

NCA SELF-STUDY ON INTERNATIONALIZATION

Preface

In a series of meetings reaching out to Michigan State University (MSU) faculty, staff, alumni, and friends earlier this spring, President Lou Anna K. Simon identified internationalization, broadly defined, as one of the chief pillars of the university. She then went on to state that one of her main goals for the university during her tenure as President was “to sustain and expand our leading position in international research, teaching, programs, and engagement.”

To President Simon, a leading position in internationalization was a natural extension of MSU’s past and present. It is a university well-known for international teaching, research, and outreach; for the wide range of study abroad programs, internships, and research opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students; and for hands-on experience and working partnerships around the globe. By embracing such a goal, MSU was doing more than building on its traditions and current successes: it was looking to its future. That future, she argued, would be one increasingly defined by a globalizing world and a globalizing university. That future would be determined by how we respond to the risks, challenges, and opportunities that are part of these trends.

She went on to remind her audience that budgetary constraints, competition, and the increasing complexity of the world around us would not permit us to carry on our international efforts as usual. As the MSU community has done in the past, so it must now adapt its traditions and practices to new global conditions abroad and budgetary constraints in Michigan. She was confident both that the opportunities outweighed the risks and that our energy and talents could overcome whatever roadblocks we found in our way.

This Self-Study is an attempt to think through MSU’s international role under the new conditions and challenges President Simon has outlined. It was conceived as part of the University’s re-accreditation process underway with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). This re-accreditation process has two parts:

**The first is an overarching report focusing on the university as a whole, headed by Deans Karen Klomprens and June Youatt.

**The second is this self-study, which aims to look separately and comprehensively at the university’s mission, research, curriculum, student and faculty issues, programs, outreach, and future aims in light of our stated goal of being a university with a global reach in a time of global change.

A committee of MSU faculty, administrators, specialists, and students came together in October 2003 to examine trends, look at challenges, identify options, and present them to the university community in advance of the NCA visit in February 2006.¹

¹ The members of the Self-Study Committee are listed in [Appendix A](#).

This Committee has worked from the first with a broad set of questions in mind, and a willingness to engage the university community and beyond.²

For those of us on the Self-Study Committee, one thing became obvious from the very beginning: MSU did not need another study on the need for the university to respond to the impact of globalization on higher education or on the value of internationalizing the campus. There are many impressive calls to action and guides for universities seeking to respond to the challenges and opportunities of a globalizing world.

We also did not want for the self-study only to catalogue the depth and breadth of ongoing international activities at MSU. As a leader in international education, MSU has for more than half a century articulated a vision of international engagement and pursued it throughout the globe. This vision and its pursuit have left behind its own literature of presidential speeches, strategies, guiding principles, scholarly literature, public policy recommendations, and reports, much of it produced by our Dean of International Studies and Programs (ISP) and the ISP staff.³ We are proud of what MSU has done and continues to do in the international arena, but it was not the purpose of the Self-Study to catalogue these accomplishments, save where they illuminate options, issues, and opportunities to expand our international engagement.

Instead, the Committee wished to present to the university community a set of issues for discussion and possible options for action that would take seriously President Simon's goal of sustaining and expanding our international efforts across the campus. At this stage, it makes no unified set of recommendations, as we see before us an autumn of consultations with interested members of the MSU community on this study. Moreover, we are also mindful that there is no "one way" to carry out international missions and programs. Whatever recommendations emerge from our discussions are likely to draw upon a wide range of experiences at MSU and elsewhere.

² The original guiding questions document is in **Appendix B**.

³ A wide array of data, reports, and other sources within MSU is listed in **Appendix D** and a timeline of key milestones in internationalization at MSU is in **Working Paper 18**.

The Committee saw the scope of its work on internationalization simply and pragmatically as focusing on making the curricular and extracurricular experiences of students, as well as faculty teaching, research, and outreach, increasingly permeated by an awareness of multiple areas, cultures, and peoples beyond the borders of the United States, of problems, trends, and issues in their global or area contexts, of globalization as a defining collection of trends in our time, and of how each of the preceding shapes and interacts with our local realities. We also saw it as a crucial part of internationalization that the university community not simply study the things listed above, but also engage and respond to them, both here and throughout the world. Internationalization, properly understood, is an important part of the university's response to an increasingly interconnected world.⁴

If we came away with one conviction, it is that, while there are many ways we could define our basic mission, research priorities, curricular goals, and outreach efforts any of these options will require a series of interconnected steps that will transform the way we do business now. These steps include the following:

**A clear statement of the connection between institutional priorities and missions as related to internationalization.

**A recognition that these priorities and missions require increasing attention to the knowledge, skills, and abilities that a liberal university education should provide the successful graduate of both undergraduate and graduate programs in the light of a globalizing world that propels continual realignment of people, ideas, and priorities.

