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Individuals, groups, businesses and institutions now function in a global environment that impacts and influences almost every aspect of their activities. Higher education is no exception as it now functions in a global environment of consumers, employees, competitors and partners. In fact, it could be argued that higher education has in many ways been a force for globalization and a model for adapting and responding to the resulting trends, but nonetheless it remains challenged in some ways in responding to the new global reality.

Against this backdrop, in November 2008 the TIAA-CREF Institute hosted the Higher Education Leadership Conference, “Higher Education in a Global Society.” The conference brought together presidents, chancellors, other senior campus officials, higher education researchers and thought leaders, and the senior management of TIAA-CREF to examine emerging issues, challenges and opportunities for advancing higher education across borders, with the realization that now is the future for creating cross-cultural understanding, building global collaborations and strengthening worldwide economies.

As noted by Roger Ferguson, President and Chief Executive Officer of TIAA-CREF, during his keynote address, the recent crisis in the financial markets highlights the sweep of globalization and the complex challenges confronting our society. He maintained that a better-educated global workforce is essential as we contemplate the future of the global economy and worldwide standards of living. He further argued that a better-educated workforce requires a global investment in human capital. This may necessitate more aggressive enrollment policies for higher education, particularly to increase enrollments in developing countries. It will also require more dynamic international cooperation and collaboration that do not presume a zero-sum game among countries; the academy can lead the way in fostering more expansive thinking in this regard. Finally, this calls for a broader definition of higher education, one that focuses on developing critical thinking and creativity as much as intellectual capacity and which also provides significant opportunities for lifelong learning.
While the demands upon and need for higher education have never been greater at both the individual and societal levels, the avenues for pursuing the mission of higher education have greatly expanded due to globalization. Many American colleges and universities are establishing a presence abroad and expanding their mission on a global scale. For other institutions globalization means recruiting international students, offering student exchanges, providing study abroad programs, and facilitating faculty collaboration and dual degree programs.

This volume was inspired by the conference presentations and dialogue. Several chapters are authored by conference speakers as the direct product of particular sessions. Other chapters provide a conceptual framework for considering the various global aspects of higher education or focus on issues addressed by conference sessions or issues raised during discussion periods, and were authored by thought leaders from the higher education community.

Several common themes emerged from the presentations and dialogue during the conference and are further explored throughout this volume:

- Students need an international experience to be effective citizens and workers in the emerging global order. But there are multiple means for colleges and universities to provide such experience.
- Challenges facing the world call for international research collaborations. But such collaborations need to be entered into with due diligence by institutions and then be led by the academics rather than administrators.
- Higher education in the rest of the world is catching up to the standard set by the U.S. system. But to U.S. institutions that think strategically, the focus on higher education abroad presents genuine opportunities to better fulfill their missions and to do so on a global scale.
- It is imperative for higher education to clearly articulate to domestic constituencies the benefits for students and society at large of investments in global initiatives.

THE LEADERSHIP IMPERATIVE ON CAMPUS

An unprecedented rate of change in the world makes it imperative for campus leaders to quickly understand and strategically respond to the implications of globalization. Fareed Zakaria, Editor of *Newsweek International* and CNN Host, maintained during the conference opening keynote that higher education is America’s best industry and in no other
field is the U.S. advantage so overwhelming. He argued that U.S. higher education is a brand with extraordinary value in the rest of the world, and higher education leaders must consider how best to leverage this brand in the global marketplace. Mr. Zakaria also stated that U.S. higher education must meet the challenge of explaining why global initiatives and engagement are good for America, and why investment in great universities is a value proposition for the country.

Peter McPherson, President, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (A.P.L.U.), observed that internationalizing a campus requires the president to make it a priority and there are, of course, other competing initiatives for the short list of priorities. He argued that, for the benefit of the students, internationalization should make that list. He also asserted that metrics are needed to track progress in achieving greater internationalization. Leo Lambert, President, Elon University, built on this by outlining the importance of building internationalization into the strategic plan of a college or university covering curriculum, faculty, staff, students and facilities.

