contributes to legitimacy and credibility. In these cases, the CIO may have a positive role to play in curricular development. However, if the institution is primarily focused on research and has a highly decentralized structure with strong deans, a CIO with a background in study abroad—even if the person has a PhD—can be seen as a student services administrator and may not gain enough respect from the senior faculty to be perceived as an academic leader.

If the institution decides to enhance the academic dimensions of internationalization, such as by developing new or revised curriculum, articulating and assessing student learning outcomes, and expanding faculty development/ exchanges, the CAO must decide if the CIO and the international staff have sufficient reputation and expertise to play a significant role. Many faculty members will consider curricular work to be the special prerogative of the faculty and, depending on the background and reputation of the CIO, may consider the CIO's interest in such matters as inappropriate. Some institutions have had curricular proposals, such as having study abroad courses fulfill a general education requirement, derailed

in faculty senate subcommittees because the CIO was perceived as the primary champion of the proposal. Even when the CIO is a faculty member or highly regarded by the faculty, that individual must work with faculty partners, who serve as the champions of the initiative, to be effective.

What Might the Areas of Responsibility for the CIO Include?

The activities that might be included in the CIO's job description include:

1. Overseeing the office(s) of international programs, with appropriate staff to handle the daily tasks of study abroad, international students, etc.
2. Chairing or co-chairing an international advisory team to develop or implement the institution's internationalization plans.
3. Coordinating work with departments and faculty to support study abroad.
4. Working with deans and faculty to broaden and deepen internationalization throughout the institution, by supporting internationalization of the curriculum and the development of student learning outcomes.
5. Working with the senior administrator in charge of graduate programs and faculty to advance internationalization of graduate programs.
6. Working with faculty and staff on multicultural education in complementary activities.
7. Exploring opportunities for international collaborations and partnerships for research, student/faculty exchange, and international development; and supporting faculty in their collaborative work in drafting and monitoring agreements.
8. Working with the alumni office and international alumni on a range of activities to support internationalization, including the establishment of international chapters.
9. Working with faculty to explore and establish dual degree programs and branch campuses abroad, and to deliver programs or degrees abroad.
10. Working with faculty and development officers in securing funds to support internationalization activities.
11. Working with stakeholders to produce an internationalization plan.
12. Maintaining primary responsibility for recruiting international undergraduate students, or working with the admissions office, if it has primary responsibility.

See also the ACE's online internationalization toolkit for sample CIO job descriptions, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/toolkit.

If the institution decides that developing or expanding partnerships with institutions abroad is an important step, the CIO should play a key role here, providing background information and advice to the CAO and to faculty, facilitating the drafting and review of agreements, and helping monitor their implementation.[18]

If the CIO reports to someone other than the CAO, he or she may not be perceived as sufficiently central to the institution's power structure or academic agenda to be effective in bringing about internationalization.

What are the important considerations in defining the CIO position or establishing reporting lines?

The CIO's reporting relationship is also important to how the CIO is perceived. As noted above, the majority of CIOs are situated in academic affairs. If the CIO reports to someone other than the CAO, he or she may not be perceived as sufficiently central to the institution's power structure or academic agenda to be effective in bringing about internationalization. Many CAOs have found it necessary to deal with inappropriate reporting lines and the delicate work needed to change them before internationalization could be seen as an institutional priority.

Some structural and personnel changes also may be needed if the institution wants to intensify or change its international programs and activities or engage in different ones from the past. An internationalization review may document the need for such changes. One institution noted during the course of its review that providing services for international students and managing study abroad were essentially two sides of the same coin, as international students were essentially "studying abroad" in the United States. Putting the two units into a shared work space, even though the reporting relationships were not the same (academic affairs and student affairs, respectively), created good synergy and more effective service to both kinds of students. Eventually, the reporting lines were changed so that both units reported to the CIO. This is a simple kind of coordination.

Changes to the reporting line of the CIO are sometimes most easily made when transitions in the CIO or senior international positions are anticipated. For example, if the CAO decides to create an associate provost position and bring the international programs office under academic affairs, the moment of opportunity may arise when the incumbent senior international person is leaving the institution. The CAO will want to consult with key players and have the broad outlines of the reorganization in place before hiring the new CIO. Or, the CAO may choose to change the CIO's reporting line with the incumbent in place, which may be a more or less delicate undertaking, depending on a host of factors, including the relationship of the CIO and his or her current

---

18 For further information on the role of the CIO in international partnerships, see Van de Water, Green, & Koch. *International partnerships*.

supervisor, the willingness of the current supervisor to relinquish the international portfolio, and how compelling a case there is for such realignment as a means of achieving stated institutional objectives.

The CAO may decide to change the reporting relationship of the CIO to reflect the importance of internationalization to the institution or to move the function into the heart of academic affairs. If the CIO reports to a research office or a student affairs office, this may indicate to the academic community that internationalization is not at the core of the institution's academic priorities. In those cases, changing the CIO's reporting line to the CAO is appropriate, if the incumbent's job description, background, and skill set justify that move. Some institutions have had the CIO report directly to the president, but this usually implies that internationalization is intended to increase the institution's global footprint, rather than to transform the institution's academic heart. A few CIOs have a dual reporting line to both the president and the CAO; in other cases, especially when internationalization is a high priority for the president, the relationship between the CIO and the president is informal but contact is regular.