**A similar recognition that internationalization of our research, teaching, and engagement has to continue to fit in with MSU's land grant mission and respond to the needs of its investors, supporters, and stakeholders.

**The provision of resources commensurate with these priorities and the stated mission. Such resources are likely to come from a variety of sources, including new investment from the Provost and Deans, outside grants and support, reductions elsewhere, and new efficiencies. They cannot come simply from the general fund. However, such resources must be forthcoming if MSU is serious about retaining and expanding its leadership role in the internationalization of higher education.

**A commitment on the part of units receiving these resources to think and act cooperatively and to exploit synergies.

**A realization on the part of faculty and administration that new investment requires more and better outcomes. New investment cannot be used to patch holes or restore lost positions or programs. MSU must move in qualitatively new directions that meet overarching research, teaching, and outreach priorities. These new efforts must produce a demonstrable value-added in reputation,

⁴ A bibliography of a selection of such sources is in [Appendix C](#).

outside funding, and public impact. It should also be expected that MSU will invest to maintain and expand areas of traditional strength and reputation.

**A recognition that outcomes must be measurable and those responsible for results are held accountable.

**Improvements to the system of managing internationalization at the unit and central levels that support the above steps. Such a system has the difficult job of balancing between encouraging and sustaining the creative and entrepreneurial energy of individual faculty and local units and ensuring these local goals, priorities, programs, and personnel fit together and result in a whole larger than the individual parts. Such a system must encourage input, initiative, and dissent, but it must also make known its priorities. One theme that emerged from the Committee's discussions throughout the MSU community is the desire to improve the administration's ability to expand participation yet more efficiently use it and to improve its capacity to respond to successes or failures in a way that everyone involved can tell the difference.

The Self-Study Committee has worked for eighteen months. It has produced the attached document, bringing together a set of arguments, proposals, and recommendations that should serve as the basis for wider campus discussion on the future direction of internationalization. This document is a draft. It contains a number of still unresolved issues, multiple options, and holes. There in fact should be room in a document that seeks broader public input for comments, criticisms, and suggestions. We hope readers will alert us to new ideas, best practices, and studies and sources of data of which we are not aware. In the end our goal is not simply a better document, but talk and action that sustains MSU's current prominence in internationalization but also positions the university to be a leader as the forces of globalization remake higher education in the years to come.

I. The Challenges and Opportunities of Internationalization

This study assumes that MSU is already an international university. It devotes considerable time, energy, and resources to providing its faculty, staff, administrators, students, alumni, and the community at large with internationally-oriented curriculum, research, and outreach. It also assumes that the university has other missions and priorities, so that not every aspect of our work can or should have an international component. Indeed, a key aspect of continuing and deepening internationalization at MSU is finding the right balance between internationalization and other crucial missions of the university, including identifying synergies and greater interdisciplinary and interdepartmental co-operation to sustain internationalization and other university, unit, and faculty priorities.

MSU has a long history of international research, teaching, and outreach that has continued un-interrupted to the present day. Hallmarks of this engagement include research and outreach crucial to the Green Revolution, decades of commitment to Africa, a special focus on international development issues, outstanding international research and technical assistance in health, education, and environment, strong area studies and foreign language courses and research, and a nationally recognized study abroad initiative. These and many other international aspects of the university have created a global reputation and expectations of MSU's continued leadership. During the Committee's long internal deliberations and its discussions with individuals throughout the campus, no one ever suggested that MSU step away from an area that has in fact brought it institutional energy and intellectual satisfaction, as well as national and international reputation. Even those not engaged in internationally-oriented work at MSU recognize the importance of the internationalization agenda for the university's future.

