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“The integration of internationalization into the core functions of higher education” has become a major objective for colleges and universities (Deetman, 1996, p. 33). Although this integration process is mostly the responsibility of the educational institutions themselves, research suggests that the higher education associations, albeit an outside agent, can play an important role in the process of campus internationalization (Ruther, 2002).

This study was an attempt (a) to identify and describe the role of the nation’s six major higher-education associations in the internationalization of American higher education, and (b) to map their involvement in terms of their advocacy efforts for international education programs and their support of member campus internationalization endeavors.
The purpose of this study was accomplished through the use of the case study research method. The data for the study were collected from personal interviews with association representatives in charge of international programs and analysis of various relevant documents. The findings were presented in the form of six individual case study reports and a comparative cross-case report.

The study found that, despite their longstanding interest in international issues, it was only at the turn of the 21st century that internationalization was promoted into an area of strategic priority in the presidential associations’ agenda.

Regarding campus internationalization, the presidential associations saw themselves first and foremost in the role of a supporter of their members’ efforts to advance internationalization on their campuses. Within this supportive role, the major associations have assumed a number of functions, such as convener, public forum, research and resource center, leadership forum, and facilitator. They provide a wide array of services for members: research data, legislative updates regarding international education issues, information regarding funding and partnering opportunities, facilitation of international partnership-building efforts and international student recruitment efforts, and professional development opportunities.

In addition to acting as an advocate for international education programs at the federal level, some presidential associations have also assumed an advocacy role with their members by promoting a comprehensive strategic approach to campus internationalization. They have done so through publications that provide roadmaps for the internationalization processes and recognition and diffusion of outstanding achievements and best institutional practices.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The late 1980s and early 1990s witnessed an acceleration of the process of globalization. As the world moved towards greater interdependency in terms of knowledge, culture, trade, and communication, internationalization "as a process of strategic transformation of institutions" (Callan, 2000, p. 17) started to emerge as a high priority for institutions of higher learning (Bartell, 2003; Callan, 2000; de Wit, 2002a).

At the onset of the twenty-first century, “the integration of internationalization into the core functions of higher education” (Deetman, 1996, p. 33) had started to become one of the major objectives for many colleges and universities.

Internationalization has become an imperative for any country that wants to be competitive in the global arena. This is particularly true for the United States if it is to maintain its role as a world leader and its ability to compete successfully in the global economy. In the words of David Ward, President of the American Council on Education (ACE), "Globalization and the changing role of the United States in international relations have created an imperative demand for graduates with international skills and knowledge."
Globalization presents the American higher education system with the challenge of taking a more systematic and strategic approach in its efforts to expand and improve its capacity to meet the nation’s increased need for international expertise and citizen global knowledge (Ruther, 2002). Yet, according to a study conducted in 2000 by the American Council on Education, almost all postsecondary international areas experienced a decline in federal funding over the previous decade (Hayward, 2000). Other scholars observed that many colleges and universities could not get involved in major internationalization initiatives due to tighter budgets and lack of coherent strategies for the internationalization of their campuses, thus raising the concern that internationalization “may be closer to a buzzword than a deep-seated reality for most colleges and universities” (Altbach & Peterson, 1998).

In addition to obstacles at the institutional level, two other factors have contributed to a less than desired state of internationalization of higher education at the national level:

First, lack of a national strategy for the internationalization of higher education. Unlike Canada, Australia, and many European countries that have developed national policies regarding internationalization of higher education or certain aspects of it, the United States lacks a comprehensive, unified, national policy on internationalization of higher education (Desruisseaux, 1992; de Wit, 2002a, Van Damme, 2001).

Second, the absence of a coordinating body at the national level responsible for international programs and activities, as is the case, for instance, with the European Commission, for which internationalization is a major policy priority (Desruisseaux, 1992; de Wit, 2002a; Yelland, 2000).
The pressure to take a closer look at the issue of internationalization and to approach it in a more comprehensive and strategic way started to build in the mid-1990s along with the realization that the country could no longer afford to adopt a “laissez-faire” or a “piecemeal” approach to the challenges of globalization (Hebel, 2002). In 1995, Altbach and de Wit expressed concern that American higher education, the undisputed leader in higher education internationally since World War II, was losing its competitive edge in the international market place due to a growing insularity. In 1999, Allan E. Goodman, the then-president of the Institute for International Education (IIE), disappointed at the general depreciation of an international outlook in American higher education, lamented “. . . the decline of federal support for educational exchange programs and the lack of a post-Cold War vision within academe for how such programs can be made central to our definition of an educated person are striking.” The same 2000 ACE study found that the state of internationalization left much to be desired: “Indeed, it has not improved from the low levels found when ACE carried out its general assessment in 1986-1987” (Hayward, 2000, p. 4).

The criticisms did not go unheeded on the part of the government, and academia, as well as the associations of higher education. In 2000, President Clinton issued a memorandum on international education policy committing the federal government to supporting international education in a number of important areas. College and university leaders started to emphasize a commitment to internationalization and its importance on their campuses. Many institutions made internationalization part of their mission statements and their strategic plans (Hayward, 2000). The major national associations of higher education published a number of studies, reports and guidelines for internationalizing campuses (Ruther, 2002).
Deetman (1996) considered internationalization “an integral part of higher education” (p. 32), while Ruther (2002) ventured to say that it was becoming “a shared institutional norm” (p. 49). This indicates that internationalization is here to stay. As such, the involvement of major education stakeholders to take up the issue and press the agenda is paramount.

Research, according to Ruther (2002), suggested that the task for advancing the issue of internationalization would largely be the responsibility of actors within higher education. At the same time, research suggested that external agents, like associations of higher education, could play a serious role in supporting this process by providing assistance, outside moral support, pressure, additional funding, and nurturing and legitimization of a pro-internationalization culture (Ruther, 2002).

Considering the nature of the higher education system in the United States — a system characterized by (a) a vast array of very diverse institutions that individually have limited power to influence higher education policy; and (b) a powerful but limited role of the federal government in higher education — the role of the higher education associations, especially the institutionally-based associations, which serve as an interface between the individual institutions and the federal government becomes crucial.

Problem Statement

The United States lacks a cohesive national policy on internationalization of higher education. To a large degree, this can be explained by the fact that in the American system of higher education the role of the federal government is limited; the Constitution is silent regarding the role of the federal government in education, making it a state government prerogative, as stipulated by the tenth amendment (Parsons, 1994; Ruther, 2002). This is not to say that the federal government, for reasons that will be explored
more in depth elsewhere in the study, has not been involved in the higher education policy arena. On the contrary, as Ruther (2002) has suggested, in spite of its weak operating role, the power of the federal government over the direction and shape of higher education is enormous. This becomes especially true regarding internationalization efforts, given the fact that foreign affairs is a federal and not a state government responsibility.

The federal government, although a very powerful actor, is not the only stakeholder in the area of internationalization of higher education. The landscape of internationalization efforts in the United States consists mainly of three major sectors — the government, the education sector, and the private sector — each consisting of various stakeholders, who have their own views and rationales as to why higher education needs to internationalize (Ruther, 2002). The public is another stakeholder, whose support for internationalization efforts, according to Kerr (1980), has never been widespread, but as the 2000 ACE report on internationalization of U.S. higher education indicated, has started to grow.

The education sector consists of individual institutions of higher education, professional and institutional associations, students, teachers, researchers, and advocacy groups (Knight, 1997). Ruther (2002) indicated that among these various actors, the higher-education associations have been “the primary non-governmental group in the network of interests that define the international higher education policy” (p. 46). Furthermore, she identified two types of associations that have been involved in the internationalization of higher education policy arena: “1) the disciplinary associations organized by field, such as the Latin American Studies Association (LASA), and 2) the institutional associations, organized by peer institutions to represent their interests and
maintain standards, such as the American Association of State Colleges and Universities” (Ruther 2002, p. 46).

Scholars (Ellingboe, 1998; Knight, 1997; Pickert & Turlington, 1992) maintain that internationalization of higher education is an institution-wide strategic process that requires full endorsement and commitment on the part of the institutional leadership in order to be successful. This being the case, the role of institutional associations becomes particularly important in this respect. What sets these associations apart from the multitude of Washington-based associations is that they are institutionally-based, i.e., they are interested in advancing the interests of the institutions of higher education as a whole (Bloland, 1985). At the same time, they are presidentially-based associations, i.e. the presidents of colleges and universities are the designated principal institutional representatives (Cook, 1998).

There are six institutionally- or presidentially-based associations within the higher education community. They are: the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the American Council on Education (ACE), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). These institutional associations of higher education, informally known as the “Big Six,” will be the subject of this study.

The major associations’ concern with international education issues, although longstanding, was not a major part of their overall mission (Ruther, 2002). However, by the late 1980s, the institutionally-based associations became more visible and more involved in internationalization efforts. The publication of a number of studies, reports,
and guidelines for internationalizing the campus was an indication that internationalization of higher education was becoming a major issue in their agenda. Their advocacy on the need for internationalization of higher education became more pronounced, constituting a larger portion of their mandate, as could be seen in their staffing and research agenda (Ruther, 2002). Yet, apart from the information in their respective websites and the publications of reports and policy statements by the associations themselves, their efforts in the area of the internationalization of American higher education have not been studied to allow an assessment or analysis of their current role and to predict their future involvement. This study was an attempt at such an assessment.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the study was to map and analyze the role and involvement of major national associations of higher education in the area of internationalizing American higher education as it related to:

1. Shaping federal policy with regards to internationalization of higher education;
2. Promoting internationalization among their members and assisting them in the campus internationalization process.

Research Questions

The main question that this study asked was: What has been the involvement and the role played by the major higher-education associations in the internationalization of American higher education in the last ten years (1996-2006)?

In order to answer the main research question and a set of three issues and secondary questions were explored:
I. Commitment and importance attached to the issue of internationalization of higher education on the part of each major association of higher education:

   A. How important is internationalization for the major associations and why?

   B. Is internationalization part of the major associations’ mission or strategic plan?

   C. How does the organizational structure of each association reflect the importance/priority given to the internationalization of higher education?

   D. What are the rationales that drive the major associations’ efforts for internationalization (i.e. globalization, national interests, academics etc.)?

II. Approaches to the issue of internationalization of higher education:

   A. How are the major associations of higher education approaching the issue of internationalizing higher education – as piecemeal or as a strategic process?

   B. What are the similarities and differences in their approaches to the internationalization of American higher education?

III. Mapping the involvement of associations in internationalizing higher education:

   A. What internationalization issues have taken priority in the major associations’ advocacy agenda, and what are they doing to influence higher educational policy in this regard?

   B. What are the major associations doing to promote internationalization of higher education among their members?

   C. What are the major associations doing to assist members in their efforts to internationalize their campuses?

   D. Have the major associations developed a common strategy on how higher education should be internationalized?
Need for the Study

A study focused on the major higher-education associations and their role in shaping international education policy and influencing members in pursuit of a more coherent and systematic approach to campus internationalization is important and timely. First, as Bloland (1985) indicated, in spite of their deep involvement in all issues that concern higher education “Washington higher-education associations are an understudied element of higher education” (p. xix). Prior to that, Bailey (1975), in a similar context, also commented on this lack of study of the associations of higher education, stating, “This lack is remarkable” (p. ix). Bailey and Bloland’s words still ring true and sound even more striking if applied in the context of the study of the major associations’ involvement in internationalizing higher education. In addition, the major associations appear to be rather shy or modest in promoting their achievements. By his own admission, David Ward, President of ACE acknowledged that, “…we haven’t done a very good job in telling our story…” (Colloquy Live, 2006).

While there has been a lot of attention and coverage of the involvement of the major associations in various areas of policy making, especially with regards to the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) and the Higher Education Act (HEA), the involvement of these associations in internationalizing higher education has gone fairly unexamined. Although their efforts are documented in the associations’ publications and their respective websites, there is no comprehensive study that examines their efforts in advocating for the internationalization of higher education with the federal government. A number of studies just mention or briefly touch on this role without any detailed analysis. To the knowledge of the author, the only study that analyzes at some length the involvement of the major associations of higher education in the context of international
education policy making is Nancy Ruther’s (2002), *Barely there, powerfully present: Thirty years of U.S. policy on international higher education.*

Furthermore, the aspect of service to members in general or in particular areas of interest has been largely neglected. Except for Cook’s 1998 book *Lobbying for Higher Education: How Colleges and Universities Influence Federal Policy*, which among other things describes in a comprehensive manner the mechanism of how associations interact with their constituents, there are no major studies that explore or analyze how the major associations serve members in specific issues of interest. This is especially true for their services in the area of campus internationalization.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the study lies in part in the observation that the higher education literature lacks an examination of the role played by the major associations of higher education and of the degree of their involvement in internationalizing American higher education. This is important considering that these six major national associations represent nearly 95% of higher education institutions in this country (Ruther, 2002). This study contributes to the current literature on associations of higher education and the literature on the internationalization of higher education.

The involvement of the major associations in internationalizing American higher education has increased especially in the last fifteen to twenty years. However, this involvement has not been studied or captured, because the main focus of most research efforts to analyze internationalization has been at the institutional level (Callan, 1998) and on specific areas that constitute what is called “international education.” Therefore, another significance of this study lies in the fact that it represents an attempt to capture and analyze internationalization efforts at a national and sector level.
Delimitations of the Study

1. The internationalization of higher education and international higher education policy making has been affected also by other professional associations, like NAFSA (Association of International Educators), or AIEA (Association of International Education Administrators). Issues of internationalization of higher education have been part of the agenda of other prominent organizations deeply involved in international education issues such as IIE (Institute for International Education) and of individual institutions of higher education. Although internationalization of higher education has been impacted by the involvement of all these types of organizations, the activities of these organizations were beyond the scope of this study.

2. Given that the internationalization of higher education has been impacted by the involvement of other actors whose activities were not part of this study, the findings of this study do not provide the whole picture of how higher education internationalization policy is shaped or how the institutions of higher education have been supported in their internationalization efforts.

3. Internationalization has been part of the major associations' agenda for many decades, however, the temporal dimension of this study spanned over the last 10 years. This represents the timeframe during which, as the literature indicates, the definition of internationalization of higher education as a strategic, comprehensive, process approach versus a piecemeal approach had been largely accepted by the research community and practitioners (Callan, 2000; de Wit, 2002a; Knight, 1997).

4. Internationalization and globalization of higher education are different, yet
dynamically linked concepts. Globalization in the context of higher education has also been an issue of interest for the major associations of higher education, but the study did not dwell on the associations’ activities or approaches vis-à-vis globalization.

5. Internationalization of higher education is a worldwide phenomenon. This study, however, was written from the perspective of the U.S. higher education.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study focused on the six major associations of higher education, otherwise known as the institutionally- or presidentially-based associations. Its findings are not necessarily applicable to other associations of higher education.

2. The use of the case study method lends itself in employing the formed opinions and at times impartial judgments of the individuals whose ideas and opinions were solicited for the study (Brown, 1985). The interviews with representatives of the associations that deal with the international issues constituted one of the sources for the data collection. As such, the study has some limitations due to the selectivity of the interviewees and the potential bias that is inherent in the interview method.

3. Many of the documents analyzed in the study belonged to or were produced by the major associations. The study has some limitations due to the fact that the data used may be construed as the “on-the-record stories” told by association documents. To alleviate the second and third potential limitation, the study triangulated the data by cross-referencing information and sources in order to corroborate the findings whenever possible.

Definitions

The following terms appear in this study. To assure common understanding, the definitions of these terms are listed below:
A case study refers to a research method that provides “intensive descriptions and analysis of a single unit or bounded system such as an individual, program, event, group, intervention or community” (Merriam, 1998, p. 19).

Globalization refers to “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas . . . across borders” (Knight 1999, p. 14).

Globalization of higher education refers to trends, such as mass higher education, a global marketplace for students and, faculty and higher education personnel; and the global reach of the new Internet-based technologies, among others, that have cross-national implications (Altbach, 2002).

Higher education association refers to a private, not-for-profit organization, no part of the income or property of which is distributable to its members, directors or officers, which has been established for the express purpose of supporting higher education (Brown, 1985).

Institutional association refers to “a collection of educational institutions, of a particular class or type, that share some attribute of size, status, location, historical background, or underlying purpose” (Bailey, 1975, p. 12).

International education refers to multiple activities, programs and services that fall within (one or all of) these three major areas:

1. International studies – international content of the curriculum;
2. International education exchange – international movement of scholars and students;
3. Technical cooperation – provision of expertise and educational technical assistance to other nations and foreign institutions (Harari, as cited in Arum & Van de Water, 1992).
An international dimension of higher education implies “a perspective, activity or programme, which introduces or integrates an international/intercultural/global outlook into the major functions of a university or college” (Knight, 1999, p. 8).

Internationalization of higher education refers to “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11).

Higher education sector is used to signify “different stakeholder groups operating in the same or similar environments, all of whom have their individual and perhaps different viewpoints on why (and how) higher education should be internationalized” (Knight, 1997, p. 12).

Summary

This chapter provided a brief background on the importance of internationalizing American higher education and the need for an orchestrated effort to promote this ideal at the national and institutional level. It described the need for this study, the statement of the problem, definition of terms, limitations, and the significance of the study. The next chapter focuses on the literature review that informed this study’s findings.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to place the study in its appropriate context, this chapter consists of three parts. Part One: Overview of the internationalization of American higher education provides a historical overview of landmark events and stages in the internationalization of higher education in the United States as reflected in the literature. Where possible, it briefly highlights any involvement or contribution on the part of the major associations. Part Two: [Literature review on] the concept of internationalization of higher education provides an overview of the literature relating to internationalization of higher education, an overview of rationales for and approaches to internationalization of higher education, the evolution of the term, and clarification of its relationship with other terms that are sometimes used interchangeably. Part Three: [Literature review on] the major higher education associations provides an overview of the various classifications regarding associations of higher education, and then focuses on the major associations of higher education – how they are defined; where do they fit in the larger picture of organized representation; how do they interact with each other; and what are the main functions they perform and services they provide.
Part I: Overview of the Internationalization of American Higher Education

The purpose of this part is to present a broad historical overview of the main stages in the development of internationalization of higher education in the United States, as reflected in the literature. In order to achieve this, the study provides a discussion on the impact that certain internal and external events, legislative acts, and political figures have had on different aspects of American international education, at different stages of its development. This part also looks at some key stakeholders – private foundations, associations of higher education, colleges and universities, and policy makers, who have played a major role in determining the fate of international education in the United States. A special emphasis was given to the involvement of the federal government, which, through funding and priority setting, has determined to a large extent how international education has been shaped. This part also highlights the main rationales that have driven the development of international education in the United States. These rationales have changed with time and with the emergence of new socio-political developments, often making the internationalization of higher education a direct byproduct of the responses to such developments. The discourse regarding the significance and impact of these events and stakeholders takes place in their historical context. That is why, dependent upon the stage of international education development under consideration, one or more of the above elements were analyzed.

Introduction

The internationalization of American higher education has been a relatively long and evolutionary process. It has often been triggered by “catalytic events” (Ruther, 2002, p. 49), motivated by different rationales, advanced as a solution to national problems, and shaped by the response, involvement and interaction of a number of actors and
stakeholders. A look at the history of internationalization of higher education in the United States allows us to see that, in its journey, it has had a lot of champions – educators, humanists, and political leaders, who have helped promote its cause. At the same time, there has been no shortage of obstacles – political climate, public sentiment, and political figures – that, directly or indirectly, have affected it.

A review of the literature indicates that the historical timeline in the internationalization of higher education in the United States can be divided into four major stages:

First Stage – from the colonial college to the turn of the 20th century;
Second Stage – from the turn of the 20th century up to beginning of World War II;
Third Stage – from World War II to the end of the Cold War;
Fourth Stage – From the end of the Cold War to the present.

There was general consensus among researchers (de Wit, 2002a; Deutsch, 1970; Ruther, 2002; Tierney, 1997) that the international dimension of American higher education was a product of the 20th century, especially during the period following WWII. This development was attributed primarily to a greater involvement of the federal government in foreign affairs, and consequently to its increased interest in the role that higher education could play as an instrument to the United States’ foreign policy given its new leadership role in the global arena. This involvement on the part of the federal government extended mostly over the last two stages. However, the first two stages, although unstructured and less dynamic, were important for the role they played in laying the ground for the future development of international education in the United States.
Stage One – From the Colonial College to the Turn of the 20th Century

From its genesis the American higher education was inescapably international in nature. The colonial college, the predecessor of the American university, patterned itself after the European university. The historian Frederic Rudolph (1990) asked the question: “What else could Harvard have become but an English college on the American frontier of Western Europe?” (p. 26)

Although the first inspiration for the colonial college was Oxford and Cambridge, the influences on the newly emerging higher education in the United States would not be solely British. According to an account by Rudolph (1990) “in 1784 the University of New York was patterned on the French model as a non-teaching and non-degree-granting supervisory institution” (p. 37).

At the turn of the 19th century, the United States emerged as an independent nation. However, the foreign influences in higher education did not end here. The rapid industrial growth that the country experienced after the Civil War led to a rising demand for scientific and technological knowledge. The German model of a research university, with distinct disciplines and advanced degrees, became especially appealing. The modern American university would forever be indebted to the German university for the beginnings of its graduate education, specialized training, and the ideal of the free pursuit of knowledge (Gruber, 1997).

By the end of the 19th century, certain aspects of what would constitute international education had started to emerge. Rudolph (1990) indicated that the French language (which was taught in some colleges as early as 1779) became an admission requirement at William and Mary by 1793. During colonial times, the children of many well-to-do families often went to Europe, especially England, to get an education. “For
many Americans the pursuit of study in Europe was considered the final touch to their cultural integration to American society: The Grand Tour” (de Wit, 2002a, p. 9).

While most of the student flow was directed from the United States to Europe, there are indications of foreign students already studying in the United States during the early years of the colonial college. In his book *The American College and University: A History*, Rudolph (1990) cited letters from English students who were studying at Harvard as early as 1651. In that same book, Rudolph (1990) noted that when the University of Chicago opened in 1892, the foreign students enrolled in it came from fifteen countries and provinces.

From very early on, the United States welcomed foreign scholars. Burn (1980) provided a number of examples to this effect. According to her, James Madison got his fundamentals in constitutional law from a Scottish professor, who was then teaching at Princeton. The first program in Italian studies at Columbia University was established by Lorenzo da Ponte, Mozart’s librettist.

It may appear as contrary to intuition, but Burn (1980) maintained that, it was not so much the institutions of higher education, but rather the learned organizations, like the Smithsonian Institution, that served as the main agents in establishing intellectual relations with the rest of the world. In fact, Burn (1980) noted the American faculty were "rather slow" (p. 84) in taking advantage of the opportunity for foreign exchange. However, by the end of the 19th century, as the value of study abroad became more recognized, faculty exchange grew into a more regular phenomenon, although not yet structured or institutionalized (de Wit, 2002a). The first fellowship enabling a college professor to pursue research abroad was established in 1890 by the American Association of University Women (de Wit, 2002a).
During the period following the revolutionary war an interesting development transpired. According to Halpern (as cited in de Wit, 2002a), opposition to study abroad, particularly regarding undergraduate students, emerged. Interestingly, the opposition came mostly from political and educational leaders, like Thomas Jefferson and Charles W. Eliott, the then president of Harvard. Both, Halpern and de Wit (2002a) agreed that this opposition was fueled by the fear that educating the young generation in foreign lands, while the United States – made up mostly of an immigrant population – was trying to become a country in its own right, would impede the process of Americanization of the United States. Paul Simon, the late former senator and a staunch supporter of federal support for international education, as well as other scholars (Scott, 2004) regarded this isolationistic sentiment as the precursor to the infamous American parochialism that has characterized a large part of the United States history, and blamed it for Americans' phobia towards foreign languages.

The state of internationalization of higher education at the turn of the 20th century can be summed up by a description that Gumperz’s (1970) used to portray the first period in the development of area studies: "It precedes the attempt to deal with this problem by organizations, but remains important for its residual effect upon later developments" (p. 2).

*Stage Two - Early 20th Century to WWII*

At the beginning of the second stage, only some elements of international education existed. This started to change when foundations and private organizations began to finance student and faculty exchange, as a way to foster understanding of other nations and to promote peace. Halpern regarded the promotion of peace and mutual understanding as the main rationale for the internationalization efforts during this period.
This rationale, which, according to Halpern, was a by-product of the American peace movement in the early 1900s, continued to be one of the most enduring motivations for the internationalization of higher education well into the 1990s.

This increased interest in international cooperation and exchange was an antidote to the horrors inflicted by World War I. It was also a direct response to the aspirations for a better world created by the League of Nations and President Wilson’s Fourteen Points for World Peace. A reflection of the sentiments of this time was the creation, in 1919, of the Institute for International Education (IIE) by two Nobel Peace Prize Laureates – Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, and Elihu Root, former Secretary of State. IIE was established on the premise that there could be no lasting peace without greater understanding between nations. Its main objective was to promote educational exchange as the foundation for fostering such understanding (Institute for International Education [IIE], n.d.).

During this period private foundations began to show an interest in promoting international education. Thanks to their involvement and financial support, international education started to gain some momentum, especially study abroad, faculty and student exchange, and area studies. According to Harari (1981-1983), "the Rockefeller Foundation pioneered this endeavor with over $1 million in grants between 1934 and 1942" (p. 40-41).

Some institutions of higher education started to institutionalize faculty exchange programs. American universities like Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, and Wisconsin established annual exchange professorships with German and French universities during the period 1905-1912 (de Wit, 2002a; Gruber, 1997).
Study abroad also experienced growth. In 1815, only two Americans attended a German university to earn an advanced degree (Rudolph, 1990). By 1920, there would be almost nine thousand Americans, who had either received a doctorate degree from a German university or had studied there as part of an American doctoral program (Gruber, 1997).

Area studies started to emerge as a new discipline. Burn (1980) provided a number of examples to illustrate this point. In 1901, Columbia University acquired a Chair in Chinese Studies through the generosity of a donor. Other generous gifts allowed Harvard to have its Harvard Yenching Institute and Cornell University to get involved in research into Southeast Asia. Another area of interest at that time was Latin American Studies, emerging especially in universities across the southern United States.

Ruther (2002) listed three main stakeholders spearheading international education efforts at this time – “enterprising faculty, private foundations and scholarly societies” (p. 4). Their efforts were especially focused on curriculum and area studies. Of all these stakeholders, Gumperz (1970) identified three organizations in particular – the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, and a later comer, the American Council on Education – as playing a major role in the internationalization process.

According to de Wit (2002), institutions of higher education during this period were less active in the area of internationalization than private foundations. To a large degree, not too many colleges had the financial resources to support an international aspect to the education they were providing. De Wit (2002) maintained that even among the institutions that were developing an international dimension, it was mainly women’s colleges that set out to establish Junior Year Abroad programs in Europe.
At this stage, the federal government was not involved much in funding international studies (Harari, 1981-1983). Its main focus was on domestic issues (Ruther, 2002). Both would change with the advent of WWII.

Three words used by de Wit (2002) can succinctly describe the international dimension of higher education during this phase: "spontaneous", "unstructured" and “[not] institutionalized.” He continued to portray this period as marked by (a) increased student and faculty mobility to and outside the United States, (b) a stronger dedication and financial support on the part of private foundations, especially for study abroad and area studies, and (c) the beginnings of institutional efforts in building study abroad and exchange programs (de Wit, 2002).

Stage Three – WWII to the End of the Cold War

Stage Three can be divided into two main periods, namely, the WWII period and the period from the end of WWII to the end of the Cold War.

International Education During WWII

“Before WWII, the United States was an essentially insular country; international affairs were marginal to most of American life” (Lambert, 1986, p. 1). As Kerr (1980) argued, the geographical isolation of the United States and the country's efforts to stay focused on developing itself as a growing nation were contributing factors to America's indifference to the rest of the world. Japan's attack of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 changed that by forcing the United States into WWII. The outbreak of WWII and the United States involvement in the war created circumstances that would give a push to certain aspects of international education (Gumperz, 1970).

As Ruther (2002) has pointed out, historically, the tendency had been for major structural change in the federal policy towards higher education to be prompted by
catalytic events; WWII being one such event. Faced with a national emergency and a shortage of personnel properly trained in the languages and cultures of the countries involved in the war, the federal government responded to this external political crisis by reaching out to the educational community and putting them in charge of providing intensive, short-term, training courses in foreign language and areas studies designed for military personnel (Gumperz 1970; Harari, 1981-1983).

Rising up to this national challenge, about 60 institutions of higher education helped over 15,000 servicemen complete an intensive spoken language program designed especially for them with the assistance of the Linguistic Society of America. Gumperz (1970) called this innovative educational program "one of the most remarkable short-term experiments in the history of American higher education . . . ,” (p.15) and considered it "a distant grandparent" (p. 16) to uncommon language courses currently offered in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

*International Education From the End of WWII to the End of the Cold War*

Mestenhauser (1998) identified four main phases of international education development in the United States from the end of WWII to the end of the Cold War. These phases were: (a) “euphoria,” lasting from 1946 to the early 1970s; (b) “darkening clouds,” lasting from 1966 to the end of the 1970s; (c) “defense through the associations,” lasting from the early 1980s to the early 1990s, and (d) “revival” following the end of the Cold War. This typology and timeline employed by Mestenhauser (1998) was used to describe the development of international education after WWII.

*Phase I – Euphoria (1946 to the early 1970s).* With the United States' victory in WWII came a better appreciation of her new role in the global arena: promoting peace and assisting in the reconstruction effort. The rationale of peace and understanding
continued to be very strong. Humanists, like Senator Fulbright, had strong aspirations about the power of educational and cultural exchange for lasting peace. Senator Fulbright himself spearheaded the legislation that in 1946 would lead to the creation of the Fulbright Program. The underlying principle of this program was the utilization of educational and cultural exchanges as an instrument for peace and greater understanding among nations. The Fulbright program has been credited for the huge strides educational exchange made in the post WWII period. The Fulbright program came to be considered "the intellectual counterpart to the Marshall Plan" (Burn 1980, p. 1), because of the impact of its exchange program. This landmark program created opportunities for such a large number of scholars to get involved in international exchange – teaching and research activities abroad – as to seemingly "parallel the massive economic cooperation undertaken by the United States and Europe" (Burn, 1980, p. 2).

The United States not only played a major role in winning WWII, but it also took a leading role in the reconstruction of Europe and in assisting poor countries in their development. Three major events in the mid-1950s demonstrated unequivocally the seriousness of the United States commitment to international affairs: (a) the Truman doctrine (1948), pledging U.S. support to freedom-loving nations; (b) the Marshall Plan (1948), greatly contributing to the economic recovery of Europe; and (c) President Truman's "Four Point Speech," (1949) articulating the commitment of the United States for the betterment of the world.

The new leadership role in the international arena brought about a greater involvement of the U.S. government in various parts of the world and had a tremendous impact for the United States foreign policy. This, in turn, impacted international education, which according to Deutsch (1970) developed “in close alignment with the
changing patterns of international relations and with the perceived function of education as an instrument of foreign policy” (p.14). A better understanding of both friendly and adversary nations became essential to the nation’s security. Higher education responded by establishing international area programs focusing on Russian, Chinese, South American, and Middle Eastern studies.

Gumperz (1970) attributed the initial federal government's interest in international education to its involvement in foreign technical assistance. In order to achieve these humanitarian objectives, the federal government again looked at higher education for the needed technical expertise. In 1953, the university contract system was established allowing universities to become involved in providing technical assistance overseas. In 1955, the International Cooperation Administration was created. In 1961 it changed its name to the Agency for International Development (AID). Its focus was on technical expertise and humanitarian assistance abroad. The AID largely utilized the technical expertise of colleges and universities as it worked to meet the U.S. humanitarian goals abroad.

According to Ruther (2002):

…in the 50s the universities offered one of the few resources for overseas developmental work. The emphasis of U.S. developmental assistance on institutional building projects in health, education and agriculture matched the talents of the universities. The land-grant institutions saw development as a natural extension of their mission. (p. 163)

Over the years the higher education system received about 10 times more funding through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) than other federal appropriations directly related to international education (Ruther, 2002). However, because of a beleaguered relationship of universities and the USAID, as well as a change in the focus of American technical assistance abroad after the amendments to
Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, the involvement of universities through government contracts and projects decreased over the years. More recently, that seems to have been repaired to some degree through the Higher Education for Development (HED), a cooperative agreement between USAID and the nation’s six major higher-education associations to support the involvement of higher education for development issues worldwide. In 2005, the HED program was renewed for another five years, and the funding for this period is estimated to be more than $50,000 (American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU], 2005a).

Starting with WWI, the federal government’s interest in higher education had slowly but steadily continued to grow. However, as many researchers (King, 1975; Parsons, 1994; and Ruther, 2002) pointed out, from the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, which marked the involvement of the federal government in higher education, until Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, the federal government had held an instrumental view of higher education. Until then, the relationship between the federal government and higher education had been, in the words of Lauriston R. King (1975), “a strictly one-way affair in which government regarded colleges and universities as resources for solution of national problems” (p. 1).

The signing into law of the NDEA drastically changed the rapport between the federal government and higher education and it also gave an impetus to the development of international education. The launch of Sputnik, the first human satellite in space, by the Soviets, in 1957, has been considered as the main catalyst for the passage of the NDEA. Sputnik was a wake up call for the U.S. government. It put into question the preparedness of this nation with regards to science, technology, and human resource capabilities and it served as a sound reminder of the fierce competition and threat posed
by the Soviet Union at a very dangerous time in world history (the height of the Cold War).

Realizing that something urgent needed to be done quickly and recognizing the capability of higher education to take charge of this task, President Eisenhower, who had run on a platform of non-federal involvement in higher education, sent to Congress the legislation that would become the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Gumperz, 1970). In the words of Ruther (2002) "the national defense link overcame long-standing objections to an increased federal role in education" (p. 43). With the signing of the NDEA, the federal government, for the first time, demonstrated an understanding of higher education's needs and was willing to enter into a partnership with higher education "… to develop high quality graduate programs in science, math, foreign languages, and area studies" (Vestal, 1994, p. 5).

An entire section of the NDEA was dedicated to international education. That was Title VI, which became "the principal title supportive of the international dimension of higher education" (Ruther, 2002, p. 61). According to Hines (2001), "the original concern driving Title VI was the lack of expertise in the uncommon languages" (p. 7). That, according to him, explained why most of the funds were channeled towards preparation of teachers in these languages and the study of the regions where these languages were spoken. That was also why Title VI was named the “Language Development” section of the NDEA. Added relatively late in the development of the NDEA legislation, Title VI focused both on higher education (Part A, sections 601A and 601B), as well as elementary and secondary education (Ruther, 2002).

Title VI Part A authorized a number of interconnected programs in foreign language and area programs: As listed by Hines (2001) these programs consisted of:
1. Language and Area Centers to provide advanced training in "uncommon languages" i.e. languages not readily available in the United States, but which were in demand from the federal government, business, industry, or education.

2. Modern Foreign Language Fellowships to assist qualified advanced students in the study of the uncommon languages.

3. Research and Studies to support research in language learning methodology and specialized teaching materials in both common and uncommon languages.

4. Language Institutes to provide advanced language training, particularly in the use of new teaching materials and methods, for elementary and secondary teachers.

The federal funding for international education through Title VI within the context of the NDEA, was modest – $32 million out of $480 million for the original four-year mandate in 1958 (Ruther, 2002). Gumperz (1970) offered two main explanations for this limited funding allocation. First, the fact that private foundations had historically been strong supporters of language and area studies programs might have affected Congress's decision to allocate more new resources for these programs. Secondly, the lobbying function of the institutional associations of higher education was still underdeveloped; it was even more so vis-à-vis international education. Bloland (1985) explained that well into the 1960s higher education chose to remain above politics, because it saw itself as "associated with the objective pursuit of knowledge and not dedicated to the pursuit of its own self-interest" (p. xix).

Although not as well funded as other federal programs, Title VI of the NDEA has been described as a "dramatic intervention" (Smith, 1990, p. 2), because of the permanent impact it has had in the way language and area studies programs are defined and taught in this country (Hines, 2001; Smith, 1990). Title VI of the NDEA – "the keystone of federal support for international education" (Hines, 2001, p. 9) – continues to be considered as the "most significant effort by the federal government" (Kerr, 1980) with regards to international education to date. According to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education, (U.S. Department of Education [USDE], 2005) to this day,
Title VI still represents the highest level of funding for international education in constant dollars, after adjusting for inflation.

In 1961, as Title VI of the NREA was getting close to completing its original mandate, Congress passed the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, known as the Fulbright-Hays Act. Hines (2002) attributed this achievement to Senator Fulbright, who, once again, had been successful in convincing Congress that awareness of similarities and differences between cultures developed through intellectual and cultural exchange can be a contributor to a greater understanding among nations and to world peace. Under the authority of Section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act, four programs were established: Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA); Faculty Research Abroad (FRA); Group Projects Abroad (GPA); and Foreign Curriculum Consultants (FCC). These programs were considered as "the overseas counterpart to the domestic capacity-building Title VI programs" (USDE, 2005).

In an effort to sustain and promote the new spirit of internationalism that was permeating the U.S. foreign policy during the 1950s and early 1960s, major private foundations like the Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Melon Foundations continued to play a vital role in financing the international dimension of higher education. According to Harari (1981-1983), the Carnegie Corporation provided about $2.5 million in support of non-Western studies between 1947 and 1951, while the Ford Foundation alone contributed an estimated $400 million in support of area and international studies since 1952. Burn (1980) reported that in the period between 1952 and 1967, the Ford Foundation's International Training and Research (ITR) program provided support to more than 100 colleges for developing undergraduate area studies programs. It also
provided support to 30 universities for developing advanced graduate training on non-Western regions, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

All this support was paramount in creating the necessary base for the development of area and international studies "so notably lacking in the early post-war period" (Burn, 1980, p. 109). Wiley (2002) credited this support as being instrumental in creating a whole generation of Ph.D.s in non-Western, language and area studies, who, in turn, became leaders of national centers and language institutes during the 1990s. Ruther (2002) made an important point regarding Ford Foundation's support. According to her, the Foundation’s intent was "[the] building of international capacity" (Ruther, 2002, p. 36) and the institutionalization of international education. The Ford Foundation required colleges and universities to provide matching funds for the funds received from the Foundation, as an indication of institutional intent in advancing international education. As a result, a number of international program offices appeared on campuses throughout the country.

With the addition of the Fulbright exchange program to the other two federally-supported programs – the NDEA and the foreign technical assistance program – the federal government was slowly replacing the private foundations as the main patron of international education (Ruther, 2002). This certainly made higher education more dependent on the federal government. Consequently, the ramifications would be both positive and negative.

Phase II – Darkening clouds (mid-1960s to the end of the 1970s). The next phase, which Mestenhouser (1998b) termed "darkening clouds," (p. 11) began with the International Education Act of 1966. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, Title VI of the NDEA had inspired many innovative programs. By 1962, from the original 19 area and
language centers the number had grown to 55; from 16 language institutes the number had increased to 83 (Hines, 2001). The consolidation and diffusion of these programs in colleges and universities throughout the country seemed both timely and necessary (Harari, 1981-1983).

Colleges and universities interested in developing the international dimension of their institutions had a lot of allies supporting their endeavors. Private foundations, like Ford and Rockefeller, were still strongly supporting the institutionalization of international programs. The higher-education associations joined efforts and became actively involved in drafting and promoting legislation regarding international education at all levels of the higher education system, including community colleges (Ruther, 2002). The federal interest in the international dimension of higher education also appeared to be very strong (Kerr, 1980). According to Ruther (2002), the Kennedy presidency gave a boost to the international dimension of higher education not only because "much of the original mandate of Title VI of the NDEA was implemented during his term" (p. 75), but also because he introduced major foreign policy initiatives. One such initiative was the creation of the Fulbright-Hays programs. Another initiative was the establishment of the Peace Corps in 1961. Its objective was to promote world peace and friendship through mutual understanding and assisting interested countries in meeting their needs for a trained workforce.

It seemed natural that this enthusiasm regarding international education could only be further boosted by the introduction of a broad federal initiative supporting the international dimension of higher education. Backed by President Johnson and with the full support from the academic community, Congress passed the International Education Act (IEA) of 1966. IEA provisions included substantial funding (about 100 million a
year) in support of international studies and research at both the undergraduate and graduate level and the improvement of relations between the United States and other countries. These provisions gave hope to the education community that IEA would raise the profile of international education within higher education, and its impact was expected to be comparable to "the great changes wrought by federal support for the sciences" (Vestal, 1994, p. 5).

In anticipation of the IEA legislation, many institutions of higher education committed funds and established international program offices (Burn, 1980). The promise, however, did not materialize. IEA, a remarkable piece of legislation representing “the only proposed full-scale, long term effort to strengthen the international dimension of colleges and universities throughout the nation” (Vestal, 1994, p. 5) did not receive funding by the new Congress. According to Ruther (2002) it marked the "end of the golden age for international education" (p. 5). The defeat of IEA was a heavy blow to the great aspirations the educational community had to finally raise international education to national attention. Institutions of higher education retreated in an effort to preserve all the funding they could (Ruther, 2002).

In spite of the failure, the cause was not totally lost. Although a “missed opportunity” (Ruther, 2002, p. 201), IEA has been considered "an important landmark of federal intention" (Leestma, 1994, p. ix), that positively influenced Title VI by “helping redefine and broaden the federal role in higher education” (Wiley, 2001, p. 15). More importantly, some of the ideas of the IEA survived and inspired many of the subsequent provisions of Title VI during several reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965. As Vestal (1994) put it, “Despite that defeat, the seeds of an expansive federal program in international education had been sown” (pp. 5-6).
Many reasons were offered as to why IEA was not funded:

1. The Vietnam War, causing financial drains to the economy and disillusionment with U.S. international involvement (Burn, 1980; Vestal, 1994; Harari, 1981-1983; Ruther, 2002);

2. Campus unrest, causing policymakers to look unfavorably on higher education legislation and the international component of it (Ruther, 2002);

3. "Lack of specificity" in the legislation itself and a perceived "vagueness of meaning" (Vestal, 1994, p. 13) as to whether international education stood for foreign aid or national educational programs (Ruther, 2002); and

4. The absence of a national defense rationale in the text of the act (Ruther, 2002).

Funding was lost not only at the federal level, but also from the longtime supporters of international education – the private foundations. According to Mestenhouser (1998b), the international relations theory of that time – interpreted to mean that the primary beneficiary of international education was the federal government, so the responsibility for funding international programs should be the responsibility of the federal government – played a role in the process. According to Ruther (2002), the Ford Foundation’s decision to cut the funding for international education became stronger after the passage of IEA and the realization that “the government was in the wings.” (p. 91)

The Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT1) between the United States and the Soviet Union was ratified in 1972. This led to an apparent "relaxation of the Cold War tensions", as well as to the questioning of the utility of Title VI programs (USDE, 2005). By that time, private foundations had, for all practical purposes, ceased most funding for
international education. Since the federal government was the main source of funding for international education, a lot was at stake.

The major efforts of the academic community were directed toward preserving federal funding for AID foreign assistance as well as the existing Title VI legislation which, after reaching an all time apex during the Johnson administration, sharply eroded under presidents Nixon and Ford (Merkx, 1998). The advocacy groups managed to preserve these programs, although at "more modest levels" (Ruther, 2002, p. 119). In 1972, the National Resource Centers (NRCs) mandate had expanded beyond their traditional functions of teaching and research to include an outreach component to the media, public, business, K-12 schools, as well as community colleges (Hines, 2001). This played out positively in their defense. They were described as "permanent national resources to be preserved" (Ruther, 2002, p. 125), whose impact, both public and domestic, was bigger than their academic function.

A national awareness was set in motion regarding students’ language competency and their global knowledge during the Carter presidency. In 1973, Richard Lambert had published his Language and Area Studies Review bringing attention to the condition of foreign language preparation. Furthermore, in August 1975, the United States signed the Helsinki Accords, which among other things obligated signatory countries to strive for international cooperation and a better understanding of other peoples' cultures and languages. In September of 1978, in the spirit of the Helsinki Accords and at the request of the Helsinki Commission, President Carter appointed the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies. The Commission's charge was:

…to recommend means for directing public attention to the importance of language and international studies, assess the need in the United States for foreign language and area specialists, recommend what study programs are appropriate at all academic levels and how they should be supported, and review existing
legislation and recommend needed changes (President’s Commission on Languages, 1978).

On November 7, 1979 the Commission issued a significant report to the President entitled *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*. The report shocked the nation with its findings. "Americans' incompetence in foreign languages is nothing short of scandalous, and it is becoming worse" (as cited in Maxwell & Garrett, 2002). The report revealed not only the deplorable state of foreign language acquisition both in high schools and colleges, but also the nation's shortage of international experts (Engberg & Green, 2002). Finding the situation unacceptable, the report called on higher education "to rise and meet the needs for international competence” (Ruther, 2002, p. 5).

Recommendations included the reinstatement of language instruction, whose enrollment, according to Welles (2001), “languished in the 70s with the removal of language requirements” (p. 1). The Commission also called on the federal government to increase its financial support for international education by more than $180 million. However, according to Ruther (2002), the mission was not completely accomplished, because the report "was not ready for the authorization hearings of 1979 amending the HEA, nor did it prioritize recommendations for setting appropriations for the new Title VI of the HEA amendments of 1980" (pp. 122-123). Some of the positive responses prompted by the report were a reexamination of the curriculum by some universities and states and the establishment of a number of regional centers for international studies and research (Allison, as cited in Smith, 1990).

*Phase III – Defense through associations (early 1980s to the early 1990s).*

According to Mestenhouser (1998b), Phase III began in the early 1980s, “when the Reagan administration proposed enormous cuts to federal international programs . . .” (p. 12). The failure of IEA had taught the higher education advocacy community a valuable
lesson. The institutional and disciplinary associations became more active on their federal relations' efforts. They started "to treat the federal government as an increasingly legitimate partner and they provided guidance and pressure" (Ruther, 2002, p. 4).