When a redefinition of the CIO position is necessary, the CAO can revise the job description (with the collaboration of the president, key faculty, and administrators) to fit the new goals or plans for internationalization. It is also possible to alter the scope of responsibilities of a sitting CIO, depending on that individual's appropriateness for the new position. In redefining the CIO position, the CAO should consider how important that individual's role will be in the academic arena. If the role is significant, the position should be filled by someone with strong faculty credentials. Additionally, if internationalization is to be an important piece of the institution's core identity, the CIO should be part of the senior staff, so that the voice for internationalization is heard where decisions are made and so that other senior officers cooperate with the CIO on areas of mutual concern.

Why is it essential to ensure adequate staffing and resources for the international office?

If the CIO has a broad portfolio, as described above, the CAO has the responsibility of ensuring the quality of the activities undertaken. One aspect of ensuring quality is having sufficient numbers of staff and providing them with adequate training. Frequently, international offices are assessed according to their "productivity"—the numbers of students going abroad or international students served by the office. However, as volume grows, so do the requirements for staff who can advise, orient, and debrief students and work with faculty. The wise CAO will develop plans for assessment and a metric of accountability for every office and administrator reporting to him or her—both qualitative and quantitative— and be sure that the CIO has the necessary personnel and resources to meet the agreed-upon expectations.

Chapter 4
What is the CAO's leadership role in planning and implementing internationalization?

Why is it important to have an internationalization plan and what is the CAO's role in ensuring its development?

Gathering information on stakeholder support for internationalization and the scope and quality of the existing programs and initiatives is not an end in itself—rather, understanding the lay of the land is a prelude to developing a strategy. Once a CAO has a picture of what the institution is doing internationally and has assessed the potential contributions of the chief international officer and the effectiveness of the international programs office, the institution must define the next level of internationalization and develop a strategy to get there.

Once the internationalization review is complete, and the findings thoroughly analyzed, the internationalization review team generally develops a series of recommendations to the president and provost. The process can take several different directions at this point. In some institutions, the internationalization review team, after consultation with the president and provost, engages appropriate campus stakeholders to develop an action plan. Alternatively, the CAO and president can designate a new group (with some carry-over members of the review committee) to develop a plan. A third strategy is to use the recommendations to incorporate internationalization into the overall institutional strategic plan. The latter strategy is especially useful if the timing is right and the institution is embarking on a strategic plan or working on a revision. Whatever route the CAO and president choose, it is important that the internationalization plan align with other institutional efforts, such as curriculum revision, institutional strategic planning, capital campaigns, and accreditation.

Precisely where the strategy is articulated depends on the institutional context. If the institution has internationalization as a priority in a strategic plan, then the CAO can elaborate the internationalization plans in it. It is difficult to move toward comprehensive internationalization if it is not in the institutional plan. However, if it is not in the institutional strategic plan, the CAO needs to show how internationalization can support the plan's priorities. For example, if enhancing research is a top priority, international collaboration provides a key means to expand and strengthen it. Similarly, community outreach to diaspora populations and immigrant groups also can be aligned with internationalization.[19]

19 For examples of internationalization strategic plans, see ACE's online internationalization toolkit, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/toolkit.

How does the CAO encourage administrative leadership and accountability for internationalization?

Because CAOs cannot single-handedly make internationalization happen, it is crucial that they engage other vice presidents, deans, and department chairs and promote and reward a culture of collaboration. Senior officers overseeing teaching and learning, research, outreach, finance and administration, and advancement must be involved in significant ways. Deans are another important group. They are pivotal to engage department chairs, who in turn work with faculty members. Since most deans and department chairs have learned to value individual performance in their academic careers, the CAO may need to find ways to encourage collaboration within and across departments, including incentives and professional development opportunities.

As noted above, if internationalization is important for the institution, it should be formalized in the overall strategic plan, with clear expectations that the deans and department chairs will outline in their annual subsidiary plans specific actions that their schools or departments will undertake to enhance internationalization. It should also be clear that they are accountable for implementing their plans.

Although many issues clamor for the CAO's attention, it will be important for him or her to stay on top of institutional progress and to receive regular, user-friendly information on goals and accomplishments. CAOs should receive annual updates about internationalization efforts, including plans and achievements for each college or department (depending on the size of the institution). Department chairs should also ask for this information in annual faculty reports. Certainly, these reports should not be the only source of information for the CAO. Regular contact with the CIO and with the internationalization committee(s) is imperative. Such ongoing communication will enable the CAO to know whether things are on track and when a judicious intervention can help clarify an issue, address a problem, or move the agenda along.

What are the benefits of creating a permanent internationalization advisory committee?

A permanent advisory group for internationalization provides valuable input from different members of the campus community and creates useful cross-campus conversations. The CAO can also give visibility and legitimacy for internationalization by creating a permanent advisory group, which generally has different membership from the internationalization review team. An internationalization review gives the institution a snapshot of what it is doing internationally and an analysis of its strengths, weaknesses, and possibilities for future action. But that is only the beginning. Ongoing work on internationalization requires different structures and players as it evolves. What opportunities and programs does the institution have or need to create to advance comprehensive internationalization?