However, past accomplishments and current reputation are not enough to sustain MSU's leadership into the future, especially in the light of the following three pervasive challenges:

****The first is long-term budget constraints.** Over the past several years, Michigan's economic troubles have steadily reduced state funding as an overall proportion of MSU's budget. MSU's reductions are part of a larger national trend of cutting state support for higher education, even as leaders call for expansion of education programs and opportunities for their citizens. State funding for Michigan universities, including MSU, has declined by 8.2% over the last two years, a cut ranking among the deepest in the nation. MSU's internal reductions and budget reallocations taken to offset state appropriation cuts have exceeded 16% over the past 4 years (thru FY05). The University has been forced to absorb appropriation cuts of 12% to date over the past 4 years. This cut-back in state funding has put a strain on every priority, program, and unit in the university. Internationalization must not only survive this trend, it must adapt to it and demonstrate its ability to help the university cope in a more competitive fiscal

environment through attracting outside support.

****The second is the pressures on faculty devoted to international research, teaching, and outreach.** All faculty and departments at MSU face the constraints of the budgetary pressure described above. MSU is in fact down nearly 200 tenure stream faculty from a high point two decades ago. Data from the Office of Academic Human Resources indicate the number of tenured faculty in October 2004 faculty was 1,897 compared to 2,084 in October 1985. This overall reduction comes at a time of the graying of MSU faculty, particularly those long associated with key international research, teaching, and outreach. Assuming the average age of retirement for faculty is 65, around 300 faculty are likely to retire over the next five years. Core international faculty must not only be replaced in a fiscally constrained environment, but their replacement must be justified in light of other unit and disciplinary priorities. In some disciplines, cutting edge work focuses squarely on theorizing processes of globalization. This priority has led to a corresponding downgrading of area expertise and research, which is viewed from this perspective as more pragmatic and less theoretical.⁵ The above national and local trends have led to an unevenness of support for internationalization across departments and disciplines in an institution as large and diverse as ours. In some cases, units with severe budget problems are forced to choose between a number of important priorities in making hires. In other cases, the retirement of someone with international experience is seen as an opportunity to “upgrade” to faculty with cutting edge theoretical interests. These trends threaten to reduce the cadre of internationally active faculty at a time when successful international efforts require multi-unit and multi-disciplinary contributions to flourish. While MSU has acted to address these pressures, especially in seeking out faculty that meet unit and disciplinary priorities and contribute to the international mission, these pressures are unlikely to abate in the next decade.

****The third is the external pressures of change from globalization in general and a highly competitive market for higher education in particular.** Two decades from now, MSU’s current strengths and unique capacities in internationalization will be more and more commonly available throughout institutions of higher learning. Study abroad, for example, has already become more common in a wide variety of educational settings and there is little prospect of this trend abating, even as individual programs remain sensitive to political and other sources of risk. Increasing numbers of students already come to MSU with significant

⁵ On the disciplinary shift away from Area Studies, see Sheila Biddle, *Internationalization: Rhetoric or reality?* New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2002, p. 69. The Report may be found on-line at: <http://www.acls.org/op56> .

international experiences under their belt. Global and market forces are working to transform the university itself, especially calling into question the idea of the university as a single and comprehensive place of research, teaching, and outreach. These forces will not sweep away the university as we know it, but they will require universities to respond to growing demands for on-line education, for mixing and matching course and research offerings at different locations, and for balancing the needs of virtual and “real” students, staff, and faculty. The university of the 21st century will need to become more globally oriented, more capable of responding to demand for access from across the globe, and more capable of educating students and conducting research and outreach in multiple settings. It will also have to connect issues, and trends of global significance to local, state, and regional matters and do so in ways that make sense to internal and external constituencies. It will have to demonstrate that international engagement brings local benefits, as well as meet the challenge of sustaining and expanding its international strengths, commitments, and reputation in a time of fiscal constraint, demographic disruption, and global change and challenges.

For MSU to continue to be a leader in internationalization in higher education, it must not only sustain the material resources, faculty, and signature programs necessary for such a position, but it must also make an intellectual and institutional commitment to understanding and adapting to globalization and its impacts on higher education. MSU has to become a model of how universities adapt and thrive under these new global conditions. This paper provides a look at various aspects of this challenge, including options for how to meet it and become a model of higher education in a globalizing world. It focuses in particular on nine areas crucial for sustaining and expanding MSU's international mission in the decades ahead:

- **defining 21st century internationalization for MSU;
- **sustaining and expanding faculty resources and excellence;
- **supporting excellence in international research;
- **enhancing international aspects of graduate and professional education;
- **enhancing international aspects of undergraduate education;
- **expanding global outreach;
- **forming new strategic partnerships to extend MSU's reach;
- **internationalizing campus life; and
- **providing the necessary administrative supports, both in International Studies and Programs and the Provost's Office.