In Chapter 1 of this volume, Bruce Johnstone discusses the concept of globalization as it applies to higher education, the positive and negative implications for higher education, and whether globalization can be managed for the greater good through policy. As a former state college president, state system chancellor, and scholar of international comparative higher education finance and governance, he addresses what an increasingly globalized world says to leaders of American higher education. First, manage through fiscal austerity. But beyond that stress second and even third language facility, reward faculty and staff who reach out to students and scholars from abroad, recognize that international students need care and support that costs money, provide financial and staff support to study abroad programs, support real curricular and departmental restructuring that leads to new levels of international and global scholarship and learning, and recognize that real scholarly collaboration comes only from faculty.

In Chapter 2, Philip Altbach discusses the “massification” of higher education throughout the world. He explains how the emerging mass higher education systems have an inherent logic that will characterize key elements of academe in all countries and in all academic systems in the coming decades. According to Altbach, topics central to the phenomenon of mass higher education in the 21st century include: the challenge of funding; new sectors of higher education, including private higher education, for-profit higher education, and new vocational institutions; distance learning as a means of coping with demand; the differentiation and complexity of academic institutions; the managerialization of academic institutions, and the
creation of the “administrative estate”; the nature of the academic profession; and the diversity of students and student culture.

In Chapter 3, Jane Knight discusses the emergence of alternative cross-border activities to provide education in response to increasing demand around the world. Cross-border education refers to the movement of people, programs, providers, knowledge, ideas, projects, values, curriculum, research and services across national boundaries. The key element is the movement from student mobility to program and provider mobility. Knight then examines the complex world of cross-border education that is emerging while noting the challenges and failures that have occurred in establishing branch campuses and operations abroad. Recognition, accreditation, and intellectual property rights to course design and materials are examples of issues that arise. Knight explains that an examination of the rationales and impacts related to the increase in cross-border education requires consideration of the diverse and often contradictory perspectives and expectations that different groups of stakeholders may have in both receiving and sending countries. Views vary according to the drastically different perspectives of a student, a provider, a governmental or non-governmental body, and whether the perspective is that of the exporting or importing country. Knight also discusses emerging second generation cross-border education strategies – regional education hubs, economic free zones, education cities, knowledge villages, gateways and hot spots.

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS AND INITIATIVES

Partnerships and collaborations with foreign universities and governments, particularly with regard to research, was an ongoing area of discussion during the conference. Molly Corbett Broad, President, American Council on Education, opened a discussion on international research collaborations by noting that in the face of stagnant or declining federal support for research, U.S. colleges and universities are open to and looking for partnerships around the world, while other parts of the world are increasing their R&D and expanding their higher education systems as a focused economic development strategy. She also noted that star academics and researchers tend to cluster and therefore many foreign-born American scientists return to their homeland once that country develops a significant strength in their particular area of expertise. Broad maintained that increased research capacity around the world has the potential to facilitate growth and development around the world, and key to realizing this potential is opening borders to more collaborative research.

Claude Canizares, Vice President of Research and Provost,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, reported during the conference that MIT has established an ad hoc faculty committee to assess overarching principles, guidelines and approaches, given that the nature and environment of international research collaborations is changing. Since these collaborations are important to both the student and faculty experience, MIT is trying to understand the drivers of successful collaboration, and also the limitations as well as opportunities in these initiatives. Canizares asserted that faculty-led initiatives should not be controlled from the center and that, while institutional collaborations are entered into by some layer of administration and may require commitment of central resources, they still must be faculty driven. He noted that cultural differences need to be recognized and addressed in research collaborations and that expectations need to be matched on both sides with a clear agreement on how to manage intellectual property rights.