In addition to the pressure, the higher education advocacy group also followed the tactics of raising public awareness. A number of studies and reports were published emphasizing the need for federal support of international education. Scott (2004) listed a number of such efforts: ACE’s 1984 report *What We Don’t Know Can Hurt Us*, which was followed up by the 1989 update *What We Can’t Say Can Hurt Us: A Call for Foreign Language Competence by the Year 2000*. In 1987, a group of 165 education organizations created CAFLIS (the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies), an advocacy group seeking federal support for the preservation and advancement of foreign languages and international studies programs.

In 1980, the original provisions of Title VI were transferred into the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 as Title VI of that act. In Hines' (2001) view, the folding of Title VI programs into the HEA was done to emphasize their role more as educational programs rather than as instruments of federal foreign policy. The emphasis now was more on the development of programs that would address the needs of American companies operating internationally. This new emphasis was a reflection of the new view in Congress that federal support for international education should ensure that it serves the country not only in the area of foreign policy, but also in the area of economic competitiveness (Hines, 2001).

The economic security rationale moved to the forefront because of some major developments that were transforming the global context of the late 1980s. The expansion and strengthening of the European Community, the rise of Japan into a world economic
power, the emergence of the "Four Tigers of East Asia", and the break-up of the Soviet Union were seriously questioning the United States position of global dominance and her ability to be the world’s economic and political leader (de Wit, 2002a; Ruther, 2002).

Again, not unlike other times in U.S. history, "higher education was seen as a key player in the national response" (Ruther, 2002, p. 5) to meet the requirements of an increased global economic competition. To this end, a number of language and business programs were established during the 1980s, such as the Business and International Education Program, the Centers for International Business Education (CIBEs), and the Language Resource Centers (LRCs).

Associations of higher education, like AASCU, issued guidelines for its members on how to internationalize their curriculum and campus as early as 1983. Institutions started to capitalize on this new emphasis on the international dimension of higher education. They reintroduced language requirements, placed a stronger emphasis on the internationalization of the curriculum, and strengthened existing international programs. Colleges and universities realized that they could use this new international dimension as a marketing advantage. "In the institutional market heavily dependent on reputation, the international dimension was becoming a market leader" (Ruther, 2002, p. 40). Colleges and universities set out to make themselves attractive to students abroad in an effort to generate additional revenue, as well as to market themselves as international institutions. Their efforts overseas extended also in the area of linkages with universities in other countries in order to enhance their international presence. Some went even further by opening branch campuses abroad.
Stage Four – End of the Cold War to the Present

Following the end of the Cold War, international education started experiencing a "revival" phase (Mestenhouser, 1998a, p. xviii) or “new euphoria” (de Wit, 2002a, p. 20). Vestal (1994) attributed much of this new impetus to the collapse of the Soviet Union. Again, the rationale of peace, understanding, and cooperation among nations resurfaced. The disintegration of the old Communist Block created new opportunities for peaceful change and democratic reform in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as in the newly independent nations of the former Soviet Union. “Central to this strategy was public diplomacy with its emphasis on educational exchanges. As a result, tens of millions of dollars of international affairs funds were redirected by Congress to democracy-building educational and cultural exchange programs” (Vestal 1994, p. 171).

The end of the Cold War was also the inspiration for a new piece of legislation in support of internationalization of higher education. In 1991, Senator Boren proposed a major initiative intended to create a supply of specialists in languages and area studies of critical interest for the national security. The Boren initiative, entitled the National Security Education Act (NSEA) was passed by Congress in July 1991 and was enacted into law by President Bush Sr. in December of that same year.

Three international educational programs were created under the National Security Education Program (NESP) providing: (a) scholarships for study abroad to undergraduate students, including community colleges; (b) fellowships in area studies and foreign languages for graduate students studying abroad or in the United States; and (c) grants for establishing or strengthening international programs in U.S. colleges and universities in less commonly taught languages, area studies and other disciplines related to national security (Kuenzi & Riddle, 2005; Vestal, 1994).
The program became controversial due to some rather unusual characteristics: (a) requirement for aid recipients to seek employment with a national security agency like the Department of Defense or the CIA; (b) administration of the program by the Department of Defense; and (c) members of its governing board holding such positions as the Director of the CIA and the Secretary of Defense (Kuenzi & Riddle, 2005). These odd linkages and the potential for ethical ramifications created certain unease among the academic community regarding the autonomy of higher education, as well as the safety of scholars and students. Some were calling for the program’s administration to be handed over to the Department of Education, while others were urging institutions of higher education not to apply for institutional grants under NESP (Kuenzi & Riddle, 2005).

The passage of NSEA, which provided for the establishment of a $150 million trust fund, was considered as "one of the most significant expansions of federal international education programs since the establishment of the Fulbright program in 1946 and the Title VI programs of the NDEA in 1958" (Vestal, 1994, p. 170). The funding of the program, however, kept shrinking. In their report prepared for Congress, Kuenzi & Riddle (2005) pointed out that in FY1995, one half of the original appropriation was rescinded leaving only $75 million, and each following year the funding declined as expenditures exceeded income.

The rationales of global economic competitiveness and citizen global knowledge remained very strong as the new millennium was ushered in. Major higher-education associations remained in the forefront, publishing studies and reports in an effort “to enable higher education, government and business to formulate policies for educating citizens for an independent world” (Ruther, 2002, p. 5). One such publication was *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States...*

The pressure to approach internationalization of higher education in a more comprehensive and strategic way started to increase in the mid-1990s along with the realization that the country could no longer afford to adopt a “laissez-faire” or a “piecemeal” approach to the challenges of globalization (Hebel, 2002). On April 19, 2000, President Clinton issued an executive memorandum on international education policy, where he emphasized the importance of American's global awareness and foreign language and culture proficiency in allowing the United States to maintain the role as world leader. In that same document he expressed the commitment of the federal government in support of international education.

The executive memorandum was addressed to heads of executive departments and agencies, whereby they were directed to take positive steps regarding (a) encouraging international students to study in the United States; (b) promoting study abroad by U.S. students; (c) supporting exchanges for faculty, students and citizens; (d) enhancing programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise; (e) expanding foreign language learning and knowledge of other cultures; (f) supporting the preparation of teachers who can interpret other countries and cultures; and (i) advancing technology to aid the spread of knowledge” (White House, 2000).

President Clinton's executive memorandum on international education policy, like the IEA, remained unfunded (Scott, 2004). Engberg & Green (2002) found the list of
directives to be "complete and admirable", but as they pointed out "without funding, its impact was limited" (p. 8). One direct and noticeable response to these directives was the institutionalization of International Education Week in November of 2000 by the Departments of State and Education. Since then, International Education Week has continued to be observed annually on university and college campuses nationwide.

Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 “congressional interest in the NSEP and other federal programs of aid for ‘critical’ foreign language and area studies” increased (Kuenzi & Riddle, 2005). The events of 9/11 brought attention to the country's shortage of experts in areas of critical importance to national security, as well as a lack of citizens’ global awareness. In response, Congress authorized an increase of over 20% in the Title VI appropriation in 2002 (Ruther, 2002). Furthermore, the 2006 budget proposal included $10.3-million for a new National Defense Education Act aiming to ensure sufficient number of experts in science, engineering, mathematics, and foreign languages to meet the needs of the Department of Defense and its suppliers (Brainard, 2005).

In January 2006, during the U.S. University Presidents Summit on International Education, an event sponsored by the Department of State, the Bush administration announced a $114-million proposal aimed at increasing the teaching of "critical" foreign languages, including at the K-12 level. The proposal met with some criticism by academics regarding whether it will achieve the intended impact. The presidential associations informed the administration to consider the measures as additions to existing programs, so that existing infrastructures could be used.

At present, the state of internationalization of higher education has reasons to celebrate as well as areas to improve upon. The United States has continued to be the
leading recipient of international students since the mid 1940s (Spaulding, Mauch & Lin, 2001), although there is increased competition from other countries like Australia, United Kingdom, and Canada. According to the Open Doors report, an annual IIE publication, during the academic year 2004-2005 the United States hosted 565,039 international students (IIE, 2005a), a dramatic increase compared to the 34,232 international students studying in the U.S. during the academic year 1954/1955 (Spaulding et al., 2001). During the last few years however, there has been a drop in these numbers due to a more stringent process of student visa application following the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and concerns over national security that resulted from those events. The same IIE publication reported a 1.3% drop in the number of international students for the academic years 2004/2005 versus the 2003/2004 enrollments, which in turn were 2.4% lower than the year before.

By contrast, the number of American students studying abroad has more than doubled over the last decade. During the academic year 2003-2004, there was a total of 192,321 students studying abroad compared to only 76,302 students for the academic year 1993-1994 (IIE, 2005b). The explanation for this may be, in the words of Allan E. Goodman, that "[m]any U.S. campuses now include international education as part of their core competence education mission, recognizing that the increased global competence among the next generation is a national priority and an academic responsibility" (as cited in IIE, 2005b). Another positive aspect of study abroad was an increase in the number of students choosing non-Western European countries as their destination. However, the average time spent abroad has shortened considerably; the most time students spent abroad was one semester (IIE, 2005b).
Foreign language enrollments have increased compared to the 1979 report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. However, the overall number of students enrolled in foreign language courses represents only 8% of the total student enrollment (ACE, 2002). Furthermore, Dounay (2002) questioned the level of commitment to learning foreign languages, citing findings of a 2002 report by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages according to which, in spite of higher enrollments, the foreign language knowledge remained at the introductory level. Apart from student’s lack of interest, the main culprit according to Maxwell and Garrett (2002) is the way foreign language instruction is designed in this country. Only one-third of K-12 students are enrolled in foreign language courses (ACE, 2002), making the United States “virtually the only developed country in the world that places the real burden of language learning on the postsecondary system” (Maxwell and Garrett, 2002).

Currently there are 114 NRCs in more than fifty major research universities. They play a very important role in preparing experts in areas of critical need, and they also provide expertise to the government. Although, the federal government has continued to reauthorize the Title VI foreign language and international programs "leaving an unbroken funding line since 1959" (Ruther, 2002, p. 6), scholars are very concerned with the erosion of federal funding caused by inflation. At present, the largest share of the cost to run the NRCs is provided by the institutions themselves and other donors. In spite of the vital role in the nation’s interest played by these centers, “some universities are questioning the wisdom of continuing to fund low-enrollment languages, no matter how nationally strategic they may be” (Wiley, 2001, p. 28), possibly having implications for the country’s national security.
In 1991, Goodwin and Nacht, rejoiced at the creation of internationally sophisticated enclaves and the impressive accomplishments of individual institutions while showing concern that a great number of institutions of higher education had either remained largely untouched by the world or that the development of certain areas of international education did not lead to a broad internationalization at the institutional level. By 2002, ACE optimistically observed that hundreds of higher education institutions had been successful in setting an infrastructure for internationalization of their institutions. Even more importantly, a movement towards a strategic approach with regards to internationalization of higher education has emerged. More college and university leaders are emphasizing a commitment to internationalization and its importance on their campuses. Many institutions have made internationalization as part of their mission statements and their strategic plans (Hayward, 2000). Associations of higher education have organized initiatives aimed at recognizing and diffusing best practices in internationalization of higher education. However, for the American higher education to remain the best in the world, it is important it does not fall into complacency. There is a lot that still needs to be done.

Summary

The internationalization of American higher education has undergone an evolutionary process of development and has involved a number of stakeholders. The timeline of this development includes four major stages. During the first stage, the American higher education was characterized by (a) importation and adaptation of European university models, which Scott (1998) described as one of the two main aspects of internationalization of the university; and (b) the modest beginnings of certain aspects of what would be known as international education. The international education at this
stage was mostly "incidental" (de Wit, 2002, p. 9). Its main rationales were social and cultural.

During the second stage, certain aspects of international education, such as study abroad and area studies, started to gain some momentum. Private foundations became strong supporters of the international dimension of higher education. A number of universities started to institutionalize certain aspects of international education. At this stage, international education still remained mostly unstructured. The rationales of peace and cooperation and some academic rationales were the main motivators for international education at this stage.

During the third stage, international education gained new momentum. The new leadership role of the United States in the global arena during and after WWII created a new national demand for expertise in foreign language, area studies and technical assistance. This stage experienced the involvement of the federal government in financing certain aspects of international education until it gradually became the most important financial provider for international education. This stage also experienced the birth of new programs, as well as diffusion of those programs. A number of internal and external crises gave rise to legislative acts supportive of international education, which created opportunities for new programs to grow and consolidate. The rationales of peace and cooperation, national security, and foreign policy were the main driving motivations for international education at this stage. Economic competitiveness and an informed citizenry emerged as important motivators.

During the fourth stage, international education moved in the direction of becoming more of a strategic process. The institutional leadership and other stakeholders became more involved in interconnecting the various aspects international education on
campus. The federal government continued to be supportive, but the level of funding still left much to be desired. The rationales of economic competitiveness and academic rationales for a citizenry with global knowledge became more prominent. Defense, public diplomacy, and national security continued to be important rationales at this stage.
Part II: Evolution of the Concept of Internationalization

A review of the literature on the internationalization of higher education reveals one thing: the definition of the term has proven to be rather ambiguous. Callan (2000) has succinctly put this dilemma in perspective:

…for many years since the Second World War the concept has been understood and applied in a highly variable fashion. Interpretations have shifted according to varying rationales and incentives for internationalization, the varying activities encompassed therein, and the varying political and economic circumstances in which the process is situated. (p.16)

Furthermore, what makes internationalization even more problematic according to de Wit, (2002) is terminology: The existence of a number of related terms that are sometimes “used to refer to a concrete element within the broad field of ‘internationalization’ . . . and also . . . used as synonymous for the overall term ‘internationalization’” (p. xvi).

The purpose of this section is to review the concept of internationalization of higher education as reflected in the literature. It tries to trace the evolution of this term, as well as draw the distinction and clarify the relationship between internationalization of higher education and three other terms – international education, international dimension, and globalization of higher education – that are sometimes used interchangeably with it. Two other important aspects related to internationalization that are reviewed in this chapter include: (a) rationales for internationalization and (b) approaches to internationalization.

Definition of Internationalization of Higher Education

The term internationalization of higher education has suffered from a vagueness of meaning (Mallea, 1996; Yelland, 2000), overuse, due to an increased interest in it, as well as misuse, due to a multiplicity of meanings assigned to it (Knight, 1999).
Internationalization of higher education “means different things to different people” (Knight, 2004). According to Knight (1999) the diversity of meaning can reflect the complexity of the concept, but at the same time it can lead to confusion.

Arun and van de Water (1992) argued that the lack of a precise definition could be attributed to the fact that each institution defined international education as it suited their purposes, given what their rationales for internationalization were. While they acknowledged that this lack of definition might have been instrumental in encouraging institutions to develop certain aspects of international education, they called for a more precise definition of the term. Lack of a common understanding, warned Arum and van de Water (1992), could have serious consequences. They illustrated this point with the conclusion drawn by Herman B. Wells, former president of Indiana University, according to whom one of the main reasons that the International Education Act (IEA) remained unfunded involved terminology – legislators were confused over whether IEA was intended to support other nations or support the internationalization efforts of the U.S. educational community (Arum and van de Water, 1992).

De Wit (2002) argued in favor of a more focused though not necessarily precise definition for internationalization in order for it “to be understood and be treated with the respect it deserves” (p. 114). Similarly, Knight (2004), while acknowledging the impossibility for a universal definition, called for a common understanding of the term to ensure that the point of reference for the academic community was the same as they strived to internationalize and rally support from policy makers and institutional leaders. Interestingly however, a 1996 report by the Organization for Economic and Cultural Development (OECD) pointed out:
The support for internationalization from the government and the public has been based on the vagueness of the term. As internationalization becomes operationalized in obvious and visible forms, it may be harder to maintain the breadth of stakeholder support that has existed for the generic concept. (as cited in Yelland, 2000, p. 298)

Bartell (2003), probably expressing the opinion of many other scholars, stated: “Internationalization of higher education is far from a clearly defined and understood concept” (p. 45). Nonetheless, there are definitions that have gained general acceptance in the research community, such as the one formulated by the Canadian scholar Jane Knight (Mallea, 1996, de Wit, 2002). The original definition, which Callan (2000) referred to as "the now classic formulation of internationalization at institutional level" (p. 16) read: “The process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (as cited in Knight 1999, p. 8). After remarks from other scholars that an institutional-based definition had limitations, Knight later amended the definitions to read: “The process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, para. 3).

Knight (2003) explained the similarities and differences of the new definition from the original one by focusing on the key words used. In both definitions the term process is a key word because it highlights the fact that internationalization is an ongoing course of action and the effort to internationalize is continuous. Integration is another keyword, which underscores the centrality and sustainability of internationalization in the mission and function of higher education. The addition of the terms purpose, function, and delivery of higher education that go beyond teaching, research and service, as the three main components of any college or university, make the new definition more generic and thus applicable not only at the institutional level, as implied in the original
definition, but also at the sector level. This definition was more relevant for this study given that the object of this study lied at the higher education sector level. The complimentary nature of the terms international, intercultural or global conveys the idea that internationalization was broad and deep, local and international (Knight, 2003).

Another scholar who has looked at internationalization as a process was B. J. Ellingboe. She defined internationalization as:

The process of integrating an international perspective into a college or university system. It is an ongoing future-oriented, multidimensional, multidisciplinary, leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally focused, ever-changing external environment. (Ellingboe, 1998, p. 199)

Apart from it being rather long, this is a good definition of a strategic approach to internationalization. Like Knight’s definition, this definition regards internationalization of higher education as a process rather than a series of events with a beginning and an end. It highlights the continuous and dynamic nature of the process of internationalization, the multi stakeholder involvement, and the need for commitment from the institution’s leadership. Similarly to the Knight’s definition, this definition too seems to extend its applicability not only at the institutional level but also at the higher education system as a whole. Although the bulk of the internationalizing processes is taking place at the institutional level (Knight, 2004), it is important that these definitions are broader conceptually and extend at the national and sector level as well. “The national/sector level has an important influence on the international dimension through policy, funding programs, and regulatory frameworks” (Knight, 2004, p. 5).

Ruther (2002) also provided a very useful description of internationalization, which was in the same vein as the two definitions cited above. According to Ruther (2002) internationalization in itself consists of two conceptual terms – international
education and international dimension of higher education. She described each of them clarifying their relationship to one another as follows: “International education focuses on the disciplinary or academic element and international dimension focuses on institutional or enterprise element. Internationalization focuses on the dynamic transformation of higher education, its institutions and the entire system, both its disciplinary and enterprise element” (p. 9).

Internationalization and Other Related Terms

Hans de Wit (2002), a highly regarded scholar in the area of internationalization of higher education, after a thorough review of the literature, analyzed the term internationalization of higher education, as well as other terms that had been used as substitutes, and provided a historical background for the term’s usage. According to de Wit (2002), the three terms international dimension, international education, and internationalization of higher education referred to a specific phase of development of this concept.

Internationalization of Higher Education and International Education

International education is frequently used in place of internationalization of higher education, thus creating confusion (de Wit, 2002). According to de Wit (1999; 2002) and Callan (2000) this could be explained by historical developments. “The concept of ‘internationalization’ carried different historical associations and hence different contemporary resonances in the United States, in Europe, and in other parts of the world . . . .” (Callan, 2000, p. 16). As such, we put it in historical context.

Tracing the usage of the terms international education and internationalization of higher education. In the United States, the term internationalization started to gain some currency in the early 1980s and more so in the 1990s. Before then, the term international
education was the most commonly used term, which still continues to be very popular (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2003). By contrast, internationalization of higher education was a term that had been most predominantly used in the literature outside the United States, especially in Europe, Canada, and Australia (de Wit, 2002; Van der Wende, 2001).

The reason that international education was the most prevalent term in the United States had to do with the fact that, from World War II until the early 1980s, the United States was the leader in the internationalization efforts (de Wit, 2002). According to researchers (see Arun & van de Water, 1992; Mestenhouser, 1998), the term international education was in usage by the end of World War I. Arun & van de Water (1992) pointed to the publication of the first bulletin of the Institute of International Education (IIE) entitled Institute of International Education, Inc., Its Origin, Organization and Activities in 1920, as the first official use of the term in a publication. According to them, the term did not imply simply international education exchange, which would have been the case at that period, given the mission of IIE; instead, it included also international studies.

According to Arun & van de Water (1992), the International Education Act (IEA) of 1966 gave a major boost to the usage of the term by virtue of its mention in the title of the bill, as well as the attention and the support it received. Furthermore, according to Mestenhouser (1998), IEA increased the comprehensiveness of the term when a number of fragmented disciplines and programs were grouped together under the umbrella of international education.

According to Vestal (1994), legislators seemed to be in agreement that international education consisted of three major strands: content of curricula, movement of scholars and students, and technical assistance and educational cooperation programs.
beyond national boundaries. This represented one of the first definitions of international education, and according to Mestenhouser (1998), it led to the birth of international education as a system. However, he argued, because legislators rather than academics came up with the definition, and because different players and areas were lumped together indiscriminately, the parts of this system remained "largely unintegrated and fragmented" (Mestenhouser, 1998, p.12). De Wit (2002) seemed in agreement when he stated:

international education . . . covers the fragmented but organized state of development in the international dimension of higher education, as it emerged in the United States and to a lesser extent in Europe after the two world wars and in particular during the Cold War. (p. 110)

The term remained in usage in the United States well through the 1990s. By this time, Arun & van de Water (1992) contended, the term international education started to serve as the “overarching term for all aspects of international activities and programs on the U.S. campuses,” (p. 199) and was used “in a broader framework, referring to the international dimensions of the entire institution’s curriculum and diverse programs, services and activities that are international in focus” (p. 199). In this context, this usage of the term international education came close to the meaning denoted by the term internationalization. According to Arun & van de Water (1992), this evolution of the term happened throughout the 1970s and 1980s without any specific groundbreaking event. However, for Rahman and Kopp (1992), it was the November 1979 report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies that served as a turning point towards internationalization of higher education in the United States.

De Wit (2002b) pointed out that the research tradition on the internationalization of higher education was more recent in Europe, while it was longer and more established in the United States. Looking from an historical vintage point, de Wit (2002) remarked
"the internationalization of higher education reflects the period starting with the end of the Cold War and is more predominant in Europe, as well as Australia and Canada” (p. 114). It appears that before then, especially in Europe, internationalization was mainly focused on the mobility of individual students and scholars (de Wit, 2002b; Van der Wende, 2001) and “not as a strategy that affected higher education as institutions or systems” (Van der Wende, 2001, p. 432). As more and more European countries, like the U.K. the Netherlands, Germany, France, Sweden, and Finland incorporated their internationalization efforts and strategies in a formal policy document (Van der Wende, 2001), the concept of internationalization clearly widened (Deetman, 1996) and became more popular.

De Wit (2002) summed up the differences in usage and meaning between American and non-American authors using the argument that:

Most practice and analysis in the period before the Cold War was done by Americans and still dominates American practice, whereas most practice and analysis of the international dimension of higher education now takes place outside the United States, in particular in Europe, Canada and Australia. (p. 112)

Definitions of international education. De Wit (2002) remarked “…especially American authors use international education more in relation to activity, rationale, competency and ethos approaches than to process approaches to internationalization” (p. 110). Following is a sampling of definitions of international education that illustrates this point.

Backman (1984) defined international education to encompass “international studies, global education, foreign language study, exchanges, study abroad, area studies, comparative education and the like…” (p. xiv). Fersh (1990) defined international education as "referring generally to all programs, projects, studies, and activities that help an individual learn and care more about the world beyond his or her community and to
transcend his or her culturally conditioned, ethnocentric perspectives, perceptions and
behavior” (p. 68). For Kerr (1990), the internationalization of learning consisted of four
main components: (a) the flow of new knowledge, (b) the flow of scholars, (c) the flow of
students, and (d) the content of the curriculum (p.10). Harari’s definition of international
education stated:

International education is an all inclusive term encompassing three major strands: a) international content of the curricula; b) international movement of scholars and students concerned with training and research; and c) arrangements engaging the U.S. education abroad in technical assistance and educational cooperation programs. (as cited in Arun & van de Water, 1992, p. 196)

Arun and van de Water’s (1992) suggested definition of international education referred to “the multiple activities, programs and services that fall within international studies, international educational exchange and technical cooperation” (p. 202).

Most of these definitions were a clear indicator that internationalization in the 1990s “was defined more at the institutional level and in terms of a set of activities” (Knight, 2004, p. 9). Taking such an approach, according to de Wit (1999), was to confuse internationalization with the various rationales that motivate it, reducing internationalization to an activity with a beginning and an end instead of looking at it as a continuous process. The activities approach continued to be strong until the mid 1990s, when Knight’s definition of internationalization as a strategic process started to gain ground in the research community and became an operative definition.

*Internationalization vs. Globalization*

Like internationalization, globalization has been defined in a myriad of ways (Knight 1999). Because both phenomena affect not only higher education, but also almost all aspects of society, the terms are often used interchangeably as they best fit the purposes of individuals using them. In spite of the confusion, the two terms are not
identical and should not be used interchangeably (Knight, 1999). Researchers and analysts have tried to explain the meaning and the relationship between the two concepts. A sampling of such definitions is provided to clarify the relatedness and difference between these two terms.

Knight (1997) defined the two concepts as follows: “Globalization is the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas…across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities” (p. 6). “Internationalization of higher education is one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization yet, at the same time respects the individuality of the nation” (p. 6). Knight (1997) viewed globalization as the catalyst and internationalization of higher education as the proactive response to it.

Knight’s view of catalyst and response was shared also by Yelland (2000), who saw the interconnectedness between globalization and internationalization as follows: "…globalization of the economy and developments in technology are producing a global knowledge economy which implies the internationalization of the producers and the products, notably the universities and other higher education institutions, and the courses they offer" (p. 298).

This notion of proactive response to globalization was present also in the statement by Green, Eckel & Barblan (2002): "Globalization has … underscored the imperative for institutions to internationalize." Altbach (2002), too, viewed internationalization as a response of a country or institution to global trends through specific policies and initiatives. For him, globalization referred to trends in higher education that have cross-national implications such as mass higher education, a global marketplace for students and, faculty and higher education personnel; and the global
reach of the new Internet-based technologies (Altbach, 2002). Van der Wende provided the following distinction between the two concepts:

Internationalization refers to the increasing interconnectedness between national education systems, in which borders and national authorities are not questioned: internationalization is perceived as a steerable policy process. Globalization involves the increasing integration of flows and processes over and across borders, transforming the spatial organization of social relations and transactions, and it is perceived as an external process to higher education, which can hardly be influenced. (as cited in Luijten-Lub et al. 2005, pp. 149-150)

Talgeri (2000) drew the distinction between globalization and internationalization as follows: “Globalization tends to homogenization of social, economical, cultural and academic processes and the marginalization of peripheral cultural and other social processes. Internationalization looks for participatory intervention among the equal partners.” This definition highlights a growing concern, especially in developing countries, that globalization will lead to homogenization of cultures. This connotation is especially serious when globalization is used interchangeably with internationalization, because it makes countries and institutions weary of efforts to internationalize. According to Knight (1999) internationalization respects the identity of individual nations.

According to Scott (1998) “not all universities are (particularly) international but all universities are subject to the same process of globalization” (p. 122). Scott (1998) saw a dialectical relationship between internationalization and globalization. For him, the essence of internationalization was captured by the image of a world over-dominated by nation states. Globalization, on the other hand “implies a radical reordering of this world order,” (Scott, 1998, p. 126) whereby new regional and global alliances and power blocks emerge. For Scott, internationalization was “a condition with which universities have always been comfortable” and globalization “a much more volatile and turbulent phenomenon” (as cited in Callan 2000. p.18).
Knight (1993) contended that globalization presented new opportunities, challenges, and risks. A similar reference was made by Luijten-Lub et al. (2005) when they said that, “globalization has increased the component of competition, when cooperation was more prevalent” (p. 148). Cooperation is more often associated with internationalization whereas competition is associated with globalization. However, they continued to say, competition does not exclude cooperation. At the same time, globalization has forced countries like the Netherlands and Finland to make policy changes that have positively influenced the international competitiveness of their country's higher education (Luijten-Lub et al., 2005).

Approaches to Internationalization

Definitions used by various authors reflect their approach to internationalization of higher education. Knight (2004) warned, “an approach is different from a definition” (p. 18). She tried to explain that sharing the same definition of internationalization did not imply that the implementation of internationalization would be the same because implementation would be dependent upon priorities, culture, history, politics and resources of the country or institution that was trying to internationalize. Knight (2004) “An approach to internationalization reflects or characterizes the values, priorities, and actions that are exhibited during the work toward implementing internationalization” (Knight, 2004, p.18).

Knight and de Wit (1997) together and in individual works (de Wit 2002; Knight, 2004) provided a typology of four different, although not necessarily exclusive, approaches to internationalization that institutions have adopted:
1. The activity approach regards the international dimension of higher education as a series of activities, like study abroad and student exchange, which are not necessarily coordinated with each other.

2. The competency approach is concerned with the human element of the academic community – the students, faculty and staff – and focuses on the development of their skills, knowledge, and values. This approach is of interest to institutions because it impacts students’ outcomes and their competencies.

3. Process approach emphasizes the integration of an international/intercultural dimension in the curriculum, as well as the policies that run an institution (Knight, 2004). This approach integrated an international dimension in all functions of the institution and according to de Wit (2002) is the most comprehensive of the four.

4. Rationale approach “defines internationalization in terms of its purpose or intended outcomes” (de Wit, 2002, p. 117). Such a rationale includes mutual understanding among nations, national security, peace, and economic competitiveness.

As mentioned earlier, Knight’s 2004 article revised her original definition of internationalization and expanded its applicability at the sector and national level. In that same article, Knight (2004) listed five different categories of approaches relevant at the education sector level: (a) the programs approach focuses on providing funded programs that facilitate institutions’ and individuals’ involvement in international activities; (b) the rationales approach emphasizes the reasons why the higher education sector should internationalize; (c) the ad hoc approach views internationalization as an accidental or reactive response to emerging opportunities for international cooperation among institutions, academic mobility or delivering education abroad; (d) the policy approach approaches internationalization of higher education in terms of policies intended to
promote an international/intercultural dimension of higher education and can originate from various sectors such education, foreign affairs, science or culture; (e) the strategic approach regards internationalization of higher education as an essential component of a national strategy that can enable a country to reach its objectives and goals.

Rationales for Internationalization of Higher Education

Knight (1997, 2004) and de Wit (1999, 2002) elaborated on four main categories of rationales that drive internationalization efforts. These four categories of rationales that defined internationalization policies and efforts at both the national and institutional level included: political rationales; economic rationales, academic and social/cultural rationales.

Political Rationales

These rationales are mostly relevant at the national level. According to de Wit (1999), the political rationales became apparent as various European nations imported their higher education systems in their respective colonies around the world in an effort to ensure their dominance over those countries. He further maintained that the political rationales assumed a new dimension especially after World War II, as the United States adopted the role of the leader of the free world. Federal funding was used to develop new programs in areas studies, foreign language training and study abroad programs (de Wit, 1999). De Wit (1999, 2002) and Knight (1997, 2004) categorized political rationales as follows:

*Foreign policy rationale.* This rationale contributes to the cultivation of good diplomatic relations and good will by sponsoring the education of future leaders, who in turn would be more sympathetic to the host country and its values system. “This affinity
can prove to be beneficial in future years in terms of diplomatic and economic relations” (Knight, 1997, p. 9).

National security. One aspect of this rationale is “providing international scholarships on the basis of security considerations” (de Wit, 2002, p. 86). According to de Wit (2002), this political rationale was especially prevalent during the Cold War and noticeably so in the United States and the former Soviet Union. After the attacks of 9/11 in the United States, national security considerations were revived through such scholarship programs as the NSEP.

Technical assistance to other countries. This rationale motivated internationalization efforts especially after World War II. This rationale characterized a large part of the United States foreign relations policy as it provided assistance for the rebuilding of Europe and other countries devastated by the war. It continued to be an important element in the foreign policy of most industrialized nations during the decolonialization period and the Cold War, until economic rationales gradually replaced technical assistance.

Peace and mutual understanding. This rationale is based on the premise that understanding cultural differences makes it easier to maintain peace. This has been one of the most prominent rationales of higher education internationalization efforts in the United States especially after World War I and World War II.

Economic Rationales

These rationales aim at improving competitiveness in the economy at the national level and raising revenue for the institution at the institutional level. De Wit (1999) maintained that after World War II the political rationales dominated most internationalization efforts and that by the end of the Cold War they were superseded by
economic rationales. The economic motivation at the institutional level has become widespread too (Knight, 1997). While acknowledging that higher education as an export commodity has provided the stimulus for institutions to compete for students and staff for the purpose of making a profit, Denman (2002) expressed concern for “the shift from civic responsibility to business opportunity” that has occurred on certain occasions. Similarly, Knight (1997) cautioned institutions about finding a balance between income-generating motivation and academic benefits of internationalization and highlighted the importance of identifying those competencies that would enable students to perform better in a more globalized environment.

**Academic Rationales**

Internationalization efforts contribute to the quality and richness of teaching and learning. According to Van der Vende (2001) academic rationales became especially prevalent in the 1980s in an effort to improve the quality of education. In more recent years, they have been somewhat overshadowed by concern of economic competitiveness.

The literature reflected six aspects that academic rationales have manifested themselves in:

*Extension of the academic horizon.* This aspect stresses the important role that academic mobility plays “as a form of social learning by means of a multicultural experience” (de Wit, 2002).

*Institution building.* Certain initiatives that cannot be achieved through local resources or expertise can serve as a catalyst for major reviews or exercises at the institutional level that can strengthen the core values of the institution (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 1997).
Profile and status. As competition at the international level becomes more pronounced, the international status and profile of the institution becomes more important for marketing purposes (Knight, 2004). Given the perception that the more international an institution is the better it is (de Wit, 2002), institutions are making major efforts to establish an international reputation or a brand name for themselves, that would give them the upper hand against their competitors (Knight, 2004).

Quality enhancement. An international dimension to teaching, research and service implies a higher quality of the education being provided. Knight (1997) pointed out that this premise is true only when internationalization is really a central part of the mission of the institution.

International academic standards. These standards serve as benchmarks for institutions that want to be recognized internationally and motivate them to strive to meet these international standards (de Wit, 2002).

Cultural Rationales

Cultural rationales aim at fostering respect for cultural and ethnical diversity and promoting international understanding. At times, they have been considered as an effort to export a nation’s cultural and moral values, as has been the case with France and the United States according to de Wit (2002). Cultural rationales are often linked with the promotion of the universality of knowledge, as well as the role universities play as generators of new knowledge, preservers of culture, and social critics.

Social Rationale

These rationales focus on the development of the student as an individual by personally experiencing a foreign culture(s) and better appreciating their own culture.
According to de Wit (2002) a fear of parochialism has been a major force driving the study abroad programs in the United States, especially at the undergraduate level.

De Wit (1999) has made the case that rationales for internationalization of higher education have changed over time: the political rationale was the dominant one after World War II, while a shift in emphasis towards the economic rationales took place at the end of the Cold War. Both Knight (1997) and de Wit (1999) pointed out that when analyzing these rationales it was important to bear in mind the stakeholder's perspective. There is a large number of stakeholders at the government, educational, and private sector. According to Knight (1997) “the different rationales can imply different means and ends to internationalization. Thus it is extremely important for a national system and an institution to be aware of the explicit and implicit motives of different groups” (p. 12).
Part III: The Major Associations of Higher Education

This part reviews the literature regarding higher-education associations and more specifically the nation’s six major higher education associations. According to Bloland (1985) "Higher-education associations belong to a category of organizations called ‘voluntary associations’; they are groups of persons organized to pursue interests common to their members” (p. 1). After providing a summary of the various classifications regarding associations of higher education, it focuses on the major associations of higher education: how are they defined, where do they fit in the larger picture of organized representation; the landscape where these associations operate, how do they interact with each other, and what are the main functions they perform and services they provide. A more detailed description of each association – mission, membership, constituencies, organization structure and policy position towards international education and information for each association is provided in Chapter Four.

A lot has been written about associations as interest groups, pressure groups, lobbyists, trade associations, organized interests etc. A number of scholars such as Babbidge & Rosenzweig (1962), King (1975), Bailey (1975), Murray (1976), Gladieux and Wolanin (1976), Bloland (1985), Parsons (1997), and Cook (1998) have written more specifically about associations of higher education. Ruther (2002) also briefly described the involvement of the higher-education associations in advancing the cause of international education.

The focus of these scholars' work has been particularly on the Washington-based higher education associations, as one of the main actors in the context of higher education policy making. They described the environment these associations operate in, characteristics of these associations, classifications of these organizations, and their
interaction with the federal government, particularly its legislative branch. Apart from Cook's (1998), Parson's (1997) and Ruther's (2002) work, most of the body of work regarding representation and higher education policy was written in the 1960s and 1970s, reflecting the proliferation of organized representation in the nation's capital that occurred in the 1960s (Gladieux & Wolanin, 1976). In their works, Cook (1998) and Parsons (1997) have pointed out the main changes that have occurred since these studies were published, but the typology regarding the higher education lobby has largely remained in place.

Classification of Higher Education Associations

Lauriston R. King was the first scholar to categorize associations of higher education (Parsons, 1997). Before him, Babbidge & Rosenzweig (1962), dedicated chapter four of their book The Federal Interest on Higher Education to the organization of higher education associations. They became known for the frequently quoted statement reflective of the explosion of higher-education associations in Washington and the variety of interests they represented: "Probably no other segment of American society has so many organizations and yet is so unorganized as higher education" (Babbidge & Rosenzweig, 1962, p. 92). The chapter, however, focused almost entirely on the American Council on Education, since according to them "... the American Council on Education is in a very real sense a creature of the relationship between the Federal Government and higher education" (Babbidge & Rosenzweig, 1962, p. 95). In this chapter, they also provided a definition for institutional associations: "Associations of institutions may represent types of institutions, others institutions of a particular size or type of control" (Babbidge & Rosenzweig, 1962, p. 93).
According to King (1975), the Washington-based higher education community consisted of the major associations, two groups of satellite associations located at the periphery of the major associations; and the offices of the state systems, small associations, and private entrepreneurs, whose very specialized services and limited resources restricted them to the fringes of the Washington-based higher education community.

More specifically, the three main categories included in King's (1975) classification of the higher-education associations were:

1. The major institutional membership associations. The six associations that King listed as "the major associations" were: the Association of American Colleges (AAC) currently replaced by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), currently known as the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the American Association of States Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the American Association of Universities (AAU), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). According to King (1975), these associations "... take part most regularly and on the widest range of political concerns of all the Washington-based higher education associations" (p. 19). Furthermore, they are very alert to higher education policy and have the resources to provide a wide representation of their institutional members and serve as central framework for the day-to-day operations of Washington representatives.

2. The special-interest associations or satellite associations were smaller and "fairly specialized constituencies within the context of the more comprehensive
associations" (King, 1975, p. 29). According to King (1975), they formed two orbits: One linked to research, graduate, and professional programs typical of schools that are members of NASULGC and AAU. The second orbit was linked to liberal arts colleges and the teacher education programs, typical of AAC and AASCU members respectively. For the most part, these associations do not get very involved and let the major associations speak on their behalf, unless the issue at hand is one of special interest to their constituents.

3. The individual representative(s) of a single institution or a group of institutions which "place their main emphasis on services to the membership and not on political activities" (King 1975, p. 20). This pattern of representation started to emerge in the early 1960s.

Murray (1976) is another scholar who tried to map the Washington-based higher education community. By and large, he followed in King's footsteps. However, unlike King, Murray was very explicit in calling higher-education associations "lobbies."

Murray (1976) created a conceptual framework of higher education lobbies, which, according to him, was based on constituent interests. Murray (1976) saw the higher education lobbies organized in core, satellite and peripheral clusters. Although the typology he used was slightly different, the main framework was not very different from the one presented by King; nor were the associations that belong to the core, satellite and peripheral clusters any different from the associations that belonged to King’s categories of major associations, special-interests associations, and individual offices and small associations respectively:

At the core of this cluster are the Big Six representing the range of public and private, graduate and undergraduate, and junior and senior schools. Connected to this core group in various ways are a number of satellite organizations whose special interests cluster in two principal categories: (1) research, graduate, and
professional programs; and (2) liberal arts, undergraduate programs. On the periphery of the framework are a number of individual lobbies representing separate state systems, small associations, individual schools, and commercial firms. (Murray, 1976, p. 81)

Bailey (1975) is another scholar who classified education associations. He, however, took a much broader approach in his categorization of educational representation in Washington. His classification scheme included higher education associations, elementary and secondary education associations, as well as non-educational groups that affect the Washington education scene (Bloland, 1985). Bailey’s (1975) typology of Washington-based education representation is as follows:

- **Umbrella Organizations**
  - American Council on Education
  - Committee for Full Funding of Educational Programs
- **Institutional Associations**
  - American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
  - Association of Independent Colleges and Schools
- **Teachers Unions**
  - National Education Association of the United States
  - American Federation of Teachers
  - American Association University Professors
- **Professions, Fields, and disciplines**
  - Music Educators National Conference
  - American Political Science Association
- **Librarians, suppliers, and technologists**
  - American Library Association
  - National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.
  - College Entrance Examination Board
- **Religion, race, sex**
  - National Catholic Educational Association
  - Washington Research Project Action Council
  - American Association of University Women
- **“Lib-lab” (liberal, labor) lobbies**
  - AFL/CIO
  - National Farmers Union
- **Institutions and institutional systems**
  - Pennsylvania State University
  - New York State Education Department
- **Administrators and boards**
  - American Association of School Administrators
  - National School Boards Association
Of special interest to us are the first two categories: umbrella organizations and institutionally-based associations, because Bailey (1975) classified ACE as an umbrella organization and the other five major associations as institutionally-based associations. Bailey (1975) went on to define these two categories: Umbrella organizations are "broad based organizations that have highly diverse institutional and associational memberships and perhaps, affiliates" (p. 8). Institutional associations are "a collection of educational institutions that share some attribute of size, status, location, historical background, or underlying purpose" (p.12); they represent a particular class or type of institution and are typical of post-secondary education.

Bloland (1985), another scholar who wrote on associations of higher education, grouped them using primary interests and purposes as the main classification criterion. He grouped them into five categories and the six major associations were included in the first category of “institutionally tied associations”:

1. Institutionally tied associations (the Associations of American Universities), which seeks to advance educational institutions as a whole or parts of them (the Council for Graduate Schools, for example);
2. Learned societies (the American Sociological Association) and research associations (the American Educational Research Association), which seek to advance knowledge in disciplines in a general area;
3. Faculty organizations (the American Associations of University Professors), which attempts to enhance the autonomy and the occupational state of academic faculties;
4. Special task associations (accreditation associations), which are organized to perform specific functions for higher education, such as accreditation; and
5. Student organizations (the National Student Association) (as cited in Bloland 1985, p. 13)
Certain changes have occurred since these classifications were formulated. For instance, AAC is no longer part of the Big Six. In 1976, NAICU took its place in representing the private colleges and universities. Furthermore, NAICU itself is regarded as an umbrella association with satellite associations around it (Bloland, 1985). In 1992, AAJCC changed its name to American Associations of Community Colleges (AACC).

In 1998, after a time span of about 14 or so years since the last major works on higher education representation were published, Constance Cook presented her research of higher education representation in a new book entitled *Lobbying for Higher Education: How Colleges and Universities Influence Federal Policy*. Building on existing research, this work constituted a significant addition to the literature on higher education associations. Cook managed to present probably the most complete picture to date of the higher education community – mapping and describing the structure of this community in general and the major national associations in particular, the relationship among them and their interaction with Congress, as well as their mechanism on attracting and maintaining members.

*The Six Major National Associations of Higher Education*

Over the course of the years, this association grouping has been attributed different names by different scholars who studied them. They were initially classified by King (1975) as ‘*the major institutional-membership association’*’ (p. 19). Murray (1976) classified them as the "core lobbies" (p. 82). Murray (1976) also made mention of the fact that they were often referred to as the *Big Six* (p. 82). Bailey (1975) classified ACE as an "umbrella association" (p. 8), and the other five major associations as "institutional associations" (p.12). Bloland (1985) retained the same classification of core associations and specified that the core group or the major associations group consists of an *umbrella*
association and five institutionally-based associations. He also made mention of the Big Six being referred to as "presidentially-based associations" (p. 18). Parsons (1997) referred to the Big Six as "the One Dupont Circle group" (p. 95) making reference to the address of the quarters where the majority of these associations were housed since 1971.

It is probably worth pointing out that many of these attributes such as institutionally based associations, major associations, core associations, the Big Six, presidentially based associations – are often used in the literature interchangeably to refer to these six major associations of higher education. The terms institutional associations, major associations, the Big Six, presidential associations are used in this study to refer to the six major associations of higher education.

**Characteristics of the Major Associations**

**Non-for-Profit Status**

The Big Six are non-profit organizations. They are tax exempt under Section 501(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. This provision allows tax-exemption as long as the organization does not spend more than 5% of its activity in lobbying to adopt or change legislation or influencing policy makers regarding legislation (Bailey, 1975). The Big Six chose to register under Section 501(3), although there were more than seventeen categories that granted organizations tax-exemption status without restricting substantial lobbying. Bailey (1975) explained that the major associations chose this rather restricting option because Section 501(3) of the Internal Revenue Code allowed the Big Six to receive donations that were tax-deductible to the donors, making it possible for major donors like Ford Foundation or Carnegie Corporation of New York to claim tax deduction on their contributions.
Membership

The Big Six have institutional members; this means that their members are "colleges and universities, not individuals" (Cook, 1998, p. 88). Each institution is represented by its president; thus the name presidentially-based associations. In some cases, institutions hold membership in more than one association, which creates an obvious overlap in membership. According to Cook (1998), in addition to joining the American Council on Education, almost all institutions choose to belong to one association, "the primary association" (p. 11) as she calls it, that best represents their type of institution, and then probably join another association. So, for instance, there is an overlap in the membership of NASULGC and AASCU, because both represent public institutions; however each one of them has a specific focus, such as research in the case of NASULGC. That is probably why this overlap in membership is of no major consequence to Bailey (1975). As he put it, "Each of the associations emerged as the expression of a peculiar confluence of circumstances. Although there is patent overlap in membership and function among many of the institutional associations, each has its own focus of concern and interest" (Bailey, 1975, p. 13).