If a standing advisory group does not already exist, the CAO is well advised to create one. It can play many different roles, including developing an action plan for internationalization to follow on the work of the review team, monitoring partnerships, reviewing study abroad programs and proposals, and generally advising the CIO. The CAO should determine the appropriate membership of this permanent advisory committee and prepare a clear charge for its work, including the scope

of what its members should address. For example, if the charge to the committee is to develop an action plan, how many years should it cover? What kinds of activities should it address? What kind of resources will be needed in the short and long runs? Who will have responsibility for what? How will the group be monitored? What programs should be on its agenda for periodic review and discussion? How will it relate to other relevant groups on campus working on internationalization issues?

If a standing committee on internationalization already exists, it is important for the CAO to determine whether its composition and functions are still the appropriate ones and whether changes are needed to accomplish different tasks. For example, if there is a standing committee whose main function has been information exchange, is this the right group to develop a new plan for internationalization? Or, if there is a specific issue that needs to be addressed, such as increasing the participation and the quality of study abroad, the CAO will want to determine whether to create a new group or a subgroup of the existing group (probably with new members added), or charge the existing committee with the task.

As is the case with the internationalization review committee, the CAO should think carefully about the selection of the chair. That individual should have the respect of the faculty and the skills to lead the group. The CIO should play a key role—either as co-chair, or less visibly as a member of the committee.

The timetable is always an issue. The CAO and the committee chair need to think carefully about the nature of the specific tasks the committee is being asked to accomplish and balance the need for thoughtful deliberation with the need to come to a timely conclusion and move ahead. In projecting a timetable for implementation, both the CAO and the committee need to remember that some actions, particularly those that affect the institution broadly or are ambitious, take time to accomplish.

How can partnerships advance comprehensive internationalization?[20]

Partnerships with institutions abroad have the potential to touch many parts of the institutions and contribute to a variety of other institutional internationalization strategies. Partnerships are central to any internationalization strategy, for how can an institution be international without real engagement with counterparts in other countries? International partnerships should not exist in a vacuum, rather, they should be part of the institution's larger internationalization strategy, grounded in the institution's mission. As institutions develop a vision and a plan for internationalization, partnerships should be an integral part of that discussion.

Although faculty and the international office are the key players in establishing and implementing partnerships, the CAO plays an important role in providing strategic direction, representing the institution internationally, and ensuring that partnerships are appropriately monitored.

20 For further information on international partnerships, see Van de Water, Green, & Koch. *International partnerships*. Portions of this section were adapted from that publication.

A first step for a CAO is to ensure that the existing institutional partnerships are evaluated. Some of this work may have been accomplished through the internationalization review. To deepen the evaluation, the CAO will likely turn to the CIO, who should work with different schools and faculty members to conduct a thorough and substantive review of partnerships. The evaluation should not only consider how well specific partnerships are working in their current form, but also assess their potential for expansion and whether they contribute to any strategic and cumulative presence in a given country or region. If a partnership supports only one faculty member's or one department's research, can other departments or programs be matched with the partner institution to expand the partnership? If so, the expanded partnership can establish explicit concentrations of activity that attract attention and support from external sources. It can lay the foundation for new projects to build upon existing ones, and involve new faculty, students, and staff, including those with little previous international experience.[21]

In thinking about developing or expanding partnerships, the CAO will want to consider the extent to which they are or should be strategic, or whether the institution prefers to let a thousand flowers bloom. ACE recommends that institutions develop a framework for partnerships and a set of criteria for judging the appropriateness of a proposed partnership and its alignment with the framework. Among the issues that the framework might address are:

- What are our rationales and institutional goals for partnerships?
- What regions/countries will be high priority and which will be low? Why?
- Are the regions/countries selected for high priority aligned with the academic degrees we offer?
- What programs, areas, or issues are a high priority for partnership activity?
- Will the institution give priority to institution-wide partnerships, those specific to a college or a degree program, or both?
- How can partnerships enhance the quality of existing programs? Of new programs?[22]

Increasingly, institutions are choosing to maximize the impact of partnerships by developing a limited number that involve several schools and departments across the institution.

---

21 See www.acenet.edu/programs/international/partnerships for examples of successful multi-layered partnerships at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis and New Mexico State University.
22 Van de Water, Green, & Koch. *International partnerships*, p. 9.

Because partnership agreements have financial and legal as well as academic implications, they should be signed by the president or CAO. If the CAO has not been involved in the development of the agreement, he or she will want to be sure that the proposed partnership meets the criteria that the institution has elaborated, and that it has been reviewed by the appropriate campus officers, including legal counsel and the chief financial officer.

The CAO will play a personal role in developing and perhaps negotiating large-scale partnerships. It is often important to the institution abroad that the U.S. institution be represented by the president, CAO, or both. The ceremonial role of institutional leaders should not be overlooked, and even if the president or CAO is not needed to accomplish the work, the symbolism of their presence can be crucial, especially at the early stages of the partnership, when establishing the relationship is of paramount importance.

For smaller-scale partnerships, the CIO and the relevant faculty or staff will play the key roles in the negotiations. However, it is important for the CAO to be informed about partnerships under development and to offer support in word and deed.