Mark Yudof, President, University of California, voiced a cautious perspective on international research collaborations. He argued that U.S. colleges and universities, at least the publics, sign too many collaborative agreements with an end result of nothing to show for it. He emphasized the challenges posed by international laws governing mutual engagements and by comparative laws across countries addressing particular issues. He noted that it makes little sense to enter into a research collaboration agreement unless the country involved has a functioning legal system that protects patents and copyrights; otherwise it is a very difficult environment in which to realize innovation. Yudof reiterated the position that if the initiatives are to be solid, then academics have to be in charge of the process with assistance from department chairs and deans.

Elizabeth D. Capaldi was a session panelist and also authored Chapter 4 in this volume. Capaldi sees international research collaborations continuing to increase because of the growing quality and capacity abroad to make them desirable. Furthermore, global challenges in health, the environment, and international relations, among other areas, demand it. Capaldi raises several issues to consider and address with international research collaborations. While such collaborations need to be faculty driven, she worries about faculty establishing collaborations on their own because of the complications inherent in the laws and regulations across countries governing credit, financing, use of animal and human subjects, and so on. She warns that managing funding for such research is also challenging given that sources often include both foreign corporations and governments (and even domestic corporations in some cases.) She notes the inherent logistical difficulties in conducting research internationally, as well as the cultural differences that must be recognized and addressed. In addition, Capaldi stresses recognition that foreign institutions do not
tie education to research as do U.S. universities; research abroad is typically driven by a desire to achieve quick, direct economic results. At the same time she believes an imperative for U.S. colleges and universities is to better connect basic research with economic development, so U.S. institutions can learn from foreign institutions in this regard.

Given their demographics, China and India are two countries where interest levels are high for international collaborations. The conference featured presentations on the current state of higher education in each. Devesh Kapur, Director of the Center for the Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania, argued that higher education in India is plagued by limited public resources, extremely centralized regulation, a dearth of quality institutions, increasing faculty shortages in elite institutions due to weak Ph.D. programs, entrenched mediocrity in most faculty, and an exceedingly weak research culture. On the last point, he noted that there is almost no research occurring in higher education institutions as research has been segregated into specialized centers since the 1950s. He further explained how the weakening of the traditional higher education sector has led to the emergence and growth of a surrogate system in India in which private providers are increasingly dominant, corporations are establishing their own schools to provide workforce training, and the elites are sending their children overseas for higher education. Kapur maintained that the quality of private institutions in India is extremely weak.

Zhang Li, Director-General and Professor, National Center for Educational Development Research, Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, discussed the status of higher education in China and priorities in China’s plan for higher education. He first noted that China’s modern higher education system is only a little over 100 years old. Zhang explained that the purpose of higher education in China is focused along three dimensions, the first being that it should ensure that China can compete in a global economic environment while promoting sustainable development. Second, it should adapt to new needs of public affairs and promote cultural development at the regional and community levels. Finally, it should promote the economic livelihood of individuals as well as their life-long development. With these objectives, China’s higher education system has developed extensively since the turn of the 21st century. With a gross enrollment rate of 23 percent, the system has moved from educating the elite to educating the masses. Zhang outlined what he saw as current shortcomings in China’s higher education system, including decreased per capita budget appropriations, wide gaps in higher education development across different regions of China, low quality of management and faculty in some new local universities, and problems from an examination-oriented education.
Not all initiatives abroad are research based; many center on academic programs. In Chapter 5, Mark Kamlet discusses fundamentals for establishing successful academic programs in foreign countries that he has learned as provost at Carnegie Mellon over the past several decades as that institution moved from one that “was in many ways a regional university” to one that currently offers over twenty degree programs in locations outside its Pittsburgh home, with over a dozen outside the U.S. He notes that becoming globally engaged in this manner has had very positive benefits, as hoped and intended, for the home campus. While not emphasized by Kamlet, one takeaway from his chapter is the importance of an institutional willingness to experiment with educational technology and pedagogical methods.