Interaction Among the Associations: Cooperation, Conflict, and Coordination

Cooperation. The Big Six constitute a group of autonomous associations "whose cooperation with one another is voluntary" (Bloland, 1985, p. 60). Although they are in Washington to represent their member institutions, it is in their best interest to act together on some issues and activities and present a consensus position and a united front. In the words of the President of American Council on Education, David Ward, "the higher education community is a force to be reckoned with in Washington when it is unified" (Colloquy Live, 2006). A positive example of speaking with a unified voice is
the success the major associations achieved in thwarting the efforts of the Regan administration in the 1980s and Republican Congressional leaders in the mid-1990s to cut down student aid (Burd, 2005).

Until 1997, all the major associations, except for NAICU, were housed in the National Center for Higher Education, an ACE-owned building at One Dupont Circle, in Washington DC. The sharing of the same quarters since 1971, gave the impression of a united front of the higher education community in Washington. The main purpose for the Kellogg Foundation to finance the building of National Center for Higher Education was to promote cooperation and collaboration among the higher education representation community (Lederman, 1997; Cook, 1998). Currently, only ACE and AACC are housed in this building. The move of NASULGC, AASCU and AAU out of National Center for Higher Education in 1997 raised questions about the unity and cohesiveness of the Washington-based higher education community and about the role of ACE (Lederman, 1997). Similar questions were raised in 2003 when ACE removed the attribute "umbrella organization" from its mission statement (Burd, 2005).

According to Cook (1998), there is still a lot of consultation and cooperation among the six major associations. Collegial decision-making, typical of the academic world, is the preferred approach among the major associations of higher education. She attributed this consensus-building approach, to a large extent, to the academic culture that the presidents of the associations, former academicians themselves, bring to Washington.

Sharing of information is a very important component of cooperation for the major associations. In its reorganization efforts in the 1970s, ACE established regular informal information meetings for the leaders, the government relations officers, and public affairs officers of the Big Six, as well as for the larger higher education
community. The following is a list of the major meetings hosted by ACE as summarized by Cook (1998):

**Big Six Presidents:** Leaders of the six major associations – meets biweekly.
**Sons of the Brethren:** Government relations officers of the Big Six – meets biweekly.
**Six Pack:** Public affairs officers of the Big Six – meets biweekly.
**Monday Group:** Heads of 15 associations with greatest interest in federal lobbying – meets every other Monday when Congress is in session.
**Secretariat:** Heads of Washington associations (about 40) – meets first Tuesday of each month.
**Friday Group:** for information sharing, open to anyone in higher education – meets every Friday afternoon. (p. 67)

According to Parsons (1997), the meetings in the smaller groups are intended for the major associations to exchange ideas and information, clarify their policy positions and work towards consensus. The meetings of the larger group are intended as a venue for information exchange among the participants, although Cook (1998) reported complaints from other representatives that ACE uses this forum more to report to them rather than to ask for their opinions.

**Conflict.** Although "[it] is unquestionably true that a consensus position supported by all of the Big Six is much more politically persuasive than a cacophony of conflicting voices,"(Wolanin, 1998) consensus is not always in the order of the day. According to Cook (1998), there is also tension and competition among these associations. Some of the major points of contention over the last decade have had to do with tuition tax breaks, SEVIS – a database launched as a security measure after 9/11 to track foreign students and scholars, and borrowing limits for federal student loans (Burd, 2005). Tension has become especially apparent in recent years, as congressional debates over the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act legislation have been taking place. Cook (1998) identified the limited financial resources available for higher education as one of
the main causes for fragmentation among the major associations, as they tried to satisfy
the needs of their particular constituencies.

Bailey (1975) saw the higher-education associations "caught between the need for
more effective collaboration and the need for associational identity and focus" (p. 76). It
is not unusual for higher-education associations to disagree. The disagreements are more
typical among associations that represent public and private colleges (Colloquy Live,
2006; Cook, 1998). One good example of these disagreements is the 1972 debacle that
occurred during the renewal of the Higher Education Act legislation. While the
associations were arguing with each other over what formula to use for allocating aid to
public and private institutions, an alternative approach was formulated and passed in the
Senate. The legislation directed the financial aid to the students and not the institutions,
leaving the major associations extremely embarrassed (Burd, 2005; Cook, 1998; Ruther,
2002).

According to Cook (1998) and Bloland (1985) another reason for conflict has to
do with the fact that each of these associations has very diverse constituents and
consequently distinct agendas. These constituents can at times be "at odds with each
other" (Cook, 1998, p. 75), so their policy positions may not always be aligned. AASCU
(Parsons, 1987) and NAICU (Parsons, 1987; Cook, 1998) are often mentioned as
examples of associations willing to get out of step from the majority and take policy
positions that are not always the same as the ones reached by consensus agreement.
AASCU, for instance, lead the move out from One Dupont Circle in 1997 (Lederman,
1997). Also, in 2003, AASCU broke ranks with the Big Six by opposing an increase in
the student federal loan-borrowing limit, since, according to them, students already
borrow too much. The other associations were caught by surprise when congressional
leaders praised AASCU for its efforts in identifying solutions, and the rest of the major associations were criticized for their abstinence (Burd, 2005).

According to Cook (1998) another reason for discord among the Big Six has to do with turf battles. "Each of the Six needs to claim credit for policy advocacy and achievements in order to justify its existence to its members" (Cook, 1998, p. 75).

*Coordination and ACE’s role in it.* ACE has historically played the role of the coordinator of the Washington higher education community. However, the Council has political limitations within this community given that “its membership covers the entire range of educational interests, and many of them are incompatible” (Bloland, 1985, p. 60). ACE sees itself as a facilitator: it cannot prevent other associations from breaking rank, nor can it use any sanctions for those who do (Cook 1998).

Given its very broad and diverse constituency, ACE usually strives to maintain a generalist approach in its policy position, or to avoid altogether certain policy positions that may give the impression of being beneficial to only a specific segment of its membership and not all its constituents (King, 1975). Being in the role of the coordinator, “ACE’s sponsored position by definition is the lowest denominator” (Cook, 1998, p. 69). Unfortunately this is not well perceived by legislators, especially those who are aware of the distinct differences in the positions of various associations. "To those in the government who know those differences are logical, it is frustrating and maddening to have a laundered policy presentation that seems to bleach out all diversity of hue in the rich tapestry of interest-group priorities" (Bailey, 1975, p. 73). So, when a policy position becomes really so bland that nobody gains anything by expressing it, then the association(s) with the greatest stake in it takes the lead and expresses its own position (Cook, 1998).
Another limitation has to do with the large number of diverse activities that ACE involves itself with, some of which make it compete with its members, raising the question as to whether it is really an umbrella organization with a coordinating function or another institutional association competing with other institutional associations (Bloland, 1985).

Cook (1998) also pointed out the dilemma that ACE faces in its duality of roles – that of a facilitator of the larger higher education community, whereby it needs to abstain from taking a position when the community does not reach a consensus; and that of an autonomous player representing its 1,800 or so members, whereby it has to play the role of the advocate on behalf of its constituents. Cook (1998) continued to say that in the more recent years, ACE has opted for the role of a more autonomous player and taking a stand when no consensus could be reached. ACE has argued that it benefits higher education for ACE to have its own voice and avoid any possible paralysis that may occur when the education community cannot reach an accord (Colloquy Live, 2006). However, the fear among some in the higher education community is that without ACE's consensus building role the higher education representation will remain fractured and the interests of higher education and students will be in jeopardy (Burd, 2005). ACE's President David Ward has strongly denied that ACE ever acts alone (Colloquy Live, 2006)

Burd (as cited in Colloquy Live, 2006) maintains that ACE is undergoing a quiet process of transforming its position vis-à-vis the rest of the community/ According to him, by emphasizing that the Council's primary role is to make ACE "the most visible and influential higher-education organization in public-policy deliberations," as stated in its 2001 strategic plan, and by increasingly taking a stand on divisive issues, ACE is
creating the impression that it is renouncing its traditional role of consensus builder (Colloquy Live, 2006).

David Ward, President of ACE, in a live chat with an higher education audience hosted by Steven Burd from *The Chronicle of Higher Education* in February 2006, tried to reassure the education community that "ACE has in no way 'abandoned' its historic role as a convener in national policy discussions" (Colloquy Live, 2006). He underplayed the fact that the term umbrella organization was dropped from the ACE's mission statement. According to him there was no major difference between the terms 'convener' and 'umbrella' apart from the fact that 'umbrella' was less defined as a term and needed to be qualified whenever used in front of audiences (Colloquy Live, 2006).

*Division of Labor*

Bailey (1975) maintained that the major associations are able to cooperate on issues that are really large and very visible. Cook (1998) attributed their ability to cooperate to their ability to agree on broad principles and then focus their work on issues that may be of interest to each one of them. This is otherwise known as division of labor. David Ward (Colloquy Live, 2006) acknowledged this when he said “we [ACE] see ourselves as visible and influential leaders in the large-scale issues. We recognize that other organizations sometimes take the lead and we defer to them. It's a matter of division of labor among the associations.”

According to Cook (1998), since the 1970s there has been an established policy among the Big Six referred to as “chosen instrument policy” (p. 70) according to which, the association with a larger stake in a policy issue became the key proponent and lobbyist of that issue and the other five associations could only assist and not duplicate this function. That association, then, had the responsibility to monitor the developments
and keep the rest of the Big Six informed on the policy issue under consideration. "The division of labor has its cooperative aspects in the sharing of information with other associations" (Bloland, 1985, p. 84).

**Norms**

The norms that guide and regulate the relationship among the associations emerged in the 1960s, but have been modified over time. Associations still continue to strive to find common ground and cooperate with each other while doing their best to represent their members. In the 1960s, associations were supposed to consult with one another, but could not get in the way of the other association’s legislative objectives (Bloland, 1985). After the 1972 debacle, ACE tried to establish new rules regarding its interaction with the other Big Six. It was agreed that ACE would not state a policy position unless the other five associations had come to an agreement. Once consensus was reached on a policy issue, it was ACE’s responsibility to make it public. If agreement could not be reached and the associations could not present a consensus position, the associations could lobby for their specific position, but they had to be upfront with what that position would be and not surprise the community (Burd, 2005). So, the stronger doctrine of no surprises to the community superseded the 1960s doctrine of consultation among associations (Bloland, 1985).

**Main Functions of the Major Associations**

According to King (1975), the role of the Washington higher-education associations is threefold: "(1) serving the needs and immediate demands of . . . constituents; (2) acting as the diplomatic agent of . . . constituents in Washington; and (3) trying to influence policy formation and administration" (p. 45). In other words the three
functions include: (a) federal representation, (b) influencing policy, and (c) member services.

Federal Representation

Scholars agree that federal representation is one of the main functions of the major higher education associations:

The Big Six associations are located in Washington D.C., expressly for the purpose of representing higher education to the federal government. College and university leaders have always entrusted the major Washington higher-education associations with primary responsibility for federal contacts on their behalf. (Cook, 1998, p. 19)

Bloland (1985), referring to colleges and universities, argued that:

They join Washington-based higher-education associations because they need to have the case for higher education presented to Congress and to the administration. They need constant, skillful monitoring of federal government decisions, and they need to be kept abreast of the shifting winds of policy making. (p. iii)

Influencing Policy

King (1975) considered influencing policy as the most important function of the associations. Influencing policy is usually equated with lobbying. However, according to King (1975), lobbying was only one form of policy influencing and even so it was restricted in scope. Furthermore, he argued that the way higher-education associations influence policy went beyond simple lobbying in the sense that they often got involved in drafting, revising and amending proposed legislation at the invitation of policy makers (King, 1975).

The lobbying techniques employed by higher-education associations include: direct participation in drafting legislation; making personal solicitation of policy makers, indirect contacts by the membership, organizing letter and telegram campaigns, contacting program administrators (King, 1975); presenting research results, letters,
attempting to shape implementation of policies, consulting with government officials to plan legislative strategy, shaping the government's agenda, and helping draft legislation, regulations, rules and guidelines (Cook, 1998); expert testimony at hearings, and grassroots organization in support of particular bills (Prusser & Wolcott, 2003).

The major associations also provide certain services for members of Congress. Some of these services include:

. . .writing speeches, drafting bills, preparing news releases, gathering witnesses to testify before a subcommittee, doing "head counts" before a floor vote, helping to draft committee reports, organizing pressures on a key but recalcitrant committee member, lining up other associations for or against a particular bill, and compiling and analyzing data needed in law making and program review. (Bailey, 1975, p. 66)

Higher-education associations have never been particularly fond of the term lobbying and lobbyists for a number of reasons. King (1975) elaborated on these reasons. These terms carry negative connotations for the higher education representatives, because they evoke a resemblance to pressure groups. Higher education has historically felt that it represents a public good and as such it belongs to a special and privileged category in society. Secondly, their tax-exempt status prohibited not-for-profit institutions like the higher-education associations from engaging in activities that can be perceived as propaganda or attempts to influence legislation. Things have changed since King (1975) wrote about higher-education associations influencing policymaking. As of January 1996, organizations that have staff who devote more than one fifth of their time to lobbying or spend at least $20,000 on lobbying every six months are required to register themselves as lobbyist in order to be in compliance with the federal Lobbying Disclosure Act (LDA) (Cook, 1998). Three of the major associations, namely, American Council on Education, American Association of Community Colleges, and National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities have registered themselves as lobbyists (Cook, 1998).
Although representation has been one of the principal functions of the higher education associations, it has not always been performed well (Cook, 1998). Throughout the years, these associations, like higher education in general, maintained a position of being above politics and policy making (Bloland, 1985). Until the 1960s, the higher education was still in the public's and legislative leaders' high esteem, thus able to do well in obtaining federal funding in spite of probably minimalist lobbying efforts in Washington (Cook, 1998). According to Bloland (1985), this started to change in the 1960s, marking a transition period for the higher education associations. Higher education legislative acts in the 1960s and the ramifications associated with them drove home the realization that the associations of higher education "had to become more politically active or be bypassed and superseded by other forms of representation" (Bloland, 1985, p. iv). The reauthorization of HEA in 1972 sensitized them to the need for unity and collaboration (Cook 1998). So, during the 1970s, in spite of setbacks, they appeared as a much more cohesive community – consulting with each other, seeking unity and emphasizing agreement, and able to present a unified position to Congress regarding legislation (Bloland, 1985).

In the 1980s, they were more successful in shaping legislation on a number of issues (Bloland, 1985). After the lessons learned from the 1972 debacle regarding financial aid legislation, the associations started to do some things differently – they devoted more resources to federal relations, improved their policy analysis, provided policy makers with better information and analysis and in a timelier manner (Cook, 1985). Consequently, “in the process they transformed themselves from a passive, partially informed often divided, nonpolitical community into a keenly attentive, and highly informed, and skillfully assertive body of associations participating daily in
Washington higher education policy and events." (Bloland, 1985, p. 90) Even during the early 1990s they "remained adept and spirited as ever" (Cook, 1998, p. 33), although more challenges would face them during the late 1990s, as the Republicans gain dual control of the House and Senate and seemed intent on restructuring higher education. "As the new Republican leadership drew its line in the sand, the community realized that its approach would have to change. Fortunately…the community has a well organized structure, which gave it the capacity to collaborate on a new approach" (Cook, 1998, p. 63).

However, the major associations have not escaped criticism for not having recognized the changes that have taken place in the policy arena since the passage of NDEA, when higher education was high in the federal government’s priority list, and for not making the necessary changes in their lobbying techniques and efforts. Wolanin (1997), while endorsing consensus decision making as a right and necessary approach, considered it no longer sufficient to get things done. According to him, in addition to a unified voice, Washington staffs of the Big Six needed to develop a closer rapport with members of Congress and their staffs. Others (Cook, 1998; Parsons 2005) have suggested the need for enhancing political relations and given its limited resources, higher education should lobby like any other pressure group. The use of political pressure has not been and still is not a favorite with higher education. Ward (as cited in Colloquy Live, 2006) explained that the main opposition to professionalizing and enhancing political relations often comes from the faculty who fear that it would bring about a greater commercialization of higher education.
Services to Members

While lobbying and policy making are probably the main functions of the major associations, they are not the only functions. Bailey (1975) saw higher-education associations as a very important link in an information network playing a dual role, on the one hand providing members with information about federal agency programs and on the other providing federal agencies with operational feedback. Cook (1998) also considered the gathering and distribution of “a great deal of reliable information in a timely manner” (p. 96) as a very important service associations provide to their constituents collectively or individually, such as tracking higher education issues, conducting research, publishing reports on various aspects of higher education, and serving as resource centers for data on their member institutions. The associations provide a number of other services to colleges and universities such as leadership programs, important forums, research results, newsletters, training programs, conferences, journals, and information. These would be examples of material incentives associations provide to their membership. According to Bloland (1985), higher-education associations rely on all three types of incentives developed by Wilson (as cited in Bloland, 1985) – material, purposive, and solidarity – to maintain old members and bring in new members.

When an association employs its stated goals or purposes to attract and or keep members, it is using purposive incentives (Bloland, 1985). Purposive incentives are intangible. They are considered a collective benefit that helps the association as whole rather than individual members and are not as essential to the running of the organization as are material incentives (Bloland, 1985).

Higher-education associations offer also solidarity incentives to their members. Solidarity incentives are intangible and refer to "warmth, congeniality and enjoyment that
may result from participation in the association (collective incentives) and specific rewards of election and/or appointment to office and honors (both selective incentives)” (Bloland, 1985, p. 11).

According to Bloland (1985), material benefits are the most predominant, visible and important of the three. Interestingly, Cook's (1998) research revealed that, while presidents viewed both collective and selective benefits important for attracting and retaining members, many of them considered their own social and professional benefits (solidarity incentives) as the main membership incentive.

**Summary**

The three parts that constituted Chapter Two provided reviews of the literature on three important elements that are interconnected as part of this study. Part One provided a historic overview of the development of the internationalization process in American higher education – the actors and factors that have affected it – and provided context for the study. Part Two provided an understanding of the terms internationalization of higher education, international education, and international dimension that often are used interchangeably and clarified the relationship between them. It also drew a comparison between the terms internationalization and globalization and drew the distinction between them. Part Three provided an understanding of the major associations of higher education, their nature, their function and the context in which they operate. The following chapter will focus on the research strategy and the methods used to achieve the purpose of the study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of the study was to map and analyze the role(s) and involvement of the major national associations of higher education in internationalizing American higher education during the last ten years (1996-2006). The study was interested in looking at (a) the major associations’ advocacy efforts regarding international programs (b) their efforts to promote internationalization among their members, and (c) their efforts to assist members in internationalizing their campuses. This chapter describes the methodology used to achieve the purpose of this study. It describes the design of the study and the procedures for collecting, recording, analyzing, and reporting the data. Chapter Three includes five sections: theoretical framework, research method, research design, instrumentation, and procedures for data collection and analysis.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in the literature on internationalization of higher education and the literature on higher education associations. There are some important points where the literature on internationalization and the literature on the major associations intersect as regards the subject of this study:
First, research indicates that internationalization is increasingly becoming “an integral part of higher education” (Deetman, 1996, p. 32). Given the importance that internationalization is assuming on college and university campuses, internationalization issues must be a defining concern for the major associations of higher education, since their main purposes is to serve members.

Second, research indicates that, although the bulk of the internationalization processes is taking place at the institutional level, “the national/sector level has an important influence on the international dimension through policy, funding programs, and regulatory frameworks” (Knight, 2004, p. 5). Research also indicates that external agents, like higher education associations, can carry out their role in the internationalization of higher education by providing assistance, outside moral support, pressure, additional funding, nurturing, and the legitimization of a pro-internationalization culture (Ruther, 2002). In that sense, in spite of their external agents status, the major higher-education associations have a major role to play in the internationalization of American campuses.

Third, internationalization has been defined as a campus-wide strategic process, whose success requires and depends on the full endorsement and commitment on the part of the institutional leadership (Ellingboe, 1998; Knight, 1997, 1999; Pickert and Turlington, 1992). These two important variables – campus-wide strategic process and institutional leadership commitment – underscore the important role the major associations of higher education can play in this endeavor, given that the presidents of colleges and universities are the designated principal institutional representatives in these associations and that the major associations represent the institution as a whole (Cook, 1998).
The major associations can influence internationalization on two fronts: (a) as part of their policy agenda through representation and advocacy for international programs at the federal level and (b) by assisting their institutional members in their internationalization efforts as a service to members.

Research Method

This study employed the case study research method. Merriam (1998) defined the case study as “intensive descriptions and analyses of a single unit or bounded system such as an individual, program, event, group, intervention or community” (p. 19). According to Yin (1984), "the case study contributes uniquely to our knowledge of individual, organizational, social, and political phenomena" (p. 14).

The two main reasons for choosing this research strategy were:

First, "case studies are the preferred strategy when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed” (Yin, 1984, p. 13). The purpose of this study was to look at how the six major associations of higher education had positioned themselves to assist their member institutions with their internationalization challenge and how were they influencing international education policymaking at the national level. Given the way the study was framed, it lent itself to the application of case study research.

Second, as mentioned in the introduction, the involvement of the major associations in the internationalization arena as an area of research has not been even marginally studied. According to Merriam (1998), case studies are useful in areas “where little research has been conducted” (p. 38). Padgett (1998) made a similar point, indicating that case study research was appropriate when “you want to explore a topic about which little is known” (p. 7).
Merriam (1998) and Yin (1984) maintained that the case study, when not developed for teaching purposes, as in business and medicine, falls under the umbrella concept of qualitative research. Patton (as cited in Merriam, 1998) defined qualitative research as “an effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context and the interactions there. This understanding is an end to itself, so that it is not tempting to predict what may happen in the future necessarily, but to understand the nature of that setting . . . . The analysis strives for depth of understanding” (p. 6). A deeper understanding of the major associations’ involvement in the internationalization of American higher education is what this study set out to accomplish.

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive multiple-case study design. A descriptive case study “presents a detailed account of the phenomenon under study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 38). According to Merriam (1998), these kinds of studies are not necessarily interested in developing hypothesis, but rather “present[ing] basic information about areas in education where little research has been conducted” (p. 38). In addition to shedding light on issues that may not have been explored much, these studies serve another useful function: “Such studies often form a database for future comparison and theory building.” (Merriam, 1998, p. 38)

According to Yin (1984) the same study may contain more than a single case. When this occurs, the study has to use a multiple-case study design. Yin (1984) maintained that a multiple-case study design is more robust than a single-case study design, because its evidence is considered more compelling. The study made use of multiple cases to address the study's research questions. The study consists of six cases that pertain to each one of the major associations.
Case Selection

The six major associations of higher education that were the subject of this study included: the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the American Council on Education (ACE), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). There were three main reasons for choosing these six associations as the subject of this study:

First, according to Ruther (2002), there are two types of associations that have been involved in the internationalization of higher education policy arena: (a) the disciplinary associations and (b) the institutional associations or the presidentially-based associations. The disciplinary associations are important actors in affecting internationalization of higher education; however, they tend to represent specific disciplines. By comparison, the major associations represent the institution as a whole. This characteristic made institutional associations an interesting object for this study, because the study was working with a definition of internationalization according to which internationalization is a strategic institution-wide endeavor.

Second, as mentioned earlier, research indicated that the success of internationalization as a strategic process requires full support on the part of the institutional leadership. The fact that presidents are the designated representatives for the institutional members of these associations was another reason that made these associations of interest for this study.

Third, the American higher education system is characterized by a vast array of
very diverse institutions that individually have limited power to influence higher education policy; a limited, yet powerful, role of the federal government in higher education; and a lack of a national policy on internationalization of higher education. The nation’s major higher-education associations represent 95% of American higher education and serve as the interface between the individual institutions and the federal government. Given this context, the study of the role of the nation’s major higher-education associations in the internationalization of American higher education seemed important.

According to Yin (1984), the enormous amount of data that the researcher can collect in the process of conducting a case study makes it essential for the researcher to clearly define the unit of analysis at the outset of the study. Given that the responsibilities for internationalization were shared by various groups within each association – the board of directors, the president, a commission for international programs, the office in charge of international programs, and the federal relations group – each association served as unit of analysis on its own. A little more emphasis was placed on the office in charge of international programs since a large part of the study’s focus was on the role the major associations have played in supporting members’ efforts to internationalize their campuses.

**Issues of Validity and Reliability**

*Construct Validity*

Yin (1984) considered the use of many sources for data collection as "a major strength" (p. 90) of the case study method as compared to other research methods. In order to increase construct validity, I used a number of sources for collecting the data. In addition to personal interviews with representatives of the major associations, I used a
variety of documents, annual and other types of reports, publications on internationalization published by the associations, press releases from the association and other sources, articles from *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and campus newsletters covering associations’ efforts in internationalization.

**Internal Validity**

Yin, (1984) maintained that internal validity was a concern only for explanatory/causal studies and not for descriptive studies, because in the first two types of studies the researcher was trying to establish whether event $x$ led to event $y$. Given that this study was a descriptive one, internal validity was not a major concern.

**Reliability**

The use of a case study protocol to deal with the documentation problem and the development of case study database, as suggested by Yin (1984), assisted with the issue of reliability. The documents collected during the course of the study were indexed in a case study protocol. The documents, the interview transcripts, and the case study notes constituted the main components of the database.

**External Validity**

The fact that this study used a multiple-case study design became instrumental to the external validity of the study. An obvious advantage of this research design, as Yin (1984) had pointed out, is that "the evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust" (p. 48).

This study’s findings were based on the evidence collected from the six major associations. In addition, I used a structured interview as an instrument for gathering data, and developed a category system for coding relevant data. These measures, too, were instrumental to the study’s external validity. According to Merriam (1998), “in multi-case
or cross-case analysis, the use of predetermined questions and specific procedures for coding and analysis enhances generalizability of findings in the traditional sense” (p. 208).

In order to enhance the credibility of the research findings, the study applied data triangulation, which, according to Padgett (1998), "is widely practiced as a valuable means of enhancing rigor in qualitative research” (p. 96). According to Denzin, data triangulation refers to "the use of more than one data source (interviews, archival materials, observational data, etc.)” (as cited in Padgett, 1998, p. 97). One way of triangulating the data was for me to confirm one interviewee’s account by checking it against other interviewees’ accounts or other documentary material, and whenever possible using other sources that were not directly related to the associations themselves as a means of corroboration.

Researcher's Bias

Merriam (1998) points out the important role the researcher plays in the process of conducting the case study. The researcher is "the primary instrument of data collection and analysis" (Merriam, 1998, p.42). At this point, it is important to mention that my choice for such a study was spurred, to a large degree, by my interest in the topic of internationalization of higher education. My educational and professional background is very international in nature. A native Albanian, I have had the opportunity to get an education and work in three different countries. I received my undergraduate degree in Albania. I received a Master's degree in the United States as an exchange scholar from Eastern Europe and benefited from the generosity of the American government that provided the financial support for my education. I received another Master's degree in Slovenia. I returned to the University of Toledo, as an international student, to pursue my
doctorate studies. I am getting completing my degree, but this time, I am an American
citizen. I have also worked for international organizations such as the World Bank and
Central and East European Management Development Association.

All these experiences have made me aware of the importance of
internationalization of higher education in preparing citizens with global competencies
and in bringing about an increased understanding among nations through exchange.
Although the importance of internationalization of higher education had been clearly
established in the literature before I started working on this study; in fact the study starts
with this premise, I felt it was important that I acknowledge where I stand with regards to
this issue. Aware of the possibility for potential bias, I have tried to stay vigilant and not
let it interfere with the study.

Instrumentation

The instrument for this study was a formally structured interview. It consisted of
21 open- and close-ended questions that probed on issues that were being explored by
this study's research questions. The interview was structured so that it would allow the
collection of data on a number of very important aspects of the primary and secondary
research questions. Some of these aspects included (a) [level of] importance of
internationalization; (b) rationales for internationalization, (c) commitment to
internationalization as expressed by the organizational structure and the organizational
support in monetary and human capital terms, (d) advocacy efforts in support of
international programs, and (e) activities the associations were involved in to promote
and support members’ internationalization efforts. Some of the questions have been
adapted from Guidelines for the Internationalization Quality Review Process (IQRP) for
Institutions of Higher Education (see Knight, 1999).
Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

This section reviews the sources and the steps that were taken in collecting the data for this study, as well as the procedures followed in analyzing the study’s data.

Data Collection

Yin (1984) maintained that the case method did not imply the use of any particular form of data collection. Of importance was that fact that the multiple sources of evidence that the case study uses should converge on the same set of issues. The data collection process for this study involved the utilization of two main data sources: (a) personal interviews and (b) document analysis.

Personal Interviews

According to Merriam (1998), "In qualitative research, interviewing is often the major source of qualitative data needed for understanding the phenomenon under study” (p. 91). Yin (1984) made the same point regarding case studies specifically: "One of the most important sources of case study information is the interview” (p. 82).

The personal interview was one of the main sources for the data collection for this study. I conducted a personal interview with one representative from each of the major associations. My initial intent was to interview the presidents of each association, in addition to the other association representatives. For logistics reasons (scheduling conflicts, distance, time), I did not interview the presidents of the major associations. However, because they serve as spokespersons for their institutions, I was able to get a lot of references relevant to the study through The Chronicle of Higher Education articles, associations’ press releases, published interviews with student newspapers from their member campuses and other types of presentations they had made. This enabled me to include their “voice” in the study.
The representatives who were interviewed for the study were the persons in charge of international programs in the respective associations. They were:

- Judy T. Irwin, Director of International Programs and Services, AACC
- Arlene Jackson, Director, International Programs, AASCU
- Matt Owens, Assistant Director of Federal Relations, AAU
- Madeleine Green, Vice President, Center for International Initiatives, ACE
- Maureen R. Budetti, Director of Student Aid Policy, NAICU
- Kerry D. Bolognese, Vice President, International Programs, NASULGC

(Note. AAU and NAICU do not have a specific office for international programs. For these two associations, international programs are a function of federal relations).

In addition, I had e-mail correspondence with Becky Timmons, Assistant Vice President, Government Relations, ACE, for the purpose of collecting some additional data. I also communicated via e-mail and phone conversations with some of the association representatives who were interviewed for the study, in order to clarify issues.

The association representatives were selected by virtue of their position. They all lead the units in charge of international programs at their respective institutions. In order to identify the individuals that I needed to interview for the study, I visited the associations’ websites. For those associations that had posted the names of the individuals in charge of international programs, I obtained the contact information through the website. For those associations that did not provide the information on the web, I conducted a phone inquiry.

In order to facilitate the process of data collection and the scheduling of interviews, I sent a letter via e-mail to the e-mail address of each association representative, requesting a personal interview with them, explaining the purpose of the
interview and the purpose of the study (see Appendix B). After receiving a positive response, a phone or email correspondence ensued to finalize the proper arrangements regarding the time and date of the interview.

A protocol of interview questions was developed (see Appendix A). The study made use of the standardized or structured interview format. “The standardized interview uses a formally structured schedule of interview questions. The interviewers are required to ask subjects to respond to each question. The rationale here, of course, is “to offer each subject the same stimulus, so that the responses to those questions ideally will be comparable” (Berg, 2001, p. 69). The reason for using a structured schedule of questions was to "minimize errors" (Fontana & Frey, 1994, p. 364) and increase consistency (Folwer, 1984).

With one exception, all the interviews were face-to-face interviews. One interview only was conducted over the phone. On average, the interviewing process lasted 50 minutes. I asked for permission to record the interviews. In all cases, permission was granted. I used a tape recorder to record the interviews. In addition, I took notes during the interviews. The interviews were first transcribed verbatim; then analyzed; and in this form they constituted the case study notes.

Prior to the interviews, I asked the interviewees for their informed consent (see Appendix C). On each occasion, two copies of the informed consent were made available – one for the researcher and the other one for the interviewee. Per Padgett's (1998) instructions, the letter of informed consent (a) briefly described the study and the interview process (b) provided my contact information (c) provided an assurance about the voluntary nature of this interview and (d) an assurance that no parts of this interview would become public without their consent.
While quantitative research can ensure the anonymity of its respondents, this is not the case with qualitative research. In qualitative research the researcher gets to meet the participants. For this reason, according to Padgett (1998), qualitative researchers cannot guarantee anonymity. However, she strongly maintained that confidentiality should remain absolute. The lack of anonymity was clearly indicated in the letter of consent. I, as a researcher, made sure that the participants were not linked to any of the information that they provided without their permission. To this end, I sent each association representative who participated in the study a copy of the case study report pertaining to their association for their review and comments.

Document Analysis

The other major source of data collection for this study was document analysis. According to Merriam (1998), documents are a major source of data in qualitative research. They provide researchers with information that otherwise would take enormous time and effort to collect. In addition, they can play a valuable role by corroborating accounts of other respondents.

The study reviewed and analyzed available documentation relevant to the issue of internationalization. The sources for the collection of data included: (a) documentation in the form of letters to Congress, memos, proposals, policy and research papers, annual reports, reports related to the topic produced by each association, meeting agendas, and articles in the media; (b) archival records such as organization charts and budget reports, mission statements, strategic plans; and (c) the associations’ official websites.

Data Collection Timeline

The interviews with representatives from the associations took place from October 27 – November 6, 2006. Data analysis started as soon as the transcript of the first
interview was prepared and lasted until mid August 2007. During this time, I established the case study database which consisted of the case study protocol of all the documents that were reviewed, as well as the copies of the interview transcripts together with my study notes. The first individual case study report (pertaining to NASULGC) was completed by mid-August, 2007. The other five individual case study reports and the cross-case report were written from September 2007-January 2008.

Data Analysis

According to Yin (1984), “data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recombining the evidence, to address the initial propositions of a study” (p. 99). The strategy that was employed with regards to data analysis was *case description*, which is a descriptive framework for organizing the case study (Yin, 1984). According to Merriam (1998), “Typically qualitative research findings are in the form of themes, categories, typologies, concepts, tentative theories, even theory, which have been inductively derived from the data” (p. 8). The main research question and subsets of questions, as well as other concepts that surfaced in the process of data analysis served as the main headings or categories for this framework (See Appendix E). The information collected via interviews, as well as through other data sources was analyzed and reported under each of the following headings or categories and sub-categories (the items preceded by a letter):

*Category I.* Importance of internationalization: (a) is internationalization part of the associations’ mission statement and (b) is internationalization part of the associations’ strategic plan;

*Category II.* Rationales for internationalization;
Category III. Commitment to internationalization of higher education as measured by:
(a) articulated commitment to internationalization, (b) organizational setup to support and
promote internationalization, and (c) organizational and financial resources dedicated to
internationalization;
Category IV. Approaches to internationalization: (a) strategic or (b) programmatic;
Category V. Roles of associations: (a) advocate, (b) promoter, and (c) supporter;
Category VI. Mapping involvement in the internationalization of higher education: (a)
advocacy efforts for international programs, (b) promoting internationalization of higher
education, and (c) supporting members’ internationalization efforts;
Category VII: Major associations contributions in internationalization in the last decade.

The data collected from the interviews and document analysis was used to map
the involvement of the associations in shaping international education policy and their
efforts in assisting members in their pursuit of an internationalized campus. I identified
and analyzed the importance of internationalization and various aspects of involvement in
internationalizing higher education on the part of each association individually and then
comparatively. Categories that were constructed facilitated the structure of the individual
reflect the purpose of the research. In effect, categories are answers to your research
questions” (p. 183). Following this advice, the majority of the categories that emerged
reflected the main issues in the primary and secondary research questions, such as
importance of internationalization, approaches to internationalization, rationales for
internationalization, and mapping involvement in internationalization.
Content Analysis

Prior to interpreting the data, it was important to conduct a content analysis. Berg (2001) viewed content analysis as "the interaction of two processes: specification of the content characteristics (basic content elements) being examined and application of specific rules for identifying and recording these characteristics” (p. 248). In other words, certain content elements, such as words, paragraphs, items, themes, concepts, etc. are coded. King (2004) described a code as "a label attached to a section of text to index it as relating to a theme or issue in the data which the researcher has identified as important to his or her interpretation” (p. 257).

Padgett (1998) explained the process of coding as follows: “Coding qualitative data is a process of identifying bits and pieces of information (meaning units) and linking these concepts and themes around which the final report will be organized” (p. 76). Since the categories for this study reflected the research questions, an initial outline of categories in the form of a template was constructed.

Following instructions from Merriam (1998), I started the process of coding simultaneously with the review of the transcript from one interview. The coding was done by hand using the initial outline of categories. Per King’s (2004) advice, the codes were clearly marked in margins using the same color for each code. As I read the transcript, I jotted down notes, comments, and observations on the margins. After abstracting additional codes from the raw data, I started looking for relations between codes to begin formulating new categories or see how they fit under existing categories. As mentioned earlier, a list of codes had been compiled in the form of a template. Subcategories and some new categories emerged in the process. If a new concept or issue
arose during the analysis of the interview, a new code was added and the outline was adjusted accordingly.

I repeated this same process with the transcript from the second interview. Once the list of categories from this transcript was created, I compared the two lists and merged them together in what Merriam (1998) called "a master list of concepts derived from both sets of data" (p.181). The process continued until all the interviews and document for all the associations were analyzed and the final list of categories and subcategories emerged. This list was used to write the individual reports as well as the cross-case report.

Modes of Analysis

According to Merriam (1998), "in a multiple-case study there are two stages of analysis – the within-case analysis and the cross-case analysis" (p. 194). The process of collecting, recording and analyzing the data involved the following steps: (a) conducting the interviews, (b) collecting documents, (c) analyzing the data, and (d) writing individual reports looking for pattern match and possible policy implication. The same steps were followed until the sixth case study was completed and the sixth report was written. After this was accomplished, I wrote the cross-case report, drawing cross-case conclusions.

Summary

This chapter summarized the purpose of the study and described the methodology that was used to achieve the purpose of this study. It described the design of the study, the procedures for collecting, recording, and analyzing the data, and writing the case study reports. The next chapter consists of six individual case study reports. It provides detailed information on each of the major association’s involvement in the internationalization of higher education.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter provides a detailed analysis of the role and involvement of each of the major associations in the internationalization of higher education as narrated in the six case study reports that make up this chapter. To facilitate the understanding of each report, the chapter revisits the purpose of the study, the theoretical framework and the study’s instrumentation.

The Purpose of the Study (Revisited)

The purpose of this study was to identify the role(s) played by the major associations in the internationalization of American higher education and map the involvement of the associations in (a) shaping international education policy, (b) promoting a strategic approach to college campus internationalization, and (c) assisting member institutions in their pursuit of an internationalized campus.

Theoretical Framework (Revisited)

The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in the literature on internationalization of higher education and the literature on higher education associations. There are some important points where the literature on internationalization and the literature on the major associations, as it relates to this study, intersect. Research
indicates that internationalization is increasingly becoming “an integral part of higher education” (Deetman, 1996, p. 32) and is moving in the direction of becoming “a shared institutional norm” (Ruther, 2002, p. 49). Research also indicates that although the bulk of the internationalization processes is taking place at the institutional level, “the national/sector level has an important influence on the international dimension through policy, funding programs, and regulatory frameworks” (Knight, 2004, p. 5). Given the importance that internationalization issues have assumed on college and university campuses, internationalization issues must be a defining concern for the major associations of higher education. Ultimately, “associations must, by definition, serve their members” (Hamilton, n.d.). In that sense, although the major higher-education associations are external agents, they have a major role to play in the internationalization of American college campuses. Research indicates that external agents can carry out their role in the internationalization of higher education by providing assistance, outside moral support, pressure, additional funding, and nurturing and legitimization of a pro-internationalization culture (Ruther, 2002).

Internationalization of higher education has been defined as a campus-wide strategic process, whose success requires and depends on the full endorsement and commitment on the part of the institutional leadership (Ellingboe, 1998; Knight, 1997, 1999; Pickert and Turlington, 1992). These two important variables – campus-wide strategic process and institutional leadership commitment – underscore the important role that the major higher-education associations are positioned to play in the internationalization of higher education, given that the major associations represent the institution as a whole and that the presidents of colleges and universities are the designated principal institutional representatives in these associations (Cook, 1998).
Furthermore, given the functions that they play, the major associations can influence internationalization on two fronts: (a) by influencing higher education policy agenda, through representation and advocacy for international programs at the federal level and (b) by assisting their institutional members in their internationalization efforts, as part of their service to members.

Instrumentation (Revisited)

The instrument for this study was a formally structured interview. It consisted of 21 open- and close-ended questions that probed on issues that were being explored by this study's research questions. The interview was structured so that it would allow the collection of data on a number of very important aspects of the research question, such as (a) [level of] importance of internationalization; (b) commitment to internationalization as expressed by the organizational structure and the organizational support in monetary and human capital terms; (c) rationales for internationalization; (d) advocacy efforts in support of international programs; and (e) activities the associations were involved in to promote and support members’ internationalization efforts. The individuals that were interviewed for this study include:

- Judy T. Irwin, Director of International Programs and Services, AACC
- Arlene Jackson, Director, International Programs, AASCU
- Matt Owens, Assistant Director of Federal Relations, AAU
- Madeleine Green, Vice President, Center for International Initiatives, ACE
- Maureen R. Budetti, Director of Student Aid Policy, NAICU
- Kerry D. Bolognese, Vice President, International Programs, NASULGC
It is important to point out that the findings of each report were based on data derived not only from personal interviews from association representatives, but also from analysis of relevant documents from the associations under study and other sources.

This chapter consists of six individual case study reports. The sequence is based on the alphabetic order of each association’s name. Each case study report starts with an organizational profile section, which provides a brief description of each association in terms of mission, membership, constituencies, and organizational structure. The remainder of each report was written following the same descriptive framework (categories) that was established for the purpose of organizing the case study report (see Appendix E).
Case Study One: The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)

Organizational Profile

The American Association of Community Colleges was founded in 1920 "to represent the interests, to stimulate the professional development, and to promote the sound growth of American two-year colleges" (King, 1975, p. 28). Originally named the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC), in 1972, it changed its name to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). In 1992, its name assumed the current form of American Association of Community Colleges (AACC).

AACC views itself as the primary advocacy organization for the nation's community colleges, the largest and fastest-growing sector of U.S. higher education. By its own count, AACC's membership includes more than 1,100 associate degree-granting institutions, close to 95 percent of all accredited U.S. two-year community, junior and technical colleges, as well as a growing number of international members in Puerto Rico, Japan, Great Britain, Korea, and the United Arab Emirates. Its U.S. members enroll about 10.5 million students and close to half (45 percent) of all U.S. undergraduates (The American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], n.d.a).

AACC’s organizational structure consists of a number of commissions that focus on issues that are of importance for the association: Commission on Academic, Student and Community Development; Commission on Communications and Marketing; Commission on Diversity and Inclusiveness; Commission on Economic and Workforce Development; Commission on Global Education; Commission on Research, Technology and Emerging Trends.

AACC is governed by a 32-member Board of Directors. AACC’s President, who also serves as the Chief Executive Officer of the association, is appointed by the Board of
Directors for a term of no more than three years and is eligible for reappointment of additional terms. Currently, George R. Boggs is serving as the President of AACC and oversees a staff of 49. In 2005, AACC had an operating budget of close to $12 million (Brush & McCormack, 2005).

AACC established its Washington office in 1939. Since then, it has maintained a relatively large presence in Washington, second only to ACE (Bloland, 1985; Cook, 1998). According to King (1975), although, its members originally lacked the political clout, or the institutional prestige of other types of institutions, AACC gradually developed itself to an "assertive autonomous association," (p. 28) often envied for its presence in almost every congressional district and its ability to quickly mobilize support from the states.

With regards to its interest position, AACC finds a natural ally in AASCU and NASULGC, as they represent the public sector of higher education and advocate low tuition (Bloland, 1985). It also works closely with ACE. AACC considers some of the most crucial areas of its activities to be: (a) providing a national voice and acting as an advocate for community colleges; (b) serving as a national information resource; (c) creating opportunities for networking and community-building; (d) offering leadership and career development opportunities; and (e) promoting the community college model nationally and internationally (AACC, n.d.a).

Background on AACC’s International Orientation

During the mid-1990s, the community colleges increased their interest in internationalization issues, as they were trying to figure out how they fit within an ever globalizing world. This heightened interest was to some degree stimulated by two conferences, in 1994 and 1996 respectively, sponsored by the American Council on
International and Intercultural Education (ACIIE), an affiliate council of AACC and the Stanley Foundation, a private foundation interested in global peace and U.S. foreign relations. The first conference, entitled Building the Global Community: The Next Step, set out to clarify the role of community colleges in a globalized world and to articulate a mission and strategies for implementing global education in community colleges. The goal of the second conference entitled Educating for the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges was to articulate a definition for what it meant to be a globally competent learner and develop strategies to help community colleges produce such learners (ACIIE & Stanley Foundation, 1996).

In April 1997, AACC’s Board of Directors adopted a position statement on international education, which, after being revised in 2001, stated:

In the light of the events of September 11, 2001, the citizenry must be prepared to engage in worldwide activities related to education, business, industry and social interaction. To ensure the survival and well-being of our communities, it is imperative that community colleges develop a globally and multiculturally competent citizenry. (AACC, n.d.h)

According to Judy Irwin, AACC’s Director of International Programs and Services, “There was strong interest by the AACC board that international and global education become one of AACC’s strategic action actions and part of AACC’s mission (personal communication, October 27, 2006). In 2001, AACC expanded its mission to include “international and intercultural education” as one of its strategic action areas. A number of programs, projects and initiatives were put in place to promote global education and to assist member institutions in their efforts to recruit international student in order that campuses would become more diversified and give U.S. students opportunities to learn about different cultures.
Importance of Internationalization

George R. Boggs, President of AACC, has commented on the importance of international education for community colleges. Reiterating on some of the reasons for AACC’s initial promotion of international education into a strategic action area, he stated:

There’s a growing realization of the importance of international education. We realize that it’s important for peace, for cultural understanding, for national security, and that we need to prepare our students to live and to survive and thrive in an increasingly global economy and society. (Boggs, 2003b)

In 2006, AACC and the Association of Community Colleges Trustees (ACCT) issued a joint statement regarding the importance of international education for community colleges:

Over the last two decades – as our world has become more interdependent and complex – community college leaders have broadened the definition of “community.” For the well-educated person, learning competency and engagement must transcend time, place and culture. Colleges must offer programs that support a more international view and active engagement on the part of faculty, businesses and community leaders (American Association of Community Colleges & Association of Community College Trustees. (AACC & ACCT, 2006)

In an AACC publication, Ed Coulter, Chair of AACC’s Board of Directors, pointed out “The board and staff of American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) rate global education as a high priority” (2006, p. 6). According to Irwin (personal communication, October 27, 2006), the importance of internationalization for AACC was determined by two factors: (a) globalization: “We can’t ignore the fact of living in a global world” and (b) interest on the part of member institutions.