II. Defining 21st Century Internationalization for MSU

During its deliberations, the Self-Study Committee conducted a little thought experiment. Given MSU's current strengths in research, teaching, and outreach, what might a unifying international mission look like? What visionary mission would also give us the best chance of succeeding in stretching ourselves, shaping new investments, and creating new synergies? We did so, not because we believe in a single, top-down command model for internationalization at MSU, but rather because we believe there is a pressing need to identify possible cross-department and interdisciplinary synergies and to use these synergies to sustain and expand viable clusters of international teaching, research and outreach.

We also came to understand better the existing gaps and frictions with respect to internationalization between the interests and priorities of graduate and professionally-oriented schools and core liberal arts programs, between science and technical programs and social sciences and humanities programs, and between even those firmly within the internationalization tent who look at the world regionally and those who look at it through the lens of global issues. In a fiscally constrained environment, supporters of internationalization need to look for synergies and opportunities to fill in or at least bridge these gaps and show how internationalization need not come at the expense of other priorities.

There is another reason for thinking about a unifying vision. Whatever the strengths of our tradition of internationalization or current position as a global leader in such areas as engagement with Africa, international development, or study abroad, our position is constantly challenged by the trends described in the last section. In particular, almost every institution is becoming or claiming to become "more international." Almost every institution can or will soon be able to produce lists of international courses, programs, research, and outreach that will seem to the bewildered prospective student, state legislator, foundation president, and taxpayer to be very much like everyone else's list. Signature programs like study abroad are becoming less and less unique now and will become more widespread in the coming years.

In the past, it may have been enough to underscore internationalization as a way of differentiating MSU from other institutions. Those days are gone. MSU now needs to define more precisely its overall international vision and niche. It also needs to nurture, expand, and build an integrated set of teaching, research, and outreach programs that reflect that vision and are widely recognized by peers and stakeholders as excellent. Some of the key building blocks, such as international missions and programs in the various academic and service units are already in place. The Committee's thought experiment below offers one version of such a unifying vision statement, aiming to present to the university community an example of what it believes is necessary and to stimulate a wider consideration of whether it or some other version better captures existing strengths, longer term ambitions, and necessary choices. Indeed, it may be

necessary to come up with three or four such mission statements to capture the breadth and depth of MSU's internationalization efforts now and in the future, but it is clear that there is a pressing need to differentiate ourselves and our international contribution clearly from a growing pack of institutions and to find a clear way of telling ourselves what our international priorities are in a time of constrained resources and difficult choices.

A Thought Experiment: Focusing on the Human Impact of Globalization

MSU has a long tradition of pioneering international work. We believe it is time to take another step and create a truly 21st century global MSU. This MSU would be committed to understanding globalization and the globalizing world in all its aspects and would make the search for that understanding one of its fundamental missions to be reflected in its teaching, research, and outreach. The basic building blocks for such a position are outlined below.

1. The initiative would require defining our internationalization missions in a way that helps us make the best use of our strengths and limited resources, while differentiating us as having a global impact at home and abroad. The Committee found that MSU's international strengths are not comprehensive. Regionally, we are strongest in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Thematically, we are strongest in global environment, development, education, and health issues.⁶ These strengths play out upon a variety of disciplinary and unit indicators, including a general recognition of the strength of our basic science and professional programs. As a result, we may be in a unique position to develop a kind of "land grant" internationalization by staking a claim to understanding and responding to the benefits, opportunities, challenges, and costs of the globalization⁷ of human and environment interactions.

2. Such an approach would single out issues where there is an impact on human and animal health; the environment; economic prosperity and development-both rural

⁶ To help us understand these areas of strength, the Committee received special papers on international strengths in environmental [**Working Paper 03**], and health [**Working Paper 19**] issues at MSU. We also made profitable use of material generated by an ongoing review of Area Studies [**Working Paper 20**].

⁷ The Committee defined globalization as less of a unifying process than a set of interconnected trends, including global economic and cultural integration, as well as the resistance to this integration. These trends include the pressures of marketization and democratization; the revolution in communications; long-term patterns of immigration; ecological interdependence, including issues of climate change, invasive species, or diseases like HIV-AIDS; and a range of proliferation and other security issues that create a more fragile and dangerous world.

and urban; ethnic, religious, and racial identities, tolerance, and conflict; political reform and democratization; equity and social justice; and armed conflicts and conflict resolution. We would look at these issues in the light of the past, present, and future, drawing on MSU's roots in the poorest regions of the globe, our strengths in outreach and research with consequences, and our global reach. All of these factors argue for becoming the institution with a mission to understand globalization, theoretically and pragmatically and ways to mitigate its negative effects and more widely and fairly distribute its opportunities.