A recurring theme throughout Chapter 5 is that establishing academic programs in foreign countries involves a myriad of complex institutional interactions – legal, tax, human resource, regulatory – that must be addressed if such initiatives are to be successful. Kamlet explains that over time Carnegie Mellon has evolved groups within its central administration with a wealth of expertise and experience on these matters. Given that there are economies of both scale and scope in developing such expertise, and that academic departments and colleges should not be expected to have such expertise, he argues that it is most efficient for central administration to handle these aspects of establishing academic programs abroad, leaving academic, curricular and student-related matters to the academic departments and colleges. Central administration and academic departments will then be “interwoven in the context of any given effort.” He also cautions that it is more expensive, sometimes significantly so, to offer degree programs outside the U.S. Finally, Kamlet notes that, with a few exceptions, Carnegie Mellon’s initiatives in offering degrees outside Pittsburgh involve professional masters programs. He explains this is driven by differences in quality metrics across program types. While the key metric of a professional masters program is career “value added,” it is academic excellence of the students and sophistication of the curriculum for undergraduate and Ph.D. programs. Nonetheless, undergraduate and Ph.D. programs offered abroad can be successful with great effort under the right circumstances.

PROVIDING AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE FOR STUDENTS

Providing students with an international perspective and understanding through higher education is an increasing imperative for colleges and
Daniel Guaglianone, Global Leader, Recruiting and Staffing, Merck & Co., observed during the conference that global work teams are common and people are needed who can function in that environment. The four items Guaglianone considers crucial in a global work force are superior functional discipline skills, multiple language capability, understanding of cultural differences, and an awareness of one’s ethnocentric behaviors and the ability to control those. Ronald A. Crutcher, President, Wheaton College, shared findings from an Association of American Colleges and Universities’ project confirming views such as Guaglianone’s are common across employers.

However, as observed by Constantine Papadakis, then President of Drexel University, it is unrealistic to expect university faculty to teach all such skills, but international programs with meaningful experience abroad can produce students with a global view regarding their profession and an understanding of what it takes to work in a global environment.

There are various strategies to achieve this objective and these were critically examined during the course of the conference. A common approach is providing students with a study abroad experience. For example, Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran, President, Kalamazoo College, noted that 80 percent of Kalamazoo students study abroad, many where English is not the primary language. Kalamazoo College has for 50-plus years considered its mission to include ensuring that students are able to cross personal boundaries of language, race and ethnicity, and to cross cultural, academic and structural boundaries as well. She also observed that students want not only to study abroad but also to have foreign internships and service-learning experiences that will enhance their résumés. During a separate session Papadakis and William W. Destler, President, Rochester Institute of Technology, discussed their institutions’ international internships where undergraduate students live and work in a foreign country.

Peter McPherson maintained during the conference that higher education is ahead of employers in understanding that an educated individual must have a sense of the world. He and Margaret Heisel argue in Chapter 6 that more research is needed regarding the academic value added of the study abroad experience. In addition, their chapter focuses on various aspects of the study abroad experience – its increasing prominence with foreign universities, the profile of students studying abroad, the types of study abroad, and the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for this aspect of U.S. postsecondary education and for the students who will be entering colleges in the coming years. They also discuss the creation of the Center for Capacity Building in Study Abroad and its efforts to address these challenges and identify issues needing further research.

But study abroad is unrealistic for many students for various reasons. In
addition, before there is even the opportunity to travel abroad, Papadakis advocated a well-diversified campus that blends foreign students with American students in an environment that broadens global perspectives. So just as important is creating an international experience on campus by engaging both students and faculty, and there are various strategies and avenues for pursuing this.