A different set of issues arises when an institution decides to offer courses, programs, or degrees abroad, compared with when it establishes a campus abroad.[23] Although only a minority of U.S. institutions offers programs abroad,

How Can CAOs Monitor, Sustain, Revise, and Revitalize Partnerships?

- Designate faculty leadership for each partnership and request annual progress reports and future plans.
- Put a time limit on any program or broad agreement and conduct a thorough review one year before the expiration of the partnership.
- Ensure that all partnerships are regularly reviewed and evaluated by the partners.
- Consider adding new features to partnerships to deepen them over time.
- Anticipate changes in leadership by embedding the activities of the partnership in the ongoing life of the institutions.

others are considering moving in this direction to enhance their global reach. If these activities occur in a partnership with another institution, the issues discussed above apply. However, some U.S. institutions offering programs abroad do so without a local partner. In either case, it is important for the CAO to ensure that a presence abroad fits with the overall institutional mission and strategy and contributes to internationalizing the home campus. It is entirely possible for students from the home campus to have little or no contact with those on the campus abroad, or for only a few faculty members to be involved. Although benefits of different kinds may accrue to the U.S. institution—including enhancing prestige, generating revenue, and contributing to internationalization—there are risks as well. Any institution considering venturing abroad must think through how it will ensure quality and reputation, and weigh the financial risks.

---

23 See Green, M., Eckel, P., & Luu, D. (2007). *Venturing abroad: Delivering U.S. degree programs and branch campuses abroad*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education for a discussion of programs and campuses abroad and a checklist of issues for leaders to consider; and Green, M., Kinser, K., & Eckel, P. (2008). *On the ground overseas: U.S. degree programs and branch campuses abroad*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

How can CAOs encourage faculty to engage in internationalization?[24]

Faculty engagement drives successful internationalization. Because the faculty's role is so central, an institutional commitment to engaging faculty in undertaking international work, expanding their existing interests, and developing their capacity should be a central focus of any internationalization strategy. The CAO has an important role to play here in creating opportunities and exerting influence. If faculty members submit annual reports to their department chairs or deans, can sections be added to emphasize international engagement? Asking questions about internationalization of courses and international presentations and research signals that such work is important to the institution, and such information should clearly be taken into account in merit pay and other incentives, including promotion and tenure.

Creating incentives for faculty to engage in internationalization may require new practices or resources, or redirection of existing resources. Some CAOs have used a portion of internal faculty development funds as incentive grants for international travel tied to research or curriculum development. Some institutions call these Presidential Grants to give them greater visibility and to underscore their prestige and importance. Another institution called them New Initiative Grants to underline their innovative character. Some institutions give awards to senior faculty only if they take another colleague, preferably a junior one, on the trip to a partner institution. This practice has several potential

benefits. It can expand the institution's base of internal support for international research/collaboration, involve new players in internationalization, and expand the opportunities for deepening the engagement with the partner institution. Some institutions work to expand opportunities for faculty members to teach abroad as a means of increasing and deepening international experience among faculty.

To create even greater impact, one institution in which internationalization was a top priority created an annual competition for departments to create the best internationalization plan for a program or department. The ensuing discussions about internationalization engaged departments in important and often new conversations, even if only one could get the award each year. After several years of such awards, a CAO can create a critical mass of departments and faculty members engaged in planning internationalization. Also, many institutions (or subunits of larger institutions) have engaged faculty by offering workshops on internationalizing the curriculum or on pedagogy suited to the multicultural classroom. Finally, some CAOs have created annual awards to recognize the international work of faculty or nominated their faculty and staff for awards given by national organizations.[25]

The CAO can be particularly effective in having a lasting impact on faculty culture by looking at hiring practices and tenure and promotion policies. If international background and experience among faculty would strengthen internationalization on campus, why not state in advertisements for faculty positions that those assets are preferred, particularly for tenure-

---

24 For further discussion of engaging faculty, see Green & Olson. *Internationalizing the campus,* chapter 8.

25 See ACE's online guide to internationalization for CAOs for a list of current national awards, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/caoguide.

track positions? In addition, the CAO should at least ensure that junior faculty's international activity is not held against them in tenure decisions. The CAO's effect on faculty culture could be even greater if the tenure and promotion policies of the institution state that any of the general categories of teaching, research, and service specifically include international/intercultural accomplishments.[26]

How can the CAO encourage internationalization of the curriculum and programming for students?

Opportunities for students to engage in international/global learning, both on and off campus, include curricular offerings, co-curricular programming, research/study/service learning abroad, and contact with international students on campus. Although the creation and implementation of these opportunities fall to faculty, international programs office staff, or student affairs staff, the CAO must still ensure that they are monitored for their range, cost effectiveness, contributions to student learning, and quality. In assessing the various international learning opportunities for students, it is particularly helpful if the institution has articulated student global learning outcomes. Doing so makes it much easier to estimate the potential effectiveness of a particular program and its alignment with stated educational objectives, rather than simply hoping that it contributes to international student learning.