AACC adopted a 5-year strategic plan in 2006. Global and intercultural education remained as one of the association’s strategic action areas, with the term “global education” replacing “international education.” According to the strategic mission document, through this strategic action area AACC was striving to achieve two goals: (a)
assist “community colleges in promoting global awareness, and responsibility, intercultural understanding, and engagement among students, faculty, staff, and decision makers” (AACC, n.d.b), and (b) promote “the community college role in global education among key constituencies, nationally and internationally” (AACC, n.d.b).

Rationales for Internationalization

The interview with Judy Irwin and a review of AACC’s documents and publications pointed at some of AACC’s rationales for internationalization.

Academic Rationales

As reflected in its documents, AACC’s focus regarding academic rationales was on the expansion of students’ education. Globalization is changing the U.S. economy and the job market for community college students. In this respect, AACC and its members recognized that they needed to provide opportunities for their students to develop the skills necessary to succeed in a global world, through internationalizing the curriculum, expanding study abroad, developing multi-cultural activities on campus, and recruiting international students.

Social Rationales

One of the main aspects of social rationales has to do with preparing students as individuals by personally experiencing a foreign culture. More recently, AACC has increased its efforts in helping members get more of their students to study abroad and learn by experiencing different cultures, while they apply their specialized skills knowledge. In February 2004, in cooperation with the Peace Corps, AACC embarked on a new initiative aimed at increasing opportunities for community college graduates to serve as Peace Corps volunteers. They were to use their specialized skills to assist other
people and nations in need and at the same time get global experience by working and living in a different culture and environment.

**Institutional Rationales**

AACC’s institutional rationales for internationalization have focused very much on promoting the concept of community colleges abroad as well as promoting its member institutions abroad through publications such as *The International Student Guide to U.S. Community Colleges* and through international student recruitment fairs.

**Political Rationales**

For AACC, these rationales encompass national security, public diplomacy, and technical assistance to developing countries.

*National security and public diplomacy.* Global education serves to promote understanding and good will among countries. According to Irwin (personal communication, October 27, 2006):

In the aftermath of September 11, understanding and respect for other cultures would be gained through expanding U.S. students’ worldwide cultural exposure, expanding the curriculum to include global components, expanding the student population to include students from numerous countries around the world, and finding ways that students could study abroad.

AACC’s President, George R. Boggs (2003a), emphasized the importance of global education to world peace and pointed out the role that community colleges can play in this arena:

In a world that has become smaller and suddenly more dangerous, community colleges must do their part to encourage global education for our students, and we must help to inform people from other countries about American values and about the importance of valuing diversity. Global education is the key to world peace and understanding and to improving the economy and quality of life for everyone. (Boggs, 2003a, para. 10)

*Technical assistance to developing countries.* AACC has a history of involvement in providing technical assistance to other developing countries. More recently, AACC
members were made eligible to apply for grants and contract agreements through Higher Education for Development, funded by the United Stated Agency for International Development (USAID) and governed by the Big Six.

Commitment to Internationalization of Higher Education

AACC’s commitment to internationalization appeared to be explicit both in terms of espoused values and organizational structure. We looked at them respectively.

Stance Towards Internationalization

According to the AACC’s International Programs and Services webpage, “the American Association of Community Colleges actively advocates for an international role of community colleges in all dimensions of worldwide education and training” (AACC n.d.e). AACC has pronounced its support for global education on more than one occasion. In 2001, when the AACC Vision Group was working to define AACC’s mission and vision, they saw an important role for global education in fulfilling AACC’s vision for the future. “AACC will pursue this vision by . . . empowering community colleges to grow as a global force for learning by disseminating information and promoting international partnerships between American community colleges and countries seeking collaborative opportunities” (AACC, n.d.b). In that same document, AACC expressed its commitment to global education by “supporting community colleges to prepare learners to be effective in a global society” (AACC, n.d.c). In a joint statement with ACCT, it reaffirmed, “a commitment to the importance of the globally educated learner and to building the global community” (AACC & ACCT, 2006).

Organizational Setup for Supporting and Promoting Internationalization

The main actors involved in internationalization issues for AACC are the Board of Directors, the President, the Commission on Global Education, the Office of
International Programs and Services, and the Office of Government Relations. The decision making process regarding AACC’s policy on internationalization resides with the Board of Directors and the President of AACC, with policy recommendations from the Commission on Global Education.

*Commission on Global Education.* The Commission on Global Education is an advisory commission that guides AACC’s work with regards to issues such as global awareness, image building, international student recruitment/retention, SEVIS, student and faculty exchange, visas, support initiatives, outreach. The Commission consists of about 24 college presidents, who provide advice to the AACC Board and staff, and provide a forum for focused conversation about important global education issues and priorities (AACC, n.d.g).

*Office of International Programs and Services.* At the operational and programmatic level, it is the Office of International Programs and Services that carries out the initiatives based on the goals of the international strategic action area. The Office of International Programs and Services is part of the Division of Economic Development and International Programs and reports to the Vice President of that division. This office is by and large an “autonomous” unit. According to its director, the office “works independently and in conjunction with the Office of Economic Development” (J. Irwin, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

The Office of International Programs and Services employs two full time staff – the Director for International Programs and Services, and a project assistant. Judy Irwin, the Director for International Programs and Services works closely with the Vice President for Economic Development and International Programs. She serves as the liaison to Community Colleges for International Development, an AACC’s council and
works with numerous associations, organizations, federal agencies, etc. to effect change. She also makes regular updates to the Commission on Global Education and the Board’s Program Initiatives Committee, informing them of the progress the association has made in fulfilling the board’s vision for AACC.

The office’s operating budget of about $50,000 (excluding salaries) is used for staff travel, meetings, special projects, and office-related costs. International recruitment initiatives (overseas fairs, a publication about community colleges, and a web site for international students) are supported by fees for services paid by the colleges (J. Irwin, personal communication, October 27, 2006). According to AACC, the Office of International Programs and Services generated 5% of the association’s revenue for 2005 (AACC, 2006).

According to its website, the Office of International Programs and Services has three main goals: “to increase global awareness in the college community, assist colleges to internationalize their programs and curricula, and to facilitate person-to-person international experiences and cooperation” (AACC, n.d.d). To accomplish these goals the Office of International Programs and Services disseminates information, informs and educates policy makers, members and other stakeholders, encourages and promotes international exchange programs, and forges partnerships with domestic and international entities to advance communication and collaboration (AACC, n.d.d). More details on this will be provided in the section regarding promoting internationalization and supporting members’ efforts.

Office of Government Relations. Part of the charge of the AACC’s Office of Government Relations is the monitoring of legislative activity as it pertains to issues of
international education. This office keeps the Office of International Programs and Services informed on advocacy issues related to international education.

_The President._ George R. Boggs, AACC’s President, plays a role in advancing AACC agenda for global education. He performs a number of functions in this regard. He serves as AACC’s representative at top level meetings within the academic community or the federal government regarding issues of internationalization. He writes to Congress or the administration or cosigns on behalf of AACC documents endorsed by some or all the academic community regarding issues of international education. He also presents AACC views and practices in this area in a number of forums, such as conferences, campus visits, and academic journals. Recently he co-wrote the chapter with Judy Irwin “What Every Community College Leader Needs to Know: Building Leadership for International Education” published in _New Directions for Community Colleges_ (No. 138).

_Approaches to Internationalization_

AACC encourages its members to make global education an integral part of their institution’s mission and calls on the board of trustees and the presidents to make a commitment and take a leading role. There have been articles in _The Community College Journal_ or other AACC publications such as _Internationalizing Community Colleges_ (2002) that have advocated such an approach. Probably the most important document outlining this approach is the 2006 AACC and ACCT Joint Statement on International Education: “Colleges have a responsibility to acknowledge global understanding and communication as integral to their mission. Indeed, they are an important voice in the nation’s public diplomacy, one sought and utilized by both federal and state governments” (AACC & ACCT, 2006).
At a policy level, this document championed some important tenets of a strategic approach to internationalization – such as the recognition of global education as part of the institution’s mission and the need for commitment and involvement on the part of the institution’s senior leadership. The AACC and ACCT Joint Statement on International Education called on the community college presidents to take an active role in promoting campus leadership to support international education, establishing a leadership role for directing international education and providing funding for international-related activities (AACC & ACCT, 2006). This document went even further by asking boards of trustees to express their support for international education by adopting a policy of support for international education, requesting periodic reports on progress, and by playing a proactive role in promoting international education with their business contacts (AACC & ACCT, 2006).

On a programmatic level, however, I did not find any programs or activities geared directly at presidents or CAOs on how to approach internationalization as a campus-wide endeavor, or how to attract support and overcome obstacles to such a strategic approach to internationalization. The focus seemed to be mostly on specific programs and services that AACC provided to members, such as assisting with foreign student recruitment and providing opportunities for community colleges to develop partnerships in other countries. AACC also promoted the U.S. community college concept worldwide and disseminated information on funding opportunities, new resources, meetings, and events. Also, internationalization was not frequently used as a term: global education was the preferred term.
Mapping Involvement

AACC’ involvement in internationalization encompasses three broad areas: (a) advocating for international programs at the federal level, (b) promoting internationalization of higher education, and (c) supporting members’ internationalization efforts.

Advocacy Efforts for International Programs

Some of the priority advocacy areas for AACC regarding international education include funding of Higher Education Act Title VI programs, visa issues and the study abroad legislation.

HEA Title VI programs. AACC has advocated for increased funding for undergraduate international education programs, which AACC considers as vital to national security and economic productivity. AACC is a member of the Coalition for International Education, which assists the presidential associations’ advocacy efforts in Congress and the administration with regards to Title VI programs. AACC and the other major higher-education associations rely on the advocacy work of the Coalition International Education to preserve or increase funding levels for Title VI programs.

Visa policy issues. AACC has advocated for a streamlined visa process that at the same time would be secure and would not create unnecessary delays for international students who wish to study at community colleges. Regarding SEVIS, AACC supported tightening security measures, but advocated for a system that would not impede the flow of international students in the United States. It also advocated for monitoring the implementation of such a system to ensure that it would not result in deterring students from wanting to study in the United States. With regards to the SEVIS visa processing fee and the process on how it was paid, AACC joined in the concerns of the rest of the
educational community and sided with their suggestions as spelled out in an ACE December 2003 letter.

Furthermore, since many community college students are of non-traditional age, AACC has worked with the Department of State and consular representatives to ensure an understanding of the diversity of community college students and to ensure that international students interested to study in community colleges are treated under the same criteria as other students.

*Study-abroad legislation.* More recently, there has been an increased interest in expanding study abroad programs for community college students. AACC has supported the study abroad legislation and has worked with the Lincoln Commission for Study Abroad to ensure that the legislation would include short-term programs to facilitate participation by community college students (J. Irwin, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

*Promoting Internationalization Among Member Institutions*

AACC’s efforts to promote internationalization across the campuses of its member institutions has consisted of:

*Policy statements.* AACC has issued a policy statement regarding international education. In the same spirit, it issued a joint statement with the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT).

*Various reports and publications.* Every year, a special issue of the “Community College Journal,” an AACC bimonthly magazine, is dedicated entirely to international education issues, such as internationalization of the curriculum (Romano, 2002).

*The Community College Times,* a biweekly newspaper, provides members with up to date information regarding issues such as foreign student recruitment efforts and
enrollment, international collaborative and grant opportunities, legislative updates on international issues, news and events on the subject.

The Community College Press has published a number of documents in the area of international education, such as Global Awareness in Community Colleges: A Report of a National Survey; or International Programs at Community Colleges; Educating for the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges. The majority of the titles, however, were published between 1991-1995.

AACC official website. In addition to information about the various international programs and services that it provides to its members, AACC’s official website contains a Global Awareness link, which lists up-to-date news and events in the area of internationalization and globalization, and legislative updates regarding international education. It also provides members with information about grants to assist members’ international education programs.

Supporting Members’ Efforts to Internationalize

AACC supports its members’ efforts to internationalize by serving as a:

Public forum. AACC has used its annual convention to offer sessions or workshops on international education issues, sharing best practices and concerns. AACC’s annual convention includes an international track and serves as a forum to discuss relevant international issues.

Facilitator of members’ recruitment efforts. According to Judy Irwin (personal communication, October 27, 2006), one of the main international services that AACC provides to its members is to assist them with their recruiting efforts. More than 86,000 international students enrolled in community colleges in 2006-2007. The number reflected approximately a 9% increase compared to 76,834 international students during
academic year 2000-2001 (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2007). AACC helped members’ recruitment efforts in a number of ways:

1. Each fall, AACC organizes an international recruitment trip to Asia for its members. The trip includes student recruiting fairs in several countries, visits with EducationUSA advising offices, Fulbright commissions, ministries of education, and high schools. According to Judy Irwin (personal communication, October 27, 2006), the value of these fairs to AACC members is that these events focus on the community colleges, rather than mixing 2-year and 4-year institutions.

2. Every year, AACC publishes and distributes thousands of copies of *The International Student Guide to U.S. Community Colleges*. This handbook provides prospective students with information about community colleges, visas, admissions requirements, application procedures, majors, housing, financial and other considerations. Among other things, it includes a list of colleges that are SEVIS-certified, thus allowing them to have international students on campus.

3. Thanks to a partnership between AACC and Study in the USA, a company that specializes in education publications for international students, AACC members can participate in CommunityCollegeUSA.com, a website for international students. The website helps promote U.S. community colleges globally. At the same time, it facilitates the search of international students for a U.S. community college that will meet their needs. A resource guide, featured in the website, provides them with information on U.S. education, on how to choose a degree or an English language program, how to test and apply for admission, and how to obtain a U.S. visa and financing.
4. AACC has worked with U.S. consular missions to promote the community college concept abroad. AACC has also worked with the EducationUSA Advising Network, affiliated with the U.S. Department of State, to educate students, parents, and counselors about opportunities and advantages of attending a U.S. community college and the potential of transferring to a 4-year college after completing the first two years of undergraduate education at a community college.

5. AACC educates its members on how to best recruit through specific workshops, presentations by the AACC’s Director of International Programs and Services, and articles published in AACC’s various publications.

Facilitator of international partnerships. According to Judith Irwin (personal communication, October 27, 2006), AACC has played the role of the facilitator of collaborative opportunities between American community colleges and foreign countries and institutions interested in cooperation.

Resource/Data center. AACC has conducted studies and surveyed members to assess their needs, the impact of certain conditions or to solicit their opinion regarding certain issues. This has allowed AACC to serve as a national data resource center regarding issues related to community colleges, including some international issues. The data is also provided to members in order to inform them on specific issues, allowing them to develop strategies to address those issues.

In 1995, AACC conducted a survey to assess community colleges involvement in international programs and services. A follow-up survey was conducted in 2000 to measure the changes that had taken place during the five-year period. The scope of the survey was broadened in order to assess three other areas – internationalization of the curriculum, campus and community activities that contribute to an increased global
awareness, and activities that facilitate international connections (Blair, Phinney, & Philippe, 2001). The findings of these studies were distributed to members in the form of a report as well as a research brief summary, with the hope that the survey results “will help colleges to shape their own responses to changing demographics in their communities, increase their international student enrollments, assess the training demands of the global marketplace, and promoting intercultural harmony on their campuses.” (Blair, Phinney, & Philippe, 2001, p. 2)

AACC has also conducted surveys to assess international recruitment activities at community colleges and used the data to inform its advocacy efforts, as well as assess members’ needs.

_AACC’s official website._ AACC has a very informative website regarding its international programs and services. In addition to clearly presenting its position regarding international education, it provides a quick link to: (a) the numerous programs and services it offers to its members, (b) funding and grant opportunities, (c) international resources, and (d) opportunities for academic exchange for faculty, administrators, and students.

_AACC’s Perceived Contribution_

According to Judy Irwin (personal communication, October 27, 2006), one of the AACC’s major achievements in the area of international education has been its assistance to members that has contributed in the fast growing number of international students enrolling in its member campuses. The second achievement has been “bringing about a greater awareness among members of the importance of international education” (J. Irwin, personal communication, October 27, 2006).
Case Study Two: The American Association of State Colleges and Universities

(AASCU)

Organizational Profile

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) was established in 1961 to represent the interests of a fast growing segment of public institutions, including comprehensive state colleges, universities, technical institutes and former teacher colleges that were left unrepresented by NASULGC and AACC (Cook, 1998; King, 1975).

Presently, AASCU consists of more than 430 public colleges, universities and systems of higher education throughout the United States and its territories. According to its literature, membership is open to any regionally accredited institution of higher education offering programs leading to bachelor's, master's or doctoral degrees and are wholly or partially state supported or state controlled. AASCU schools enroll more than 3 million students or 56 percent of the enrollment at all public four-year institutions.

AASCU opened its Washington office in 1962 and has been a consistent advocate for lower tuition and equal opportunity in higher education (Parson, 1997). In addition to representing its members in Washington, AASCU is also involved in other activities such as analysis of federal and state programs and promotion of international education. With regards to its public policy position at the federal level, it is closely affiliated with NASULGC as they both represent public four-year institutions (Cook, 1998; King, 1975).

AASCU sees its role as being four-fold:

1. To promote appreciation and support for public higher education and the distinctive contributions of our member colleges and universities;
2. To analyze public policy, and to advocate for member institutions and the students they serve;
3. To strengthen academic quality, promote access and inclusion, and facilitate educational innovation and;
4. To create professional development opportunities for institutional leaders, especially presidents, chancellors and their spouses (American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU], n.d.a).

AASCU is governed by a Board of Directors and the Council of State Representatives with representatives from each state that has an AASCU member school. Six committees work in key areas of member interest. AASCU employs a staff of 40. Constantine “Deno” Curris is the President. He has been serving in this capacity since 1999.

**Background on AASCU’s International Orientation**

AASCU is the newest of the six presidential associations. From early on, AASCU recognized the importance of an international dimension to higher education and got involved in promoting international education via support for internationalization of curricula, exchange programs, and technical assistance (Bloland, 1985; Marshall, 1973). A committee on international education, which consisted of 15 presidents of AASCU universities, guided its international programs. The committee, organized in three task forces, focused on the areas of internationalization of the curricula, overseas programs, and international development. AASCU had also established an Office for International Programs, designed to support its members’ efforts in strengthening the international dimension of their educational programs. AASCU had three low cost international study
centers based in Italy, Mexico and Canada and distributed a regular publication on international issues to members (Marshall, 1973).

In 1972, AASCU published the discussions of an international seminar with representatives from a number of universities from the Americas entitled The Seminar on U.S. College and University Curriculum Improvement Toward Increased Awareness, Interest and Understanding. The first part of the publication was a summary of the seminar discussions, setting the stage for discussions that followed in the second part. The seminar focused on sharing different perspectives and experiences regarding internationalization of the campus and the curriculum, and making sense of the processes and issues involved (Marshall, 1973).

During the 1980s, AASCU’s international involvement became more visible. In the fall of 1980, the Office of International Programs conducted a survey of its members to assess the level of internationalization of the curriculum and the degree of international engagement of their member campuses. The findings and the analysis of the data from this survey were published in 1981-1983 as the first part of an AASCU publication entitled *Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus: Guidelines for AASCU Institutions*. The second and third part of *Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus* discussed the issue of the internationalization of the curriculum and internationalization of the institution respectively. The fourth part provided guidelines to support the planning efforts for AASCU members or other higher education institutions interested in internationalizing their campuses. Among other things, the guidelines suggested (a) the integration of an international dimension throughout the institution, (b) encouragement of faculty members to infuse their undergraduate courses with non-western material and to apply a comparative approach in their teaching and research, (c)
display of commitment of the institutional leadership in international endeavors, (d) encouragement of student and faculty exchange, and (e) establishment of international linkages and involvement in international development (Harari, 1981-1983).

What made this publication even more remarkable was the fact that, at the time of its publication, internationalization was not yet a priority in the agenda of the higher-education associations or its member institutions. The term internationalization itself had not yet become main stream in higher education. Even more importantly, *Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus* called for commitment of the highest levels of administration to the internationalization agenda, which is one of the most important tenets of the current discourse on the internationalization of the university. It is important to mention also that the author of *Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus* was Maurice Harari, the then Vice President for International Programs for AASCU. His national reputation in the area of international education augmented the credibility of this document.

By this time, AASCU had ventured in establishing relations with institutions outside the United States. In 1981, AASCU established a working relationship with the Chinese Educational Association for International Exchange (CEAIE) – a partner Chinese association. This partnership still exists today, and has actually experienced a revival during the last six or so years.

*Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus* called for incorporating international education in the undergraduate curriculum. To this end, in 1986 AASCU established and is still sponsoring the Japanese Studies Institute (JSI), a program designed to assist faculty members interested in incorporating knowledge about Japan in the undergraduate courses they teach.
By the end of 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century, internationalization and their role in educating global citizens had emerged as an important issue for the university campuses. In a 2002 meeting, AASCU’s Committee on International Education laid forth a number of programs and activities that AASCU should pursue. These included: (a) surveying members regarding interests and needs in the area of internationalization, (b) surveying the state of internationalization at AASCU schools, (c) providing professional development programs for member institutions, (d) providing opportunities for linkages and partnerships for members through presentational overseas missions, (e) promoting AASCU schools abroad, (f) assisting members in their efforts to recruit international students, (g) continuing collaborative efforts with the other organization for program development; (h) and promoting or supporting legislation regarding international issues (AASCU, 2002).

Furthermore, AASCU’s Task Force on Global Priorities and Responsibilities laid out standards and processes for measuring the success of a campus in its effort to achieve a global environment. Some of the more significant indicators of success were:

1. Expressed commitment to internationalization, preferably on a campus-wide level, articulated in the institution’s mission statement;
2. Foreign language proficiency as a graduation requirement;
3. Provision of faculty development seminars for internationalizing curricula;
4. Formal incentives for internationalizing the curriculum on the part of faculty, departments and colleges; and
5. Availability of at least one established study abroad program (Center for Global Education [CGE], n.d.).
Importance of Internationalization

According to Arlene Jackson, Director of International Education within AASCU, “Internationalization is most definitely a priority. It is part of AASCU’s mission and goals for the association” (personal communication, October 30, 2006). AASCU’s Public Policy Agenda, a publication that summarizes AASCU’s principles and priorities in key areas of higher education policy, considered “the promotion of global awareness, understanding, and competitiveness” as one of the vehicles that will assist state colleges and universities in carrying out their mission of “delivering America’s promise” (Public Policy Agenda, 2007, p. 10). This sentiment was echoed by Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006): “You see that our theme is ‘delivering America’s promise’; and preparing global citizens at our public institutions is part of that promise.”

AASCU perceived internationalization of the university as a member-driven need for AASCU. As an institutional association, AASCU has sought to meet what is perceived as an important need on the part of its member institutions.

We are … a presidential association and therefore we respond to the interests of our members; and as public education focuses more broadly on meeting those international goals in preparation of their students, then, we respond to the need to assist our presidents in meeting those goals as they work toward the internationalization of their campuses. (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006)

Again, commenting on the serious consideration that AASCU has given to this membership-driven need, Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006) said:

Just the mere re-establishment of an office [referring to the Office of International Education which she heads] that was created to assist presidents in their efforts to internationalize their campuses is a statement that, yes, they view it as an important component to the mission of universities, as well as the education of the students in the university campuses.

Although internationalization, per se, is not mentioned in AASCU’s mission statement, as of 2006 it has become one of its strategic areas of focus. In 2006, AASCU’s
Board of Directors approved a set of strategic directions intended to guide AASCU’s work in the future. One of the strategic directions had to do with promoting “key values that undergrid and are expected from public higher education” (AASCU, 2006a, p. 1). “International engagement and competitiveness” (AASCU, 2006a, p. 1) was considered one such key value.

Rationales for Internationalization

From the interview with Arlene Jackson and an examination of AASCU publications available for review, it can be concluded that AASCU’s rationales for internationalizing the university include both academic (internationalization of the curriculum, study abroad, international students) and political rationales (national security and public diplomacy).

Academic Rationales

According to Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006), the purpose of AASCU institutions is to provide the broadest educational opportunities for their students. Study abroad, an internationalized curriculum, and interactions with international students on campus are means to achieve that goal.

AASCU has maintained that it is a strong supporter of study and work abroad opportunities for students and faculty, because of the value such programs have both for students, the campus, the nation and the world. “Foreign exchange opportunities enhance campus life, contribute to international understanding, and offer life-enriching opportunities for individuals” (AASCU, 2007, p. 13). President Curris has spoken to this issue as well. “Our students can derive significant benefits from immersion to other cultures. America’s ability to compete and lead on a global scale in the years ahead depends on our commitment to international education” (as cited in IIE, 2006).
**Political Rationales**

A review of AASCU’s publications and website indicated that AASCU viewed international educational as very strongly linked with political rationales.

*National security.* AASCU sees internationalization as very closely connected with national security. In all AASCU documents that were reviewed, internationalization was listed under the major heading of *national security*, probably because AASCU’s stated belief is that “the nation’s security is best served by an educated, globally engaged population” (AASCU, 2007, p. 13). For AASCU, ensuring the security of the nation does not mean, however, that the country should close its borders to foreign students and scholars. AASCU has been active in supporting the free flow of international students into U.S. campuses, while supporting measures to ensure the country’s security.

*Public diplomacy.* AASCU viewed international students as a very important means for public diplomacy and for building international understanding. “International students are important to the United States. They are critical to the globalization efforts of our campuses; they promote stronger ties between the United States and home nations of visitors, who often become civic and economic leaders. . . .” (Curris, 2002, last paragraph).

*Commitment to Internationalization of Higher Education*  
AASCU’s commitment to internationalization appeared to be explicit both in terms of espoused values and organizational structure.

*Stance Towards Internationalization*  
An AASCU official statement discussing its role regarding internationalization, posted on the Center for Global Education’s website, stated:

AASCU has long recognized the importance of promoting international studies and a global campus environment on its member campuses. Its Office of
International Programs has for 20 years facilitated international study and travels, has encouraged interaction between American educators and their counterparts around the world, and has assisted member campuses' efforts to internationalize the curricula (CGE, n.d.).

Statements such as “... an educated citizenry and a work force with this level of international understanding and sensitivity is essential for our nation’s economic success ...” (CGE, n.d., Final Report section); and “... America’s ability to compete and lead on a global scale in the years ahead depends on our commitment to international education” (as cited in IIE, 2006) illustrate AASCU’s understanding of both the role that higher education can play in preparing citizens with global skills and the importance of such an endeavor for the nation.

Organizational Setup for Supporting and Promoting Internationalization

According to Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006), the Board of Directors and the President have the overall and ultimate policy-level responsibility for setting AASCU’s agenda on internationalization. “The Board of Directors in conjunction with the President sets the policy for the association and the executive staff implements that policy.”

There are three other constituents within AASCU that are involved in advancing its internationalization efforts, namely the Committee on International Education, the Office of International Education, and the Division of Government Relations and Policy Analysis.

Committee on International Education. The Committee on International Education serves as an advisory committee that sets the direction for AASCU’s internationalization endeavors. The committee membership consists of representatives from member institutions. Two university presidents serve as the chair and the vice chair of this committee. The committee meets twice a year to review the work that AASCU has
done in the area of internationalization and makes suggestions regarding possible programs and initiatives they would like to see the association be involved in the future (A. Jackson, October 30, 2006, personal communication).

The Office of International Education. The Office of International Education was re-established in 2001. For Arlene Jackson, the head of this office, the fact that AASCU re-established an office for international education alone indicated “commitment by the senior administration and the association as a whole to include internationalization as one of its responsibilities to its members” (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

The Office of International Education reports to the Vice President of the Division of Academic Leadership and Change, who, in turn, reports to the President. This office consists of only one professional staff – the Director of the International Education. However, depending on the activities and programs support staff is pulled in on as-needed basis. The Director of Office of International Education works closely with the Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change on particular projects. In addition, the President of the association and the Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change represent the institution in senior level meetings regarding internationalization issues.

I was unable to obtain a dollar figure regarding AASCU’s operating budget for international programs. However, the 2006 annual report listed some grants and endowment money that AASCU had dedicated to some of its international programs – $103,770 from the State Department were allocated for Diplomacy in Action Program and $126,463 from the Nippon Foundation for the Japanese Studies Institute. The previous years too had line items in the form of grants from the State Department and
Higher Education in Development in addition to the annual funding for the Japanese Studies Institute.

_Division of Government Relations and Policy Analysis._ AASCU relies on the Division of Government Relations and Policy Analysis to advocate for international issues at the federal level. Among other things they monitor the legislation that impacts international issues and provide analysis on how that affects AASCU institutions (AASCU, 2006a).

_Interaction among the constituents._ Although there is no formally structured interconnection among the Office of International Programs and the Division of Government Relations and Policy Analysis, there is collaboration between the two divisions. “Government Relations is a separate office and they handle all of the advocacy. . . . We collaborate. If something is written, I am asked to look at it, to give input, to provide comment, but basically it comes from that office, the Vice President of that office . . .” (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

_Approaches to Internationalization_

AASCU’s approach to campus internationalization seems to be more programmatic or project driven rather than strategic/comprehensive as Jane Knight’s definition would suggest. Describing AASCU’s role in the arena of international education, its 2005 AASCU Annual Report included the following statement: “AASCU works on international issues to assist members as campuses change their curriculum to a more global focus, internationalize their faculty, and prepare students to live and work in a global economy and society” (p. 6). Furthermore, according to AASCU’s _Public Policy Agenda_, the focus for AASCU’s internationalization efforts would be on those activities that create opportunities (a) for students to study abroad, (b) increased interest in
majoring in international fields and foreign languages, (c) for faculty members to conduct research abroad or improve their foreign language proficiency, and (d) enhanced foreign language and area studies (AASCU, 2004).

AASCU’s focus seems to be strongest on programs for members, such as international exchange, partnership building, or foreign student recruitment. Support for a strategic approach to internationalization exists, but is rather understated. Unlike the 1980s, when campus internationalization and leadership commitment were highly emphasized in AASCU publications, in the last six years or so internationalization as a campus-wide initiative and the commitment of institutional leadership in the internationalization process were not being emphasized strongly as policy direction for AASCU members. For instance, the list of standards and processes for measuring success of internationalization in member campuses compiled by AASCU’s Task Force on Global Priorities and Responsibilities included the articulation of a commitment to internationalization in the institution’s mission statement, however, it was only “preferable” that this commitment be at a campus-wide level (CGE, n.d., Task Force section). Furthermore, neither the Public Policy Agenda publications of the last six years, nor the annual reports of the same period emphasized the need for a campus-wide initiative or senior leadership commitment to internationalization.

These statements are not meant to undervalue AASCU internationalization efforts, rather they are meant to highlight the observation that AASCU’s approach to internationalization has been more program-driven than a comprehensive approach. This approach perhaps has to do with the roles that AASCU as an association sees itself playing, and that has carried over the area of internationalization as well. Describing the
role of AASCU with regards to internationalization, Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006) stated:

Historically the association has focused on advocacy, professional development, and program development. Within that context, internationalization is one of the themes. So, we advocate for our members legislation that has an international effect on campuses. We provide professional development; do seminars and workshops, sharing of information through a periodic newsletter, and do our meetings – annual meetings or academic affairs meetings – where we have international speakers and workshops around issues that are critical to the internationalization process on campus.

*Mapping Involvement*

AASCU’s involvement in internationalization encompasses three broad areas: (a) advocating for international programs at the federal level, (b) promoting internationalization of higher education, and (c) supporting members’ internationalization efforts.

*Advocacy Efforts for International Programs*

As any other institutional higher education association, AASCU regards advocacy on behalf of its member institutions as one of its main functions. According to Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006), in the area of international education, AASCU has played more of a collaborative role, by mostly endorsing legislation or issues championed in conjunction with other presidential associations. Some of the international issues that have had the support of AASCU’s advocacy efforts included (a) support for an improved visa process and tracking system, (b) the study-abroad legislation, and (c) support for the funding of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) programs.

*Visa policy issues.* AASCU has advocated for legislation and regulations that help streamline the visa process for foreign students, faculty, and administrators. AASCU has joined the other presidential associations in writing to Congress and the administration
pointing out issues regarding the backlogs and deficiencies in the visa issuing process, as well as providing suggestions on how to improve the processes.

AASCU has showed support regarding the modernization of the tracking system for visa holders, and took the lead in endorsing the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS). On September 24th, 2002, Dino Curris, the President of AASCU submitted a testimony to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Twenty-First Century Competitiveness, expressing support for the SEVIS system accompanied with suggestions for making the January 2003 deadline for the introduction of SEVIS achievable.

**Study-abroad legislation.** AASCU’s policy statement regarding study abroad states: “AASCU supports federal legislation that gives authorizing and funding priority to programs that facilitate student, faculty, and administrator exchanges and study abroad” (AASCU, 2004, p. 27). In a recent interview, President Curris, emphasized the need for a dramatic increase in the number of U.S students studying abroad (IIE, 2006). According to Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006), AASCU has supported the findings of the Lincoln Commission, which called for one million students a year to study abroad by the year 2016-2017 and the study-abroad legislation that the higher-education associations have been trying to pass in Congress.

**HEA Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs.** Title VI and the Fulbright-Hays programs enjoy strong support on the part of the higher education community and of the presidential associations in particular. AASCU, like the other presidential associations, is a member of the Coalition for International Education. As such, it has worked through the Coalition to promote and advocate for legislation that may have an impact on international programs or issues (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30,
2006). This is particularly true with regards to Title VI of HEA and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) since these programs are the focus of the coalition’s advocacy work.

Promoting Internationalization Among Member Institutions

AASCU has utilized different tools to promote internationalization among its members, the most common being various AASCU publications and documents, as well as AASCU’s official website.

Publications. AASCU has made use of a number of publications to share information about its internationalization efforts and achievements in this area. The bi-monthly magazine Public Purpose showcased, among other things, achievements and contributions of AASCU members, as they tried to internationalize their campuses. It also allowed members to share their experiences about foreign exchange or international collaboration. Through its annual reports AASCU has provided a brief summary of the annual achievements and new developments in the area of internationalization. Public Policy Agenda, an annual publication that makes known AASCU’s stance with regards to internationalization via policy statements and by setting priorities for the year in question. International Update is an electronic occasional newsletter that AASCU provides to its chief international officers to inform them about opportunities that may be interesting campus wide.

Best practices. In July 2005, AASCU published a document entitled International Initiatives on AASCU Campuses. The publication included a summary of 34 accounts by AASCU university presidents and chancellors regarding the efforts of their institutions in internationalizing their campuses, with special emphasis on their personal involvement as institutional leaders.
Official website. AASCU has utilized its website to provide a list of institutional study abroad programs, resource guides, and links to international education resources for students and universities. The website also provides downloadable PDF files of the above AASCU publications and documents that have relevant information regarding internationalization. AASCU has a designated page/link within its official website called Presidential Leadership Connection. This link serves as an informal Q&A resource center for members interested in a particular area or seeking advice from colleagues that have addressed similar issues. International education was one of the listed areas, where information and informal council could be shared among members.

Supporting Members’ Internationalization Efforts

AASCU takes pride in assisting members and in providing them with many opportunities that in the words of Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006), “probably would not have been there, if they had not been members of AASCU – just in terms of awareness; services provided; making the contacts with other institutions.” However, she conceded “the actual day-to-day implementation of internationalization is left to the university president and the provost, as the chief academic officer on that campus. So, we work to assist our members in their efforts to internationalize their campuses” (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

AASCU has framed its support of members’ efforts for campus internationalization in the context of facilitating innovation as well as providing leadership support and professional development in response to the needs of its member institutions. Within this support role, AASCU serves as a:
Resource center. AASCU was the coordinator of the Global Access Project (GAP) – a twelve-institution project funded by the U.S. Department of State (DOS). GAP was intended to serve as a resource for both students and international programs in colleges and universities. It aimed at enhancing international studies programs at AASCU schools. It also sought to assist students, especially those who majored in international fields, in getting a better understanding of contemporary international issues and encouraging careers in the international service.

Facilitator. According to Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006), AASCU viewed itself as a facilitator for its membership. AASCU has served as (a) a facilitator of international partnership building for its institutional members, as well as (b) a facilitator of its members’ efforts to recruit international students.

1. Facilitator of international partnership building. One of the processes that AASCU has helped facilitate is the process of building partnerships between its members and universities in other countries. To achieve that AASCU has worked with other associations, ministries of education, and universities in other parts of the world. “We built sustainable partnerships for our members and allow them to expand on that partnership by creating faculty/student exchanges, joint research consortium, and opportunities for them to conduct conferences” (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

One of the countries of particular interest for AASCU has been China. Cooperation with China was considered a strategic area in the 21st century. Each October, for the last six years, AASCU’ Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change and the Director of International Education has lead a delegation of representatives from member institutions to China. The purpose for these missions is three-fold: (a) to promote
understanding and encourage the development of partnerships between AASCU and Chinese institutions; (b) to participate in a number of activities organized by AASCU and CEAIE, its Chinese partner association; and (c) to raise awareness of AASCU institutions in an international student recruitment fair where around 35,000 Chinese students come to seek information about U.S. academic programs (AASCU, n.d.c).

AASCU together with its Chinese partner has developed a number of programs, for Chinese senior university administrators and students that have benefited members of both associations. Also, as of 2005, AASCU has helped establish more than 35 partnerships between AASCU members and Chinese universities (AASCU, 2005b). In addition to China, other countries with which AASCU has facilitated partnership building and the signing of memoranda of understanding include Cuba, Morocco, South Africa to mention a few (AASCU, 2006a).

In an effort to assist members in forging partnerships with universities from other countries, once a year, AASCU organizes and leads AASCU’s presidential mission, an overseas mission of a presidential delegation, consisting of AASCU presidents and chancellors. The purpose of these weeklong missions is “[to] provide opportunities for presidents to travel to countries they would not ordinarily go to learn more about the educational system of that country and to provide opportunities for exchange” (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

Since 1970, AASCU has led presidential missions to countries such as China, Cuba, Morocco, Russia, South Africa, Malaysia and Singapore. Typically during these presidential missions, university leaders have the opportunity to meet with government representatives, particularly from the Ministry of Education, and university officials in the host countries and to discuss the possibility for collaboration. Often a memorandum
of understanding is signed to initiate opportunities establishing exchanges, collaborative research, and other mutually beneficial programs (AASCU, 2006).

2. **Facilitator of members’ efforts to recruit international students.** In order to facilitate the process of recruiting international students, in 2006, AASCU has created an International Friendly Campus Student Portal within its website. It was initially designed for the U.S. Department of State’s EducationUSA overseas advising centers to provide counseling to international students interested in attending an AASCU institution. This portal has links with information for potential international students about what they need to know regarding admission, transcripts, degrees, and programs at AASCU member institutions (AASCU, n.d.e).

In addition to the international students’ portal that allowed international students to get information about AASCU universities, AASCU has also assisted members in their efforts to recruit international students abroad. AASCU members benefit from the recognition that their association with AASCU provides. AASCU allows members to bring literature about their institutions to student recruiting fairs and display them from AASCU’s booths at these fairs. Again, Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006) pointed out "this is an opportunity for the institutions to participate and recruit students that they would not necessarily have if they had to pay and go on their own to recruit students.” One of the biggest recruiting endeavors for AASCU takes place in China during the month of October, when about 35,000 interested students attend a student-recruitment fair.

**Professional development provider.** One of the strategic directions approved by AASCU’s Board of Directors in 2006 was: “Provide leadership support, professional development and advancement programs responsive to the needs of presidents,
chancellors, and their spouses, as well as provosts and governmental relations professionals” (AASCU, 2006, Annual Report, p. 1). Professional development is perceived as an important way of supporting members’ efforts to internationalize their campuses. “We conduct workshops on campuses as well as at international conferences; we conduct training programs for senior university administrators within the international community” (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

Every June, for the last 20 years, AASCU has sponsored the Japanese Studies Institute (JSI), an intensive summer program “that brings 24 faculty members together at San Diego’s State University campus to increase their awareness and knowledge of Japan and immerse that knowledge in the curriculum and teaching” (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

Funded by an endowment from the Nippon Foundation of Tokyo, JSI is tailored mainly to faculty from AASCU member institutions with little or no prior experience in Japanese studies. During the three weeks of the program, participants, who come from different disciplines, gain knowledge about the most important aspects of Japan’s history, culture, business, government, and education and learn techniques and strategies on how to incorporate this new knowledge into the undergraduate courses they teach (AASCU, 2006a). AASCU covers the costs of the Institute for all participants by providing Sasakawa Fellowships (AASCU, n.d.d).

Convener. AASCU has played the role of a convener, at both the national and international level. Every fall, AASCU and its Chinese counterpart convene a joint Sino-American seminar, based on a theme or topic of interest to both parties. Current issues related to that theme are discussed from both the American and Chinese perspective.
In October of 2001, AASCU co-sponsored a national conference on study and learning abroad. In attendance were representatives from colleges and universities, as well as representatives from the Bush administration. The main message conveyed by the conference was that study abroad should be part of the overall efforts to internationalize the campus and that colleges and universities should demonstrate their commitment to creating citizens with global knowledge and experience. The conference called for the integration of study abroad into the curriculum, so that every student and faculty member is given the opportunity for a meaningful international experience (AASCU, 2001).

*Data center.* During the last six years, AASCU has surveyed and analyzed data on different aspects of internationalization of the member campuses and has informed them about the findings. AASCU conducted a survey regarding the level of activity and institutional commitment to internationalization in areas such as international programs, curriculum, activities abroad, and future assistance sought from AASCU. Another survey assessed foreign language instruction at state colleges and universities. In the fall of 2006, AASCU took part in a joint effort of the six presidential associations and IIE to conduct an on-line survey of its members regarding international student enrollment.

*AASCU’s Perceived Contribution*

According to Arlene Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006), the members’ response to the AASCU programs had been overwhelming:

They’re all extremely pleased about the way that AASCU has sort of taken this grass-root initiative to do hands-on projects and programs that have direct benefit for university campuses; so we’re not sitting in an ivory tower sort of looking down, you know, we’re actually creating programmatic opportunities that will provide short-term results.

Jackson (personal communication, October 30, 2006) felt that the greatest contribution that AASCU’s efforts had made was:
The expansion of those programs to our membership on a consistent basis, offering them the opportunity to create and develop sustainable partnerships with international institutions; to recruit international students, as well as to promote study abroad for their students. We have, in my mind, really expanded the opportunity to our total membership of 430 institutions on a consistent basis, in the last five years. (A. Jackson, personal communication, October 30, 2006)
Case Study Three: The American Association of Universities (AAU)

Organizational Profile

The American Association of Universities (AAU) is an organization of premier research universities. It is the smallest and the most selective of the Big Six. Its members consist of "the most prestigious private and public institutions" (Bloland, 1985, p. 22). It has only 62 members, two of which are Canadian. Gladieux, & Wolanin (1976) referred to it as the “exclusive club” (p. 44). King (1975) argued that, for most of its history, AAU had been "a president's club" (p. 26), because membership in the association was by invitation only. This selective method to membership, stipulated by the founders of AAU, continues even today. An invitation to a new member can be extended only if three-fourths of current members are in agreement (The American Association of Universities, [AAU], n.d.a). AAU tries to preserve a balance between public and private universities (Cook, 1998).

According to its own literature, the Association of American Universities was founded in 1900 by a group of fourteen Ph.D.-granting universities for the purpose of strengthening and standardizing U.S. doctoral programs. AAU founders felt that it was time to address the issue of standards in American higher education and to have American academic degrees be treated with respect by European universities (AAU, n.d.a). For the first 35 years of its history, AAU "acted as a standardizing and accrediting association" (King, 1975, p. 26). AAU still remains "dedicated to issues of quality, particularly in graduate education and research" (Cook, 1998, p. 21).

AAU maintains, "its primary purpose is to provide a forum for the development and implementation of institutional and national policies promoting strong programs in
academic research and scholarship and undergraduate, graduate, and professional education" (AAU, n.d.a). Interestingly, for the first sixty or so years of its history the AAU involvement in federal relations was minimal. According to Bloland (1985), AAU members did not feel a need for an official presence in Washington. The presidents of the AAU schools had easy access to congressional leaders, which allowed them to promote the interests of their institutions. AAU established its Washington office in 1962 (Cook, 1998). According to King (1975), even after its Washington presence, AAU continued to let ACE represent its membership. It was only after the creation of the Council on Federal Relations in 1969 that AAU schools began to promote their special interests in an organized way and their focus on federal matters increased (King, 1975).

AAU has a staff of 22. An Executive Committee governs the association. The association’s president is Robert Berdahl. He assumed AAU’s presidency in February of 2006. In addition to a standing Membership Committee, AAU also maintains a number of committees and task forces whose charge is to analyze and develop policies in specific areas of interest. Other ad hoc committees of presidents and chancellors are also formed on an as-needed basis (AAU n.d.a). Its policy agenda often aligns with that of NASULGC since their members are research institutions.