Kathleen Waldron, University Professor, The City University of New York, and President of Baruch College at the time of the conference, was both a conference panelist and the author of Chapter 7. Baruch College is the most ethnically diverse college in the United States, with 40 percent of students having been born outside the U.S. and 60 percent speaking more than one language (over 100 languages are spoken on campus.) But for reasons such as economics, family obligations and cultural restrictions, study abroad is not a realistic option for most Baruch students. In response, Baruch undertook a reassessment of its international activities to address the goals of study abroad at a non-residential urban public institution. As Waldron details in this volume, Baruch leverages the international experience available on campus and in New York City to promote initiatives with different international groups and cultural institutions as part of the academic program. Specifically, its Global Student Initiative seeks to build on Baruch’s inherent international diversity to prepare students for work in the global economy through the Global Student Certificate Program. Students achieve the learning outcomes of study abroad while in residence at Baruch. Waldron maintains that it is the responsibility of the president to provide resources and to develop measures of success and accountability for internationalization programs. She also emphasizes that such programs on campus need to be institutionalized and strategic so that they do not fade when key faculty leave the school.

This latter point – the importance of engaged faculty to the ongoing success of internationalization efforts – was elaborated on at various points during the conference and is specifically addressed in this volume by Patti McGill Peterson in Chapter 8 and Diana Bartelli Carlin in Chapter 9. Peterson argues that internationalization efforts have frequently fallen short of the goal because faculty have remained on the periphery, often because of their lack of interest and motivation. She maintains that faculty have been neglected and ignored rather than encouraged and enabled to rise to the opportunity of this complicated task. She notes that internationalization efforts will require many faculty members to move beyond that which they were explicitly trained to do and to challenge their immersion in their “discipline.” Faculty engagement will require adaptation of tenure, promotion, leave, compensation policies and departmental practices to this objective. And beyond the opportunity for international
research collaborations, there needs to be the opportunity for teaching one’s discipline to students in another cultural context.

Carlin reiterates that internationalized faculty are the key to creating a truly internationalized education for students. She highlights what she sees as the barriers to faculty international activity – lack of incentives for faculty and, in fact, the presence of disincentives regarding compensation, tenure and career advancement; lack of institutional funding; lack of support for faculty interested in internationalizing their courses; attitudinal barriers to institutionalization among faculty; and a disconnect between faculty and international offices along with their senior international administrators due to decentralized campus structures. Carlin then moves on to present and discuss an array of facilitators and programs to overcome these barriers to faculty involvement in internationalization.

A primary point of emphasis is the necessity of a college or university having a systematic knowledge of the international activities of its entire faculty, something best achieved by a comprehensive annual survey. This then serves as a tool for promoting internationalization by identifying disciplines, programs and individuals (faculty with international activities, visiting scholars, and so on) that can be leveraged as resources (some likely unknown or unrecognized without such a survey), as well as areas in greatest need of assistance. She gives various examples of how this knowledge of existing internal expertise can then be leveraged. Carlin also discusses the importance of internationalizing faculty before they are faculty, that is, while they are graduate students, and strategies for doing so.

Another element of internationalizing the domestic campus is the recruitment and integration of foreign students. A strong presence of foreign students can serve to enhance domestic students’ cultural understanding, increase enrollment and tuition revenue, and serve international economic needs. Two million students worldwide currently study outside their home countries and this number is expected to reach approximately eight million by 2025. Graham Spanier, President, The Pennsylvania State University, stated during the conference that he considers it desirable to recruit more international undergraduates to the U.S. He noted that most international students in the U.S. are graduate students; at Penn State they account for two-thirds of the international population. But he further observed that international undergraduates tend to be more integrated into campus life, and the relationships formed with domestic undergraduates contribute toward building goodwill and lasting respect among young adults. President Wilson-Oyelaran noted that foreign students develop a much deeper understanding of the U.S. when they are fully integrated into the campus fabric.

Andrew A. Sorensen, Distinguished President Emeritus, University
of South Carolina, observed that American institutions now face a new environment where they often must compete with universities in other countries for the best students. He noted that the U.S. share of students who left their home country to study abroad fell from 38 percent to 22 percent between 1985 and 2005. Previously foreign countries would often pay the expenses of faculty and students who came to the U.S., but the expectation now is that U.S. colleges and universities will bear increasing shares of these costs. Sorensen argued that U.S. institutions must be more aggressive in competing for foreign students (and foreign faculty, as well.) For public universities, he noted, this means addressing the challenge of convincing legislatures that this is money well spent.