A key curricular issue is the role of language instruction. Although this can be a highly sensitive topic to broach with language faculty, the CAO can play an important role in catalyzing discussion of this important issue. Is studying a world language a graduation requirement? Does it involve only language acquisition, or does it intentionally develop intercultural competence? Can students fulfill a language requirement with high school language study? If the faculty is interested in adding a college-level requirement to meet certain student learning goals, what are the implications for the faculty structure,

If faculty members submit annual reports to their department chairs or deans, can sections be added to emphasize international engagement?

hiring, and budget? Is the requirement to be based on earned credit hours or demonstrated competency? If the latter, does the institution have the faculty expertise to conduct the assessment? Does it have the technological capacity to offer self-paced instruction? Are there potential tutors or language partners in the international student population or in the local community? Given the recent national discussions of the need to increase the teaching of "strategic languages," these issues are not trivial and must be addressed by the conscientious CAO.

---

26 See ACE's online internationalization toolkit for examples of tenure and promotion policies that reward international work and experience, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international/toolkit.

The CAO will also want to pay attention to the role that internationalization plays in general education. According to 2006 data from ACE, 37 percent of institutions have an internationally focused general education requirement.[27] If such a requirement exists, the CAO should work with deans and relevant committee chairs to ensure that these requirements actually address the institution's internationalization goals, particularly if the requirements have been in the catalog for a long time. The original faculty champions of such courses may have retired or become

It is important for CAOs to know that the most effective curricular strategy for internationalization is to infuse intercultural and global issues into the existing curriculum.

interested in new areas of study, and recent hires may have different views on such courses. Some institutions include either a course with an international or global focus or one with a focus on multicultural or domestic diversity issues in their general education requirement. Although internationalization and multicultural education share some goals, they are not identical, either in content or historical development. This complicated set of issues is dealt with in greater detail in ACE's publication, *At Home in the World: Bridging the Gap Between Internationalization* and *Multicultural Education*.[28] The thesis of that essay is that

neither internationalization nor multicultural education is complete in itself and needs to be complemented by the other approach.

Another area for the CAO's attention is programs with a specific international or global focus. Many institutions are establishing or strengthening programs in international studies, international relations, global studies, and globalization. Enrollment in these programs is expanding rapidly on many campuses. The issues here for the CAO are the usual curricular ones related to the quality and adequacy of the faculty and staff to launch and sustain programs in response to student demand. Such programs may be structured as majors, minors, or global competency certificates. The CAO should determine if these programs can be launched by creatively combining existing courses or if they will demand new resources.

In thinking about internationalizing the curriculum, it is important for CAOs to know that the most effective curricular strategy for internationalization is to infuse intercultural and global issues into the existing curriculum, so that global learning is part of every student's education and is deepened over time, rather than being confined to a single general education course requirement. Because the vast majority of students are unlikely to study abroad, "internationalization at home" through the curriculum will reach more students than education abroad programs. Additionally, it is generally less expensive to the institution than sending students abroad. The argument for internationalization at home should not rest on institutional costs, because these expenses can be difficult to track. Certainly, a CAO can

---

27 Green, Luu, & Burris. *Mapping internationalization*.
28 Olson, Evans, & Shoenberg. *At home in the world*.

determine the cost of workshops and faculty development initiatives, research and curricular development support, technology to support courses jointly taught with partners abroad, and the infrastructure to support internationalization. Other costs are more difficult to measure, for instance, how does an institution measure the costs of a course that infuses global issues and pedagogy? But the answer to that question may be less important than the fact that the educational argument is more powerful than the cost argument: In order for an institution to ensure global learning for all, the CAO must support internationalization throughout the curriculum and the on-campus student experience.

CAOs can also support co-curricular experiences that enhance internationalization, such as the ubiquitous student festivals, language partner programs, language residence halls, and international guest speakers and performances. Because international students can be a significant presence on campus and contribute to the international learning of domestic students, they warrant the CAO's attention. Students in ACE focus groups reported that friendships with international students and their presence in the classroom were powerful learning experiences.[29] While CAOs are unlikely to have responsibility for international student services, they should encourage faculty to see these students as assets in the classroom, adding intercultural perspectives to class discussions and assignments. The CAO may find it useful to have faculty workshops to help faculty devise ways to constructively engage these students in their courses.

How does the CAO obtain financial support for internationalization?

The CAO's financial authority and responsibility vary considerably from one institution to another. In some cases, the CAO serves as the institution's chief budget officer, especially if that individual functions as a provost executive vice president. In other cases, the CAO is equal to other vice presidents or the budget is developed by a system office. In these institutions, the CAO must try to influence those whose decisions have an impact on internationalization. Whatever the responsibilities and relative authority of the CAO, it is important for that individual to work with other senior officers such as the chief financial officer, the director of enrollment management, and the chief institutional advancement officer, who may have influence, responsibility, or authority for institutional revenue streams and expenditures that will affect the success of internationalization.

Consider the example of an institutional decision to increase the number of international students. Does the responsibility, authority, and budget belong to the CIO, who may report to the CAO, or to the director of enrollment management, who may report to the president or the vice president for student affairs, or to both of them? If the latter, the director of enrollment management will need to support the goal fully, and be prepared to devote the necessary resources as well as see his or her office as part of a larger team effort. Another example of the need for the CAO to collaborate

---

29 Green, M. (2005). *Internationalization in U.S. higher education: The student perspective.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

with fellow senior officers is international research. The CAO will want to engage the senior finance and research officers in collaborative decisions concerning allocation of overhead for international grants. What portion of the overhead goes directly to the principal investigators and what percentage is kept by the central administration? Can some of it be used to support internationalization?