3. This unifying vision should also underscore the way in which the vast array of global issues and the university's international engagement has its roots in, and provides benefits for, the state of Michigan and its citizens. Moreover, the Committee believe such a focus can do this.

**Most obviously, the United States is not immune to the impact of the core issues that make-up the human impact of globalization, whether it be the many environmental, health, educational or economic linkages that tie our planet together or more pragmatic research and market benefits that come from global involvement.

**Our international mission does not prevent our continuing to serve Michigan and in fact should help establish clearer linkages for ourselves, the legislature, and many public groups between our local and state work, our international missions, and our global vision.

**In fact, the reverse is true, our international mission should enable us to understand how global processes generate constraints and opportunities for Michigan and to suggest policies or strategies to effectively position the state in relation to those global processes.

4. Implementing this commitment would require us not only to build upon strengths but also to fill in gaps, such as currently exist in areas of understanding global conflict or in working out the public policy implications of our theoretical and practical insights, yet the Committee believed significant resources already exist within the university and across its many departments to contribute to such a mission today.

5. The most important benefit of visioning of this type—whether it becomes the overarching mission or is linked with other such statements that together define internationalization for MSU—is that it helps to define more clearly for faculty, staff, and administrators priorities in a time of scarce resources.

**Priority for investment in internationalization would flow from the vision statement. Though such a statement recognizes existing strengths, it would encourage investment in new areas that would support various other missions, such as expanding our coverage of Central Asia or armed conflicts in the poorest regions. It requires making hiring and support choices.

**This unifier would create a clear set of research, resource, and teaching priorities within the international missions at MSU. It would not attempt to micro-

manage faculty research, teaching, or outreach, but it would create a broad set of themes, concentrations, and priorities that would be easy to present to ourselves and to the outside world.

** A vision of this type and its effective implementation through greater focus in investment, research, and curriculum would define concentrations for outreach efforts and better place outreach and pragmatic work in a broader context, one of both theoretical and practical significance and one more likely to garner peer and public respect.

**This initiative would help distinguish our understanding of international missions within a global vision from many other colleges and universities also claiming to be international or global.

**It would also require restructuring some administrative and other support structures and acquiring a limited set of true global strategic partners.

**MSU already has a foundation in place for such an initiative but requires the foresight and follow-through to stretch that foundation and pioneer a new kind of world leadership position. Indeed, such an initiative needs to build upon existing foundations in research, teaching, and outreach.

**It must have roots in undergraduate and graduate education, in visible research and support for research, and in our hiring and retention of faculty and staff who support the initiative.

**It must also build synergy between the liberal arts and the professional schools and natural sciences beyond their liberal education function. In some visions of internationalization, these programs are seen as outside of—or even hostile to—international missions and programs, because program requirements, lack of language requirements, and the simple lack of room in many students' schedules to do study abroad leave many faculty and students in these areas outside of what most universities and colleges see as international programs. MSU must be different, as some of our greatest international academic strengths and a large concentration of foreign students are present in Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Biomedical schools and programs, Law, Education, and Business.

Questions for Further Consideration—

As stated above, the Self-Study Committee believes a vision of this type is a useful thought experiment, helping us to discuss more generally our strengths and gaps, our goals, and our shared criteria for investment of scarce resources. Our aim is not to create a take-it-or-leave-it, one-size-fits-all mission statement, but to stimulate consideration of a range of options that might stand singly or be combined together to better define our vision of where we must head to sustain and expand our leadership role in internationalization. Questions that need consideration for this or any alternative visioning include the following:

**Is this or any unifying mission statement feasible within so large and diverse an

institution as MSU?

**Does it adequately differentiate us from other institutions and create a niche, while providing a model for other institutions and creating opportunities for interaction?

**Does it fully capture where we are already strong or where we can improve? Which units and programs are missing from its focus?

**Can MSU live by the implications of a vision of this type, especially the budget and management priorities it suggests? Can we change our culture to support such a vision?

**Where and how is it [or an alternative formulation] already supported in the university and what other actions are needed to broaden support for it?

**How disruptive will and should this or any new vision be? Do we have the institutional and fiscal wherewithal and individual and unit energy and morale to steer such a course?

