Goals

- Explore the dynamics of academic internationalization (IZN) in general.
- Assert that international partnerships are key to the kind of IZN now needed.
- Place COIL-type activities within this evolving context.
Chaos in the World

Three covers from the February 22, 2015 New York Times Magazine
The Changing Landscape of Academic Internationalization

Eduardo Contreras’ 3 Phases (2015)
1. Experimentation (1918-1945)
2. Expansion (1945-1980)
3. Integration (1980-present)
Even during its expansion phase, international education was seen as:

- Taking some students “in” & sending others “out”
- Teaching some students another language
- Relevant only to certain types of institutions, disciplines, and students
- Sometimes connected to “technical assistance” projects in the developing world
- Central neither to the institution nor to student learning
- A scattered set of disparate activities
- Not of great interest to most faculty (in the U.S.)
International Education in the 1960s
Bryn Mawr College

[Black and white photo of a group of people holding a banner for the Institut d'Etudes Françaises d'Avignon, under the auspices of Bryn Mawr College 1962, with travel arrangements by Royal Travel Service & Air France.]
International Education in the 1960s
IUPUI
A new word coined to herald the phase of integration.

**internationalization**

“integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of an institution [of higher education]”

(Knight 1994)
Even then, it was slow going at first…

“…U.S. faculty participation in international activities and programs is … lower than that of academics in the other countries studied.

It is not misleading to describe U.S. faculty as parochial in outlook and behavior …”

*The International Academic Profession*, 1996, p. 386
(Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Higher Education survey of faculty in 14 OECD nations)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inst Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>A</strong></th>
<th><strong>B</strong></th>
<th><strong>C</strong></th>
<th><strong>D</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Institution’s mission statement specifically refers to international education  
B = International education among top five priorities in institution’s strategic plan  
C = Institution has campus-wide committee that works solely on advancing internationalization  
D = During recent years internationalization has accelerated at the institution

American Council of Education *Mapping Survey* 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit of IZN</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Latin - America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th>North America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased international awareness of students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality of teaching and learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced international cooperation and capacity building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened research and knowledge production capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced internationalization of the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced prestige/profile for the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased international networking by faculty and researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased/diversified revenue generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking institutional performance to international of practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4 (?) (2008-present)
Reassessing, rethinking & reworking

“Internationalization is claimed to be the last stand for humanistic ideas against the world of pure economic benefits allegedly represented by the term globalization. Alas, this constructed antagonism between internationalization and globalization ignores the fact that activities that are more related to the concept of globalization (higher education as a tradable commodity) are increasingly executed under the flag of internationalization.”

(Brandenburg and deWit 2011)
“uncritical pursuit of internationalization [in higher education] can result in a reproduction of the economic dimensions of globalization [unequal wealth, power, cultural dominance] … Can the current state of internationalization be more accurately described as the globalization of higher education?”

(Beck 2012)
### Figure D.2
The top three ranked potential risks of internationalization to institutions: regional results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int. opportunities accessible only to students with financial resources</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Latin - America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th>North America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty regulating locally the quality of foreign programmes offered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive competition among HEIs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-emphasis on internationalization at the expense of other priorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of internationalization partnerships / policies only for reasons of prestige</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain drain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much focus on recruitment of fee paying international students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse of English as a medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogenization of curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputational risk derived from our institution’s offshore activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure D.4
Top three ranked potential societal risks of internationalization - regional results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity / commercialization of education</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Latin - America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th>North America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unequal sharing of benefits of internationalization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing gaps among HEIs within country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in number of foreign low quality providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain drain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance of a ‘western’ epistemological approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing gaps in terms of development among countries and regions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-dependence on international students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of cultural identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of linguistic diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **1st**
- **2nd**
- **3rd**
Perhaps international partnerships and collaborations should be articulated not primarily as tactics, but rather as worthy goals, in and of themselves.
International academic partnerships are increasing.

- **ACE 2012**: 90% U.S. doctoral & 50% baccalaureate institutions greatly increased partnership activity in last 5 years
- **IAU 2014**: 75% of institutions worldwide increased funding for exchange and research collaboration over last 3 years
- **EAIE 2015 Barometer**: 79% institutions see partnerships as central feature of IZN
An spectrum of partnership impacts

- Paper-only
- Dormant
- Lop-sided
- Enabling
- Transactional
- Generative/collective growth
- Common Good
Partnerships offer the possibility of a global network of higher education that...

- shares resources
- develops a sense of mutual responsibility
- creates the transformative, transcendent knowledge needed for a shared world
- sees advancement of any one institution as directly connected to advancement of others
- distributes centers of excellence and is balanced in input and impact across nations
- values different academic forms and audiences
- operates according to mutually developed standards and principles
The shared world of the 21st century asks us to pool efforts & connect beyond ourselves to:

- Bring all perspectives and insights to the tasks of our collective future
- Reach all students with knowledge that empowers them to engage the world positively
- Rethink how higher education might reform itself in a globally collaborative way
A broadened view of institutional benefit.

- Benefits that each institution receives individually
- Benefits that both institutions create and share collectively
- Benefits that go beyond the institutions to the environment in which they operate
International partnerships require investment, but they return benefits many times over.

In addition to broader goals already mentioned, they:

- Replace doubling faculty size to cover the world knowledge now needed
- Give known base in unknown environment
- Reduce transaction costs
- Become centers of energy attracting external funding
- And so forth …..
- Rosabeth Moss Kanter – collaborative advantage
In short,

the conversations, interactions, and commitments that emerge from meaningful international academic partnerships should be seen as a worthy goal, in and of themselves.

It is only through them, that we will discover the ways to move beyond ourselves to a shared future.
COIL activities are key to such a collaborative/partner-based form of internationalization.
COIL activities…

- Establish the importance of global conversations
- Enable such conversations for all, even at home
- Connect institutions as well as students & faculty
- Engage in the co-construction of knowledge
- Build understanding of others on their own terms
- Can be pursued by institutions with few resources
- Create connections transcending national & other boundaries
- Generate ideas & activities not anticipated when they began
IUPUI and the University of Tehran
What are the implications for how we might want to shape COIL activities?
A few ideas…

• Reach out to institutions beyond the usual
• Pay as much attention to relationships as to any specific project
• Embed in a long-term institutional partnership that deepens capacity & mutual knowledge
• Use COIL to transform disciplinary knowledge
• Teach cultures & nations as mutually constitutive
• Recognize different modes of learning & epistemologies
• Two-language ecology
• Think about what kind of global system of HE we are building
Articulate that COIL initiatives are not only a high-impact pedagogical development but also a clear statement that the global system of higher education that is emerging from our institutional actions should be a shared and collaborative one.

And that our institutions, students, faculty, and nations will benefit from this.
“Heritage” Cai Guo-Qiang
Gallery of Modern Art, Brisbane 2013