Another example of the CAO's role in securing resources is collaboration with the senior advancement officer. If internationalization is a key priority and core value of the institution embedded in a strategic plan, it should find its way into any case statement for fund raising, in either an annual fund or a capital campaign. It will be crucial for the CAO to work closely with the institutional development office to present proposals from the academic area and to ensure that internationalization figures prominently in the case statement and development activities. The CAO and CIO will want to work closely with the development office on the internationalization agenda.

Gaining access to institutional resources will be easier if the CAO has clear measures of the impacts of various internationalization strategies, both academic (such as achievement of student learning outcomes) and financial (such as costs and revenues). But revenue generation is only one piece of the picture. We have already noted that some costs are difficult to document, and that should not prevent the CAO from working with the CIO and faculty to develop cost and revenue indicators related to internationalization.

How do CAOs stay on top of issues that affect internationalization?

The CAO also needs to be aware of changes in external environments, both national and international, that may affect campus internationalization. The CAO should rely on the CIO for information on internationalization trends such as student mobility, visa issues, and good practice in study abroad. Memberships in NAFSA: The Association of International Educators, the Forum on Study Abroad, and the Association of International Education Administrators will help the CIO and staff members stay current in this rapidly changing field.

Professional development always seems to take a back seat in the busy life of a CAO. We started this publication noting that internationalization is one of many areas of CAO responsibility. Inevitably, the CAO needs just-in-time information on the practicalities and process issues surrounding internationalization. ACE has a host of resources tailored to CAOs that can meet this need—meetings for CAOs and presidents, research findings, how-to publications, and opportunities for institutional engagement such as the Internationalization Collaborative or the Internationalization Laboratory.[30] In addition, the CAO should participate once a year in an appropriate international conference with colleagues from the home institution as well as peer institutions, visit an international site to visit partner institutions with faculty members, or engage with international alumni and potential donors.

---

30 See the web site of ACE's Center for International Initiatives for more information on programs and services, available at www.acenet.edu/programs/international.

Institutional membership in international higher education organizations such as the International Association of Universities (IAU) is also useful in making international contacts and receiving timely information on developments in higher education worldwide (see www.unesco.org/iau).

Finally—and here is some good news—international and global issues are an intellectually stimulating set of questions, and exploring them can provide relief from the grind of administration. Learning about the history and culture of partner institutions' countries provides an opportunity for new kinds of reading and exploration. Ensuring that every international visit is a learning opportunity as well as a ceremonial occasion can turn an obligation into a break from the routine. Although many CAOs feel that administration crowds out everything else, providing intellectual leadership is still a central task of the office. What better way to do this than to seize opportunities to reflect on the changing global realities that shape higher education and our future?

Chapter 5

What is the evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that the institution is becoming internationalized?

The central and frequently vexing questions in undertaking any change is: How do we know we are making progress? What are our metrics of success? Increasingly, these questions are being asked about all aspects of higher education by boards, accrediting agencies, and the public. Institutions should think about responding to these questions as they begin their work in internationalization, not as an afterthought when the process is well under way.

Good practice in measuring results suggests that institutions should use multiple measures—both quantitative and qualitative. The standard measures used to see if the institution is meeting targets describe the "inputs" of internationalization such as the number of international students or the numbers of students going abroad. As we will elaborate below, these indicators are useful, but are silent on what the results of these activities are (the outcomes). Nor are they sufficient to determine whether the institution is undergoing the transformational change that is comprehensive internationalization.

A quantitative set of measures developed by German academics provides a framework for measuring internationalization of faculty and staff, academic research, teaching and studies, and academic output.[31] The authors distinguish between *key figures* and *indicators*. The former is simply a number—such as the number of international doctoral candidates. The latter describes the relationship of a key figure to another figure—such as the proportion of international doctoral candidates to the total number of doctoral candidates at the institution.

While a key figure may be a target (e.g., we will increase our international student population to 500), indicators tell how deeply a particular initiative has become embedded in the life of an institution (e.g., we have increased the international student population relative to the total student population from 6 percent to 9 percent). When asking for reports on those activities that can be quantified, indicators may be most helpful in suggesting how broad and deep internationalization has become. However, indicators need to be understood in the total institutional context. For example, one institution set a percentage target for international students

---

31 Brandenburg, U., & Federkeil, G. (2007, July). *How to measure internationality and internationalization of higher education institutions: Indicators and key figures*. Centre for Higher Education Development, working paper no. 92, Berlin. Available at www. che.de/downloads/How_to_measure_internationality_AP_92.pdf.

at the same time it decided to increase the total undergraduate student enrollment. The number of international students did increase significantly, but so did the total number of students. Thus, the percentage target was not met and the effect of the increased population of international students was also diminished.