Background on AAU’s International Orientation

According to Matt Owens, Assistant Director of Federal Relations, AAU’s efforts to internationalize can be traced back to an international convocation on globalization and international cooperation that AAU organized in April 2001 (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006). This was the first international convocation initiated by AAU and it drew leaders from AAU members and major research universities from all over the world. The 3-day program explored issues such as conflict between globalization
and cultural identity, the impact of the technology in a global world, university collaborations across nations and across the world, and university’s response to globalization (AAU, n.d.b). In Owens’ words:

I think the convocation, from what I understand, was sort of ground breaking for this organization. To my knowledge, it [AAU] never had an international convocation . . . . That convocation really opened the door . . . . it brought a stronger realization among our members that they needed to pursue these international connections and these relationships and opportunities for collaboration, whether on the undergraduate, graduate, or research realms and that has remained at the forefront of people’s attention to non-federal issues in addition to federal issues. (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006)

In 2002, following the international convention, AAU established an internationalization committee which set out to explore what AAU’s contribution would be to the existing bilateral and multilateral cooperation agreements in existence among AAU members (Hasselmo, 2002). At the same time, the committee was interested in identifying ways to assist members in their internationalization efforts, facilitate discussions related to international education, research and outreach activities on their campuses and sharing information and learning from other members’ experiences. To this end, the internationalization committee commissioned a survey to assess members’ internationalization efforts. The questionnaire attempted to collect information regarding internationalization initiatives, outcomes, funding, international collaboration, and internationalization as it related to the student body and faculty, and internationalization-related priorities. The survey also collected information regarding whether internationalization had a formal or informal role on the AAU campuses; whether somebody was in charge of it; or whether there was a separate office overseeing the internationalization efforts. The survey also asked members for input regarding actions that AAU and the federal government should take to encourage their internationalization
efforts. In addition, the survey inquired input regarding how internationalization can pervade the curriculum and how it can involve research (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), the findings from the survey were shared with AAU member institutions and they have served as benchmarks for them. At this point, I have not been able to learn more as to how AAU has utilized the survey findings to assist members in their internationalization efforts, apart from the fact that there were plans for a follow-up survey.

Importance of Internationalization

Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) identified the issue of internationalization as very high in AAU’s agenda. According to him this importance is derived from (a) members’ interest to prepare their students and researchers to fit in the global community and (b) the interest of international institutions and governments for greater cooperation.

Internationalization is not mentioned in AAU’s mission statement, but according to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) it is always mentioned in AAU’s work plan. He added:

In our federal agenda, which is one of the primary things we do in this organization, internationalization items, whether following visa/immigration issues, funding for international education programs at the Department of Education – Title VI programs, national security programs at the Department of Defense, Fulbright, we pay attention to that. All of those are important activities that remain in our work plan. (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006)

Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) emphasized on more than one occasion that AAU internationalization efforts were member driven. Other AAU officials have pointed to AAU’s role in strengthening international education throughout
AAU campuses, as one of the important issues that AAU has tackled in order to emphasize the relevance of AAU in the troubled times following 9/11 (Linda Grace-Kobas, 2002). This can be interpreted as an indication of the importance this area has for AAU members.

_Rationales for Internationalization_

A review of AAU documents and the interview with Matt Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) revealed that for AAU the main rationales for internationalization were academic, political, and economic rationales.

_Academic Rationales_

Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) ranked academic rationales at the top of AAU rationales for internationalizing AAU campuses.

_Expansion of students’ education._ AAU considered providing students with global competences as very important. “. . . it’s the notion of a global citizen, preparing those individuals to participate in a global economy, in a global marketplace . . .” (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

_Integrating an international dimension into the curriculum._ AAU valued the importance of incorporating an international experience into the curriculum, into the research experiences, and scholarship of students and faculty:

There is a greater convergence towards how all disciplines mesh with what’s happening in the world; and how do we bring those experiences back here; how do we produce an engineer, who can communicate in another language, who has a broad enough liberal arts understanding to operate in a market place of ideas or in the commercial market place that will allow him or her to succeed. That’s what drives our members’ interest in terms of wanting to figure out ways to engage in internationalization. (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006)
**Political Rationales**

A review of AAU literature (most of AAU’s positions have been best reflected in documents related to their advocacy efforts), indicates that AAU sees a strong correlation between international education and political rationales. “American universities have long had the unique ability to attract the brightest minds from around the world, contributing to both our international leadership in innovation and our national security” (AAU, 2005b).

AAU has pointed to the role international students play as ambassadors for the United States in their native countries and around the world:

Moreover, foreign students contribute to national security. When we provide an opportunity for the best and the brightest international students to study in America, we give them a chance to understand the American values and the American way of life. (Hasselmo, 2004, point#2, para. 5)

AAU has argued that, through the presence of international scholars and students on their campuses, colleges and universities contribute to the United States economic and national security in two major ways: (a) by actively engaging them in the generation of new knowledge, discoveries and technological developments that occur on U.S. campuses – American research universities alone conduct over one half of the nations’ basic research, and (b) by spreading our nation’s democratic values through the educational and cultural exchanges that they facilitate (AAU, 2005b).

**Economic Rationales**

AAU advocacy efforts have intended to make Congress and the administration understand the impact international students have on this country’s economy in terms of the dollars they infuse in the economy making international education the fifth largest service sector export for the United States, as well as the role they play in generating new knowledge and advancing new cutting edge technologies that makes the United States a
world leader. “Foreign students and scholars are integral to what makes university research so dynamic . . . they represent a core element that drives the dynamism and excellence of the American research enterprise” (AAU, 2005b).

Commitment to Internationalization of Higher Education

Stance Towards Internationalization

AAU considers international education as “key to the U.S. effectiveness in the world economy and national security” (AAU, 2003).

Organizational Setup for Supporting and Promoting Internationalization

There is no formal structure or a specific office regarding internationalization matters at AAU. There is an Internationalization Committee that advises the association on its internationalization activities. When approval is needed on policy issues, the matter is brought to the attention of the Executive Committee that governs the association and gives policy direction.

“We work on a team model depending on areas of expertise” (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006). Support for international issues is provided by a federal relations specialist, a policy analyst that also staffs the internationalization committee, and a staff member that is involved in visa issues. At the time of the interview, Matt Owens was in charge of international education matters and staffed the internationalization committee, but his duties in this regard were being transferred to a policy analyst. According to him (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006), the former President of the association was very involved in international issues, as was the Executive Vice-President, John Vaughn. The latter has had a long involvement in major international education policy issues, as well as in representing AAU in forums such as the HED.
**Internationalization Committee.** The Internationalization Committee was established in 2002. It consists of about a dozen presidents and chancellors and serves as an advisory board on internationalization issues. According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), “it focuses on all things international,” and has a practical as well as a programmatic approach. To illustrate the practical side of the committee’s work Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) explained that during the clamp-down on the visa process following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the committee took a practical look and became involved in finding practical ways to move the streamlining of the visa process along. Regarding its programmatic approach Owens mentioned the committees’ work in assessing members’ internationalization efforts through collecting and disseminating the data from the AAU Internationalization Survey.

**Federal Relations.** Seven or almost one third of the AAU staff were engaged in federal relations issues. Three of them - a federal relations officer, responsible for international education appropriation issues; a senior federal relations officer, responsible for issues related to the Department of Homeland Security, and visas/international students; and the Assistant Director of Federal Relations, responsible for issues related to Higher Education Act (HEA) reauthorization and higher education policy across all federal agencies, including international education – were responsible for certain aspects of international education in addition to other federal issues.

**The President.** Until 2006, the office of the president was very involved in the international education area. With reference to this, Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) stated: “Nils Hanselmo, was our previous president. . . . Internationalization consumed a lot of his time . . . .” According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 006), Hasselmo was instrumental in organizing the
international convocation in 2001. Also, the establishment of the internationalization committee was his idea. Owens attributed this special interest on the part of Hasselmo to his background, being of Swedish origin, and being a Fulbright scholar, and his international connections both from his own history and presidency at the University of Minnesota.

A review of Hasselmo’s biography and some of his speeches shed some light on his interest and involvement in internationalization issues. This is not to downplay his insight as a leader, who clearly understood the importance of internationalization in advancing American higher education, in maintaining its historic leadership role in the world, and in preserving national security without compromising the notion of free exchange of ideas and people. Some of his quotes included previously, as well as the following quotes illustrate this point. “The internationalization of universities is inevitable, and it is going to make our world a better place” (Hasselmo, 2005). On another occasion, he stated:

If our nation is to maintain its leadership role in science and innovation – a role that has paid enormous economic, educational, diplomatic, and national security dividends – then universities and policymakers will need to cooperate in keeping U.S. higher education a magnet for foreign students and in making sure that potential students overseas know what an extraordinary opportunity it is to attend a U.S. research university. (as cited in Hollander & Hurley, 2005)

Nils Hasselmo retired in February of 2006 after having led AAU since 1998. Robert Berdahl from University of California at Berkley is AAU’s new president. “For our new president, this [internationalization] remains an important part of his portfolio, but it is still being defined as we go forward” (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

AAU had a budget of $3.8 million dollars ending September 30th, 2003 (Brush & McCormack, 2005). This was the most recent figure I could obtain. I was unable to
obtain information regarding a budget specific to international efforts. When asked if AAU had an operating budget for internationalization efforts, Owens’ response was “Our budget is not structured that way” (personal communication, October 30, 2006). This is probably due to the fact that there is no staff completely in charge of internationalization issues, and international education constitutes only part of the responsibilities of the staff that cover federal relations for the association.

**Approaches to Internationalization**

This study was interested in finding out, among other things, if the presidential associations were advocating for a systematic process approach or a piece-meal approach to internationalization. According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), AAU was not advocating or stressing either:

> We’ve allowed for it to sort of be defined as we go along. We’re not promoting a particular way of thinking about internationalization with our members, but rather having it as point of discussion either in our member meetings or internationalization committee, for it to sort of organically come about and we have not formalized that; it is not part of our mission as I understand it.

Part of the reason for such a laissez-faire approach on the part of AAU regarding campus internationalization has, probably, to do with the fact that AAU considers advocacy at the federal level rather than programmatic activities as its main service to members and its main purpose as an association. Secondly, AAU members, individually, are significantly involved in internationalizing their campuses and are leaders in certain aspects of international education. Harvard University, for instance, has made study abroad an undergraduate requirement. It has also established outposts across the world to facilitate research and to enhance the classroom experience for its students. Duke University, on the other hand, has made the study of a foreign language an undergraduate requirement. Duke University is also arguably the first university to create the position
of a vice provost for international affairs for the purpose of integrating internationalization with the university’s central academic planning. Michigan State University has one of the nation’s leading study-abroad programs. Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006) also made reference to this:

There have been some very visible leaders in AAU, I mean Duke University immediately comes to mind; Harvard of course, University of California at Berkeley, Stanford. There are a number of institutions that have made highly visible efforts making sure that their students are required to study abroad; reorienting their undergraduate curriculums; their ability to attract international students – NYU, USC – the numbers are incredible. So, the most important actor in my view regarding internationalization has got to be the campus.

Mapping Involvement

Advocacy Efforts for International Programs

According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), the three major advocacy issues with regards to international education include (a) visa policy issues, (b) Title VI/Fulbright-Hays and other international education programs, and (c) the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program.

Visa policy issues. AAU has played a major role in advocating for an improved and streamlined visa process. “With regards to the visa issue, this organization was at the forefront” (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006). AAU took the stance that it was possible to maintain an efficient visa system that allows the United States to attract and welcome the brightest and the most talented people in the world to study and work here without endangering the security of this nation.

A 2004 survey had indicated continued declines in enrollment of international students. In AAU’s view, the inefficient visa system was alienating potential international students, who were being lured by other countries, thus undermining United States ability to be the country of first choice. The system was also, although unintentionally,
undermining America’s image of an open and welcoming society. AAU together with AAAS (American Association for the Advancement of Science) took the lead in spearheading the effort to bring changes to the visa system. On May 12, 2004, they wrote a letter highlighting issues with the visa process such as inefficiency and repetitiveness that caused lengthy delays, inconsistency in treating visa cases, lack of transparency, an unproductive SEVIS fee collection mechanism, shortage of funding and staffing resources, and made recommendations to the administration on how to address them (Statement and recommendations on visa problems, 2004).

AAU supported the implementation of SEVIS (Student and Exchange Visitor Information System), to track the movement of international students and faculty. However, AAU noted the significant implementation issues that existed. According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), “AAU worked both with the executive branch as well as Congress to see that those things could be streamlined as much as possible. We were very heavily engaged in all those processes.”

AAU’s efforts to improve the visa process met with a degree of success, such as the extension of Visa Mantis, a type of visa issued for scientists, from one year to two years; the acceptance of a number of payment options for the SEVIS fee collection, as suggested by the higher education community; the improvement in the tracking of student and scholar applications, prioritization of interviews for students, so that they can travel in time for the beginning of the school year; an increase in number of consular staff, as well as better trained consular staff (Hasselmo, 2004).

While thankful for the improvements in the process, AAU remained concerned about the barriers that continued to exist preventing the United States from attracting the most talented people and brightest minds. Because of such concerns, on May 18, 2005,
AAU and AAAS, heading a group of 40 associations, wrote another letter, Statement and Recommendations on Visa Problems Harming America's Scientific, Economic, and Security Interests, urging the federal government to approve previous recommendations that had not been implemented and made six recommendations for improvements.

The May 18, 2005 letter included a new recommendation that had to do with the request that the federal government not require export licenses for international scientists and engineers, coming from certain countries and nationalities, to use specialized equipment for research in the United States (AAU, 2005a). This was in response to a controversial measure that was being considered at that time by the Bush administration, which would require institutions to obtain licenses for students or scholars from certain countries and nationalities to use technology that is subject to export controls, even if used for fundamental research in the United States.

AAU feared that limiting access to labs and technologies for students and scholars from certain countries might have the potential impact of reducing the flow of international scientists and engineers. Given that American research universities conduct over one half of the nations’ basic research, such request would create undue burden and would lead to a decrease in the number of international students and scholars, whose presence is essential especially in areas of mathematics, engineering, and sciences (AAU, 2005b).

On June 27, 2005, AAU sent a document to the Bureau of Industry and Securities of the U.S. Department of Commerce regarding export-related regulatory requirements pointing out that “Indeed, it is likely that any security benefits derived would be very limited at best and be achieved at an unacceptably high cost to broader national security and economic interest” (AAU, 2005b).
Title VI/ Fulbright-Hays and other international education programs. According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), Title VI/Fulbright-Hays and other international education programs are very important to AAU. “The American Association of Universities wants to make sure that the resources are there, and there are policies that allow for these programs to continue and not be impeded by overregulation or requirements. We’ve spent a lot of time on that.”

Like the other six presidential associations, AAU is part of the Coalition for International Education, whose charge is mostly to advocate for Title VI/ Fulbright-Hays programs. AAU has worked both through the Coalition to support TitleVI/ Fulbright-Hays programs, but when warranted AAU has presented testimony before Congress, either via its own president or presidents from member institutions, to make the case for continued support for international programs.

Study-abroad legislation. AAU has strongly supported the efforts of the higher education community led by NASULGC in passing the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, a bill that would allow for one million students to study abroad by 2016-2017. “That is something that we are spending an increasing amount of time, working with NASULGC and others through Peter McPherson’s leadership and the committee that came up with that proposal” (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

Promoting Internationalization Among Member Institutions

Assisting members’ international collaborations. Following AAU’s 2001 international convocation, AAU members have displayed an increased interest in establishing connections with other research universities across the globe. AAU had a long list of international contacts that it had brought to the attention of its members as
they explored opportunities for exchange and collaboration: The League of European Research Universities (LERU); The Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU) – thirty-five universities in Russia, Korea, Japan, China, Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, Chile, Mexico, the US, and Canada; "The Group of Eight" – leading research universities in Australia; "The Russell Group" – an informal group of research universities in the UK. In addition, many efforts have been made to establish protocols with the Chinese Ministry of Education to reduce red tape in connection with bilateral agreements between Chinese and US universities, and to expand opportunities for American undergraduates to study and to create collaborative doctoral programs (Hasselmo, 2002)

*Publishing various reports and publications.* The various AAU publications include reports and policy papers that concern the internationalization of American higher education. In 1996, for instance, AAU published a policy paper entitled *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States.* Recently, AAU has been advocating for a new federal initiative similar to the very successful NDEA. In January 2006, AAU wrote a policy paper entitled *National Defense Education and Innovation Initiative: Meeting America’s Security Challenges in the 21st Century.* The document was targeted at Congress, the administration, businesses and institutions of higher education urging them to work towards putting in place a strategy for addressing the challenges of the first half of the 21st century. The document listed objectives for the 21st century, initiatives to meet these objectives, as well as offered recommendations to colleges, universities and the federal government on how to achieve them (AAU, 2006).
Supporting Members’ Internationalization Efforts

The notion that internationalization is in AAU’s agenda because it is of great interest to its members was very clear in the interview with Matt Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006):

This [internationalization] is member driven. I think that’s the bottom line. This is something they want, and they expect the association to provide that forum and that leadership on policy initiatives that can be pursued in the higher education arena and in the federal context.

AAU supports its members’ efforts to internationalize by serving as a:

Convener. As mentioned earlier, in 2001, AAU organized its first international convocation bringing together educational leaders from all over the world, sparking a great interest among its members for more international cooperation. From then on, the AAU annual meetings include sessions that address international issues.

Resource/data center. According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), AAU, as an organization, often surveys its members and analyzes the results of the surveys in order to inform its members about trends in any given area, including internationalization. In 2002, AAU conducted an internationalization survey for AAU universities. Owens considered this survey as probably the most useful endeavor on the part of AAU in the area of internationalization. According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), through the survey AAU empowered its members to have a better understanding of what was happening at peer institutions and provided them with a good tool to benchmark themselves. “A number of institutions, as we understand, have been following up and using it as instrument, again to go forward” (M. Owens, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

Starting with the fall of 2002, AAU has jointed efforts with NAFSA, NASULGC, and ACE to survey its members regarding enrollment, applications, and visa delay trends
for international students and scholars. Through these surveys, AAU has solicited members’ input regarding causes for delays, denials for student visas in an effort to assess the impact that the visa process and other conditions were having on these issues. The findings of these surveys have been shared with members via press releases. In addition, AAU has also used the findings to inform Congress and the administration in their policy making process.

*AAU’s Perceived Contribution*

According to Owens (personal communication, October 30, 2006), the visa and immigration issues were an area that AAU was particularly proud of its involvement:

On the federal relations side of things, “visa issues” is where we have made significant strides. We went from the proposal of having a moratorium on the issuance of any student visas, and we saw a significant drop in the number of students coming to this country, and now it’s steadily rising. Part of that, not all of it, is because we have been able to successfully work with members of Congress, the executive branch, to make visa procedures more secure, but simultaneously user friendly.
Case Study Four: The American Council on Education (ACE)

Organizational Profile

The American Council on Education (ACE) is the major coordinating body for all the nation's higher education institutions. ACE sees its role as “as a consensus leader on key higher education issues” (ACE, n.d.a). Cook's research (1998) found that the majority of college and university presidents "consider ACE to be the major voice for higher education in Washington" (p. 66).

The American Council on Education has always been considered as higher education's umbrella organization (King, 1975; Bailey, 1975; Cook, 1998). This role dates back since its creation. The American Council on Education was established during World War I under the name Emergency Council on Education. Its founders were 14 national education associations. Its purpose was to serve as the coordinator of these constituent associations (Bloland, 1985) and its larger role was that of coordinating higher education's relations with the federal government (King, 1975).

After the war, it changed its name to the American Council on Education. Struggling financially and feeling handicapped in its role as coordinator of associations, in 1962, the American Council on Education underwent a major overhaul and successfully reorganized itself. It added dues-paying institutional members that strengthened its finances; created a governing body consisting mostly of presidents representing their own institutions rather than representatives of constituent associations (Bloland, 1985). As it reduced its dependency on the constituent associations it assumed the role of the coordinating agency of the higher education system as a whole rather than associations of higher education alone (Murray, 1976; Bloland, 1985; Cook, 1998).
However, critics have put into question its desire to be the coordinator of the higher education community after the ACE’s Board of Directors removed the phrase “umbrella group” from ACE’s mission statement. The phrase made reference to the coordinating role ACE had historically played (Burd, 2005).

ACE represents the whole spectrum of higher education. Its membership includes approximately 1,800 accredited, public and private degree-granting colleges and universities and higher education-related associations (including the other five major associations), organizations, and corporations. In addition to the largest membership, ACE also has the most resources. King (1975) regarded it as "higher education's most visible organization . . . [that] has the most extensive membership and the most bountiful resources than any of the higher education associations" (p. 20). Because of a staff of 175 employees and a budget over $30 million, Cook (1998) called it as "a massive enterprise” (p. 66). By 2003, it had a staff of 185 employees and a budget of $35.1 million (Brush & McCormack, 2005).

The American Council on Education is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of college and university presidents. Mr. David Ward is the Council’s 11th president, and has been serving in that capacity since 2001. ACE is organized in three divisions: Division of Government and Public Affairs; Division of Business and Operations; Division of Program and Research.

According to its website, three key strategic priorities drive ACE's activities: representation, leadership development, and service. The American Council on Education operates basically on a committee structure. The commissions of the American Council on Education advise ACE on various mission-related issues and guide ACE in initiating new programs and policies, drafting action plans, and working with outside

Over the years, ACE has broadened the scope of its activities far beyond that of a coordinating agency. Some of the activities the American Council on Education is involved in as listed in its website (http://www.acenet.edu) include:

1. Representation of higher and adult education before the federal government;
2. Coordination of the Washington Higher Education Secretariat;
3. Research and data analysis regarding U.S. higher and adult education.
4. Shaping international education policy at the federal level and promotion of international education among its member institutions;
5. Publication newsletters, magazines, professional books, guides, and reports.

Background on ACE’s International Orientation

Not too long after its establishment, ACE got involved in activities that had an international orientation. Initially, ACE’s focus was on international exchange and international educational cooperation. Following are some of these internationally-oriented activities that were included in a chronology written by Charles Dobbins. The chronology covered ACE activities from 1918, the year it was founded, till 1968.

In 1920, ACE administered exchange scholarships between American higher education institutions and French lycées and universities. In 1928, after following some students who received part of their college training abroad, ACE published The Junior Year Abroad: A Successful Experiment.

In 1941, it called a meeting between experts in the area of the Far East and the curriculum to explore the possibility of teaching subjects on what was then called "the
Orient.” In 1944, it received a grant in the amount of $50,000 from the Department of State to conduct a two-year educational survey of the Arabic-speaking countries of the Near East. That same year, it was contracted by the Department of State to administer a grant-in-aid intended to purchase educational materials for some schools in China (Dobbins, 1968). After WWII, ACE completed ten studies on the transition of educational wartime programs into post-war America. Two of these studies involved foreign language and area studies (Gumperz, 1970; Ruther, 2002).

From an organizational point of view, by 1924 the Council had established the position of assistant director of international educations relations to respond to member demands for expended services in the international area. In 1944, the Council established the Committee on International Education and Cultural Relations (Dobbins, 1968).

The 1950s mark the period when ACE started to become a player in international education. In 1953, ACE established the Commission on Education and International Affairs and started to better identify its role in international education vis-à-vis IIE which was probably the leading organization with regards to international exchange. In order to clarify ACE’s position in the area of international education and exchange, in 1954 an ACE executive committee approved a document which specified that the center of interest for the Council in its work in international education was “to concentrate on providing high level planning and guidance on international education in all aspects” (Dobbins, 1968, p. 83).

ACE played an extremely active role in the preservation of Title VI of the NDEA during the 1960s and pushed for the passage of the International Education Act (IEA). While getting praise for the preservation of funding for Title VI of the NDEA, ACE, as well as the rest of the higher education community, was criticized for IEA’s demise.
In 1973, ACE established the International Education Project under whose auspices ten studies on international education were completed. Some of these studies proved helpful in convincing Congress to continue support for international education (Ruther, 2002). According to ACE, “since the 1970s, ACE has written or recommended every change that has been made to Title VI of HEA” (B. Timmons, personal communication, October 14, 2007). ACE’s research efforts in the 1970s have also been credited for convincing the higher education community about their need to develop strategies that were informed by research and data. One of the studies was incorporated in the Title VI during the 1980 reauthorization of HEA (Ruther, 2002).

ACE continued to maintain a strong although not as active stance in supporting Title VI in the 1980s, now under the HEA. During this time, ACE was starting to raise the nation’s consciousness regarding to role that international education could play in preserving America’s political and economic leadership role in the world and the importance of preparing global citizens to this end. With its publications *What We Don’t Know Can Hurt Us* (1984) and *What We Can’t Say Can Hurt Us: A Call for Foreign Language Competence by the Year 2000* (1989), ACE tried to make the case for international education and global competence. Alongside the advocacy for a more globally competent citizenry, the advocacy for a more strategic approach to internationalization started to gain momentum in the mid to late 1990s. During this time, ACE had openly adopted Jane Knight’s 1994 definition of internationalization as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institutions,” (see Knight, 1999) as well as *Guidelines for the Internationalization Quality Review Process (IQRP) for Institutions of Higher Education.*
(see Knight, 1999) that would assist institutions of higher education in their internationalization efforts.

By the early 2000, ACE had already started a number of programs to help institutions develop strategies to advance internationalization on their campuses. It also had issued a number of publications with the lessons learned from these programs to assist other institutions interested in these processes. Many of these programs are still in existence, continuously being updated as new ones are being developed.

On the federal advocacy side, ACE remained in the forefront of the efforts to reverse the negative effects of the September 11 terrorist attacks had on the number of international students studying the United States. ACE strongly supported The Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Act of 2006 (S. 3744) and expressed commitment to work in cooperation with the other presidential associations to see this legislation enacted (ACE, n.d.e). As the other presidential associations started to get more involved in international education issues, ACE helped to create the Coalition for International Education, an ad-hoc organization of 35 higher education associations, whose advocacy efforts focus on preserving Title VI and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) programs.

ACE has actively pursued and maintained linkages with associations of higher education and other international organizations serving as a focal point for U.S. higher education abroad. It has strengthened connections with the European University Association. During the last 20 years ACE has been involved in a series of bilateral meetings with European university heads called the Transatlantic Dialogue. It has promoted international collaboration through meetings and projects with partner organizations (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2006).
Importance of Internationalization

According to Madeleine Green, Vice-President for International Initiatives, internationalization of higher education was a “high priority” for the American Council on Education (personal communication, November 6, 2006). She emphasized two main reasons for the high level of importance that ACE attached to internationalization: (a) “[ACE’s] long history of being engaged in internationalization” and (b) the declaration of internationalization as “a priority and one of the four areas of program focus” (M. Green, personal communication, 6, 2006) in the 2001 strategic plan. Clearly, as the brief overview of ACE’s international involvement indicated and as Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006) pointed out, “by the time the strategic plan was underway, there was already a strong international capacity within ACE. It did not just get invented in 2001 . . . It firmed the centrality and importance of internationalization.”

Rationales for Internationalization

Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006) identified two main rationales for ACE’s internationalization programs: (a) academic “… it is about the academic quality of our institutions . . . helping our institutions develop an internationalization strategy” and (b) public diplomacy, “representing U.S. higher education to organizations around the world.”

Academic Rationales

ACE’s publications and literature have focused on three aspects as regards the academic rationales for promoting internationalization:

Internationalization of the curriculum. From many of its publications and its
website, it becomes clear that ACE views the curriculum as the most important element of a campus's internationalization strategy that directly contributes to the preparation of all students to live and work in a global society.

*Internationalizing the disciplines.* ACE has promoted internationalization across disciplines as part of a strategic approach to campus internationalization. The project Where Faculty Live: Internationalizing the Disciplines and the report with the same title promoted the internationalization of teaching and learning at U.S. colleges and universities. ACE worked in collaboration with four disciplinary associations in the fields of geography, history, political science, and psychology.

*Student learning.* ACE has been a strong advocate, within the education community, of recognizing the need to identify and assess learning outcomes for international/global learning and to develop strategies to assess these outcomes. The Global Learning for All project has been instrumental in this respect. It has helped participating institutions articulate and develop models for assessing international learning outcomes.

*Political Rationales*

ACE clearly has understood the role that international exchange and study abroad can play as a public diplomacy tool in promoting better understanding among people and in improving America’s image in the world. David Ward, President of ACE, expressed this sentiment, “It is vitally important that we continue to foster programs of international exchange. I can think of no better investment in the excellence of U.S. higher education, public diplomacy and national security” (as cited in HENA Online News, 2006, para. 4).
Commitment to Internationalization of Higher Education

Stance Towards Internationalization

A review of the internationalization literature, as well as ACE documents clearly revealed that internationalization was an espoused value for ACE. According to David Ward (2003), the classification of internationalization as one of the areas of program focus during the 2001 strategic plan process was a natural result of ACE’s understanding of the importance of an international dimension in learning at the onset of the 21st century. “With the new strategic plan, ACE reaffirms its commitment to internationalization” (Ward, 2003, p. iii). The webpage of the Center for International Initiatives included this statement: “ACE recognizes that global perspectives are critical to solving contemporary problems, ensuring academic excellence and preparing world-class workforce” (ACE, n.d.c).

Although there is no policy statement regarding internationalization specifically, according to Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006), ACE’s policy regarding internationalization “is really threaded throughout our strategic plan.” This became evident upon reviewing ACE documentation and its website.

According to its website, ACE had three main strategic goals/priorities, namely (a) representation; (b) leadership development; and (c) service. International education/internationalization was an integral component in two of the three strategic goals. Under the goal “representation” among other things ACE intended to: “Develop strategies to shape federal initiatives in student aid, scientific research, tax policy, and international education [italics added]” (ACE, n.d.h, para. 3). Under the goal “service” among other things ACE intended to: “Support higher education in the advancement of access and
diversity, lifelong learning, and internationalization [italics added]” (ACE, n.d.h, para. 11).

Furthermore, internationalization has been categorized as one of ACE’s four areas of strategic focus: (a) access, success, equity, and diversity; (b) intuitional effectiveness; (c) lifelong learning and (d) internationalization. As an area of focus, internationalization included “programs to help colleges and universities prepare students to work and live in a globally interdependent world” (ACE, n.d.b, para.11).

Organizational Setup for Supporting and Promoting Internationalization

According to Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006), ACE’s international agenda was shaped by a combination of senior leadership – “. . .the Vice President, in consultation with the President and the Cabinet, with the advice of the Commission on International Initiatives, and the overall supervision of the Board.” This statement alluded to most of the main stakeholders involved in ACE’s internationalization efforts: the Commission on International Initiatives, the Center for International Initiatives and ACE’s President. Government Relations also play an important role in advocating for international issues at the federal level. Following is a very brief commentary on each of these stakeholders.

Commission on International Initiatives. Commission on International Initiatives is an advisory body that provides ACE guidance regarding its internationalization initiatives. The Commission on International Education has a broad range of responsibilities. It plays the following functions: (a) serves as an advisory body for the association regarding international initiatives and programs; (b) assists ACE members in their internationalization efforts; and (c) collaborates with other higher-education associations for the purpose of obtaining support for international programs and
initiatives from the federal and state governments and the private sector (ACE, n.d.c).

The members of the commission are university presidents or chancellors who serve on a three-year term. The commission meets twice a year, usually in spring and fall.

Government Relations. Government Relations is part of the Division of Government Relations and Public Affairs. According to Becky Timmons, Assistant Vice President for Government Relations, the efforts of Government Relations staff have been focused on “making modifications to Title VI, through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to expand linkages with K-12, reinstate foreign language fellowships for undergraduate students, expand study abroad opportunities for undergraduate students and the like” (B. Timmons, personal communication, October 14, 2007).

Center for International Initiatives. The Center for International Initiatives has the operational responsibility for implementing the strategic plan with regards to internationalization issues. “Through its Center for International Initiatives, ACE offers programs and services that support and enhance the internationalization of U.S. campuses and works with international partners on higher education issues and situate U.S. higher education in a global context” (ACE, n.d.c).

The Center for International Initiatives falls under the Division of Program and Research. Its director is Madeleine Green, who is also the Vice President for International Initiatives. The Center has a staff of seven and operates with a budget of approximately $700,000 of core internal funding, allocated by the Council. In addition, dependent on the number of projects underway, it raises about $250,000-$500,000 in the form of project money from other sources such as private foundations, the government, as well as member institutions (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2007).
ACE has been able to garner grant funding from a number of private foundations such as the Ford Foundation, the Henry Luce Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, AT&T Foundation, as well as the federal government through the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). The considerable external funding it has received is a testament not only to the hard work of ACE’s staff in obtaining additional dollars to advance its internationalization agenda, but also of the confidence these organizations have in ACE and the outcomes of the programs they are sponsoring.

_The President._ In spite of the long history of ACE involvement in the international education arena, it was not until the strategic planning process initiated by Mr. Ward, after his appointment as president of ACE in 2001, that internationalization emerged as area of strategic focus for ACE (Green, personal communication, November 6, 2006; McDonough, 2007). He has been credited with playing a critical leadership role in supporting the cause for international education and international exchange at the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks (McDonough, 2007). Under Ward’s leadership, ACE has strengthened relations with many higher-education associations abroad, particularly the European University Association (June 2005; McDonough, 2007). Mr. Ward is said to take pride in what he has to done to "position ACE to be effective in the international arena" (as cited in June, 2007, para. 5).

_Interaction among the stakeholders._ Although each stakeholder has certain responsibilities regarding internationalization, there is cooperation among them. The Commission on International Programs holds an annual meeting with presidents and chief academic officers, who form the Leadership Network for International Education, to discuss a major issue in the internationalization of higher education. Other ACE senior staff, such as the Senior Vice-President for Operations or the Director of the Center for
Policy Analysis, are involved in international efforts through their specific offices. “So, part of our international effort is working through other offices, which themselves are internationally engaged around their issues. In a way it is like campus, you know. Other people besides the international services do international” (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2006).

Approaches to Internationalization

ACE has been a strong proponent of a comprehensive and strategic approach to internationalization, one that sees internationalization as “pervading the institution and affecting a broad spectrum of people, policies, and programs, leads to deeper and potentially more challenging change” (ACE, n.d.d, para. 2). “We have really tried to work with institutions on developing a strategic approach to internationalization, so that internationalization is not just about study abroad or international students, but it has to involve strategic thinking at every level” (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2006).

This approach is evident in ACE’s literature and website information, particularly after the year 2000. A number of ACE publications such as Internationalizing the Campus: A User’s Guide (2003); Building a Strategic Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization (2005); Campus Tools For Internationalization (2007); and A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization: What Institutions Can Do and What Students Should Learn (2006) outline the way ACE has helped institutions think about internationalizing their campuses.

In addition to its publications, ACE has tried to advance the notion of a strategic approach to internationalization empirically, through initiatives such as the Internationalization Collaborative and the Internationalization Laboratory, where
institutions are actively involved in developing comprehensive internationalization strategies under ACE staff guidance.

ACE’s emphasis has been on both a comprehensive approach and involvement of senior leadership in the internationalization process. One of ACE’s objectives has been to support the senior leadership of its member institutions in their efforts to internationalize their campuses and to provide them with strategies for implementing a comprehensive internationalization process. To this end, many of ACE’s programmatic efforts have been directed at institutional leaders in order to help them “think about internationalization in an intentional and strategic manner” (ACE, n.d.c).

Mapping Involvement

Of all presidential associations, ACE has had the longest involvement in international education matters and has played a very active role in supporting, promoting, and advocating for internationalization of higher education. This became evident in its literature, website, its research efforts and the number and types of programs and initiatives that it had put in place for this purpose. In addition, representatives from the other presidential associations, who were interviewed for this study, clearly indicated that ACE was an important actor in the international arena because it had the resources and organizational set up and research capacity for that purpose.

Advocacy Efforts for International Programs

Federal representation of member interests is probably the most important function of ACE. In the words of Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006), “ACE’s federal relations agenda is a very important one. We see our role as representing our members first and keep federal money flowing to institutions to support
internationalization.” In the area of international education, there were three priority issues for the ACE advocacy efforts that Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006) identified: (a) visa policy issues, (b) Title VI international programs, and (c) the issue of higher education and trade in the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) negotiations.

Visa policy issues. Madeleine Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006) commented on the long history of ACE’s involvement in advocating for an improved visa process especially after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. “Since 2001, we have done an enormous number of things … there is a long history there.” ACE advocated for a more streamlined visa-issuing process. According to Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006), ACE’s advocacy efforts in concert with the efforts of the higher education community, NAFSA in particular, succeeded in raising a high level of consciousness about the importance of Department of Home Land Security paying attention to higher education in terms of visa. She admitted that the higher education community did not achieve all the things it set out to achieve, but the end result was much better than if they had not tried so hard (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2006).

Title VI/Fulbright-Hays international programs. As mentioned earlier, Title VI International programs have been very important programs for higher education. As such, all the higher education community gets behind them in an effort to preserve their funding, as well as their very existence. Of particular importance in this respect, has been the work that the Coalition for International Education has done. With regards to advocacy for international programs of the Higher Education Act – Title VI and Fulbright-Hays – ACE has worked, for the most part, through the Coalition for
International Education. ACE is the founder of the coalition and its fiscal agent. The ACE president is often the main signatory of the letters that the Coalition for International Education, a group of 35 national higher education associations, sends to Congress.

In addition to and in cooperation with the Coalition, ACE senior representatives have also been instrumental in supporting or advocating for the Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs. For instance, in January 2004, Terry W. Hartle, ACE’s Senior Vice-President for Government and Public Affairs testified in front of Congress making the case for the national importance of Title VI programs against criticism that Title VI Centers, particularly Middle Eastern Studies Centers, were ideologically biased and that federal funds were being used to support programs where faculty were openly critical of the United States (Hartle, 2004). The ACE’s president has written numerous memos to members of Congress and government officials.

*General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS).* ACE has advocated against the inclusion of higher education into GATS. In the American context, higher education is a state prerogative. However, participation into GATS can be achieved only by the federal government. Even though GATS is a voluntary agreement, once a country becomes a member that country is subject to the stipulations made by that agreement. ACE believes that the risks associated with participation of higher education in GATS outweigh the benefits. Some of the risks include (a) greater federal intrusion into higher education, confusion resulting from vague GATS language, and problems posed by multiple regulatory authorities. ACE has tried to (a) monitor the discussions regarding GATS and keep its membership informed; (b) stay in contact with major actors representing the United States’ trade interests; and (c) has signed a joint declaration with
a number of international higher-education associations expressing concerns regards GATS (ACE, n.d.g). Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006) considered ACE’s efforts successful to a certain degree. She said, “I think we have gotten the U.S. trade representative to, at least, pay attention to us.”

Promoting Internationalization among Member Institutions

One strategy that ACE has used for the purpose of promoting internationalization has been to focus on certain themes such as engaging faculty in internationalization, internationalizing the curriculum, compiling strategies that member institutions have successfully used in internationalizing their campuses, and publicizing them among its membership. Similarly, ACE has identified and disseminated the lessons learned from its various programs and projects to a wider audience through its web site, web-based publications, working paper series and other publications. For a list of such publications within the timeframe 1996-2006 see Appendix F.

Another strategy that ACE has employed has been to showcase outstanding programs or practices in its publications and on its official website. Its 2002 publication Promising Practices: Spotlighting Excellence in Comprehensive Internationalization showcased the experiences of eight institutions that have taken a comprehensive approach in integrating an international dimension to undergraduate curricula. Also, web links such as Innovative Campus Strategies provided members with success stories of other institutions that were successfully implementing a strategic approach to internationalization from which they could draw lessons, learn strategies or even contact them for more input.

Recognition of innovative practices. In order to encourage institutions to develop innovative practices for enhancing campus internationalization ACE, in collaboration
with the AT&T Foundation, has established the ACE/AT&T Award for Technology as a Tool for Internationalization, an award that recognizes the innovative use of technology to promote international learning at U.S. colleges and universities.

*Supporting Members’ Internationalization Efforts*

According to Green (personal communication, November 6, 2007), ACE has been in a supporting role and an advocacy role with its institutions. Cognizant of the fact that different institutions could be at different stages and may have different objectives, ACE has maintained that the institutions themselves should determine the pace with which they should move towards internationalization (Green & Olson, 2003). “I think we see our main role with institutions as helping them enhance internationalization, as opposed to just exhorting them” (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2007).

The section *Approaches to Internationalization* in this study made reference to ACE’s efforts to advocate for a strategic approach to internationalization. ACE has not only promoted that ideal but at the same time it has put in place a whole mechanism of support for members interested in internationalizing their campuses. Though the Center for International Initiatives, ACE has provided a wide variety of programs and services to its member institutions, for the purpose of supporting them in their efforts to enhance their international capacity. ACE’s official website (http://www.acenet.edu) has done a very good job of providing a detailed account of the multitude of programs and services that ACE has provided to its membership. I did not attempt to describe these programs and services; instead, I tried to incorporate examples from these programs as I tried to categorize ACE’s supporting role to its members’ internationalization efforts.

*Convener.* ACE has played the role of the convener by bringing a lot of the higher education community together under its auspices through Higher Education for

**Public forum.** ACE has used its annual meeting, a forum for its college and university administrators and faculty, to hold sessions on international issues. Since 2000, ACE has been convening the Annual Conference on Campus Internationalization within the context of the International Collaborative project to discuss strategies, challenges, and successes related to various aspects of campus internationalization. In addition, most of the projects that ACE coordinates have a meeting or conference component to them, which allows representatives from participating institutions to get together and to exchange information and experiences.

**Leadership forum.** Cognizant of the important role that institutional leaders play in advancing campus internationalization, ACE has strongly advocated for commitment on the part of the institutional leaders in developing and implementing a comprehensive internationalization strategy. Two programs, namely, the Internationalization Forum for Chief Academic Officers and the Leadership Network for International Education, which have been tailored for university presidents and chief academic officers, are cases in point. These forums have helped senior leaders to identify and to explore more in-depth key leadership challenges of internationalization and to share promising practices in addressing these challenges.

**Resource center.** ACE’s numerous publications on the internationalization topic have been an invaluable resource for any institution interested in internationalizing its campuses. These publications (see Appendix F) draw from both the current literature in the area of internationalization and the experiences of member institutions. Through such publications ACE has tried to accomplish a number of things:
1. Clarify the distinction between internationalization and globalization;
2. Explain the meaning and usage of the term international education vis-à-vis internationalization in a way that helps those interested in these processes to crystallize their understanding of the process of internationalizing a campus;
3. Guide those interested in advancing internationalization on their campus on how to make the case for it in order to build the necessary good will and funding sources;
4. Draw a road map in terms of content and processes that can guide campus teams in charge of designing plans for campus internationalizations;
5. Provide strategies on how to get wide participation from faculty and other stakeholders;
6. Outline elements of a successful internationalization process;
7. Provide an inventory of tools for reviewing existing programs and defining learning competencies.

Through its web resources and direct web links such as External Funding Sources or Innovative Campus Strategies, ACE’s website has provided members with a wealth of information regarding funding opportunities provided by the federal government or non-profit organizations as well as best practices from member institutions in the area of internationalizing the disciplines, study abroad, and in engaging faculty in internationalization process.

*Research center.* ACE has had an ongoing research program in the area of international education for over 40 years. From the interviews done for this study, it became apparent that ACE is regarded as the presidential association with the capacity, in
monetary and human terms, to be the most active in the area of research on internationalization in the United States:

ACE is seen as a major source of data in the internationalization field. Except for the Institute for International Education (IIE) that produces the Open Doors report, ACE probably has the most data on issues related to internationalization and higher education institutions” (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2006).

According to Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006), the research that ACE has conducted through the years “has formed an empirical base for internationalization in the United States,” which has positioned ACE so that “we are looked to as an authoritative authority on internationalization.”

In 2000, ACE conducted three national surveys intended to assess the level of internationalization of American higher education by surveying samples of all types of institutions, undergraduate students and undergraduate faculty. The findings of the surveys were published in the report Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education. The report presented the status of internationalization of American higher education along a number of variables such as institutional type, study abroad, internationalization of the curriculum, academic requirement of foreign languages and international education content, international students and faculty and institutional support for internationalization.

Previously, ACE had surveyed opinions from the general public and college-bound seniors regarding international education. In 2001, A Report on Two National Surveys about International Education shared public’s opinion regarding their attitudes and perceptions about international education. After 9/11, ACE, in cooperation with other presidential associations, conducted a number of surveys to assess the levels of
international student enrollment and input from the institutions regarding the reasons for a decrease in the enrollment levels.

*Funding source.* ACE has encouraged members’ efforts to internationalize or to find innovative approaches by providing much needed funding for this purpose. For instance, with the help of the Henry Luce Foundation, ACE has set up a fund to encourage the development of innovative practices to enhance campus internationalization. ACE also has provided mini grants to institutions participating in the Internationalization Collaborative to stimulate learning and to accelerate the internationalization process.

*Laboratory for testing innovative approaches.* Many of ACE’s programs in the area of internationalization are intended to enable participating institutions to learn “hands on” how to approach specific internationalization challenges and to find solutions to these challenges with a lot of guidance from ACE staff. The benefit to the large membership is that the experiences and lessons learned from such programs are shared through the web site and other publications. Following are some examples of such projects.

In the Lessons Learned in Assessing International Learning project, six institutions agreed to assess international learning outcomes by developing and using assessment instruments to measure student learning. The Internationalization Collaborative has provided a forum for faculty and administrators of 82 institutions of different types, committed to advancing internationalization, to learn from each others’ efforts as they try to implement a comprehensive internationalization strategy on their campuses. This valuable information is shared during the Internationalization Collaborative annual meeting, regional meetings, and a website for good practices that
has been set up for this purpose. The Internationalization Laboratory consists of a smaller group of institutions. These institutions have tried to deepen the internationalization level of their campuses through the direct guidance of ACE staff. They follow a well-established protocol that includes such steps as establishment of an internationalization leadership team, assessment of present achievements, development of institutional goals and of an internationalization strategy, and host of a peer review team. In return, at a price of $18,000, ACE staff visits each of these campuses and assists them in preparing a self-assessment report and developing a strategic plan that is grounded in an analysis of institutional strengths and weaknesses. Then, ACE arranges for ACE staff and a team of experts to visit the site and meet with stakeholders. Finally, ACE assists in writing a report that analyses the internationalization status of the institution and provides recommendations for the future (ACE, n.d.f).

*ACE’s Perceived Contribution to Campus Internationalization*

When asked about ACE’s main contribution with regards to internationalization, Green (personal communication, November 6, 2006) identified the following:

1. Reaching a lot of campuses with its programs;
2. Providing sustained attention and thought leadership in the area of internationalization;
3. Giving the area of internationalization a lot of visibility; and
4. Sending a clear message to the presidents, chief academic officers that internationalization is important.
Case Study Five: The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU)

Organizational Profile

The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) considers itself as the unifying voice of American independent higher education. NAICU has nearly 1,000 members nationwide. Its membership includes traditional liberal arts colleges, major research universities, church- and faith-related institutions, historically black colleges and universities, women's colleges, performing and visual arts institutions, two-year colleges, schools of law, medicine, engineering, business, and other professions (the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities [NAICU] n.d.a).