**What other alternatives are within reach? Are they more viable, strong, and innovative?

III. Sustaining and Expanding Faculty Excellence

Sustaining and deepening MSU's commitment to internationalization depends, first and foremost, on the indispensable role MSU faculty play and will continue to play in all aspects, particularly its reputation as a leader in international research, teaching, and outreach. There is indeed probably no single greater factor in enhancing the dynamism, direction, and depth of internationalization of MSU than the support of its related faculty. Successful internationalization cannot simply add another set of demands to an already overburdened faculty member. Rather, it requires creating a sufficient critical mass of faculty, a creative mix of interests, disciplines, and research interests, an intellectually stimulating environment of research, teaching, and outreach, and the proper incentives. Below we list a range of ideas gathered from our research and discussions directly related to internationalization, mindful that there is vast experience on campus and a large literature on faculty issues in general.

(a) **Expanding the Cadre of International Faculty.** Our first priority is to hire the very best faculty, especially those who are internationally-minded and internationally-experienced, preferably with foreign language capacity. Great international faculty include scholars who work in international contexts and who work on problems of global consequence, faculty who teach study abroad courses faculty who mentor graduate students engaged in international research, and who infuse on-campus courses with international content, and faculty from around the world who research and teach and engage the community in all areas. Not only should these faculty fill positions related to an internationalization effort, but such capabilities should be seen, where possible, as a plus factor in hiring generally. In this fiscally constrained environment, there has to be a more serious commitment made to look for faculty who fill multiple niches, are inter- and cross-disciplinary, and are able to work in or across a number of departments.

As noted at the outset of this study, the number of tenure stream faculty at MSU has declined over the past two decades. The President and Acting Provost have identified reversing this decline, despite budget constraints, as a key priority. Campus discussions have centered on 100-200 new tenure stream faculty as a likely target. The Self-Study Committee has taken its bearings from the low end of this proposal, rightly noting that the issue is still in discussion. Assuming an effort to expand MSU tenure stream faculty by 100, the Committee thought that at least a third of these faculty should have a clear connection to the mission of internationalization. We will present below a number of ideas for encouraging existing faculty to try international work, but the action likely to have the greatest single impact on the internationalization of the university is the hiring of 30-40 new faculty with substantial international experience and ambitions. We believe that these new faculty should be connected beforehand to a clear set of priorities, that, where possible, there should be cluster hiring around these priorities, and search committees should contain members with expertise or interests in these international priorities. It makes little sense to dribble new resources into dozens of different directions. The Committee also heard proposals that a subset of these new hires (e.g., 5-6) be senior and established scholars.

(b) **Upgrading International-Oriented Grant and Development Efforts.** The proposals we make above and below cost money. They will not be achieved without upgrading our development goals and efforts and expecting individual faculty, programs, and centers to generate more outside support. Our chance of recruiting the senior scholars recommended above increase greatly if we are able to offer them endowed chairs. Support for international travel and research, as presented below, cannot be expanded simply by seeking increases from general fund allocations.

(c) **Creating a Strategic Plan and Support System to Monitor Faculty and Positions Supporting our International Missions.** Such a plan would match existing faculty to international teaching, research, and outreach priorities, identify gaps and additional positions needed, and have a role in monitoring these positions and the faculty who hold them in all phases (e.g., searches and hiring; reappointment, tenure, and promotion; research and teaching support; recognition). We need to know now how well faculty and other resources match the University's international priorities, where the gaps are, how many positions are required to fill them, and how to monitor hiring, tenure and promotion, and incentive processes over the next decade to reach our goals. Such a plan and system could be built upon the effort already underway in ISP to create an inventory of faculty engaged in international work.

(d) **Supporting International Faculty in Disciplines and Units Without a Special International Focus.** In many professional and scientific disciplines, international work as such is not part of the basic mission. Here there is a need to sustain important pockets of internationalization, as well as recognize how international the basic underlying practices are. Globally standard scientific procedures and reporting are practices that should be highlighted and explored in this endeavor. It should be noted that faculty and graduate students in the basic sciences are far more diverse internationally than other units on campus and cooperative international research is commonplace.⁸

(e) **Balancing International and Disciplinary Priorities.** Of greater concern, however, are trends in the core academic disciplines of the liberal arts traditionally favorable to regional studies and other aspects of internationalization, where a greater emphasis is now put on disciplinary theoretical priorities. Where open international positions exist or are created and incumbent faculty have been identified who are crucial to the University's international mission, there should be consideration given to a process of career management that ensures some attention is paid to international priorities, with special consideration being given to supplementing established departmental or unit reviews with an outside look when a faculty member's international role is in some apparent tension with internal standards.