As is the case with other assessment efforts, qualitative measures for internationalization are also important. Because internationalization is a process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or

Institutional declarations, however, must be accompanied by action. The CAO needs other markers to make sure that institutional reality aligns with rhetoric.

delivery of postsecondary education, not all of its dimensions can be captured in numerical terms. Changes in structures, practices, and policies can show progress in internationalization, as can the way the institution conducts its business, and in the attitudes and behaviors of faculty and students. Comparisons to peer institutions can also be helpful.

ACE's national survey of campus internationalization provides another way for institutions to measure their international activities and policies, and allows comparisons to other institutions of the same Carnegie classification.[32] The survey reports on responses from 1,074 institutions that were queried about the following elements of internationalization:

- Institutional support (including stated institutional commitment, organizational structure and staffing, and external funding).
- Academic requirements, programs, and extracurricular activities (including foreign-language requirements and offerings, international/global course requirements, education abroad, use of technology for internationalization, joint degrees, and campus activities).
- Faculty policies and opportunities (including funding for faculty opportunities and criteria for promotion, tenure, and hiring).
- International students (including enrollments, recruiting targets and strategies, financial support for international students, and programs and support services).

Finally, it is important to note that growth is only applicable to some aspects of internationalization. Some actions that an institution can take to further comprehensive internationalization cannot be increased over time, such as adding language to recognize the legitimacy of international activities in tenure and promotion policies. A one-time event can be a marker of success, if not a metric of success. The next section discusses how changes in different areas may act as markers of success.

32 Green, Luu, & Burris. *Mapping internationalization*. See www.acenet.edu/programs/international/mapping2008 for highlights.

How can comprehensive internationalization change the way an institution conducts its business?

An institution on its way to comprehensive internationalization will reflect this goal in its strategic documents and in its policies and practices; it will have international/global/intercultural education prominently featured in its mission statement and institutional priorities. The 2006 ACE survey indicated that overall, only 39 percent of responding institutions had such a mission statement, and only 34 percent listed internationalization among its top five priorities.[33] There were, however, important variations by institutional type. If an institution moves from having no such mention to specifically mentioning international education, that change is one marker of success.

Institutional declarations, however, must be accompanied by action. The CAO needs other markers to make sure that institutional reality aligns with rhetoric. If the campus has not previously had an institution-wide committee advising about comprehensive internationalization, then the creation of such a committee would be another marker of success. Similarly, if the chief international officer did not directly report to the senior leadership, then a shift upward would be another marker of internationalization's central importance to the institution.

A set of indicators also can be established for partnerships. How many incoming and outgoing faculty, students, and administrators have participated annually over the life of an existing partnership? Has the partnership expanded to include additional programs or units over time? If the partnership is inactive or stagnant, the CAO may decide to revitalize it and invest resources or to reallocate them to more thriving partnerships.

The effect of comprehensive internationalization on institutional priorities should be reflected in changes in budgetary priorities as well. To track this metric of success would require creating definitions of expenditures that directly and indirectly support internationalization and tracking them over time, in terms of relative growth compared to the overall budget. Establishing such metrics requires continuing cooperation among the CAO, the CIO, deans, department heads, and the chief financial officer. At large institutions, this budget reporting may be the responsibility of the deans. Thus, it would be important to have a single template for accounting for internationalization expenditures, so that the information reported is comparable across units and the institution gets a reliable and comprehensive picture of change.

---

33 Green, Luu, & Burris. *Mapping internationalization*.

How does comprehensive internationalization affect the faculty?

Another measure of internationalization is the background and experience of the faculty. If the institution is making a concerted effort to recruit faculty who have international interests and experience, the results of these efforts should be visible in the profile of the faculty. Similarly, if tenure and promotion policies are changed to recognize international accomplishments, this, too, should have an effect on the international engagement of the faculty. Changing the faculty pipeline in these ways should yield measurable change over time.

Similarly, faculty opportunities for international work in research and for course development should affect the curriculum, both in course content and new program offerings (discussed below), and faculty research. Institutions that offer grants to faculty to support internationally focused research and teaching can track the results in publications and through development of new course content or new courses. Similarly, CAOs can track external awards and grants for international work.

How does comprehensive internationalization affect students?

Infusing the curriculum with international or intercultural content and offering new programs in global studies, international affairs, and so forth enhance the opportunities for students' global learning. New course content or pedagogy or student participation in the new opportunities can be measured quantitatively, but the outcomes of such changes are more likely to be measured qualitatively.

The most significant qualitative marker of internationalization success would be the demonstrable global learning achieved by students (see ACE Resources on Assessing International/Global Learning). We noted earlier that a useful addition to any institutional internationalization review is the development of international/global learning outcomes. By addressing the following questions, institutions can look at their activities or inputs in terms of the outcomes they are trying to achieve and create a more explicit link between them.

- What global knowledge, skills, and attitudes should a graduate of this institution possess?
- How will students demonstrate that they have achieved the outcomes?
- What qualities should be looked for in student work?
- What qualities will distinguish exemplary student work from satisfactory work? Are these differences described in ways that students can understand?
- What will distinguish our graduates?[34]

Once the outcomes have been crafted, faculty can use them as guideposts for course and program development, and incorporate them in their individual course objectives. Student achievement of these desired learning outcomes would then be assessed in the context of the course. Because student international/global learning can occur in a variety of courses, as well as through on- and off-campus activities, a portfolio is a particularly rich way for students to document their learning and for faculty to assess it, according to agreed upon learning outcomes and standards.