NAICU's roots can be traced back to the Association of American Colleges (AAC), which was established in 1915 by a number of independent, church-related institutions (King 1975). Dedicated to liberal education, AAC also served as the voice for the independent sector of higher education (Bloland, 1985). The financial difficulties that independent colleges were encountering in the 1970s as well as the controversy over the roles of state and religion led AAC to a number of crises. These crises eventually led to the creation of "a separate association to represent private higher education, leaving AAC to dedicate itself to the promotion of liberal education" (Bloland, 1985, p. 19). So, in 1976, NAICU emerged from and eventually replaced AAC within the Big Six. Since 1976, the association has represented private nonprofit colleges and universities on policy issues with the federal government, such as those affecting student aid, taxation, and government regulation.
At the federal level, NAICU’s policy position consists of three objectives:

1. Ensure that student aid programs continue to provide all Americans with access to the college of their choice;
2. Promote a tax policy that helps families save and pay for college, and also helps private colleges fulfill their distinctive missions;
3. Seek appropriate regulation of private colleges and universities that is sensitive to their diversity and independence while addressing society’s needs. (NAICU, n.d.a)

In addition to lobbying on behalf of its members, NAICU is involved also in other activities such as tracking campus trends, conducting research, analyzing higher education issues, publishing information, helping coordinate state-level activities, and advising members on legislative and regulatory developments that could have a potential impact on their institutions (NAICU, n.d.a).

NAICU is governed by a Board of Directors that consists of 44 voting members and 4 non-voting members. David L. Warren has been serving as the president of NAICU since 1993. He leads a staff of 19. NAICU carries its activities organized in committees that report to the Board. There are six committees, two of which deal with internal organizational issues and the other four focus on public policy issues that are important to NAICU like accountability, student aid, policy analysis and public relations, and tax policy.

Importance of Internationalization

NAICU has had a long standing involvement in issues of international education – Title VI foreign languages and international programs. However, according to Maureen Budetti, Director for Student Aid Policy, who serves also as the association’s liaison
regarding issues of international education, “internationalization is low or medium priority because NAICU has the main areas it focuses on” (personal communication, October 27, 2006). The three areas she was referring to are student aid, tax policy, and regulation of private colleges and universities.

Internationalization is not part of NAICU’s mission statement; however, international education is part of NAICU’s advocacy agenda. International education is included in the policy document that NAICU prepares for each new Congress. In that document NAICU succinctly points out the issues that are important for NAICU while that Congress is in session (M. Budetti, personal communication, October 30, 2006).

*Rationales for Internationalization*

According to the interview with the association representative and association documents, NAICU’s main rationales for international education are both academic and political:

*Academic Rationales*

In the case of NAICU, the primary purpose of academic rationales is the expansion of students’ education, and they are as part of the research and service functions of its member institutions. “[It] fits with the three main [aspects] of our institutions – teaching, research and service” (M. Budetti, personal communication, October 26, 2006). Since a liberal education is central to most NAICU institutions, the understanding of other cultures and the learning of foreign languages are an important part of the education students receive. Also, there is interest in research of other cultures, societies, and world economy. Furthermore, a large number of NAICU members have a religious affiliation, where the idea of service is important. For students, this service component finds expression in the form of serving abroad, while for the institutions
themselves it takes the form of outreach and development programs (Budetti, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

**Political Rationales**

NAICU considers the education of international students an American tradition, an important public diplomacy instrument, and vital to the nation’s interest. “Such exchanges are essential to promoting international understanding and to the peaceful resolution of world conflicts. . . .The ability of colleges to admit and educate students from throughout the world is in our vital national interest” (NAICU, n.d.b).

**Commitment to Internationalization of Higher Education**

**Stance Towards Internationalization**

One could say that NAICU’s position regarding international education has been long standing but internationalization has not been a major preoccupation. While NAICU has been engaged in issues related to international programs advocacy, I was not able to get obtain any documents in which the issue of internationalization, per se, was discussed.

**Organizational Setup for Supporting and Promoting Internationalization**

The decision making process regarding international matters rests with NAICU’s Board of Directors and its president. The responsibility for international programs is part of the portfolio of the Director for Student Aid Policy within Government Relations. The reason for this is that NAICU is a relatively small association and its focus is on student financial aid issues at the federal level, where it plays a leading role. According to Budetti (personal communication, October 27, 2006), for NAICU international education is an important area in general. However, international education falls under student aid
policy because of some very specialized student aid for the study of foreign languages, such as Jacob K. Javits fellowships that give priority to advanced linguistic studies.

The Director for Student Aid Policy works through the Vice President for Governmental Relations and represents NAICU when dealing with Congress, the Department of Education, and the higher education community. She acts as a liaison for the association with various entities such as the Coalition for International Education and the Higher Education for Development. She keeps update on international issues that are important to NAICU. She informs the association when action needs to be taken. For specific topics or for higher levels of involvement, the President of the NAICU, David L. Warren, represents the association. There is no committee or any such structure to guide or advice NAICU on internationalization issues, since it is not a priority in its agenda.

Approaches to Internationalization

My research and the interview with the NAICU representative indicate that NAICU is not advocating for any particular approach to internationalization. The individual members that are interested to advance internationalization on their campuses take the approach that best fits their institution’s mission, goals and objectives.

Mapping Involvement

Advocacy Efforts for International Programs

Some of the priority advocacy areas for NAICU regarding international education include reauthorization of HEA and in that context the preservation of funding Title VI international and foreign language programs, visa policy issues, study abroad legislation and funding for Higher Education for Development.

Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs. NAICU has had a long standing interest in the international programs that are part of the Higher Education Act and has advocated for
increased funding for graduate international education programs, which NAICU considers to be important for the nation’s security and economic productivity.

NAICU is a member of the Coalition for International Education, which assists the presidential associations’ advocacy efforts in Congress and the administration with regards to Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs. As such, NAICU, like the other major higher-education associations has worked through the Coalition International Education to preserve or to increase funding levels for Title VI programs.

In addition to Title VI and Fulbright-Hays international programs, NAICU has advocated for the preservation and increased funding for Jacob K. Javits fellowship program that is focused on the areas of arts, humanities, and social sciences. Many of NAICU members are liberal arts colleges, as such, they make this program attractive for NAICU. The grants under this program give priority to advanced linguistic studies and courses that prepare teacher to teach ESL (English as a Second Language) courses.

Visa policy issues. NAICU like the other presidential associations has advocated for a streamlined visa process that would be secure and at the same time would not create unnecessary delays for international students. In 2005, during the reauthorization of HEA 1965, NAICU expressed concern regarding a sense of hostility towards international students studying in the United States and favored safety measures that would still attract bright people from across the globe without jeopardizing the country’s security, (NAICU, n.d.b). On May 18, 2005, NAICU joined AAU and other associations in urging the federal government to implement previous recommendations and made six other recommendations for improvements of the visa process (AAU, 2005a).

Study-abroad legislation. There has been a long standing interest in studying abroad for many of NAICU members. NAICU has supported an expansion of study
abroad programs for college students, as advocated by the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. NAICU also supported NASULGC’s efforts to see this legislation enacted (M. Budetti, personal communication, October 27, 1996).

Promoting Internationalization Among Member Institutions

NAICU has not made any attempts to promote internationalization per se and has let the institutional members make those decisions for themselves (M. Budetti, personal communication, October 27, 1996).

Supporting Members’ Efforts to Internationalize

NAICU supports its members’ efforts to internationalize by serving as a:

Convener. NAICU together with Michigan State University and seven other national higher education organizations co-sponsored a major national conference, Study and Learning Abroad: Quality, Value, Access, and Safety, which was held in Washington, D.C., in October 2001.

Public forum. NAICU has used its annual convention to invite speakers to share their views on international education issues.

Facilitator of international partnerships. According to Maureen Budetti (personal communication, October 27, 1996), who is involved with international programs, NAICU is playing a bigger role in facilitating the partnership building between NAICU members and international partners, especially in the context of technical assistance for developing countries.

Many of NAICU’s members are religiously-affiliated institutions and service in the form of outreach is a very important component of their campus culture. NAICU has worked to accommodate an increased interest on the part of its members for developing partnerships and collaborating with other institutions worldwide. At the same time, being
a member of the governing board of HED, NAICU has worked with HED to meet its need for more diversity, by having liberal arts colleges that are members of NAICU participate in HED projects (M. Budetti, personal communication, October 27, 1996).

*Information/resource center.* NAICU has used its website to provide members with legislative updates as it regards international education legislation. NAICU also has tried to provide members with information about possibilities for grants and funding “so as to broaden the understanding of some of our smaller schools and also to support some of their own initiatives that they have in these areas, you know, to get them funding for things they already are trying to do” (M. Budetti, personal communication, October 27, 1996).
Case Study Six: The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

(NASULGC)

Organizational Profile

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) is an association of public universities, land-grant institutions and many of the nation's public university systems. NASULGC is regarded as the oldest of the six major associations (Bloland, 1985; Cook, 1998; King, 1975). In its current form, it represents a merger of three associations, the oldest of which, the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations (AAACES), later known as the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities (ALGCU), was formally established in 1887. The second association, the National Association of State Universities (NASU) was established in 1895 for the purpose of lobbying for a land grant status for each state university (Cook, 1998). The third association, the Association of Separated State Universities, later known as State Universities Association (SUA), was established in 1918 by a number of state universities disgruntled by a perceived inadequate representation of the interests of state universities with no land-grant status (Cook, 1998). Given the broad overlap between the institutional members of each of these associations, in 1963 they merged together and formed the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (Bloland, 1985; Cook, 1998; King, 1975).

As of 2006, NASULGC had 215 institutional members. This number included 76 land-grant universities and 27 public higher education systems each representing 36%, and 12% of NASULGC's membership, respectively. NASULGC institutional members enroll more than 3.2 million students and award 62% of all doctoral degrees. Its members are strongly focused on research and development as can be demonstrated by the fact that
NASULGC member universities include 15 of the country's top 20 universities in total federal spending for research and development expenditures (NASULGC, n.d.g).

NASULGC first established a Washington office in 1939 (Cook, 1998) and has had full-time Washington staff since 1947 (Bloland, 1985). Its interest position has been driven by issues that are important to its members. NASULGC has displayed a strong commitment and dedication to high quality, low-cost public education and to the promotion of graduate study and research. Many of its members are nationally recognized for the quality of their graduate programs (Bloland, 1985; King, 1975; Parson, 1997).

The reputation of NASULGC in Washington has been that of an effective association (Bloland, 1985). This effectiveness has been attributed to the "long tradition of experience in state politics, the prestige of many of their presidents, and the personal skills of their Washington representatives" (King, 1975, p. 22).

The association has a staff of 35. It is governed by a Board of Directors elected by the member institutions. Peter McPherson is serving as NASULGC’s President since January of 2006. NASULGC’s organizational structure consists of 10 councils and 6 commissions. The councils are more specific in nature and, for the most part, reflect the structure and divisions within a university. The commissions, on the other hand, have a broader scope and are cross-disciplinary. They are “analogous to interdisciplinary centers or institutes within a university” (NASULGC, 2005, p. 14).

The variety of councils and commissions that make up NASULGC’s organizational structure is a reflection of the association's wide range of concerns, which include governmental relations, membership issues, research and graduate education, agriculture, marine and urban affairs, health and nutrition, the environment, and the
advancement of black colleges to mention a few. International programs also constitute an area of importance to NASULGC. NASULGC’s *People and Programs*, a publication that provides an in-depth overview of the association, its organization, mission and structure, lists international programs as one of the “specific areas of interest to the association” (2005, p. 7).

*Background on NASULGC’s International Orientation*

International education and international development assistance have been an important part of NASULGC’s agenda for the better half of the 20th century. These aspects of its work continue to be very important to NASULGC due to the importance they hold for its members. The following are some factors that have driven this international orientation for NASULGC:

*Member Involvement in International Development Programs*

Public universities and land-grant colleges, the core of NASULGC membership, have assisted the federal government in carrying out its foreign policy agenda, particularly after WWII. Following President Truman’s Four Point speech in 1949, many public universities and land-grant institutions, in particular, got involved in foreign assistance programs in developing countries. This involvement accelerated even more after the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Amendment of Title XII of this Act in 1975. The 1975 amendment of Title XII was especially advantageous to NASULGC members. It led to the creation of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), which was established in part to “strengthen the capacity of United States land-grant and other eligible universities in program-related agricultural institutional development and research” (as cited in Sherper, 2003, pp. 3-4).
This amendment thus “formalized the land-grant universities’ participation in international development efforts” (NASULGC, 2004b, p. 2).

NASULGC’s institutions continue to be involved in foreign assistance programs; however, as a result of the Title XII amendment in 2000, this focus has gradually shifted from poverty alleviation in developing nations to improvement of human health, research and application of science to solving nutrition and food issues, the environment, as well as training and human capital development. More recently, the assistance has been more collaborative in nature, whereby NASULGC institutions also benefit from this interaction, particularly in research projects (NASULGC, 2004b).

*Outreach and Service Mission of Public Institutions*

According to Ruther (2002), “many of the land-grant institutions conceived agriculture development as a natural outgrowth of their domestic agricultural extension and community service missions” (p. 70). It appears that this commitment has remained relevant to NASULGC institutions. They regard university international development activities as an important form of outreach and as an indicator of a globally competent university that is engaged and involved in finding global solutions (NASULGC, 2004b).

*Broad Expertise in Areas of Development*

The reason NASULGC institutions have been called upon to be involved in development work has had a lot to do with the broad expertise that is readily available on their campuses. As Peter McPherson put it in a letter to Paul V. Applegarth, CEO of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, “land-grant institutions have a wealth of experience and expertise in working . . . on issues as diverse as human capacity training to agricultural development to health care to law” (P. McPherson, personal communication, November 11, 2004).
The International Nature of Public Universities

According to Kerry Bolognese, NASULGC’s Vice President for International Programs, “A lot of our campuses are international. They may have a branch campus. They do joint degrees. They may do twinning . . . . They have programs, and opportunities, and exchanges with other countries and other institutions” (personal communication, October 27, 2006).

Historically, many public universities and land-grant colleges have maintained an international dimension in certain aspects of their work. As beneficiaries of the 1958 NDEA legislation and its various amendments from then on, NASULGC institutions house a large number of the National Foreign Language Resource Centers (LRCs) and National Resource Centers (NRCs), which have served as an essential source for experts in less-commonly taught languages and area studies and continue to be of vital importance for the security of this country.

Furthermore, as beneficiaries of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and its subsequent amendments, many of NASULGC’s institutional members have been able to establish and maintain partnerships with educational institutions or governments in other countries in the context of foreign technical assistance programs, as well as cooperation in the research arena.

Campus Internationalization

While international education and international development assistance has been an important part of the agenda of NASULGC’s members, the focus has been in certain areas and programs, often independently of one another. In 1997, the International Agricultural Section of NASULGC published its strategic plan, whereby it recognized the
need for incorporating an international dimension to teaching, research and extension/outreach missions of NASULGC institutions (NASULGC, 1997).

NASULGC’s call for campus internationalization started to get particularly stronger at the end of the 20th century and the onset of the new millennium. The 2004 NASULGC report *A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University* (*A Call to Leadership*) identified the 2000 NASULGC report entitled *Expanding the International Scope of Universities: A Strategic Vision Statement for Learning, Scholarship and Engagement in the New Century* (*Strategic Vision Statement*) as the starting point for the broader internationalization efforts that have been taking place within NASULGC and its member institutions. While that probably may be correct, in the foreword to the *Strategic Vision Statement*, William E. Kirwan, former Chair of the Commission on International Affairs and C. Peter Magrath, the former President of NASULGC, seemed to consider the work of the Kellog Commission on the Future of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges as the precursor to NASULGC’s renewed efforts to internationalize.

The Kellog Commission was created in 1996 by NASULGC through a $1.2 million grant from the Kellogg Foundation. The charge of the Commission was to analyze changes that public universities were undergoing; to help define the direction they needed to take in the future; and to make recommendations as to how to accomplish this task. The sixth and final report, *Renewing the Covenant: Learning, Discovery, and Engagement in a New Age and a Different World*, that the Kellog Commission put out in March of 2000 stated: “The great international economic, technical, geo-political forces shaping the world are hardly by-passing higher education. We will not only lead new
developments in globalization and technology, we will be reshaped by them” (as cited in NASULGC, 2000c, Foreword section).

Kirwan and Magrath quoted the above statement indicating that the findings of the Kellog Commission spurred the association into establishing a task force on international education and into commissioning a vision statement and guidelines for the internationalization of NASULGC’s campuses (NASULGC, 2000c). The Kellog Commission’s findings prompted the Vision Statement Report, which in turn put into motion the whole process of internationalization of NASULGC campuses.

**Importance of Internationalization**

Addressing an international conference in Salzburg, Austria, C. Peter Magrath, who served as the President of NASULGC until 2005, stated “…Our university leaders believe that universities not fully engaged with students and scholars from other lands are ultimately not worthy of the name ‘university’” (2004, p. 2). Furthermore, in the foreword to the Strategic Vision Statement, Magrath pointed out that “… international education has become a new imperative” (NASULGC, 2000c). The first statement alluded to the need for an international dimension to a university, while the second one was a clear indication of the growing importance of internationalization for university campuses.

Kerry Bolognese, Vice President for International Programs, ranked the importance of internationalization as “very high” in NASULGC’s agenda (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006). According to Bolognese the importance that NASULGC places on internationalization stems from the fact that internationalization is important to its institutional members:
We [our members] are large comprehensive universities and internationalization is such an integral part of these universities. A lot of them offer degrees in some type of international program. But they are all research universities, and international graduate students are absolutely vital to these institutions, so, we have to work here to make sure that federal policy issues don’t encumber the ability of our institutions to secure international students from abroad. So, that’s very important. (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006)

Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006) attributed the importance that NASULGC attaches to internationalization to some other factors as well: “The need for a globally competent workforce in order to be competitive in the world markets, and the need to maintain America’s leadership in the world, for which we need people who understand the world” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

Reference to the importance of internationalization can also be found in a number of NASULGC publications. For instance, NASULGC’s People and Programs listed “promoting international awareness and understanding” as one of “NASULGC’s most important priorities” (NASULGC, 2001, p. 9; NASULGC, 2005, p. 8). A Call to Leadership stated “It [internationalization ] is right for NASULGC institutions. It is integral to our mission to bring together students and scholars, to encourage intellectual exploration, and to support discovery and scholarship that serves the world” (NASULGC, 2004a, p.16). In addition, this report stated that “Internationalization is not the latest academic fad, nor is it a simple add-on to existing practice. It is the single most important challenge of the new century” (NASULGC, 2004a, p. ix).

An examination of various NASULGC documents published after the year 2000 clearly brings to light a sense of urgency with which NASULGC approached the need of public universities to adapt to and deal with the new realities of a global society and economy. In these documents, NASULGC started to underscore the notion that to be successful in the new global environment in which higher education was operating
required public universities to internationalize and to introduce an international
dimension to their teaching, research, and outreach and services functions. It also
emphasized the need for involvement in and endorsement of the internationalization
process on the part of campus leaders in order for these efforts to be successful.

It appears that even after the appointment of Peter McPherson’s as President of
NASULGC in 2006, internationalization continued to be very important in NASULGC’s
agenda; in fact, it became one of NASULGC’s four strategic areas of focus. Early in his
tenure, in a 2006 letter entitled A New NASULGC Agenda that was addressed to
member institutions, President McPherson laid out four major strategic areas that were
going to be the focus of work for NASULGC in the coming years. One of these four
strategic areas was study abroad and internationalization. Referring to these four strategic
areas specified by President McPherson in his 2006 letter to members, Bolognese
(personal communication, October 27, 2006) stated, “It [internationalization] is one of
our four major priorities or major themes.” Again during the interview, he affirmed, “I
mean it’s a strategic priority. Because it’s something that we will continue to do” (K.
Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

Rationales for Internationalization

The interview with Kerry Bolognese and a review of NASULGC documents and
publications reveal some of NASULGC rationales for internationalization. *A Call to
Leadership* spells out four main rationales for internationalization of NASULGC
institutions, namely, “our students…, our communities…, our nation…, our institutions”
(NASULGC, 2004a, pp. 7-8). According to this document, internationalization will assist
students by enabling them to become citizens of the world and to develop diverse and
broad points of view; assist communities by enabling them to stay connected and
competitive in the global economy; assist the nation by enhancing national security, and ensuring the country’s economic competitiveness; assist member institutions by creating new opportunities for cooperation, enriching teaching and research experience of faculty and by bringing them national and international prominence (NASULGC, 2004a). Most of these rationales take the form of academic, social, political, and institutional rationales:

**Academic Rationales**

Academic rationales have emphasized (a) the expansion of students’ education and (b) integrating an international dimension into the curriculum.

*Expansion of students’ education.* According to *A Call to Leadership* internationalization improved the quality of learning when it integrates international perspectives and foreign languages into the curriculum, when it provided opportunities for study and research abroad. It prepared students for citizenship by making them more aware of diversity and global implications of the decision making process. In addition, given how globalization of the world economy was making companies value employees with world experience, it also prepared them for the workplace (NASULGC, 2004a).

*Integrating an international dimension into the curriculum.* According to Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006), “Whatever the discipline is, international is becoming increasingly important to that discipline. And it’s hard to isolate international and not integrate it into the curriculum.”

**Social Rationales**

NASULGC considers study abroad as a means that could assist in the social and cultural development of students:

Part of the education mission is giving students a very broad-range educational experience. That includes experience abroad, study abroad. All our institutions take that very seriously. They work very hard to find ways to send a lot of students abroad. (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006)
Institutional Rationales

The institutional rationales for internationalization that NASULGC has tried to promote include:

Infuse an international dimension to faculty’s teaching and research. According to Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006), “Faculty are enriched when having an international experience, when, you know, they’ve done research abroad, when they lead students abroad, when they can set up institutions, facilities abroad.”

Increase revenue for institutions. NASULGC has promoted internationalization also in economic terms, as a vehicle that “offers colleges and universities a market edge in attracting students and creating a distinctive identity” (NASULGC, 2004a, p. 15).

Build institutional profile and status. NASULGC has also promoted internationalization as “a pathway to national and international distinction” (NASULGC, 2004a, p. 15).

Political Rationales

Three aspects of the political rationales seem to be more prevalent in NASULGC’s literature: (a) national security, (b) public diplomacy, (c) technical assistance to developing countries.

National security. In their advocacy efforts and otherwise, NASULGC has promoted the notion that national security was linked with the United States’ need for and ability to attract the brightest minds and the most talented intellectuals from all corners of the world. The United States benefits when scholars, engineers, scientists from other countries view the United States as open and welcoming and choose it as the destination for their studies. This allows United States to maintain a cutting edge in science and
technology as well as a global leadership role. Public universities play a major role in this regard (NASULGC, 2004a; ACE, 2006).

NASULGC has also considered global competency of American students to be important for national security. "Greater engagement of American undergraduates with the world around them is vital to our nation's national security [and] economic competitiveness" (Bollag, 2005, para. 6).

**Public diplomacy.** NASULGC viewed internationalization as a vehicle for public diplomacy. NASULGC took pride in the numerous foreign leaders who were graduates of its member institutions and who had led distinguished lives in the service of their respective countries or the world.

**Technical assistance to developing countries.** Since after World War II NASULGC has been very instrumental in assisting members in their involvement in foreign assistance programs intended to improve human condition, solve nutrition and food issues, and develop human capital in developing countries.

**Commitment to Internationalization of Higher Education**

NASULGC’s commitment to internationalization appeared to be explicit both in terms of espoused values and organizational structure. We looked at them respectively.

**Stance towards Internationalization**

A review of NASULGC publications provided a glimpse of what internationalization meant for NASULGC. The report *Expanding the International Scope of Universities: A Strategic Vision Statement for Learning, Scholarship and Engagement in the New Century* urged members to “integrate global perspectives and promote international experiences as part of their core mission” (NASULGC, 2000c, p. 1) and infuse internationalization in the functions of teaching and learning, research and
scholarship, and service and outreach. The report went on to say, “as colleges and universities work to move international studies and programs from the periphery to the center of their teaching, research and outreach activities, so too must they refocus their overarching mission to incorporate an international dimension” (NASULGC, 2000c, p. 4).

The publication People and Programs explicitly stated that NASULGC “promotes legislative programs that strengthen public higher education, including the increasingly important national security, information technology, and international arenas [italics added]” (NASULGC, 2005, p. 4).

Organizational Setup for Supporting and Promoting Internationalization

According to Kerry Bolognese, Vice President for International Programs, the internationalization agenda was weaved into NASULGC’s organizational fabric: “It is part of the fabric, of the way we’re structured” (personal communication, October 27, 2006). Again during the interview, he reiterated, “Like I said, we’re structured so that we have international embedded and integrated into our structure . . . .” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

At the policy-making level, it is the Board of Directors that gives the final stamp of approval for any matters international. “They are the ultimate authority” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006). However, there are a number of other entities and constituents involved in the development and execution of internationalization policy for NASULGC: (a) the Commission on International Programs, (b) the Federal Relations Group, (c) the International Agriculture Section (IAS) of the Board on Agriculture Assembly, (d) the Division of International Programs, and (e) the President.
The Commission on International Programs (CIP) is made up of mid-level and senior level administrators involved in international programs at NASULGC universities. “They are the administrators of international programs on their campuses. They can be deans; some of them are vice provosts” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

CIP plays the role of an advisory body for NASULGC on international issues. It consists of one voting member and up to three nonvoting members from interested institutions. It also has representation from the other NASULGC commissions and councils. The commission’s charge includes recommending policies and establishing priorities regarding internationalization issues. The Commission on International Programs defines its scope of work as follows:

*The Commission on International Programs (CIP) seeks to incorporate a global dimension into the learning, discovery, and engagement activities of NASULGC members. It also supports initiatives in Congress, federal agencies, and multilateral development banks to enlarge the international component of academic exchanges, research, and development programs. The Commission promotes the international mission and activities of NASULGC member institutions including advocacy for internationally relevant curricular, research, and student and faculty exchange issues.* (NASULGC, n.d.f)

The Commission has four standing committees: (a) International Exchange and Matriculation Committee; (b) International Development Committee; (c) Academic Affairs Committee; and (d) Federal, State Private Sector Relations Committee. The Commission holds two formal meetings during the year – one takes places during the summer (usually July) and the other one coincides with NASULGC’s annual meeting (usually in November). An Executive Committee sets the direction for the work of the commission (NASULGC, n.d.a).

In a true academic style, the recommendations put forth by this commission are usually developed collaboratively, often via task forces. These task forces consist of
representatives from NASULGC member institutions, thus giving more legitimacy to their findings and recommendations.

*Federal Relations Group.* The Federal Relations Group consists of staff responsible for specific legislative areas. One area of interest for the Federal Relations Group is international programs. They try to advance members’ interests in Congress and to keep them informed about new legislative developments, such as study abroad legislation, visa issues, and appropriations and funding for various programs. They also work with other higher-education associations to formulate and to develop policy positions regarding these issues (NASULGC, n.d.e). The Group provides consultation and support to the Commission for International Programs, the International Agricultural Section, as well as the Vice President for International Programs.

*The International Agriculture Section (IAS) of the Board on Agriculture* Assembly. The roots of the International Agriculture Section can be traced back to the early 1960s, as public universities assisted the federal government with its international development agenda. In 1961, as a result of disagreements with USAID, the main federal agency with which universities partnered in their foreign assistance efforts, NASULGC established its own international agricultural affairs office. This office together with ACE’s international unit was then actively involved in contract negotiations with federal agencies for foreign assistance, representing the interests of higher education institutions (Ruther, 2002).

Currently, it is known as the International Agriculture Section (IAS) of the Board on Agriculture Assembly. IAS consists of individuals that head the international agricultural programs in the colleges of agriculture of NASULGC member institutions or one of their designees. Each institution that is a member of IAS has a vote in its decision
making process. At present, IAS has about 100 members. The Chair of IAS also serves as the IAS representative on the Executive Committee of the NASULGC Commission on International Programs (NASULGC, 2002a).

IAS defines its mission as follows:

The International Agriculture Section (IAS) promotes, facilitates, and supports the international agricultural, food, and environmental programs and activities of members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). Through IAS, NASULGC members accomplish tasks that are best approached as collaborative efforts among U.S. institutions and with institutions overseas. These include: (a) exchange of faculty, students, staff and information to facilitate the internationalization of curricula and programs within our member universities, and (a) federal relations activities with the executive and legislative branches of government to ensure an appreciation of the role of universities in international agricultural, food, and environmental programs. (NASULGC, 2002a, p. 1)

IAS strives to provide assistance to members with regards to a better understanding of NASULGC’s role in international development. It assists members with their internationalization efforts. It also tries to expand resources for various international development programs and to improve member access to such resources (NASULGC, 2002a).

IAS is made up of five standing committees: (a) the Executive Committee, (b) the Nominating Committee, (c) the Program Committee, (d) the Strategic Planning Committee, and (e) the International Agriculture Coordinating Committee (IACC). The latter “serves as the legislative and advocacy committee of the International Agriculture Section” (NASULGC, 2002a, p. 4) and is responsible for dealing with Congress and federal agencies to promote programs and budgets that are important to IAS. It also works towards establishing and maintaining coalitions with other parties interested in international development
The Division of International Programs. The Vice President for International Programs is “the primary agent for implementing the internationalization agenda” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006). The Division of International Programs was established in 2006, when Peter McPherson became president, “as part of his effort to mirror the comparable positions on campus” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, May 21, 2007).

NASULGC’s staff involved in international issues consists of two-full time positions – the VP for International Programs and a staff assistant, and one part-time position – the Associate Vice President of International Development, who mostly focuses on issues of international development. The operating budget for the Division of International Programs is approximately $35,000 budget, excluding salaries (K. Bolognese, personal communication, May 21, 2007).

The Division of International Programs is one of five, out of ten divisions, that has a budgeted vice president position. The Vice President for International Programs has “the overall responsibility for seeing that all Board decisions in this area are implemented appropriately” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006). In Bolognese’s words (personal communication, October 27, 2006), “It’s a pretty broad responsibility.” The Vice President for International Programs works with members of the Internationalization Commission and the International Agricultural Section members, as well as the president, “trying to make sure that we’re implementing what we’re supposed to implement.” The Division of International Programs sees itself as “work[ing] on behalf of our universities; so, it’s the Commission and the International Agriculture Section that will get involved on their campuses to try to integrate what we’re doing here on the campus level” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).
The President. The President of NASULGC is also an important actor in the area of internationalization, not only by virtue of the position itself, but also because of the background and the passion for international issues of the person who occupies that position. Peter McPherson replaced C. Peter Magrath as NASULGC’s President and has been serving in that capacity since January 1, 2006. In the words of former Michigan Governor, John Englar:

The selection of President McPherson to head NASULGC is an inspired choice. He combines outstanding higher education credentials with keen awareness of the importance of higher education to America’s ability to compete in the global economy. And his innovations in international education alone put him at the head of the class. (as cited in Fields, Denbow, & McPherson, 2005)

This statement makes reference to the vast experiences McPherson has had in the international arena, which include among others being the Administrator of USAID (United States Agency for International Development), the Chair of the Board of International Food and Agriculture Development (BIFAD); Founder and Co-chair of the Partnership to Cut Hunger and Poverty in Africa. Also, during his tenure as President of the Michigan State University he developed one of the largest and most innovative study abroad programs in the country. In October 2004, McPherson was appointed chair of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Commission, which Congress established in an effort to expand the number of students who have an opportunity to have an educational experience abroad. As previously stated, very early in his tenure he emphasized internationalization as one of the strategic areas of work for NASULGC and has been actively involved in the pushing for the study abroad legislation.

Interaction among the stakeholders. In spite of the fact that there are a number of constituents involved in international issues, it appears that NASULGC has developed a way to coordinate the efforts of the different constituents:
The Chair of the CIP has a seat on the NASULGC Board, so, that person does have input into the president. CIP has a summer meeting and a number of individuals from the International Agriculture Section attend. The Section is a voting member of the CIP Executive Committee, and the Federal Relations Group (CGA) also has a voting member on the CIP Executive Committee. As the VP, I am responsible for ensuring appropriate interaction among the groups. (K. Bolognese, personal communication, May 21, 2007)

As mentioned earlier, the Federal Relations Group advises and assists CIP and IAS in their advocacy efforts regarding international programs.

Approaches to Internationalization

According to Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006), one of the associations’ main areas of focus with respect to internationalization has been “building internationalization on the campus and that includes making sure that it’s across campus; it’s integrated across, not only the curriculum but in its social, cultural life of the campus.”

From the interview with Mr. Bolognese and a review of NASULGC documents, it appears that NASULGC has moved in the direction of promoting a strategic process approach to internationalization. The process approach is more comprehensive in nature – it combines the activity approach (internationalization as a series of activities) and competency approach (concern with the human element – faculty staff and students’ learning and outcomes). At the same time, this approach stresses the need for internationalization to be integrated across the campus and the need for the engagement of institutional leaders in the process.

A review of NASULGC literature and documents revealed that NASULGC has been very open and clear about the importance of a strategic approach to internationalization as a campus-wide initiative that requires the involvement of institutional leaders. This point of view was evident in a number of documents and
reports. *The Strategic Vision Statement* urged member institutions to treat international experience as an integral part of their mission and infuse it in their institution’s core functions (NASULGC, 2000c). It also cautioned NASULGC members about “the need to invest more human and financial resources in the task of comprehensively internationalizing their programs if they are to fulfill their responsibilities in a global society and economy” (NASULGC, 2000c, p. 1).

In addition to the goal of making internationalization an integral part of the university’s mission and strategic plan, the report presented public universities with six other recommendations to consider such as, (a) promoting student involvement in significant international experiences, (b) providing a supportive environment for international students and scholars, (c) increasing the international activity of faculty and professional staff, (d) internationalizing the curriculum, (e) ensuring the internationalization efforts cut across disciplines, and (f) ensuring the internationalization efforts become part of outreach and extension activities (NASULGC, 2000b; NASULGC, 2000c, p. 1). In turn, these actions would contribute towards the achievement of the broader goal of making internationalization an integral part of the university’s mission and strategic plan.

A pivotal moment in NASULGC’s efforts to emphasize the need for institutionalizing internationalization on the campuses of its member institutions was a resolution that the Commission on International Programs (CIP) issued in the summer of 2002. In this resolution, the Commission on International Programs called upon the presidents and chancellors of member institutions “to embrace internationalization of their campus activities as a priority in order to achieve global competence” and urged the Board of Directors “to establish of a task force to explore ways NASULGC institutions
can develop and implement strategies that increase global competency” (NASULGC, 2002b, para.10).

The Statement of Purpose of the Task Force on International Education that the Board of Directors established in November of that year reflects the high importance of International Education in NASULGC’s agenda, its commitment to it, as well as the intent of approaching it as a campus-wide initiative. Among other things, it announced, “The initiative will be known as *Institutionalizing the Campus Commitment to Internationalization, Throughout the Institution and Curriculum* (NASULGC, n.d.d, para. 1). Again, in the words of the NASULGC Task Force on International Education, “If we are to maintain our place at the forefront of the world’s institutions of learning, we must truly be universities and colleges of the world. To make that claim we must internationalize our mission – our learning, discovery and engagement. And it is the presidents and chancellors who must lead the change” (NASULGC, 2004a, p. v.).

Involvement of institutional leaders in the internationalization process is key to a strategic approach to internationalization. The 2000 *Strategic Vision Statement* report recommended that universities integrate global perspectives into the functions of the university and to make internationalization part of their core mission. The 2004 *A Call to Leadership* report, whose targeted audience was university presidents and chancellors, went a little further. It recommended that university presidents and chancellors make it their responsibility to internationalize their campuses. The report stated:

Internationalization does not involve tweaking the academy around the edges. It will require substantive, transformative change at all levels. That change will be possible only with the determined leadership of the presidents and chancellors. It will require a focus on the ‘3 A’s of presidential leadership’ – to articulate, to advocate, and act. (NASULGC, 2004a, p viii)
Another statement from the *A Call to Leadership* report highlighted both, the importance of internationalization as a campus-wide endeavor and the need for the commitment of institutional leadership: “Internationalizing our colleges and universities will require transforming our institutions – a transformation that demands the committed leadership of presidents and chancellors” (NASULGC, 2004a, p. 5).

Notwithstanding the significance of the messages relayed in these reports and other NASULGC documents, it is important to point out that these documents were intended to serve as resources, roadmaps, guidelines, reference, or benchmarks for member institutions. The members had to make their own judgment with regards to what works best for their institution and how to apply these recommendations. Kerry Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006) explained this approach as he referred to a recent NASULGC report called *A National Agenda for Internationalizing Higher Education*: “And again, this is more of a vision document, where it sets some goals, so that our institutions, you know, they have something to look at and they can hold on to.”

**Mapping Involvement**

In broad terms, NASULGC’s internationalization efforts have consisted in advocating for legislation and funding that supports international issues and programs that are of interest to its members, promoting internationalization to members, and assisting them in their efforts to internationalize their campuses.

*Advocacy Efforts for International Programs*

NASULGC advocacy efforts for international programs has taken place both at the federal and the state level. Most of NASULGC institutions are flagship institutions and they rely on the state legislatures to finance some of their international efforts.
Because of the wide diversity of issues and programs at the state level, we will focus only on NASULGC’s advocacy at the federal level.

Kerry Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006) listed, in no order of priority, the study-abroad legislation, visa policy issues, Title VI of HEA, and the funding for Higher Education for Development (HED) as the main issues that top the association’s advocacy efforts in the area of internationalization at the federal level.

*Study-abroad legislation.* NASULGC took the lead in advocating for a study-abroad legislation. To a large degree, their efforts focused on lobbying for a legislation that would allow the creation of an Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program:

That has been one of our priorities. We have worked very hard at it. We work through our institutions; we have presidents calling their senators to co-sponsor the legislation; we have written letters to Secretary Rice, to OMB Director [Rob] Portman; we’ve written letters to Congress. That’s a major area of activity. (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006)

During the interview, Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006) seemed pleased to admit “…not only were we able to introduce that legislation, but we were able to pick up 34 co-sponsors in a little over a month.” The legislation Mr. Bolognese was referring to was the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Act of 2006, S. 3744. By the time the 109th Congress ended its session the bill enjoyed strong bipartisan support and the number of co-sponsors increased to 46. Senators Dick Durbin (D-IL) and Norm Coleman (R-MN) reintroduced the bill in the Senate in 2007 (Edelson and Sullivan, 2007). The U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed the bill on February 13, 2008. The next step was for the bill to clear the Senate and become law.

Part of the reason for NASULGC took the lead in pushing for the study abroad legislation had to do with the fact that in October 2004 Congress appointed two NASULGC representatives to be in charge of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad
Commission – Peter McPherson, the then-president of the Michigan State University, was appointed as Chair of the Commission and William B. DeLauder, President Emeritus of Delaware State University was appointed as its Executive Director. This choice was probably not only a reflection of the accomplishments of the two university presidents, but also a reflection of the positive examples that NASULGC members were setting in the area of study abroad. For instance, as President of the Michigan State University, Mr. McPherson has been credited with creating an outstanding study abroad program that sends more than 2,000 students per year in over 50 countries (ACE, n.d., Overview section).

The study abroad legislation aimed at reaching three objectives:

1. Having one million students studying abroad on an annual basis by the year 2016-2017. According to McPherson, “One million students studying abroad per year will transform our country, in a positive and powerful way. For the American workforce to be competitive in the global marketplace, our students need experience in and knowledge about the world outside the U.S.” (as cited in Edelson & Sullivan, 2007)

2. Providing opportunities for underrepresented groups of students to participate in study abroad. The intent of this legislation was to ensure that the study abroad participants better reflected today’s demographics on the American campuses. The Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005) called it “democratizing study abroad” (p. vii). This would lead to “…increasing the number of underrepresented students that have an opportunity to study abroad. Right now it’s two thirds white women. We’d like to see more men, more black men and more Hispanics” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).
3. Diversifying the study abroad destination countries. “We’re working to see our students in non-traditional destinations, not only western Europe” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

Visa policy issues. Restrictions on international student visas put in place after 9/11, for national security reasons, had the unintended consequence of leading to a drop of applications and enrollment of graduate international students in the U.S. colleges and universities. A Call to Leadership report has warned that this drop in international student enrollment could lead to “…serious implications for the graduate programs at many institutions that depend on foreign student enrollment and for the future ability of higher education to meet America’s demand for a highly qualified science and technology workforce drawn from home and abroad” (NASULGC, 2004a, p. 4). Given the fact that its membership consists of research institutions, NASULGC has realized the importance of international students for its institutional members. “…international graduate students are absolutely vital to these institutions, so, we have to work here to make sure that federal policy issues don’t encumber the ability of our institutions to secure international students from abroad” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

NASULGC has worked with members and other associations to develop an appropriate response to restrictions on international student visas. Some of the efforts to improve the visa situation include: (a) sending letters to Congress and the administration with “recommendations for an improved system for tracking foreign students” (NASULGC, 2002b), (b) calling on university presidents to engage in national and state policy advocacy to preserve international students and faculty exchange (NASULGC,
2004a), and (c) working together with other associations and members of the higher education community.

During the time between 2001 and 2006, NASULGC advocated for an efficient visa processing system. In May 2004, NASULGC was part of a joint statement that the higher education community addressed to the federal government. After documenting the substantial drop in applications and enrollment of graduate international in U.S. research institutions for the academic year 2004-2005, the statement made six concrete recommendations to address issues such as lengthy delays, lack of transparency and inconsistency in the visa-issuance process, and the impediments caused by the fee collection mechanism under the proposed SEVIS [Student and Exchange Visitor Information System] (Amarelo and Toiv, 2004).

It appears that the efforts of NASULGC and the rest of the education community have paid off, particularly regarding foreign science students and scholars through the Visas Mantis program. While all the education community supported the effort NASULGC together with AAU and ACE took a leading role, due to the direct implications that visa delays for science students would have for their research institutional members. “We continue to have improvements by engaging the administration. The time it used to take to issue a visa for a science scholar has been greatly reduced” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006). According to the United States Government Office of Accountability (2005), an investigative arm of Congress, the processing time for a foreign science student or scholar visa was reduced from 67 days in 2003 to 15 days on average in 2004.

*Title VI international programs.* Title VI of the HEA is a very important piece of legislature for international programs at U.S. universities and particularly so for many
NASULGC institutions. “There is another element that we strongly advocate for ….It is Title VI of the Higher Education Act. That is very important for our own institutions. I mean, that is the funding for international programs on our campuses. They do the Language Resource Centers and they do National Resource Centers, and the area studies programs. Probably two thirds of them are on our campuses, probably even higher, but I am going to say two thirds” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

Most of the efforts are geared towards preserving funding for the different Title VI programs from the threat of perennial cuts. Title VI is one of the advocacy issues that enjoys the wide support of the higher education community and benefits from the collective advocacy effort.

_Funding for Higher Education for Development (HED)_.

NASULGC’s efforts in the area of international development have aimed at:

Increasing the ability of our institutions to work with institutions abroad, whether it’s research, teaching or extension, doing joint research projects, technical assistance, agriculture programs, institution building and distance learning, long-term training, which is basically degree training, bringing students from developing countries to the United States to get degrees in agricultural science. (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006)

Collaborative research support programs (CRISPs) constitutes one of the areas for universities in international development that has benefited from NASULGC’s advocacy efforts. CRISPs are cooperative agreements between USAID and U.S. universities and other research organizations. There are 9 programs under CRISPs. They were mandated under Title XII of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975 and they provide graduate training as part of their broad research efforts (Sherper, 2003).

The success of NASULGC’s advocacy efforts consisted in the fact that “First of all, we were able to maintain or increase funding for what is called collaborative research support programs . . . . It’s perennially subject to cuts and elimination, but we’ve always
been able to keep that from happening” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006). In addition, NASULGC has worked with and through BIFAD to ensure a good relationship between USAID and its member institutions involved in development programs, by trying to address member concerns about the sometimes heavy-handed approach on the part of USAID, or its lack of proper scrutiny of the credentials of some institutions selected to receive the grants (Price, personal communication, June 14, 2004).

In addition to its internal resources, NASULGC has sought to support its internationalization efforts by creating consortia and by building strategic alliances. For instance, in order to expand international exchanges it has cooperated with the Association of International Education Administrators, while to fund these international exchanges it has had the support of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange. Other organizations such as the Association for International Agricultural and Rural Development, Citizens Democracy Corps and World Food Day and InterAction have been instrumental in supporting NASULGC’s effort to fund international development (NASULGC, n.d.b).

NASULGC has worked particularly closely with the other five presidential associations on all the four issues regarding international programs that were elaborated earlier. Collectively they have developed agreements or built coalitions to facilitate their advocacy efforts. One such instrument has been Higher Education for Development (HED), a cooperative agreement between the Big Six and USAID. The six presidential associations are the governing body for HED whose primary focus is “to create and advance partnerships between institutions of higher education in the United States, across the board – 2-year colleges, private, public, small, large and institutions in developing
countries on specific thematic areas” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

Another such instrument has been the Coalition for International Education, “the primary effort of higher education institutions to promote the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays sections at the Department of Education” (NASULGC, n.d.e).