(f) **Supporting Pre-Tenure Faculty and Faculty in Less "Internationally-**

⁸ An overview of science as an international activity, focusing especially on the Physics department, is at **Working Paper 06**.

Minded” Departments. Not all disciplines, units, or colleagues on campus have an international focus. They in fact carry out a wide range of vital teaching, research, and outreach unrelated to the international mission of the university. It is thus a fact that some internationally-oriented faculty end up in places where their interests are not wholly in tune with unit and disciplinary priorities. In such cases, what can be done to assist such faculty?

**The Committee heard a wide variety of suggestions aimed at getting the university to make international criteria listed on promotion and tenure documents meaningful. MSU is out in front of other universities in that the current tenure and promotion materials include performance rating for “service” to ISP and narrative evaluations for such items as international instruction abroad and comparative /international courses led on campus.

**However, faculty, especially pre-tenure faculty must have a clear understanding of how international instruction is evaluated and valued particularly concerning developing and teaching courses abroad. This is particularly relevant for faculty who engage in international instruction but do so as overload pay (e.g., teach study abroad for 3 weeks in the summer).

**As will be discussed more fully in the section on administration below, a system for monitoring of critical international positions could be overseen by the Dean of International Studies and Programs. Such a system could include advising and mentoring of pre-tenure faculty, as well as providing incentives for faculty to support priority university international activities.

**Still others argued that MSU must present more broadly models of senior faculty success in supporting internationalization to pre-tenure faculty, the campus as a whole, and external constituencies. If internationalization as outlined above is to sustain and expand its prominence at MSU, there should be a set of faculty at all career stages who are models of success through their research, teaching, outreach, and outside support. A number of these models already exist, but are they as numerous as they should be and are their international accomplishments highlighted? Are they proportionately represented in University Distinguished Professorships and Hannah Professorships? Should there be additional, international categories of faculty status (e.g., global scholars or professors)?

(g) Creating Additional Incentives and Addressing Constraints. There are several notions under this heading.

**Create a program to help support faculty to serve as a visiting scholar abroad for a semester or longer. This could be combined with a sabbatical leave or a summer appointment for academic year faculty.

**Programs modeled on the ISP study abroad course development program should be created to encourage faculty not currently engaged in international work to expand their horizons. A model might be Texas A&M’s program in which 10 faculty are selected each year to go to its Mexico City Center for a 10-day

intensive networking and cultural learning experience; however, given the far-flung opportunities already available on account of existing MSU research, study abroad courses, and collaborative partnerships, an annual program of this type could and should be much broader and more diverse.

**Consider alternatives to standard teaching assignments. There is a compelling need for units to address the inflexible academic calendar, which inhibits faculty travel and research. Such alternatives might include assigning faculty to team-teach courses for half-semesters, or offering more courses abroad on a schedule that would allow faculty to combine teaching abroad with a preceding or subsequent period devoted to research. This is an issue of interest well beyond internationalization.

**Give appropriate recognition for international teaching efforts.

**Provide greater support for international curriculum development. Faculty incentives can be developed or expanded for faculty to develop new international courses or modify existing ones to include an international component. The Center for Advanced Study of International Development (CASID) and Women and International Development (WID), the African Studies Center, Asian Studies Center, and MSU Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) currently offer faculty grants for international course development, but these programs need to be expanded. Texas A&M, Virginia Tech, and Wright State University offer grants to faculty members each semester to offset professional expenses related to international curriculum development. could be expanded. currently offer faculty grants for international course development, and these programs could be expanded.

**Continue to provide and upgrade faculty salaries and other incentives for those leading study abroad programs.

**Expand the hosting of international scholars and visitors to campus.

**Encourage increased involvement of international graduate students in internationalization efforts.

**Provide a more effective central mechanism for gathering and distributing information on international research and grant opportunities.