---

34 Olson, Green, & Hill. *Building a strategic framework*, p. 11.

Although portfolios are labor-intensive for faculty, they yield rich results that can help faculty understand where adjustments are needed in the curriculum and other learning experiences to help students achieve the learning objectives. Consider the example of one outcome agreed upon by institutions in the ACE assessment project: "Accepts cultural differences and tolerates cultural ambiguity." If students who study abroad are not demonstrating in their portfolios that they perform better in achieving this outcome than students who have not studied abroad, faculty will want to look at the nature of the students' education abroad experiences and try to explain these findings.

What changes from comprehensive internationalization affect institutional attitudes, culture, and behaviors?

Culture change can be subtle, but the discerning observer can see its effect. The CAO will know that internationalization is succeeding when the language used across the institution refers to international/inter-cultural issues as a matter of course, and when the presentation of the institution's image has a global character. Some of this can be tracked by listening carefully to the issues presented through faculty/staff/student conversations, deliberations and rationales for activities, and through the institution's publications and web presence. If the institution's international programs and activities are accessible from the institution's home page and they are rich in content, that probably signals a qualitative change at the institution. When internationalization is simply part of an institution's identity and "the way we do things here," it has become embedded in the fabric of the institution.

Conclusion

Implementing internationalization successfully requires the CAO and the senior leadership team to create intentional processes and well-designed and agreed-upon plans, exert vigorous leadership, and provide sufficient resources. In addition, internationalization takes time and sustained attention. The wise CAO will obtain commitment from key players, look for evidence of success at regular intervals, assess progress against articulated goals and milestones, and recognize the good work and accomplishments of others. Without such systematic attention to recognizing achievements, CAOs run the risk of wearing out the very people critical to bringing internationalization to fruition. Successful internationalization requires the balancing of processes and products, goals and accomplishments, and programs and people.

Appendix A

**Institutional Members of the ACE Internationalization
Forum for Chief Academic Officers (2005–2008)**

Community Colleges

Bunker Hill Community College (MA)
Coastline Community College (CA)
College of DuPage (IL)
Columbus State Community College (OH)
Community College of Philadelphia (PA)
CUNY LaGuardia Community College
Georgia Perimeter College
Mesa Community College (AZ)
Northern Virginia Community College
Oakland Community College (MI)
Prince George's Community College (MD)
Santa Fe College (FL)

Baccalaureate Colleges

Barnard College (NY)
Chatham College (PA)
Colorado College
Connecticut College
Denison University (OH)
Grinnell College (IA)
Knox College (IL)
Lewis and Clark College (OR)
Mount Holyoke College (MA)
St. Mary's College of Maryland
Saint Mary's College (IN)
St. Norbert College (WI)

Masters' Universities

Boise State University (ID)
California State University, Sacramento
Central Michigan University
College of Notre Dame of Maryland
CUNY Queens College
Kentucky State University
Manhattanville College (NY)
Montclair State University (NJ)
San Jose State University (CA)
St. Mary's University (TX)
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
University of Wisconsin–La Crosse
Wagner College (NY)

Research and Doctoral Universities

Howard University (DC)
Kent State University (OH)
New Mexico State University
San Diego State University (CA)
Tufts University (MA)
University of California, Davis
University of Denver (CO)
University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana
University of Montana
University of Oregon
University of Texas at Austin
Wake Forest University (NC)

Appendix B

Institutional Participants in ACE's Internationalization Laboratory

2003–04

California State University, Sacramento
Fairleigh Dickinson University (NJ)
Fordham Schools of Business (NY)
Kalamazoo College (MI)
Kansas State University

2004–05

Indiana University Purdue University
    Indianapolis
Juniata College (PA)
Pacific Lutheran University (WA)
Park University (MO)
St. Mary's University (TX)
University of South Florida
University of Wisconsin, Madison

2005–06

Boise State University (ID)
Northern Virginia Community College
Pace University (NY)
University of Denver (CO)

2006–07

Arcadia University (PA)
College of Charleston (SC)
New Mexico State University
Park University (MO)
University of Iowa

2007–08

Appalachian State University (NC)
City University (WA)
Seton Hall University (NJ)
SUNY College at Cortland
SUNY University at Albany
University of Kentucky
University of Wisconsin, Stout
Western Kentucky University

2008–09

Central Connecticut State University
Pacific University (OR)
Purdue University (IN)
Saint Mary's College (IN)
Temple University (PA)
University of Colorado at Boulder
Western Michigan University

Appendix C

Institutional Participants in ACE's Global Learning for All and Promising Practices Projects

Global Learning for All (2002–2007)

California State University–Stanislaus
Cleveland State University (OH)
Kennesaw State University (GA)
Montgomery College (MD)
College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Portland State University (OR)
San Diego Community College (CA)
St. Louis Community College at
    Forest Park (MO)

Promising Practices (2000–2002)

Appalachian State University (NC)
Arcadia University (PA)
Binghamton University (NY)
Dickinson College (PA)
Indiana University, Bloomington
Kapi'olani Community College (HI)
Missouri Southern State College
Tidewater Community College (VA)