As part of his conference presentation, Mark S. Wrighton, Chancellor, Washington University in St. Louis, described the model developed by Washington University of strategic partnerships abroad with a network of 24 premier and developing foreign universities with the aim of recruiting several students annually from these partner institutions. These students are fully supported by Washington University. He argues that the benefits to domestic as well as foreign students justify the investment in a diversified student body. Key faculty members are also tapped to serve as ambassadors to the partner institutions, with the objective of building strong ties in collaborative education and research.

In Chapter 10, Charles Phelps, University Professor and Provost Emeritus, University of Rochester, elaborates upon the benefits of an internationally diversified student body and reviews the demographic trends in student movements. He then focuses on how to recruit, retain, educate, support, and celebrate international students. In the process he touches upon a variety of issues, many of which would not be readily top-of-mind to administrators and institutions with limited experience regarding international students: language competency, financial aid, travel and visa pitfalls, necessary and appropriate on-campus support, nurturing a sense of community, addressing ethnic tensions, understanding and adhering to U.S. academic norms, and special issues that arise in the sciences with foreign research assistants. He then discusses the potential of leveraging these individuals once they are graduates of the institution.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

There was a consensus during the conference that the U.S. system remains the world leader in higher education, but the rest of the world is catching up. Rather than being threatened by such developments, U.S. colleges and universities are viewing them as opportunities to better fulfill their
missions of advancing knowledge through research and educating the next
generation of workers, educators and leaders throughout the world, and
in the process promoting the economic growth and social progress and
stability of the world.

In Chapter 11, Rizvi and Horn argue the need for colleges and univer-
sities, both in the U.S. and around the world, to rethink their roles and
purposes given the realities of the new knowledge-based global society
and then to reinvent themselves accordingly. They argue the enduring
value to society and individuals from the learning and critical thinking
skills traditionally found in a liberal arts-based education and the impor-
tance of internationalizing higher education so it can continue to fulfill
its purpose. They outline numerous avenues, many discussed in detail in
previous chapters, which must be simultaneously pursued to achieve this
internationalization. Rizvi and Horn argue that a primary challenge will
be devising curricula that will be “innovative and imaginative, reflect the
changed circumstances of the 21st century, and have a pedagogy centered
on students.” In their view, such curricula must move beyond a focus on
traditional academic disciplines. But, in addition to addressing excellence,
society must also address access and ensure that all academically qualified
individuals, irrespective of socio-economic background, have equal access
to such excellence. They argue that no country can afford to forgo the
potential economic resource that is a college-educated individual; there-
fore, financial constraints should not and can not be a barrier to access.
They further argue that all students benefit from socio-economic diversity
in higher education through improvements in learning outcomes.

In Chapter 12, Bruce Johnstone shares his thoughts from the per-
spective of both a scholar of international comparative higher educa-
tion and someone who has served as a university vice president, college
president, and public system chancellor. He notes that today’s global
economy favors nations, such as the U.S., with advanced technologies and
advanced systems of higher education. He feels that such nations have a
responsibility, however, to assist the spread of knowledge and expansion
of higher education elsewhere. He argues that U.S. higher education is
far less internationalized than it should be and needs to be. He maintains
that our weakest link in this regard is the lack of second language facility
among American undergraduates and faculty to a degree allowing study
and research in another language. He argues furthermore that global
awareness must be strengthened through the core undergraduate cur-
riculum and also through upper-division majors and graduate programs.
Johnstone explains how the financing of higher education in the U.S. can
create disincentives for institutions to provide students with opportunities
for significant foreign study and experience as part of their education. In
his view, higher education budgets “must recognize the appropriateness of curricular and scholarly activities that are international.” He further explains that, while the world is learning and adopting from the U.S. system of higher education, there are numerous areas where U.S. institutions could and should learn from the practices of foreign universities and systems.