In the advocacy arena, NASULGC has sought to play the role of an advocate as well as that of a collaborator and coalition builder. However, it is important to point out that except for the Study Abroad Legislation where NASULGC openly admitted to having taken the lead, in all the other advocacy areas they acknowledge that they have worked together with the rest of the Big Six and or other associations and the accomplishments were attributed to their joint efforts. For instance, referring to the Title VI legislation, Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006) said, “That’s very important to us. The reason that I didn’t identify that right off the bat, even though it’s the singularly most important piece of legislation, the most important thing to our institutions, is because the community as a whole gets behind that, the Big Six get behind that.” Also, with reference to the advocacy efforts for funding universities in international development, he reiterated a similar stance, “We do our own part; we send letters and we do our own advocacy, but I think that survives because of the efforts of the entire community” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

**Promoting Internationalization Among Member Institutions**

A resolution that the Commission on International Programs (CIP) issued in the summer of 2002 clearly defines CIP’s role both as a promoter of the integration of internationalization in the university campuses and a supporter of the efforts of its member institutions to increase global competence on their campuses. NASULGC’s
efforts to promote the integration of internationalization across the campuses of its member institutions have consisted in:

*Helping members get a better understanding of internationalization.* NASULGC has attempted to explain what’s at stake and why, and has provided guidelines and strategies on what can be done and how. Working with Knight’s 1997 definition of internationalization (see chapter 3), which is a widely-accepted definition among the research community, NASULGC understood the need for building a constituency in support of internationalization. To this effect, it created two work groups to address this issue. The first one, the Strategic Vision Committee was charged with developing a vision and a roadmap of how to integrate internationalization across the campus. This was achieved with the 2000 report *Expanding the International Scope of Universities: A Strategic Vision Statement for Learning, Scholarship and Engagement in the New Century.*

The charge of the second work group – the Task Force on International Education – was “to increase the capacity of NASULGC institutions to strengthen campus structure and strategies to enhance international education, and to improve students’ global competence” (NASULGC, n.d.d, para. 1). In 2004, the findings of the task force were published in the form of a report called *A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University*, which consisted of a set of recommendations regarding strategies for internationalization of both large, research-driven universities, historically known for their international orientation, as well as for the smaller public universities in order to expand access and international opportunities to all its members’ campuses (NASULGC, n.d.d, para. 2).
In 2004, IAS also came out with a *Strategic Plan for Enhancing the Global Engagement of Land-Grant Universities*, whereby it emphasized the importance of global competency, study abroad and international exchanges, internationalization of the curriculum, expansion of public understanding of global issues, providing global learning to leaders in agriculture, and developing products for the international markets (NASULGC, 2004a).

*Disseminating information.* (See “Clearing house for information exchanges and update,” pp.246-248 of this document)

*Recognizing outstanding achievements.* Another way of promoting internationalization to member institutions is by recognizing outstanding contributions in this area. To this end, in 2000, CIP established an international leadership award dedicated to the memory of Michael P. Malone (1940-1999), President of Montana State University and Chair of the Commission on International Programs. *The Michael P. Malone International Leadership Award* recognizes significant contributions in international education on the part of CEOs and key university administrators (Track I), faculty and staff of member institutions who have provided outstanding leadership to the development of international programs (Track II), as well as public officials and individuals that have contributed in building international programs on NASULGC campuses (Track III). The nominations are made by member institutions and two awards are given out annually providing national recognition for a career of outstanding contributions that furthers international education of state and land-grant institutions (NASULGC, n.d.c).
Supporting Members’ Efforts to Internationalize

According to Kerry Bolognese (personal communication, October 27, 2006), campus-wide integration of internationalization is part of the strategic plan of most NASULGC members. NASULGC sees its role to be that of a supporter. “NASULGC’s role is to assist them in their efforts” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

People and Programs stated, “NASULGC will work with its member universities to help them integrate a global perspective and promote international experiences as central to their academic, scholarly and outreach missions. It also works with members to foster partnerships in the U.S. and abroad to promote these goals” (NASULGC, 2005, p. 9). NASULGC has supported its members’ efforts to internationalize by serving as a:

Public forum. During NASULGC annual convention, the CIP and IAS usually sponsor international sessions on their own or jointly with other commissions or councils to discuss with member institutions international issues at hand and get feedback from them.

Resource center. NASULGC serves as a resource center by providing members with data and information through its publications and its website, by putting its office resources at their disposal, by sponsoring and hosting meetings and by providing assistance. According to Bolognese (personal communication, October, 2007), the administrators in charge of the international programs at it member institutions, “look to us as one of their resources, because that’s what we’re here for.”

Data center. As mentioned earlier, NASULGC has surveyed members to assess the impact of certain conditions or to solicit their opinion regarding certain issues. The findings were then published and disseminated among members in the form of
publications or were posted on the association’s website. For instance, in the fall of 2002, NASULGC surveyed member institutions to assess the impact that the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks had on international student enrollment on their campuses. Again, in 2004, concerned about the possibility of the United States not being the destination of choice for international students due to policy changes in the student visa process, NASULGC in collaboration with AAU, ACE and some other associations conducted a joint national survey for the purpose of assessing the trends in foreign student enrollment.

At the time when the interview took place (2006), NASULGC was working on creating a web-based survey for the purpose of monitoring the progress that NASULGC institutions had made over the years and sharing it with other members. “We’ll ask them a series of questions, we’ll do this once a year, and we’ll ask for best practices; so that will also be helpful to our institutions when they see some of these data and some of the best practices” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

**Clearing house for information exchanges and updates.** NASULGC has used various means to spotlight efforts and achievements in the area of internationalization and to keep members up-to-date with new developments in the funding arena and changes in the legislation. Some of the most means NASULGC has used for this purpose include:

1. **NASULGC’s annual conference.** NASULGC uses its annual conferences, a major event that attracts close to 1,000 attendees, to disseminate the findings of studies, reports, and recommendations regarding on international programs. For instance, the Strategic Vision Committee, the Task Force on International Education, and International Agriculture Section all released their findings during NASULGC’s annual conference in 2000, 2004, and 2004 respectively.

2. **Various reports and publications.** A number of important documents and
reports have been published and distributed to members – *The Strategic Vision Statement* report by the Strategic Vision Committee; *A Call to Leadership*” by the Task Force on International Education and *The Strategic Plan for Enhancing the Global Engagement of Land-Grant Universities* by the International Agricultural Section – in an effort to assist members in understanding the various aspects of internationalization and strategies on how to go about it.

3. **NASULGC’s official website.** Another very helpful tool that NASULGC has employed to report on its efforts in the area of internationalization, as well as those of its members, has been NASULGC’s official website. It is user friendly and it is packed with information and documents regarding NASULGC activities in the internationalization arena.

4. **Newsline.** NASULGC has used *Newsline* – a monthly NASULGC publication – to report and share with members (a) various internationalization efforts such as, the recommendations made by the Strategic Vision Committee and the Task Force on International Education and the progress made in following those recommendations, (b) best institutional practices in international administration, (c) information about increased advocacy efforts regarding the study abroad programs and the student/scholar visa policy issues, and (d) funding for various international programs.

5. **Sharing best practices and obstacles.** NASULGC has assisted members’ internationalization efforts by facilitating the sharing of best practices with respect to international administration. On its website, NASULGC has created and posted a document that includes best institutional practices submitted by member institutions. In November 2001, NASULGC published *Major Obstacles and Best Practices in International Educational Exchange* [by Rea Aslup and Everett Egginton in cooperation
with NASULGC Commission on International Programs and Standing Commission on International Exchange and Matriculation]. The publication was an analysis and interpretation of the findings of a survey regarding members’ best practices and obstacles in international exchange. NASULGC has also promoted the sharing of best practices through its Newsline and the international session of its annual conference.

*Facilitator.* NASULGC has also helped members in their effort to attract new foreign students as well as in creating linkages with other institutions abroad.

“NASULGC assists institutions in marketing themselves abroad, it’s making sure they can attract more students; create strategies for making the international students really want to go to their campus and that has also to do with policy and that kind of stuff” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

One effort in creating linkages with other institutions abroad was the Memorandum of Understanding between NASULGC and the Intern-University Conference for Agricultural and Related Sciences in Europe, signed in April 2000. The purpose of this endeavor was cooperation for mutual benefits between land-grant universities and European universities in such areas as curriculum development, distance learning and research, exchange programs for students, administrators and faculty (NASULGC, 2000a).
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter includes the following sections: (a) theoretical framework [revisited], (b) a summary of the study and the research process, (c) the summary of findings and the discussion of these findings, (d) conclusions, (e) limitations of the study, (f) implications for research and practice, and (g) recommendations for future research.

Theoretical Framework Revisited

The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in the literature on internationalization of higher education and the literature on the major higher education associations. There are some important points where the literature on internationalization and the literature on the major associations intersect as regards the subject of this study:

1. Research indicated that internationalization is increasingly becoming “an integral part of higher education” (Deetman, 1996, p. 32). Given the importance that internationalization is assuming on college and university campuses, internationalization issues must be a defining concern for the major associations of higher education, since one of their main purposes is to serve institutional members.
2. Research also indicated that, although the internationalization processes is mostly taking place at the institutional level, “the national/sector level has an important influence on the international dimension through policy, funding programs, and regulatory frameworks” (Knight, 2004, p. 5). In that context, although the major higher-education associations are viewed as external agents, research suggested that they have a role to play in the internationalization of American campuses. They can carry out their role in the internationalization of higher education by providing assistance, outside moral support, pressure, additional funding, nurturing, and the legitimization of a pro-internationalization culture (Ruther, 2002).

3. Internationalization has been defined as a campus-wide strategic process, whose success requires and depends on the full endorsement and commitment on the part of the institutional leadership (Ellingboe, 1998; Knight, 1997, 1999; Pickert and Turlington, 1992). These two important variables – campus-wide strategic process and institutional leadership commitment – underscore the important role the major associations of higher education can play in this endeavor, given that the presidents of colleges and universities are the designated principal institutional representatives in these associations and that the major associations represent the institution as a whole (Cook, 1998).

4. Given that the main functions of the major associations consist of representing members, influencing policy, and providing services to members, the major associations can influence internationalization on two fronts (a) as part of their policy agenda through representation and advocacy for international programs at the federal level and (b) by assisting their institutional members in their internationalization efforts as a service to members.
Summary of the Study and the Research Process

The primary purpose of this study was to analyze the role(s) and map the involvement of the six major national associations of higher education in the area of internationalizing American higher education as it related to: (a) their advocacy efforts with regards to internationalization of higher education; (b) their efforts in promoting internationalization among their members and, (c) their efforts in assisting members’ internationalization endeavors.

The six major associations of higher education that were the subject of this study included: the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the American Council on Education (ACE), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC).

There were three main assumptions for selecting the major national associations, otherwise known as the institutional or presidential associations, as the focus of this study. Ruther (2002) identified two types of associations as being involved in the internationalization of higher education policy arena: (a) the disciplinary associations and (b) the institutional associations. The disciplinary associations represent specific disciplines, while the major associations represent the institution as a whole. This important distinction made institutional associations an interesting subject for this study, given that the study was working with Jane Knight’s definition of internationalization according to which internationalization is seen as a strategic institution-wide process.

Secondly, the major associations are presidentially-based associations, meaning that the presidents of the colleges and universities are the designated principal
institutional representatives (Cook, 1998). The study worked with the premise that since
the presidents of the institutions were the designated principal institutional
representatives in the major associations, in turn the major associations were better
positioned to play a major role in the internationalization of member campuses. This
assumption was grounded on research (Ellingboe, 1998; Knight, 1997, 1999; Pickert &
Turlington, 1992) that indicated that internationalization of higher education is a strategic
process that requires full endorsement and commitment on the part of the institutional
leadership in order to be successful.

This assumption was further confirmed during the interview with Madeleine
Green, Vice President of International Initiatives at ACE. Commenting on the role of
different associations as actors in the internationalization of higher education, she stated:

I think NAFSA and AIEA have been very important for professional development
activities for their members, but their members are not in a position to influence
campus strategy without senior leaders; it’s the presidents and the provosts who
will ultimately decide how much of a priority internationalization is. (M. Green,
personal communication, November 6, 2006)

Thirdly, the study worked on the premise that, since the six major associations
represent 95% of the entire American higher education (Ruther, 2002), and they serve as
the interface between their institutional members and the federal government, they are
better positioned than any other type of association to play a major role in the
internationalization of the American higher education.

The purpose of this study was accomplished through the use of the case study
research method. A review of the literature revealed that there was very little research
done to depict the involvement of the major higher-education associations in
internationalizing American higher education. Since this specific topic had not been
studied much, it lent itself to the case study method, which is an appropriate form of
The study employed a descriptive multiple-case study design. According to Merriam, (1998) a descriptive case study “presents a detailed account of the phenomenon under study” (p. 38) without being interested in developing any hypothesis. The multi-case design was used to accommodate the study of the six major associations individually.

The data for the study were collected mainly through two sources: the personal interview and document analysis. A personal interview was conducted with a representative in charge of internationalization programs from each of the six major associations. All the interviews were face to face interviews, except for one. Because of scheduling conflict, one interview was conducted over the phone.

A protocol of interview questions was developed (see Appendix A). The study made use of the standardized or structured interview format in order to "minimize errors" (Fontana & Frey, 1994, p. 364) and to increase consistency (Folwer, 1984). By offering each participant the same questions, the assumption was that the responses to those questions ideally would be comparable (Berg, 2001). The interview protocol consisted of 21 open- and close-ended questions that probed into issues that were being explored by the study's research questions. The interviews were transcribed verbatim. Together with the documents collected and the case study notes, they formed the database of the case study.

The other source of data was document analysis. According to Merriam (1998), documents constitute a major source of data in qualitative research because of the amount of information that they may provide and because they may help corroborate the accounts
of other respondents. The study analyzed documents, reports, annual reports, press releases, and other publications issued by the associations themselves and by other sources, whenever that was possible.

The interviews and documents allowed the collection of data on a number of very important aspects of the research questions, such as (a) the level of importance of internationalization for the major associations; (b) their commitment to internationalization; (c) rationales for internationalization; (d) the role(s) they have played in internationalizing American higher education; and (e) the mapping of their involvement as regards advocating for international programs, promoting internationalization of higher education, and supporting the internationalization efforts of their member campuses.

Each association constitutes one unit of analysis and represents a case study on its own. The individual cases were analyzed along categories and subcategories that emerged from the research questions as well as from the data (see Appendix E). The individual case study reports represent a detailed analysis of each major association’s involvement in internationalization. They constitute Chapter Four of this study.

Each individual case study report contributed in the writing of the comparative case report that emerged as a cross-case analysis of the role that institutional associations have played in internationalizing American higher education. The cross-case report utilized the same categories used for writing the individual case studies. This report constitutes the *Summary and Discussion of Major Findings* section of Chapter Five. In addition, the cross-case report included some additional information regarding collaboration among the major associations in the area of internationalization.
Summary and Discussion of the Major Findings

This section presents the findings of the study in a comparative format, trying to point out similarities and differences among the major national associations regarding the following aspects or categories: (a) the importance they have placed on internationalization; (b) their commitment to internationalization both in terms of their stance towards internationalization and their organizational set-up to assist in the internationalization process, including the human and financial resources dedicated to it; (c) their approach to and their role in advancing the issue of internationalization; (d) the kinds of roles they have played in assisting member institutions in their internationalization efforts; (e) and the activities in which they have been involved. Finally, it looks briefly into the cooperation among the six major national associations in the internationalization arena.

Importance of Internationalization

International education has been a part of the major associations’ agenda for many decades. Its significance, however, experienced a dramatic upward shift starting in the early to mid-1990s and onwards, in the form of a better understanding of higher education’s need to pursue campus internationalization. This understanding was stimulated by their realization of the important role an internationalized higher education can play in preparing students with global competencies, in maintaining America’s leadership role in the world, and in preserving the country’s national security.

With the exception of NAICU, which ranked campus internationalization as “a low to medium priority,” the other major associations ranked internationalization as “a high priority” in their organization’s agenda. NAICU attributed this kind of ranking to the fact that NAICU’s priorities had to do with three issues – student aid, tax policy, and
regulation of the private colleges and universities (M. Budetti, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

The reason most quoted for why internationalization was important to the major associations was “because it is important to members.” As institutionally-based associations, they felt obligated to address this membership need. The second most quoted reason why internationalization was important to the major associations had to do with the interest shown by international institutions and governments for greater cooperation with U.S. institutions and vice versa. A third reason that was mentioned had to do with the declaration of internationalization as “an area of strategic focus” for a number of the major associations.

Some other themes that emerged as to why internationalization was so important to the presidential associations included (not in any ranking order):

1. Globalization and the realization that we live in a global world and that higher education has an obligation to prepare a globally competent workforce.

2. The realization that international education has become a new imperative.

3. A growing realization of the important role international education can play for promoting peace, cultural understanding, and national security.

4. The need to maintain America’s leadership in the world and to ensure America’s competitiveness in the world markets.

The study was interested to find out whether internationalization was an area of strategic importance for the major associations. Except for AACC, internationalization was not part of the major associations’ mission statement per se. For the majority of
them, however, it had become a part of their organization’s strategic direction or one of their areas of strategic focus.

Although the presidential associations had maintained an international aspect to their work for decades, the promotion of campus internationalization into an area of strategic focus occurred at the turn of the 21st century. The timing when internationalization became an area of strategic focus differs from one association to another with the earliest being ACE and AACC starting in 2001, followed by AASCU and NASULGC in 2006.

The stimuli for such a move came in a number of forms or a combination of forms: a change in presidency (ACE, NASULGC), an inclination of presidents because of their personal and professional backgrounds (AAU and NASULGC), as an outcome of the organization’s strategic planning process (AACC, ACE), as a response to the directions of a commission’s findings (NASULGC), or as an understanding of the new global environment that higher education was operating in, and the kinds of skills students needed to be successful in a global economy (AACC, AASCU, ACE, AAU, NASULGC).

International and intercultural education had been part of AACC’s mission statement since 2001, when AACC’ Board of Directors approved the association’s strategic plan and mission statement. It remained part of the mission statement and a strategic action area even after the approval of the new strategic plan in June 2006, although the term global education now replaced the term international education.

For ACE, the declaration of internationalization as a priority and one of the four areas of program focus was the outcome of the 2001 strategic plan undertaking. This process was initiated by its president, David Ward, who had recently been appointed in
that role. ACE had established a strong international capacity for quite a long time, and this prioritization, in the words of Madeleine Green, ACE’s Vice President for International Initiatives, only “firmed the centrality and importance of internationalization” (personal communication, November 6, 2006).

Internationalization became a strategic area of focus for NASULGC after the appointment of Peter McPherson as its president in 2006, although a lot of work had been done around the late 1990s and beginning of 2000. Early in his tenure, in a letter entitled A New NASULGC Agenda, addressed to member institutions, President McPherson laid out four major strategic areas that were going to be the focus of work for NASULGC in the coming years. One of these four strategic areas was study abroad and internationalization.

International education became an area of strategic focus for AASCU in 2006, when AASCU’s Board of Directors approved a set of strategic directions intended to guide AASCU’s work in the future. One of the strategic directions had to do with promoting key values that underline what was expected of public higher education; and “international engagement and competitiveness” (AASCU, 2006a, Annual Report, p. 1) was considered one such key value.

In the case of AAU and NAICU, international education was mentioned neither in their mission statements, nor in their strategic plans. However, international education was part of AAU’s and NAICU’s work plan, which in fact has to do more with these associations’ advocacy work as it relates to issues such as visa/immigration policy and funding for international education programs at the Department of Education – Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs.
Table 1
Importance of Internationalization for the Major Associations of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>International Education as a Strategic Area of Interest</th>
<th>Committee/Commission on International Education</th>
<th>Level of Priority in Association’s Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AACC</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCU</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICU</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASULGC</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationales for Internationalization

As the literature review indicated (see Knight, 1997; 2004, and de Wit, 1999; 2002) there are four broad categories of rationales for internationalization – academic (internationalization of the curriculum, study abroad, international students, etc.), social, economic, and political (national security and public diplomacy) rationales.

From the interviews with the major association representatives, the number one rationale that was pointed out was the academic rationale. The other rationales were elaborated more at length in association documents that were mostly related to their advocacy efforts.

Academic Rationales

Two of the most prevalent academic rationales as reflected in the associations’ literature and the association representatives’ interviews were (a) the integration of an international dimension into the curriculum and (b) the expansion of student’s education.

Integration of an international dimension into the curriculum. The major associations considered the integration of an international dimension into the curriculum
as the most important component in equipping students with global competencies, directly contributing to their preparation to live and work in a global society.

*Expansion of student’s education.* The major associations seemed in agreement regarding the fact that by integrating an international dimension into the curriculum, by providing opportunities for study and research abroad, and by raising students’ awareness regarding the global implications of human activity, internationalization broadens and improves the quality of education. In addition, by giving students the necessary global competences they need to successfully participate in the global market, it prepares them for global citizenship.

The issue becomes how one measures the learning outcomes. ACE, in particular, has been a strong advocate within the education community of recognizing the need to identify and assess outcomes for global learning and for developing strategies to assess these outcomes. Through projects like The Global Learning for All, ACE has helped participating institutions articulate and develop models for assessing international learning outcomes.

*Institutional Rationales*

In the documents available for the study, some of the major associations appeared to have been more actively involved in promoting institutional rationales for internationalization. The major associations valued and promoted the importance of incorporating an international experience into the curriculum, the research, and the scholarship of students and faculty. Some associations, like NASULGC for instance, have tried to promote internationalization as an instrument for building institutional profile as it allows colleges and universities to create a market edge for attracting students.
and creating a distinctive identity (NASULGC, 2004). AACC, on the other hand, has focused its efforts primarily on promoting the concept of the community college abroad.

**Social/Cultural Rationales**

Internationalization is seen as a means that can assist in the social and cultural development of students. The associations remain strong supporters of study and work abroad opportunities for students and faculty, because of the life-enriching opportunities they provide for individuals involved and the value such programs have not only for students, but for the campus, the nation, and the world. An interesting program that had recently emerged in this regard was the initiative that the Peace Corps and AACC embarked on in 2004 for the purpose of increasing opportunities for community college graduates to serve as Peace Corps volunteers, using their specialized skills in countries where they are most needed.

**Political Rationales**

Three political rationales for internationalization were particularly prominent in the major associations’ publications and advocacy-related documents: (a) national security, (b) public diplomacy, and (c) technical assistance to developing countries.

*National security.* In their advocacy efforts and otherwise, the major associations have taken the stance that national security is linked with (a) the United States’ ability to attract the brightest minds and the most talented intellectuals from all corners of the world, and (b) with higher education’s ability to produce citizens with global competencies.

Regarding the first point, the associations argue that foreign students and scholars enable the United States to maintain a cutting edge in science and technology (NASULGC, 2004a; ACE, 2006). They do so by playing an active role in the generation
of new knowledge, discoveries and technological developments that occur on U.S. campuses, constituting “a core element that drives the dynamism and excellence of the American research enterprise” (AAU, 2005, p. 5).

The major associations have been strong supporters of the free flow of international students into U.S. campuses. In their view, ensuring the security of the nation should not be synonymous with closing the borders to foreign students and scholars. The major associations have supported security measures, like the SEVIS (Student and Exchange Visitor Information System) program to ensure the country’s security, while at the same time they have urged and made recommendations to the administration to find a balance between keeping the country safe, yet hospitable to foreign students and scholars.

Another important factor that the major associations view to be contributing to the national security is the global competency of American students. For them, “the nation’s security is best served by “an educated, globally engaged population” (AASCU, 2007, p. 13).

Public diplomacy. The major associations view international exchange and international education as a vehicle for public diplomacy and as a very important means for promoting international understanding and good will among countries and improving America’s image in the world. Almost all the presidents of the major associations have weighed in on this topic. They point to the role international students play as ambassadors for the United States in their native countries and around the world. They take pride in the numerous foreign leaders who are graduates of their member institutions and who have led distinguished lives in the service of their respective countries or the
world. They also take pride in spreading our nation's democratic values through the educational and cultural exchanges that their member institutions facilitate.

*Technical assistance to developing countries.* Since World War II, higher education has assisted the United States foreign policy in the international development arena. In this context, the major associations have been instrumental in advocating for their members’ involvement in foreign assistance programs. At the same time, they have been instrumental in helping members establish partnerships with educational institutions or governments in other countries through the Higher Education for Development, a cooperative agreement between United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the six major higher education associations.
Economic Rationales

The economic rationales present themselves on two levels: (a) the institutional level and (b) local/national level. At the institutional level, the argument has had to do mostly with the impact that international students have on the individual institution’s balance sheet and their role in making the campus more diverse and international. Given that international students pay out-of-state tuition, they contribute to the increase of the revenue stream for institutions. This is important especially during these times of financial difficulty for many higher education institutions. At the local/national level, the argument has had to do with the fact that international education constitutes the fifth largest American export, pumping about 13 billion dollars in the U.S. economy (Blair, Lisa Phinney & Phillippe, 2001). The major associations have used these arguments in their advocacy efforts to help relax the strict visa regulations imposed after the terrorist attacks of September 11, as they sought to convince Congress and the administration that overall international students were an asset rather than a threat to the nation.

Commitment to Internationalization

For the majority of the six major national associations, commitment to internationalization appeared to be explicit both in terms of their stance or expressed commitment towards internationalization and the organizational structure to facilitate their involvement in it.
**Stance Towards Internationalization**

The presidential associations have embraced the fact that internationalization is not an academic fad but a palpable reality and “the single most important challenge of the new century” (NASULGC, 2004a, p. ix).

Internationalization is an integral component of two of ACE’s three strategic goals. It is also categorized as one of ACE’s four areas of strategic focus. Commenting on the inclusion of internationalization in ACE’s strategic plan, David Ward, President of ACE has stated, “with the new strategic plan, ACE reaffirms its commitment to internationalization” (Ward, 2003, p. iii).

Internationalization is an espoused value for AACC, AASCU, AAU, and NASULGC as well. “Supporting community colleges to prepare learners to be effective in a global society” is included in AACC’s mission statement (AACC, n.d.c). In its joint statement with the Association of Community Colleges Trustees (ACCT), AACC reaffirmed “a commitment to the importance of the globally educated learner and to building the global community” (AACC, n.d.b).

AASCU’s 2004 *Public Policy Agenda* – an annual publication that makes known AASCU’s stance with regards to internationalization via policy statements – stated, “AASCU strongly believes that higher education institutions, as primary agents of intellectual and cultural exchange, must maintain and enhance their international outlook in the world that is emerging” (AASCU, 2004, Internationalization, para#1). AASCU’s President, Dr. Constantine W. Curris, linked America’s ability to be a global leader with higher education’s commitment to international education (as cited in IIE, 2006).

AAU considered international education as “key to the U.S. effectiveness in the world economy and national security” (AAU, 2003).
NASULGC’s *A Call to Leadership* report stated “It [internationalization] is right for NASULGC institutions. It is integral to our mission to bring together students and scholars, to encourage intellectual exploration, and to support discovery and scholarship that serves the world” (NASULGC, 2004a, p.16).

*Organizational Setup for Supporting and Promoting Internationalization*

The major associations’ realization of the need to advance internationalization on college campuses was followed by the establishment of new organizational structures that allowed them to address issues related to internationalization. These organizational changes took the form of:

1. The promotion of internationalization into a strategic area of interest;
2. The establishment of a commission or committee on international education, consisting of presidents of member institutions, to guide the associations’ efforts in this area;
3. The creation of the position of vice president for international programs.

There is a lot of resemblance among the presidential associations regarding their organizational setup in terms of policy setting and policy implementation, regarding internationalization issues. The boards of directors, together with the presidents of the associations make the ultimate policy decisions with regards to international education issues. Except for NAICU, these decisions are informed by the recommendations of a commission or committee on international education that is usually made up of presidents or other senior officials from member institutions.

The implementation of these policies is done by a specific unit which has the operational responsibility to implement the association’s strategic vision with regards to internationalization and is in charge of the programmatic activities as they relate to
internationalization or international programs and services provided to members. These units are housed under a division, which may be different from one association to another. After the year 2000, many of the presidential associations (exception here are AAU and NAICU) created a vice president position, that was directly in charge of international programs and services or added international programs and services as part of a vice president’s portfolio. In the case of ACE’s Center for International Initiatives and NASULGC’s Office for International Programs, these units are directly led by a vice president, whereas in the case of AASCU’s Office for International Education and AACC’ Office for International Programs and Services, these offices are led by a director who reports to the vice president of the division under which the international unit is housed. AAU and NAICU do not have any specific unit dedicated to their organization’s programmatic activities regarding international education.

In addition to the personnel in the programmatic and service areas, the presidential associations have one or more professional staff from their federal relations unit to assist, in a full-time or part-time capacity, with international education advocacy-related issues such as visa issues, funding, and appropriations for international education programs. For Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs, the major associations work through the Coalition for International Education, of which they are members. With regards to international development programs and international cooperation, the major associations work, to a large extent, through the Higher Education for Development, in which they are a major partner.

International programs are also part of association presidents’ agenda. The presidents work closely with their boards of directors in crafting association policy for international education; they represent their institutions in senior-level meetings
regarding internationalization issues; they promote their associations’ vision for a global or international education to their constituents and other parties; they present their associations’ positions on internationalization at higher education national conferences and on member campuses; they write and present testimony to Congress, they write to the administration; and they are quoted by the news media on the associations’ advocacy efforts regarding international education issues.

Often their dedication to the internationalization issues appears to be connected not only to their position in the organization, but also to their personal and professional background prior to their appointment to this position. For instance, Nils Hasselmo, former President of AAU, is of Swedish origin, while David Ward, President of ACE, is of British origin; and both are Fulbright scholars. Peter McPherson, President of NASULGC, has had an impressive international career in international development and as the former President of Michigan State University has been credited for building one of the nation’s most highly regarded international programs.

Organizational and Financial Resources Dedicated to Internationalization

What distinguished the presidential associations from one another was the degree of emphasis they put on the issue of internationalization in (a) organizational and (b) financial terms (See Table 2).

Except for ACE, the major associations are relatively small in terms of staff and budget dedicated to international programs and services. Of all the major associations, ACE had the largest budget, about $700,000 in core internal funding and about $250-500,000 in the form of grants and external funding. This was followed by AACC with $50,000 and NASULGC with $35,000. I could not obtain data regarding AASCU’s operating budget, but AASCU has utilized outside resources in the form of grants from
the State Department, Higher Education for Development, and the Nippon Foundation. AASCU’s 2006 annual report listed $103,770 from the State Department allocated for the Diplomacy in Action Program and $126,463 from the Nippon Foundation for the Japanese Studies Institute (AASCU, 2006). AAU and NAICU’s budgets were not structured to include international programs as a budget line item, since they did not have specific positions dedicated to international programs.

ACE had a staff of five professionals and two support staff working in the area of internationalization. AACC had one full-time professional staff and one full-time support staff. AASCU had one full-time professional staff, while NASULGC had 1.5 fulltime professional staff and one full-time support staff. NAICU and AAU had not created specific positions for international education programs or services. NAICU and AAU had respectively 2 and 4 staff members under federal relations who followed advocacy issues related to international programs and visa issues on a part-time basis.

Another organizational difference among the major associations had to do with the fact that some of the international programs offices were directly led by a vice president (ACE and NASULGC); some others were led by a director who reported to the vice president of the division under which the international office was housed (AACC and AASCU); yet others did not have any specific unit dedicated to their organization’s programmatic activities regarding international education (AAU and NAICU).

The organizational changes that started to occur around the year 2000 are an indication of the growing importance of internationalization in the agenda of the major associations. However, while ideologically and organizationally the major associations seem to have accepted internationalization as an imperative of the present and the future, it can be said that the budget and staffing for internationalization efforts still has some
catching up to do. During the interviews most representatives indicated the need for more resources to be dedicated to internationalization efforts. It is unclear if the reason for this mismatch lies in the fact that in spite of the importance of international education institutional members had more pressing needs, other than internationalization, that they expected their associations to address, or any other reason. A contributing factor may be the fact that except for ACE that has 180 employees and to some degree AACC with 50 employees, the presidential associations are relatively small organizations with a staff ranging from 20-40 employees.

As it will be presented later in this section, the variety of programs and activities that the presidential associations carry out on behalf of and as a service to their members is rather impressive. What is more impressive is that they have been able to achieve that in spite of the limited number of staff and limited dollars dedicated to international programs and services.
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Association’s Annual Budget*</th>
<th>Operating Budget for International Programs (Excludes Salaries)**</th>
<th>External Funding**</th>
<th>Number of Staff****</th>
<th>Staff Involved in International Programs**</th>
<th>Leadership of International Programs**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeted Position</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACC</td>
<td>$11.8-million</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCU</td>
<td>$9.2-million</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$230,000***</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>$35.1-million</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$250-500,000</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>$4-million</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICU</td>
<td>$4.2-million</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASULGC</td>
<td>$7.9-million</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


** Source: Association representative interviewed for the study.


**** Source: Association website.
Approaches to Internationalization

The presidential associations differed in the way they approached their support of members’ efforts to internationalize. Only two of the major associations, namely ACE and NASULGC, have openly accepted and adopted Jane Knight’s definition of internationalization, as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institutions” (as cited in Knight 1999, p. 8).

Both ACE and NASULGC have been strong proponents of a comprehensive and strategic approach to internationalization. They both have tried to send a clear message to members that internationalization is more than just study abroad or international students, and that it involves commitment of institutional leadership and the development of a strategic approach.

One major difference between these two associations had to do with the fact that ACE has put in place a whole mechanism of program support for members interested in internationalizing their campuses. Through specific initiatives, such as The International Collaborative and The Internationalization Laboratory, ACE has tried to assist member institutions in developing their own strategic approach to internationalization under the guidance of ACE staff. ACE has also built programs for the senior leadership of its member institutions to help them “think about internationalization in an intentional and strategic manner” (ACE, n.d.c). In addition, publications such as Internationalizing the Campus: A User’s Guide (2003); Building a Strategic Framework for Comprehensive Internationalization (2005); and A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization: What Institutions Can Do and What Students Should Learn (2006) outline the way institutions should think about internationalizing their campuses and
serve as guidelines and resources to members interested in advancing internationalization on their campuses.

In addition to its publications, ACE has tried to advance the notion of a strategic approach to internationalization empirically, through initiatives such as The International Collaborative and The Internationalization Laboratory, where institutions are actively involved in developing comprehensive internationalization strategies under ACE staff guidance.

NASULGC, too, has outlined its stance towards internationalization in a number of reports. The 2000 NASULGC report entitled *Expanding the International Scope of Universities: A Strategic Vision Statement for Learning, Scholarship and Engagement in the New Century* urged member institutions to treat international experience as an integral part of their mission and to infuse it in their institution’s core functions (NASULGC, 2000c). The 2004 *A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University* report recommended that university presidents and chancellors make it their responsibility to internationalize their campuses. These reports provided NASULGC members with a clear roadmap on how to internationalize their campuses, as well as a lot of strategies for achieving that. However, I could not find evidence of hands-on-development programs to train members on how to approach the issue of campus internationalization. A probable explanation for this may be the fact that, according to Kerry Bolognese, Vice President for International Programs, the majority of NASULGC members had already declared internationalization as part of their mission statement or strategic goals of the institution (personal communication, October 27, 2006). Another explanation may be the fact that the majority of NASULGC members are flagship institutions, with a long history of involvement in international development and
Title VI programs, and may need less assistance in this regard. On the other hand, ACE’s membership is much broader and it includes institutions with probably less experience in international matters. More importantly, ACE seems to have taken the position of wanting to be a thought leader in the area of internationalization of higher education.

Although they do not formally use Knight’s definition of internationalization, philosophically, AACC and AASCU have espoused some of the tenets of a strategic approach to internationalization. However, they have not made their case with their members in the same way as ACE or NASULGC regarding a strategic approach to internationalization. Also, their publications promoting such an approach have been rather limited.

AACC’s philosophy of global education includes some tenets proponed by a strategic approach to internationalization, such as the recognition of global education as part of the institution’s mission and the need for commitment and involvement on the part of the institution’s senior leadership. There have been articles in the Community College Journal or other AACC publication such as Internationalizing Community Colleges (2002) that have advocated such tenets. On a policy level, probably the most important document outlining this approach is the AACC and ACCT Joint Statement on International Education that called on the community colleges to acknowledge global understanding and communication as integral to their mission. It also called on community college presidents to actively promote and support international education by establishing a leadership role for directing international education and by providing funding for international-related activities (AACC & ACCT, 2006).

On a programmatic level, however, my research did not find any programs or activities geared directly at presidents or CAOs on how to approach internationalization
as a campus-wide strategic endeavor. The focus seems to be mostly on specific programs and services that AACC can provide to members, such as assisting members with foreign student recruitment and study abroad. Also, *internationalization* is not frequently used as a term; *global education* is the preferred term.

AASCU’s focus seems to be strongest on programs for members, such as international exchange, partnership building, or foreign student recruitment. Support for a strategic approach to internationalization exists, but is rather understated. For instance, AASCU’s Task Force on Global Priorities and Responsibilities, which laid out standards and processes for measuring a campus’ success in its effort to achieve a global environment, called for colleges to commit to internationalization by articulating it in the institution’s mission statement. However, it did not require that the commitment be on a campus-wide level, although it was implied that that would have been the preferable choice. Furthermore, neither the *Public Policy Agenda* publications of the last six years, nor the annual reports of the same period have emphasized the need for a campus-wide initiative or senior leadership commitment to internationalization. AASCU’s approach to internationalization seems more activity-driven rather than strategic or comprehensive, as Jane Knight’s definition would suggest. This approach perhaps has to do with the roles that AASCU historically has focused on – advocacy, professional development, and program development – and that may carry over in the area of internationalization as well.

The documents available for this study did not indicate in any way that AAU and NAICU advocated or promoted any particular approach to internationalization. This was confirmed by the interview with the AAU and NAICU representatives. On the AAU’s part, the only document that included elements associated with a strategic approach to
internationalization was a survey administered in January 2003, intended to assess the state of internationalization of AAU members. While not quite clear why AAU has taken such as a laissez-faire approach regarding internationalization, it is possible that the explanation may lie in two factors – the fact that AAU considers advocacy at the federal level rather than programmatic activities as its main service to members, and secondly, the fact that AAU members, such as Harvard University, Duke University, and Michigan State University are national leaders in certain aspects of international education.

*The Roles of the Major Associations in Internationalizing Member Campuses*

As for the roles that the major associations have assumed with regards to the internationalization of higher education, we can say that in addition to being advocates for international education programs at the federal level, overall they have assumed the role of supporter of their members’ internationalization efforts, while some of them have also assumed an advocacy role for internationalization as a strategic process with their members.

It should be pointed out that the major associations have displayed different degrees of engagement in these roles. For instance, as mentioned earlier, ACE has been highly engaged in both roles – it has strongly promoted a strategic process approach to internationalization and at the same time it has built an array of programs to assist members that are interested in institutionalizing internationalization on their campuses. NASULGC’s role as a promoter appeared stronger than the role of a supporter via specific programs. NASULGC had less of a programmatic infrastructure built in the form of supportive programs. AASCU and AACC’s supporter role was definitively more pronounced than their promoter role. NAICU and AAU have not promoted any approach to internationalization; they offer some support mostly in developing international
connections, serving as a public forum (AAU), and assisting with members’ involvement in international development projects (NAICU).

It appears that, to a large degree, the major associations’ role in internationalizing higher education has been framed in close connection with the associations’ approach to internationalization. For instance, if the major associations took the approach of internationalization as a strategic process, they were more likely to be a promoter of a strategic process approach of internationalization among their members (NASULGC). If, on the other hand, their approach was more programmatic, the associations were more likely to offer specific programs and services to members to support their internationalization efforts in certain areas (AACC and AASCU). If the associations had not taken a particular stance towards internationalization, their involvement was limited (AAU and NAICU). The exception here was ACE, which has taken a strategic approach to internationalization and has been very involved in both promoting a process approach to internationalization and offering specific programs to guide and support members’ efforts to approach internationalization strategically.

It is important to note that from all the interviews it became clear that the major associations saw themselves first and foremost in a supportive role with regards to campus internationalization. The presidential associations viewed the decision to internationalize as a decision that should be taken at the campus or system level and the actual day-to-day implementation of internationalization was left to the leadership team of a particular campus. Furthermore, cognizant of the fact that different institutions were at different stages and might have different objectives for internationalization, the associations felt that the institutions themselves should determine the pace with which they should move towards internationalization. Madeleine Green of ACE seemed to echo
the sentiment of all the other associations’ representatives, when she stated, “I think we see our main role with institutions as helping them enhance internationalization, as opposed to just exhorting them” (M. Green, personal communication, November 6, 2007).

Even when these associations tried to advance the concept of internationalization among members, it is important to point out that the publications, reports, and survey findings that the associations distributed among members were intended to serve as resources, roadmaps, guidelines, reference, or benchmarks for member institutions. Members were expected to make their own judgment with regards to what worked best for their institution and how to apply these recommendations.

*Mapping Involvement in the Internationalization of Higher Education*

In broad terms, the internationalization efforts of the major associations have consisted in (a) advocating for legislation and funding that supports international issues and programs that are of great interest to members, (b) advocating for or promoting internationalization to members, and (c) assisting members in their efforts to internationalize their campuses.

*Advocating for International Education Programs at the Federal Level*

The association representatives interviewed for the study almost unanimously, pointed at four priority issues for the major associations in the area of advocacy for international programs. The advocacy issues included (a) study-abroad legislation, (b) visa policy issues, (c) Title VI/ Fulbright-Hays foreign language and international programs, and (d) funding for Higher Education for Development (HED).

*Study-abroad legislation.* All the major associations have supported a study-abroad legislation. The Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Act of 2006, S. 3744 was drafted
following the recommendations of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Commission, which was established by Congress in 2005 for the purpose of developing the framework for an international study abroad program for college students. The legislation recommended a national policy that would lead to a greater expansion of study abroad opportunities and would allow the creation of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. The goals of this legislation were:

1. To have one million students studying abroad on an annual basis by the year 2016-2017;
2. To provide opportunities for underrepresented groups of students to participate in study abroad, ensuring that the study abroad participants better reflect today’s demographics on the American campuses;
3. To diversify the study abroad destinations to include other non-Western or non-English speaking countries.

NASULGC took the lead in advocating for this study-abroad legislation and was actively involved in gaining support for it. By the time the 109th Congress ended its session, the bill enjoyed strong bipartisan support and the number of co-sponsors had increased to 46. Senators Dick Durbin (D-IL) and Norm Coleman (R-MN) reintroduced the bill and the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed the bill on February 13, 2008. The next expected move was for the bill to clear the Senate floor and become law.

*Visa policy issues.* Restrictions on international student visas put in place after 9/11, for national security reasons, had the unintended consequence of leading to a drop of applications and enrollment of international students in the U.S. colleges and universities. The new procedures hit research universities hardest. Almost 50% of all international students are graduate students, and the majority of them study at research
universities. AAU, whose membership is made up of research institutions, played a major role in advocating for an improved and streamlined visa process. AAU received strong support from the other associations, particularly NASULGC and ACE with whom its membership overlaps. All the major associations as well as the rest of the higher education community provided support for these advocacy efforts.

The major associations took the stance that it was possible to maintain an efficient visa system that allowed the United States to attract and welcome the brightest and the most talented people in the world to study and work here without endangering the security of the nation. In alliance with the rest of the higher education community, the major associations worked to develop an appropriate response to restrictions on international student visas in order to ensure that these measures did not encumber the ability of their member institutions to secure international students. While supporting the implementation of the SEVIS (Student and Exchange Visitor Information System) program to track the movement of international students and faculty, the major associations strongly advocated for monitoring the implementation of this system in order to ensure that it would not result in deterring students from wanting to study in the United States.

The major associations worked both with the executive branch, as well as Congress to see that the processes were streamlined as much as possible. They sent letters to Congress. They rallied the presidents of their institutional members to testify before Congress regarding the negative impact the measures were having and how these measures were affecting their institutions, as well as the country’s image of an open society. They wrote letters to the State Department and the Department of Homeland
Security, making recommendations for process improvement and offering their cooperation.

The visa issue was one area that the successes of advocacy efforts were evident. The education community made significant strides regarding an improved and streamlined visa process. On the days following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the major associations helped avoid the establishment of a moratorium on the issuance of any new student visas that was proposed at that time. The substantial drop in applications and enrollment due to stringent rules and procedures put in place with the 2001 Patriot Act was stopped and the numbers of international students started to steadily rise as the IIE Open Doors reports (IIE, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007) and various surveys conducted by major associations indicate. Also, the delays in visa issuance were reduced. According to the United States Government Office of Accountability (2005), the processing time for a foreign science student or scholar visa was reduced from 67 days in 2003 to 15 days on average in 2004. Students who had undergone security clearance did not need to go through that process every time they had to leave the United States to visit their countries. Visa Mantis, a type of visa issued for scientists, was extended from one year to two years. As recommended by the major associations, the State Department provided more training for staff in consular offices abroad to avoid unnecessary delays in visa processing.

The major associations attributed their successes in this area in part to their ability to successfully work with members of Congress and especially to their ability to engage the administration in their effort to make visa procedures more secure and simultaneously more efficient.
Title VI and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) programs. Title VI and Fulbright-Hays foreign language and international programs are very important programs for higher education. They are part of the Higher Education Act (HEA) and constitute the main federal program that is supportive of the international dimension of higher education. Every time HEA is up for reauthorization, all the higher education community gets behind Title VI programs and together they try to preserve their funding, as well as their very existence. Because of the importance of such programs to the higher education community and the national security, the major associations under the leadership of ACE founded the Coalition for International Education, an ad hoc group of 35 national higher education organizations whose advocacy focus is on international education programs of the Higher Education Act – Title VI and Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6) programs, as well as international education programs and initiatives at the U.S. Department of Education.

The presidential associations have work through the Coalition for Higher Education to advocate for Title VI/Fulbright-Hays programs. However, when necessary, the major associations have presented testimony before Congress, either via the presidents or vice presidents of the associations themselves or the presidents of their member institutions, making the case for continued support for international programs.

Title VI is one of the advocacy issues that enjoy the wide support of the higher education community. The programs under Title VI were intended to make sure that the nation had the necessary expertise in foreign languages, area studies, and international business to meet national strategic requirements and as such has benefited from the collective advocacy effort. One of the greatest successes that the major associations count with regards to Title VI programs has to do with the fact that, in spite major cuts in many other programs, they have been able to preserve Title VI programs. The programs have
remained intact although their funding levels do not match the original authorization in terms of real dollars. The major associations take pride at the preservation of these programs. “No harm done” in the advocacy world is considered to be a good thing.

Madeleine Green of ACE, echoed this notion when she stated:

Don’t forget, there are two kinds of achievements in the advocacy arena. One is making something good happen and the other is preventing something bad from happening . . . . I think we have done a pretty good job on Title VI, preventing some cuts and damage and getting some increases. It’s a very tough budget climate. (personal communication, November 6, 2006)

Another achievement on the part of the major associations was their successful thwarting of a congressional effort to establish an HEA Title VI advisory board that would have too much investigative power and very little accountability.

**Funding for Higher Education for Development (HED).** Higher Education for Development was another main issue that topped the association’s advocacy efforts in the area of internationalization at the federal level. HED is a cooperative agreement between USAID and the major associations, which serve as the governing body for HED. The primary focus of HED is to create and advance partnerships between institutions of higher education in the United States and institutions in developing countries for global social and economic development through human and institutional capacity building. After a rather rocky relationship with USAID, the cooperation seems to be working better. In 2005, the HED program was renewed ensuring about $50 million for development work for the next five years. Recently, the 2-year colleges have also become eligible for HED grants thanks to the efforts of AACC.

The major national associations combined a number of methods in their advocacy efforts such as writing policy papers, assisting in drafting legislation, testifying before Congress – either via the CEOs of the associations themselves, or by engaging the
presidents of their member institutions, writing analysis and recommendations for the administration as was the case with the visa issues, and by engaging the administration. The techniques the associations used in their advocacy efforts for international programs did not differ much from what King (1975) and Cook (1998) had indicated, except that, as suggested by Ruther (2002), the major associations were now engaging the administration more and successfully so, especially regarding international visa issues. Matt Owens, Assistant Director for Foreign Relations at AAU gave an explanation for this:

We were able to use the current laws and work the regulatory process as supposed to the legislative aspect of it . . . . Statutory law is very hard to change once it is put into effect, whereas we could use the regulatory process, the flexibility that it has to tighten or loosen as appropriate and still meet the concerns that the public or the experts of national security have. (personal communication, October 30, 2006)

Promoting Internationalization Among Member Institutions

The six major associations have utilized different tools to promote the concept of internationalization among their members, the most common being (a) publications, (b) the associations’ official websites, and (c) recognition of outstanding achievements in the internationalization arena.

Publications. The major associations have utilized the publication and distribution of reports and other documents regarding internationalization as a tool to educate their membership on the topic, and provide benchmarks or roadmaps for the processes involved. NASULGC’s 2000 report Expanding the International Scope of Universities: A Strategic Vision Statement for Learning, Scholarship and Engagement in the New Century developed a vision and a roadmap of how to integrate internationalization across the campus. In 2004, NASULGC published a report called A Call to Leadership: The Presidential Role in Internationalizing the University, which consisted of a set of
recommendations regarding strategies for internationalization of both large, research-driven universities, historically known for their international orientation, as well as for the smaller public universities, in order to expand access and international opportunities to all its members’ campuses.

ACE has by far been the most prolific in this regard. ACE has 23 publications dedicated to issues of internationalizing the campus in the 1996-2006 timeframe. These publications (see Appendix F) draw from both the current literature in the area of internationalization and the experiences of member institutions. They (a) define the most important concepts and clarify the distinction between internationalization and globalization; (b) draw a road map in terms of content and processes to guide campus teams in charge of designing plans for campus internationalizations; outline elements of a successful internationalization process, and (c) provide an inventory of tools for reviewing existing programs, and defining learning competencies.

Every year, AACC’s bi-monthly publication The Community College Journal, dedicates a special issue entirely to issues related to international education, such as internationalization of the curriculum or study abroad. AASCU’s bi-monthly magazine Public Purpose showcases achievements and contributions of AASCU members, as they try to internationalize their campuses, and offers reflections on AASCU’s presidential missions abroad or other international endeavors. AAU’s National Defense Education and Innovation Initiative: Meeting America’s Security Challenges in the 21st Century called for putting in place a national strategy to address the challenges of the first half of the 21st century.

Association websites. The associations utilize their official websites to provide members with information on a number of issues depending on the focus of their
activities and commitments regarding internationalization. The associations’ websites also provide downloads, in a PDF format, of publications and reports that they have produced, containing relevant information regarding internationalization or examples of best internationalization practices. They also provide periodic legislative updates regarding international education.

ACE has an exceptionally rich website that outlines all its services, projects, and initiatives and when applicable it provides details on eligibility to participate or whom to contact for more information. NASULGC, AASCU, and AACC also provide a lot of information on the programs and services they provide for members such as lists of institutional study-abroad programs, resource guides, and links to international education resources for students and universities. AAU’s content on international education was limited. It had a link called International Education Programs under the heading Education Issues, which only provides access to a number of letters to Congress or the administration written or endorsed by AAU, findings of international surveys, as well as policy papers issued by AAU. NAICU’s website provides only relevant articles from the press with the focus more on study abroad and some legislative updates.

Recognizing outstanding achievements. Another way of promoting internationalization to member institutions has been for the major associations to recognize outstanding contributions in this area. This recognition is achieved in a variety of ways:

1. Annual reports. Through their annual reports, the major associations provide a brief summary of their members’ achievements and new developments in the area of internationalization, as well the contributions that the associations themselves have made in that particular year.
2. **Awards.** Another strategy for promoting internationalization has been to recognize significant contributions in international education through an award system. NASULGC has established *The Michael P. Malone International Leadership Award* to key university administrators, faculty and staff of member institutions who have provided outstanding leadership in the development of international programs on NASULGC campuses. In order to encourage institutions to develop innovative practices for enhancing campus internationalization ACE, in collaboration with the AT&T Foundation, has established *The ACE/AT&T Award: Technology as a Tool for Internationalization*, an award that recognizes the innovative use of technology to promote international learning at U.S. colleges and universities.

3. **Sharing best practices.** The major associations share best practices in international education through (a) their various association publications and or (b) their official websites. ACE’s 2002 publication *Promising Practices: Spotlighting Excellence in Comprehensive Internationalization* showcased the experiences of eight institutions that have taken a comprehensive approach in integrating an international dimension to undergraduate curricula. In July 2005, AASCU published a document entitled *International Initiatives on AASCU Campuses*. The publication included a summary of 34 accounts by AASCU university presidents and chancellors regarding the efforts of their institutions in internationalizing their campuses, with special emphasis on their personal involvement as institutional leaders. In November 2001, NASULGC published *Major Obstacles and Best Practices in International Educational Exchange*. The publication was an analysis and interpretation of the findings of a survey regarding their members’ best practices and obstacles in international exchange.

4. **Official websites.** Through their websites the major associations provide links as
well as downloadable documents celebrating best practices. Web links such as ACE’s Innovative Campus Strategies provide members with success stories of other institutions, which are successfully implementing a strategic approach to internationalization from which they can draw lessons, learn strategies or even contact them for more input. ACE has also set up a good practices web site within the context of The Internationalization Collaborative, a program where interested members take a hands-on approach to internationalizing their campuses by following a well-established protocol.

For the purpose of sharing best practices among members NASULGC has employed its monthly publication Newsline, and the international session of its annual conference. In addition, on its website, NASULGC has posted a document where member institutions share best institutional practices. At the time of the interview, NASULGC was working on creating an annual web-based survey for the purpose of monitoring the progress that NASULGC institutions had made over the years and sharing it with other members. One of its components had to do with members sharing best practices.

*Supporting Member’s Internationalization Efforts*

Most of the major associations have a strong *supporter* component in their work, which finds expression in the various programs and services they provide for their members. Within the role of supporter of member’s internationalization efforts, the major associations play a number of sub-roles:

*Convener.* The presidential associations have played the role of a convener, both at the national and international level. Every fall, AASCU in conjunction with CEAIE, its Chinese partner, convenes a joint Sino-American seminar, based on a theme or topic of interest to both parties. In 2001, AASCU co-sponsored a national conference on study
and learning abroad. In attendance were representatives from colleges and universities, as well as representatives from the Bush administration. In 2002, AAU organized its first international convocation, which brought together educational leaders from all over the world, sparking a great interest among its members for more international cooperation.

ACE has played the role of the convener nationally by bringing a lot of the higher education community together under its auspices through Higher Education for Development; Coalition for International Education, and the Washington International Education Group. In addition, since 2000, ACE has been convening The Annual Conference on Campus Internationalization, within the context of The International Collaborative project to discuss strategies, challenges, and successes related to various aspects of campus internationalization. Most of the projects that ACE coordinates have a meeting or conference component to them, which allows representatives from participating institutions to get together and exchange information and experiences.

ACE has actively pursued and maintained linkages with associations of higher education and other international organizations abroad, serving as a voice and as a main focal point for the entire U.S. higher education abroad.

Public forum. All the associations serve as a public forum for their membership. They all use their annual conferences or conventions as forums where they discuss internationalization issues, disseminate findings of studies, reports, recommendations regarding international programs, and share best practices. In addition, some associations like AACC use their annual meetings to offer sessions or workshops on international issues. In the case of NASULGC, its Commission on International Programs usually sponsors international sessions with other commissions or councils to discuss international issues with member institutions and get feedback from them. ACE’s The
Internationalization Collaborative provides a forum for faculty and administrators of 82 institutions of different types, committed to advancing internationalization, to learn from each others’ efforts as they try to implement a comprehensive internationalization strategy on their campuses.

**Leadership forum.** ACE has strongly advocated for commitment on the part of institutional leaders in developing and implementing a comprehensive internationalization strategy. To this end, ACE has established two programs, namely, The Internationalization Forum for Chief Academic Officers and Leadership Network for International Education, specifically tailored for university presidents and chief academic officers. These forums help senior leaders identify and explore more in-depth key leadership challenges of internationalization and share promising practices in addressing these challenges.

AASCU’s presidential missions are another form of a leadership forum. In an effort to assist members in forging partnerships with universities from other countries, at least once a year, AASCU organizes and leads an overseas mission of a presidential delegation, consisting of AASCU presidents and chancellors. During these weeklong missions university leaders have the opportunity to meet with government representatives and university officials in the host countries and discuss the possibility for collaboration.

**Funding source.** From the research and the documents that I was able to review for this study, only ACE and AASCU provided funding for member institutions or representatives from member institutions to participate in programs intended to promote internationalization. AASCU, for instance, covers the costs for all participants of its Japanese Studies Institute, a faculty development program, by providing the Sasakawa Fellowships. ACE encourages members’ efforts to internationalize or find innovative
approaches by providing much needed funding for this purpose. So for instance, with the help of the Henry Luce Foundation, ACE has set up a fund to encourage the development of innovative practices to enhance campus internationalization. ACE also provides mini grants to institutions participating in The Internationalization Collaborative to stimulate learning and accelerate the internationalization process.

Resource center. Through their publications and their websites, the associations serve as very important resource centers for their members interested in internationalizing their campuses. Through the content of the various programs and initiatives posted on their websites, as well as their web resources and direct web links, such as ACE’s External Funding Sources or Innovative Campus Strategies, AACC’s Global Awareness link, the associations provide members with a wealth of information regarding funding opportunities provided by the federal government or non-profit organizations, as well as best practices from member institutions.

The associations that are advocating for a strategic approach to internationalization, such as ACE and NASULGC, have put out numerous publications that serve as resources to institutions interested in advancing internationalization on their campuses. These association publications provide members with road maps in terms of content and processes for campus internationalization. They outline elements of a successful internationalization process and provide links to funding resources and an inventory of tools for reviewing existing programs and for defining learning competencies.

Data source/center. The major associations often conduct surveys and data analysis on different aspects of internationalization on their member campuses, such as the level of international activity and institutional commitment to internationalization in
areas such as international programs, funding and grant activity, curriculum, and activities abroad. This allows them to serve as a national data source regarding their members on international education issues.

The major associations provide the data obtained from their studies to their members keeping them informed about the findings on specific issues, thus enabling them to develop strategies to address those issues. At the same time, the survey findings provide member campuses with a good benchmarking tool, allowing them to get a better understanding of what is happening at peer institutions.

In addition to surveying their member institutions, at times, the major associations have joined forces together to study issues that are of common interest to them such as trends in enrollments, applications, and visa delays for international students and scholars. The findings of these surveys too have been shared with members and have also been used in their advocacy efforts to inform Congress and the administration in their policy making process.

From the interviews with association representatives, it became clear that of all the six major associations, ACE was regarded as the presidential association with the capacity, in monetary and human resources terms, to be the most active in the area of research on internationalization. In 1999, ACE conducted two national surveys of opinions from the general public and college-bound seniors regarding international education. In 2000, ACE conducted three national surveys regarding the state of internationalization of American higher education by institutional type. All the presidential associations cooperated with ACE to collect information about the state of internationalization of their institutional members along a number of variables such as institutional type, study abroad, internationalization of the curriculum, academic
requirement of foreign languages and international education content, international students and faculty, and institutional support for internationalization.

_Professional development provider._ AACC, AASCU and ACE viewed professional development as an important way of supporting members’ efforts to internationalize their campuses. AASCU and ACE have conducted training programs and workshops for senior university administrators on campuses as well as at international conferences. For twenty years, AASCU has been sponsoring the Japanese Studies Institute (JSI), an intensive summer program that focuses on increasing faculty awareness and knowledge of Japan in order to include that knowledge in their curriculum and teaching. AACC has offered specific workshops and presentations by the AACC’s Director of International Programs and Services to educate its members on how to best recruit international students. ACE has established a variety of programs for its member institutions, mostly catering to CEOs, CAOs, and faculty. This could be explained by the fact that ACE has strongly advocated for commitment on the part of the institutional leaders in developing and implementing a comprehensive internationalization strategy. Furthermore, ACE has viewed the curriculum as the most important element of a campus' internationalization strategy that directly contributes to the preparation of all students to live and work in a global society.

_Facilitator of international partnerships building._ All the major associations have tried, in different degrees, to assist members in developing international partnerships with other international institutions or governments. Working with their foreign counterparts, ministries of education, and universities in other parts of the world, the major associations have taken on the role of a “matchmaker” between American colleges and universities and countries and foreign institutions seeking collaborative opportunities.
AASCU stands out a little more in this regard. Once a year, AASCU organizes and leads an overseas mission of a presidential delegation, consisting of AASCU presidents and chancellors and chief academic officers. Such efforts have taken AASCU to countries such as Cuba, Morocco, South Africa, Malaysia and Singapore, where AASCU has facilitated its members’ partnership building and the signing of memoranda of understanding with these countries.

All the major associations are members of Higher Education for Development (HED), which creates avenues for their members to get involved with other foreign counterparts or governments. Many of NASULGC’s members, in particular, have benefited from this arrangement; until recently the international development work was focused on developing countries whose economies were often agricultural and many of NASULGC’s members have a land-grant component, playing to their advantage.

More recently, community colleges too have become eligible for such grants under HED, thanks to the efforts of AACC. In cooperation with its affiliate council, the American Council on International Intercultural Education, AACC has worked to help community colleges develop partnerships and collaborate with other institutions worldwide.

NAICU also has made attempts to facilitate the creation of partnership between its members and other organizations and countries abroad. NAICU invited the head of HED to make a presentation to its members during NAICU’s annual convention and a survey was sent out to collect information about areas of expertise from interested institutions, generating interest on the part of NAICU’s membership.

Facilitator of members’ international student recruitment efforts. Of all the major associations, AASCU and AACC have done more in facilitating the process of recruiting
international students on behalf of their members. AASCU’s International Friendly
Campus Student Portal within its website has links with information for potential
international students about what they need to know regarding admission, transcripts,
degrees, and programs at AASCU member institutions. AASCU has assisted members
also in their efforts to recruit international students abroad and has raised awareness of
AASCU institutions in international student recruitment fairs, such as the one held in
China during the month of October, where about 35,000 interested students attend
(AASCU, n.d.c).

In addition to training members on how to recruit international students, AACC
has established a whole protocol of activities it gets involved in to assist members in their
recruitment efforts. Since 2002, AACC has facilitated member participation in student
recruitment fairs overseas that completely focus on the recruitment needs of community
colleges. Every year, AACC publishes and distributes thousands of copies of *The
International Student Guide to U.S. Community Colleges*. AACC has been instrumental
in the creation of a website for international students to facilitate their search for an
American community college that will meet their needs. AACC has worked with the U.S.
consular missions and the EducationUSA Advising Network to promote the community
college concept abroad and to educate students, parents, and counselors about
opportunities and advantages of attending a U.S. community college.

*Laboratory for testing innovative approaches.* ACE was the only association that
has played the function of a laboratory for testing innovative approaches. Many of ACE’s
programs in the area of internationalization are intended to enable participating
institutions to learn “hands on” how to approach specific internationalization challenges
and to find solutions to these challenges with a lot of guidance from ACE staff. The
Internationalization Laboratory project is an example of this function. It consists of a group of institutions which are trying to deepen the internationalization level of their campuses via direct guidance of ACE staff. These institutions follow a well-established protocol that includes such steps as the establishment of an internationalization leadership team, assessment of present achievements, development of institutional goals and of an internationalization strategy, the hosting of a peer review team, preparation of a self-assessment report and development of a strategic plan grounded in an analysis of institutional strengths and weaknesses.

*The Major Associations and a National Policy on International Education*

Since the United States does not have a national policy for international education, the study was interested to find out if the major associations were advocating for such a policy. According to the interviews conducted for the study, the major associations were not advocating for a national policy on international education. My research revealed three attempts had been made, two of them in the form of policy papers. The first one was a 2001 policy document entitled *Beyond September 11: Comprehensive National Policy on International Education*. It was created under the leadership of ACE and was supported by the other major associations, as well as the rest of the Coalition for International Education. This policy paper outlined (a) the needs for globally competent individuals at various levels of American society – government, business, public sector, higher education, (b) recommendations on how to address these needs, (c) as well as the role the federal government should play in this regard. Not much was done with this policy paper. According to Kerry Bolognese from NASULGC (personal communication, October, 2007), who participated in the drafting of the paper,
the document was “crafted” around August of 2001 and as the September 11 terrorist attacks took place “it just blew everything out of the works.”

The second attempt focused on a particular aspect of international education. The major associations supported a study-abroad legislation that was recommending the establishment of a federal policy that would lead to a great expansion of study-abroad opportunities. The efforts led by NASULGC met with a lot of support from the rest of the higher education community. On February 13, 2008, the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed the bill under the name of Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act. The next move will be for the bill to go on the Senate floor for full Senate approval in order to become law.

The third attempt, involved a policy paper entitled National Defense Education and Innovation Initiative: Meeting America’s Security Challenges in the 21st Century issued by AAU in January 2006. The document was aimed at Congress, the administration, businesses and institutions of higher education urging them to work towards putting in place a strategy for addressing the challenges of the first half of the 21st century. The document listed objectives for the 21st century and initiatives to meet these objectives, as well as offered recommendations to colleges, universities and the federal government on how to achieve them (AAU, 2006).

The only association that has been pushing for a national policy on international education is NAFSA, which is a professional association. NAFSA has recommended a policy that would promote international and area studies, foreign languages and study abroad as a component of undergraduate education, and that would build strategies for attracting international students to the United States. It has also called on the federal
government to set aside adequate funding and to appoint a senior official to be in charge of this policy (Rainey, 2006).

Although the major associations were not actively advocating for a national policy regarding the internationalization of higher education, their advocacy efforts with regards to international education constituted an important part of their advocacy agenda. The study elaborated briefly on four of their main legislative priority areas regarding international programs. The reason for this was to acknowledge the fact that through their advocacy efforts – representing members’ interests for the various international programs and issues and ensuring that federal money keep flowing to institutions to support their internationalization efforts – the associations were ultimately supporting their members’ internationalization efforts.

**Cooperation Among the Major National Associations**

All the association representatives interviewed for the study praised the collaboration that existed among the major associations with regards to international education issues. According to them this collaboration was strongest in the advocacy arena, because of their common support for the issues in question. There was also an appreciation of the common efforts for the successes achieved. “Yes, we do our own part, we send letters and we do our own advocacy, but I think that [Title VI] survives because of the efforts of the entire community” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006).

The six major associations have worked closely together on all of the advocacy issues regarding international programs that were elaborated earlier. Collectively they have developed agreements or built coalitions to facilitate their advocacy efforts. Higher Education for Development (HED) has been one such instrument. “That’s one where
everybody gets together. Everybody has a piece of the action and they all have the same end” (K. Bolognese, personal communication, October 27, 2006). Another such instrument is the Coalition for International Education, which assists the presidential associations’ advocacy efforts in Congress and the Department of Education with regards to Title VI, Fulbright-Hays programs, and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). Through its work, the Coalition ensures that the presidential associations are abreast of any congressional or administrative developments related to international education (B. Timmons, personal communication, October 14, 2007).

The reason that the major associations have been able to work well together on all these issues is because they are large and visible issues that are very important to their members. Student visa issues for instance can affect the enrollment of international students as it can affect the revenue stream and research capacities of their institutional members. Title VI programs are critical for the sustenance of National Resource Centers, Language Resource Centers, and Centers for International Business. As Bailey (1975) had indicated, the associations are usually able to cooperate on issues that are really large and very visible.

In my research there was mention of only one instance of a disagreement among the presidential associations regarding their advocacy efforts for international programs. Burd (2005), reported that SEVIS – a security measure introduced after 9/11 terrorist attacks aimed at tracking foreign students and scholars – became a point of contention between AASCU vis-a-vis the rest of the presidential associations. I learned that the reason for the disagreement resulted from the fact that AASCU was in favor of implementing SEVIS, because it saw the introduction of such a measure as inevitable and
believed that cooperation with the administration would benefit higher education. The rest of the major associations on the other hand were rather reluctant to accept SEVIS initially. I was not able to find documentation to substantiate this development.

Division of labor is another aspect of this cooperation among presidential associations. According to Cook (1998) division of labor implied that one or more associations that have the highest stake in an issue, take the lead in advocating for that particular issue while the other associations assume a supportive role. The division of labor was very evident in the major associations’ advocacy efforts for international education issues. For instance, AAU played a leading role in the issue of streamlining the international student/scholar visa process. Since its members are all research universities, they were really affected by the drop in numbers of international graduate students due to the increased security measures following the terrorist attacks of September 11. NASULGC on the other hand took a leading role in advocating for the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Legislation, to some degree because its president, Peter McPherson, was appointed Chair of the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Commission in 2005. ACE not only played a leading role in the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) negotiations, an issue that was a priority on its advocacy agenda, but it has maintained its coordinating role by bringing a lot of the higher education community together under its auspices through Higher Education for Development, Coalition for International Education, and the Washington International Education Group.

From the documents reviewed for the study there was no indication of any competition among the associations. However, one of the interviewees indicated, “We all have overlapping membership and feel the need to serve our members, so on the programmatic level there is less cooperation than on the advocacy level with the
exception of HED” (M Green, personal communication, November 2006). This is understandable because advocacy issues, at least in the area of international programs, are such that they can best benefit from the major national associations presenting a united front. By the same token, given the overlap in membership, programmatic services are an area where the associations try to distinguish themselves from one another by the types of services they can offer their members in return for their membership.

**Contributions to Internationalization of Higher Education Over the Last Decade**

1. The higher education landscape of the United States is characterized by a large diversity of institutions, some of whom have had an international dimension for a long time while others may have not. Given their nature, as organizations consisting of institutional members, the presidential associations have been able to reach a lot of campuses and to provide members with many opportunities in the internationalization arena that may have not been available to them otherwise.

2. Through their publication, annual meetings, website information, and the various programs and services they have offered to their members, the presidential associations have contributed to internationalization receiving a lot of visibility and attention during the last decade.

3. Some of the major presidential associations, such as ACE, have not only provided thought leadership in the area of internationalization, but they have also helped members get a better understanding of internationalization by providing guidelines and strategies on what can be done and how.

4. The major associations have raised consciousness regarding the role that an
internationalized education can play in preserving America’s political and economic leadership role in the world and have made the case about the importance of preparing citizens with global competences to this end.

5. By elevating internationalization into an area of strategic importance and making changes in their own organizational structure to reflect this importance, the presidential associations have sent a clear message to the presidents and chief academic officers of their institutional members that integration of an international dimension in the core functions of the institution is very important.

6. Through their advocacy efforts the presidential associations were able to put a stop to a serious decline in international student enrollment and technically reversed that negative trend caused by restrictive security measures taken after the terrorist attacks of September 11. They were able to ensure funding for important international programs like Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs and to thwart Congressional efforts to establish a supervisory board for Title VI international programs, which would have had too much power and very little accountability.

7. Through their involvement in the Higher Education for Development program and cooperation with other international organizations, partners, and governments, the presidential associations have facilitated international collaboration for their members by creating opportunities for them to develop sustainable partnerships with international institutions.

Conclusions

Internationalization has become a priority for the major associations of higher education as they try to be responsive to their members’ interest in integrating an international dimension into the core functions of higher education. Given that they
represent institutions as a whole and that the presidents of the institutions are their designated members, the major national associations of higher education are positioned to play an important role in internationalizing American higher education and in affecting international education policy. The major associations have held a sustained presence in terms of advocacy for international education programs for many years. Except for ACE that has had a programmatic agenda for longer than any of the other associations, their involvement in terms of programmatic activities has increased dramatically especially in the last seven to ten years. The understanding of the need to advance internationalization on college campuses led the major associations into promoting internationalization into a strategic area of interest and making organizational changes to facilitate their involvement in campus internationalization. To this end, during the past decade they put in place new organizational structures such as the creation of committees/commission of international education to guide their efforts and the establishment of a vice president position to allow them to address the issues related to campus internationalization.

Although they consider themselves as external agents and in a supportive role in this process, the major associations will continue to play an important role in the internationalization of the American campus. They can play this important role by keeping internationalization visible, reminding institutional leaders of the strategic importance of internationalization, providing support and assistance to their members efforts, providing professional development opportunities for institutional leaders and individuals involved in the internationalization process, providing research data and other useful resources to assist institutional leaders in their decision making process, facilitating exchange of ideas and best practices, facilitating international cooperation, and ensuring federal funding for international programs through advocacy efforts.
The major associations are in an advocacy and supportive role with their members, although they see themselves first and foremost in a supportive role. As research suggested (Ruther, 2002), the brunt of campus internationalization will be borne by the institutions of higher education themselves. The way each institution will go about internationalizing its campus will largely remain an internal affair. The challenge is that, given the financial difficulties that institutions of higher education are currently facing, internationalization will have a lot of competition for limited resources with other institutional priorities, some of which may appear more urgent or eminent. Keeping the campus internationalization momentum going will be essential. This is probably where the assistance of the major associations will continue to play a major role in terms of campus internationalization.

Another area where the major associations can play a bigger role is the area of student learning outcomes assessment. Collectively, these associations can work towards the creation of a set of guidelines, which although not mandatory, can serve as benchmarks for those institutions that have an interest in internationalizing the curriculum and student learning. On March 21, 2006, the CEOs of the six presidential higher-education associations sent a letter to Secretaries Spellings and Rice, outlining their vision for the major components of a national program for creating the necessary language and cultural competencies needed for the 21st century. Given that they have reached a consensus with regards to what constitutes global competencies, the major associations should now work with their members in setting some parameters to assist them in determining if they are achieving the goal of educating students with such competencies.
Very likely funding for international programs will remain an issue. Strong advocacy will remain vital for the preservation of existing international programs and the emergence of new ones. Given that historically the presence of a national security rationale has been a must for federal legislation to translate into funding for international programs, the major associations will have to try to make even a better case for the strategic importance of international education in preserving national security and maintaining America’s leadership role in the world.

Last but not least, the major associations need to give a boost to their public relations efforts regarding their work in the area of internationalization. There is hardly any press regarding the programmatic aspect of their work in the area of internationalization. They need to make their work and achievements, as well as the achievements of their institutional members in the area of internationalization more visible. The public, as well as policy makers would most likely be pleased to hear about their achievements, accomplished in part with the help of tax payers’ money.

Limitations of the Study

One of the major limitations of the study has to do with the sources of data. The interviews with association representatives were one of the main sources of data for the study. As such, the study has some limitations due to the selectivity of the interviewees and the potential bias that comes with it. The information provided may be construed as the “official version” that the associations would like the public to know. The study could have benefited from the input of some other association representatives not in leadership position or representatives from member institutions to counterbalance some of the information provided by the association representatives. Given the large scope of the study, it was not feasible for me to interview additional persons.
The other source of data for the study consisted of document analysis. Many documents analyzed for this study belonged to or were produced by the major associations. The study has some limitations due to the fact that the data used may be construed as the “on-the-record stories” told by associations’ documents. To alleviate the impact of these limitations, as a researcher I tried to triangulate the data by cross-referencing information among the interviewees whenever possible and using other sources such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and other sources to corroborate the information obtained. As it has been mentioned, because the major associations are an understudied element of the higher education sector, the amount of outside sources elaborating on the associations’ internationalization efforts was limited and mostly corroborated the associations’ advocacy efforts.

Another limitation of the study has to do with terminology. It should be noted that even though the presidential associations are intimately involved in issues of international education, the terminology remains a little elusive. Terms such as international education, global education, and internationalization are used somewhat differently by different associations. The terminology may have affected to some degree the understanding and interpretation of information on the part of the participants and the researcher.

**Implications for Theory and Practice**

Higher education literature lacks an examination of the role played by the institutional associations of higher education and of the degree of their involvement in internationalizing higher education in the United States. A study, like this one, focused on the major higher-education associations and their role in shaping international education policy and influencing member institutions in pursuit of a more coherent and systematic approach to internationalizing higher education was important and timely.
After having investigated the role(s) of the six presidential associations in the internationalization of American higher education, the study examined various aspects of their involvement as it related to advocacy for international programs affecting federal international education policy and to their support of institutional members in their campus internationalization process. In so doing, the study was able to accomplish three objectives:

1. Created an inventory of activities (nominally and descriptively) that the major associations of higher education were involved in the area of internationalization of higher education in the United States in the last 10 years. Such an inventory or mapping of activities was important on two accounts: (a) it informed the main research question of this study, and (b) it provided a valuable addition to the literature on major associations given the absence of any comprehensive study of major associations’ involvement in internationalizing efforts.

2. Assessed the importance that the major associations attach to internationalization of higher education and their commitment to it.

3. Drew a comparative picture of how involved the major associations are, and where they stand with regards to the issue of internationalization of higher education.

Implications for Theory

The study was not intended to confirm or expand any existing theory. Its purpose was to depict the involvement and to describe the role(s) that the major associations have played in internationalizing American higher education during the last decade. However, given how limited the study of the major associations currently is, this study provides an important contribution to the higher education literature by providing a window through which one can examine the role(s) that these associations have played and are playing
collectively and individually in the area of internationalization of higher education, particularly from the viewpoint of supporting members’ efforts to internationalize.

Also, most research efforts regarding internationalization have been at the institutional level (Callan, 1998). The focus most often has been on the specific areas such as study abroad or the internationalization of the disciplines. Another contribution of this study is the fact that it represents an attempt to capture and analyze internationalization efforts at the national and sector level.

*Implications for the Major Associations and Their Members*

The study provided a description of the roles the major associations have assumed and an “inventory” of the activities the major associations have been involved in to assist members in their efforts to advance campus internationalization. This may benefit dues-paying members which can better familiarize themselves with what the association(s) they belong to could offer to them in the area of campus internationalization so that they can take advantage of existing opportunities and be more involved in the solutions and services that the associations provide.

The study may also benefit the major associations themselves, if they were interested in finding ways to improve what they are doing on behalf of their membership by looking at what their counterparts are doing and or by possibly assessing members’ needs. With very few exceptions, I did not find much evidence of efforts on the part of the major associations to gather input from members regarding the quality of programs and services they were providing to support members’ internationalization efforts. The study may motivate the associations to ask for members’ input regarding new services and programs they consider instrumental for their internationalization efforts or improving existing ones.
Recommendations for Further Research

1. This study focused mostly on describing the scope of activities that major associations have been involved in and the roles they have assumed in the area of internationalization. Additional research may be needed to find out what are the members’ perceptions regarding the work the major associations have done in the area of internationalization so far.

2. Another area of research may involve studying the impact that the associations have made on their members’ efforts to advance internationalization on their campuses by surveying member institutions. The latter study would complement the findings of this research and could help create a more complete picture of the major associations’ involvement in the internationalization of higher education.

3. This study mapped the involvement of the nation’s six major higher-education associations in the internationalization of American higher education. As mentioned elsewhere, there are other higher education associations, such as NAFSA and AIEA, which have played and are still playing a role in the internationalization of American higher education. Of interest would be a study that explores the existing linkages and areas of actual or possible cooperation between the major associations and the disciplinary associations for the purpose of finding out (a) how can they take advantage and benefit from each other’s efforts at the federal and institutional level and (b) what are some avenues for coordinating their efforts in order to create synergy that could benefit the state of internationalization of American higher education.

4. The study made mention of the negative impact that the terrorist attacks of September 11 had on the international student enrollment on U.S. campuses. Soon, it will be ten years since the terrorist attacks of 9/11 took place. These tragic events have had
ramifications on the American higher education; some obvious, others may be not so obvious. For instance, SEVIS – a database intended to track foreign students and scholars – was launched in 2003 as a security measure after the 9/11 attacks and all colleges and universities that enroll international students were required to participate in it. One of the recommendations of The 9/11 Commission Report was for the United States to increase support for scholarship and exchange programs (Durbin and Coleman praise, 2008) that could lead to a better U.S. understanding of the world and the world’s better understanding of American values. Given the benefit of time, it would be of interest to study the long-term impact of the 9/11 attacks – how have they affected and shaped the internationalization of American higher education?

Summary

This study was an attempt to identify and describe the roles that the nation’s six major associations have played in the internationalization of American higher education, and to map their involvement in terms of their advocacy efforts for international programs and their support of members as they internationalize their campuses.

The findings of the study suggest that despite their longstanding interest in international issues, campus internationalization did not become an area of strategic priority for the major associations until the turn of the 21st century. The major associations saw themselves first and foremost in the role of a supporter of their members’ efforts in advancing internationalization on their campuses. In this supportive role, they assumed a number of functions and provided a lot of services. In addition to their role as advocates for international education programs at the federal level, some presidential associations also assumed the role of advocate with their members, promoting a strategic approach to campus internationalization.
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APPENDIX A

PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWING ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES

Obtain personal information of interviewee:

Name of the Interviewee: ..........................................................

Position Title: ...........................................................................

Name of Association: .............................................................

Phone and E-mail: .................................................................

Explain the purpose of the study, as well as timeline of the study. Obtain written consent for participating in the interview. Ask about permission to use name and to use direct quotes from the interview. Reassure the interviewee about confidentiality of any information that is not public knowledge that the interviewee would not like disclosed.

Prior to starting the interview, clarify the working definition for

\textit{Internationalization of Higher Education}: In order to insure a common understanding of the term \textit{Internationalization of Higher Education}, I am using this term to mean “the process of integrating an international, intercultural and/or global dimension into the goals, functions, (teaching/learning, research, services) and delivery of higher education” as defined by the Canadian researcher, Jane Knight, in 2003.

Continue with the standardized questions:

1. What level of importance does internationalization have for your association?

Would you say it is of “No priority”, “Low Priority”, “Medium priority”, or “High priority”?
1.a. If the answer to question 1 is any of the first three choices, follow up with this question: Could you explain why does internationalization of higher education hold that level of importance for your association?

1.b. If the answer is “high priority” ask the question: Could you provide a list of reasons why internationalization is important to your association?

1.b.a. Follow up with this question: Out of the list of reasons why internationalization is important to your association that you have just identified, which ones do you think constitute the top three reasons?

2. Would you say that the internationalization of higher education holds --[insert interviewee's answer]--------level of importance in your association as regards assisting member institutions in their internationalization efforts, or your’ association's federal advocacy priorities, or does it apply to both of them?

3. Is internationalization part of your association’s mission?

4. What is your organization’s stated policy (goals and objectives) with regards to internationalization of American higher education and implementation strategy? Could you provide the existing policy if available.

5. What unit in your organization has the overall and ultimate policy-level responsibility for the agenda/strategy on internationalization and how is that (responsibility) exercised?

6. What unit(s) in your organization has the direct operational responsibility with regards to the implementation of the internationalization activities and how is that (responsibility) exercised?

7. What is the number of staff in your association working in the area of internationalization?
8. What sources of financial support exist for internationalization efforts in your association?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Identify/Name Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>e.g., The Ford Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. a. What financial resources has your association allocated to its internationalization efforts (in dollar terms)?

$\underline{_________________}$

8. b. What percentage of the total budget of your association does that figure represent?

$\underline{_________________}\%$

9. Could you provide a list of the main rationales that drive your association’s efforts for internationalization of higher education?

9.a. Follow up with this question: Out of the list of the main rationales that drive your association’s efforts for internationalization of higher education that you have just identified, which ones do you think constitute the top three reasons?

10. Could you please provide a list of the main activities that your association is involved in to promote and support internationalization of higher education in the United States?
10.a. Out of the list of main activities that your association is involved in to promote and support internationalization of higher education in the United States that you have just identified, which ones do you think constitute the top three activities?

11. What mechanisms are in place to facilitate these programs or initiatives?

12. What are some of the outcomes of these programs and initiatives?

13. What do you think the impact of such programs or initiatives has been?

14. Has your association advocated internationalization as a strategic process for its member institutions or has it stressed certain aspects of it? If the latter, which aspects of internationalization has it emphasized?

15. Please indicate, in ranking order, the 3 main issues that top your association’s advocacy efforts in the area of internationalization. (1= more important)

16. Given the division of labor that exists among the associations of higher education, is there any particular association that has taken the lead in representing the issue of internationalization with the federal government?

17. What are some issues, programs, or projects involving internationalization of higher education that your association is working on in cooperation with other associations?

18. Has a national level policy or strategy for internationalization of higher education been elaborated in the United States?

18.a. (If the answer to questions 18 is “Yes”, follow up with this question: Is there a federal government department or agency, which is leading the implementation policy strategy? If yes, please provide the name of the government department or the co-ordinating body.)
18.b. If the answer to question 6 was “No” follow up with this question: Has the higher education community developed/put forward a national policy on internationalization of higher education?

18.c. If the answer to 18.a. was “Yes” follow up with this question: Was your association involved in developing this national policy?

18.d. If the answer to 18.c. was “Yes” follow up with this question: What is the status of this policy?

19. Which of the following would you consider as major actors affecting internationalization of higher education in the United States and why: the federal government, the major associations of higher education (the Big Six), the professional/disciplinary (NAFSA, AIEA) or other non-governmental organizations like IIE?

20. Is there any other area of internationalization of higher education your association is involved in that was not covered in this interview so far?

21. In your opinion, what has been the contribution your association has made with regards to the internationalization of higher education in the last 10 years?

Thank the interviewee and provide contact information so that s/he she may contact you with questions or additional information.
October 6, 2006

Dear [Name],

My name is Reti Shutina. I am a doctoral student in higher education administration at the University of Toledo. I am in the data-gathering phase of my dissertation and am requesting your assistance in completing my research.

I am conducting a descriptive comparative study of the role and involvement of the six major associations of higher education in the internationalization of American higher education. In order to collect the data to support my thesis, I am asking for your cooperation in the following areas: (1) allow a personal interview to provide information regarding the role your association is playing in the internationalization of American higher education; (2) provide access to any public documents issued by your association that are relevant to my study’s topic; and (3) suggest any other individual that you think may be instrumental to this study.

My preliminary work to date indicates that higher education literature lacks an examination of the role played by the institutional associations of higher education and of the degree of their involvement in internationalizing higher education in the United States. A study focused on the major higher-education associations and their role in shaping international education policy and influencing member institutions in pursuit of a more coherent and systematic approach to internationalizing higher education is important and timely. This research could benefit yourself and other associations like yours, as well as, provide me an opportunity to complete my study. Enclosed is a document that summarizes my project and explains the purpose of this study.

I will be in Washington D.C. from Oct. 24th to October 31st. Could you please be so kind and send me an email or call me at (419) 343 XXXX letting me know if we can arrange a time for an interview? I am available on Oct. 25th, 26th and Oct. 30th. I certainly appreciate your valuable time and kind consideration in helping me with this study.

Sincerely,

Reti Shutina
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

An Investigation of the Role that the Six Major Associations of Higher Education Have Played in the Internationalization of the American Higher Education From 1996 to 2006

Researcher: Reti Shutina, Doctoral Candidate, College of Education, University of Toledo

Faculty Advisor: Dr. David Meabon, Associate Professor, College of Education, University of Toledo

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

You are being asked to participate in a qualitative study that investigates the role that the six major associations of higher education have played in the internationalization of the American higher education from 1996 to 2006. I am investigating this topic as part of my dissertation research in order to further my understanding of the role of major national associations of higher education in the area of internationalizing American higher education as it relates to:

3. Shaping federal policy with regards to internationalization of higher education;
4. Promoting and coordinating internationalization efforts among their members and assisting them in this process.

I anticipate that the time frame for the date collection and analysis to be about 4 months. The data collection process will consist of (1) interviews with the directors of centers for international activities/initiatives in each of the six presidential associations, and (2) document analysis.

Your selection to participate in the study is due primarily to your position as director of the Center for International Initiatives in your association. Your participation in the research study is voluntary. Before agreeing to be part of this study, please read the following information carefully. Feel free to ask questions if you do not understand something.

If you participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview lasting approximately one hour. The interview consists of 21 standard questions. All your counterparts in the other associations will be asked the same questions. You will also be asked to provide certain materials and documents that are public record and relevant to the study.
Apart from the inconvenience of dedicating one hour of your time to this interview, I do not anticipate any other inconvenience or risks to you. I do not anticipate that any of the questions will make you feel uncomfortable, but if you do feel uncomfortable, you can choose not to answer that particular question.

This study was not designed to benefit you directly; however, since higher education literature lacks an examination of the role played by the institutional associations of higher education and of the degree of their involvement in internationalizing higher education in the United States, there is some possibility that this research could benefit yourself and your associations.

Since this is a qualitative study, it may become necessary for me to quote parts of the interview. If that would be the case, I, as a researcher will make sure that you will not be linked to any of the information that you provide without your expressed permission. Given the limited number of participants in this study your anonymity may not be guaranteed. If you would prefer complete anonymity you may choose not to participate in the study. However, the data collected for this study will be used primarily to help me complete my dissertation and at this point, I do not anticipate publishing it. If you or your association is interested in obtaining the findings of the study, copies will be sent as requested.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this research. Such refusal will not have any negative consequences for you. If you begin to participate in the research, you may at any time, for any reason, discontinue your participation without any negative consequences.

Please feel free to ask any questions about anything that seems unclear to you and to consider this research and consent form carefully before you sign.

Authorization: I have read the above information and I have decided that I will participate in the project described above. The researcher has explained the study to me and answered my questions. I know what will be asked of me and I understand the purpose of the study. If I don't participate, there will be no penalty or loss of rights. I can stop participating at any time, even after I have started.

I agree to participate in the study. My signature below also indicates that I have received a copy of this consent form.

Participant’s signature: __________________________
Name (please print): __________________________
Date: ______

If you have further questions about this research project, please contact the principal researcher, [Reti Shutina at (419) 343-XXXX, e-mail: rshutina@hotmail.com].
January 21, 2008

Dear [Name],

I am writing to inform you that I have finally finalized writing the individual reports regarding the involvement of the six presidential associations in the internationalization of American higher education, as well as the cross-case report. After a long hiatus from the birth of my son and some really serious health problems I have been experiencing, I am now approaching the stage of defending my dissertation.

Attached please find the case study for NASULGC. Please be advised that the narrative regarding NASULGC is based both on the interview I had with you as well as various documents that I was able to obtain from the website of your association, as well as other sources.

The reason I am sending the case to you is two-purposeful. First, I had made the promise not to quote you without your permission. The yellow highlights in the text are the quotes. They are direct quotes or paraphrases of your statements. I transcribed the interviews verbatim, so I am pretty confident that they are accurate, however I want to make sure that I get your blessing for that.

Secondly, it would be wonderful if you would find some time to read the whole case and let me know if I have been able to interpret your interview responses correctly and in general if I have a good interpretation of NASULGC’s involvement. Be advised that the categories I have used correspond to a breakdown of the primary and secondary research questions that I explored in this study. Also, generally speaking, my interpretation is based on the literature on internationalization and this is my interpretation of the documents that I have reviewed for the study. (Please note that in text or in the bibliography, when you see n.d. (it means “no date” as the document has been obtained from the web. When there is more than one such source, then, letters such as a,b,c are added, i.e., n.d.a).

If you do not have the time to read the whole piece, for your convenience, I have highlighted all the quotes that I have used from our interview, so you can focus only on the quotes if you so choose. Please let me know your opinion at your earliest convenience, the sooner the better. I am scheduled to defend my dissertation mid-February, and it will really be helpful to hear from you some time before then.

Thank you very much for your assistance,

Reti Shutina
APPENDIX E

CATEGORIES USED IN WRITING THE CASE STUDY REPORT

Category I. – Importance and Rationales for Internationalization

1. Importance as Measured by:
   a. Inclusion in Mission Statement
   b. Inclusion in Strategic Plan or
   c. Strategic Area of Action

2. Rationales for Internationalization:
   a. Academic Rationales
   b. Social Rationales
   c. Political Rationales
   d. Economic Rationales

Category II. – Commitment to Internationalization of Higher Education

as Measured by:

a. Stance toward Internationalization

b. Organizational Setup to Support and Promote Internationalization

c. Organizational and Financial Resources Dedicated to
   Internationalization

Category III. – Approaches to Internationalization

a. Strategic Approach

b. Programmatic Approach

Category IV. – Roles of Associations

a. Advocate

b. Promoter

c. Supporter
Category V. – Mapping Involvement in the Internationalization of Higher Education

   a. Advocacy Efforts for International Programs
   b. Promoting Internationalization of Higher Education
   c. Supporting Members’ Internationalization Efforts

Category VI. – Major Associations Perceived Contributions in the Internationalization Arena Over the Last Decade

Category VII. – Cooperation among Major Associations on International Issues (used in the cross-case report)
APPENDIX F

LIST OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS BY ACE (1996-2006)

7. Measuring Internationalization at Comprehensive Universities (2005)
8. Measuring Internationalization at Liberal Arts Colleges (2005)


23. Spreading the Word II: Promising Developments for Undergraduate Foreign Language Instruction (1996)

Note. The list was compiled on the basis of a list of publications posted by ACE. Source retrieved on September 20, 2007, from http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/category.cfm?categoryID=6