** In 2003-04, MSU departments, faculty, Graduate School, and ISP together provided circa \$200,000 support for dissertation, pre-dissertation, and other graduate student research abroad and for the faculty *Special Foreign Travel Fund*⁹. That is too small for an AAU research university with a global vision and

⁹ The *Special Foreign Travel Fund* (SFTF) is a source of supplemental funding to assist MSU faculty travel (airfare only) outside the U.S. to present papers, deliver keynote addresses or juried exhibitions to international professional meetings and congresses, or perform in major concert halls. Departments/colleges are expected to provide a 50/50 match with ISP in support of their faculty's air travel costs. Total SFTF funding awarded in 2003-04 was \$31,078. In addition, the Office of Study Abroad offers grants to undergraduate advisers to visit MSU study

reach. MSU should consider quadrupling those amounts. Indeed, a university like MSU, with its land-grant mission of global outreach, should spend at least as much for the international travel and immersion of its graduate students and faculty as it does for the study abroad of its undergraduates.

**Increase the educational expectation for MSU undergraduate students for international experience and their awareness of global perspectives.

Budget Realities Must Be Addressed—

The Committee is mindful that this section—and others to follow—contain notions that require new resources. It is obvious that the internationalization mission on campus requires an overarching financial plan that (a) expands the search for contracts and grants; (b) sets new development priorities and goals; (c) supports university efforts to seek targeted funds from government sources; and (d) looks for synergies and reinvest from within its own programs and funds. There is little chance of success for these or any other initiatives if their financial basis rests with expanded support from the General Fund.

abroad sites.

IV. Supporting Excellence in Research

Ongoing research provides the underpinning for quality teaching, outreach, and engagement. MSU's commitment to international research at the highest level is central to its mission as a leading global land grant and AAU institution. MSU's stated goal "to discover practical uses for theoretical knowledge, and to speed the diffusion of information to residents of the state, the nation, and the world" depends upon the breadth and quality of its research.¹⁰ We discuss some of the key issues related to research below, recognizing that some issues of hiring, support, and retention of faculty and graduate students will be discussed in separate chapters.

Overarching Issues-

At the very outset, there continues to be a need to recognize that research base and key opportunities are international in ways that are unprecedented. For example, many Social Science faculty collaborate with colleagues from the countries upon which their research focuses. This trend responds to the desire of governments and researchers in the developing global South to participate actively in the production of knowledge about their countries and the issues their countries confront; it also responds to the prioritization of capacity building by many of the agencies that fund international research. Natural Science faculty often work in international teams that coalesce at select research institutions across the globe. Though US institutions drew together many of the best minds in the past, their ability to do so is challenged by growth of high quality universities throughout the world and U.S. tightening-up visa requirements since September 11, 2001. Michigan and MSU competitiveness depends on continued internationalization of the university, just as overall U.S. competitiveness depends on the same process carried out in higher education.

****Universities need to remove impediments to cooperative research and be in the forefront of demonstrating the value of international cooperation.**

****The sharp distinction between local and international issues is dead. Given the globalization of the market, the internationalization of health and environmental concerns, and the global flow of information, people, and ideas, many local issues are informed by international trends and conditions. MSU must continue to be a leader in demonstrating to the state legislature and the public at large that helping the people of Michigan requires our expansion internationally.**

****When it comes to research and outreach, MSU has a strong**

¹⁰ MSU Mission Statement, <http://www.msu.edu/unit/provost/resources/mission.html>. A background paper highlighting some examples of MSU's international research is in **Working Paper 11**.

international presence. However, translating this body of work into a growth in reputation and rankings among peers has stumbled upon the perception that this work has been traditionally pragmatic and extension-oriented. Our land-grant tradition does indeed make us a practically-minded place, but to claim a leadership role in internationalization over the next decade and beyond requires this important practical work be nested within larger theoretical and public policy frameworks. We need to be seen as grappling with the problems of globalization as a process, with weak states, misgovernment, corruption, and economic development on a large-scale, theoretically and in ways that have public policy significance.

**We also need to develop, where possible, broad synergies and connections between international priorities and other priorities of the university, particularly in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. Such synergies encourage the interdisciplinary hiring and research cooperation we want. Our basic strengths in science, environment and health issues are a good example of something that needs to be developed and exploited for our international mission. We also need to work out ways in which international and disciplinary priorities can be better harmonized.

**Finally, we need to recognize our best work publicly and regularly, MSU needs to establish major awards that recognize outstanding research that involves international content, is conducted outside the US, and/or that otherwise promotes faculty and student engagement in global issues.

Putting International Research Firmly in MSU's Institutional Priorities—

MSU installed a new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies in September 2004. Vice President Ian Gray embarked on a series of discussions in order to establish a University strategic research agenda. These ongoing discussions include members of the University Research Council (made up of Associate Deans, VP staff, and a member of University Graduate Council), college Deans' and their staff, and faculty.

**The MSU research agenda does not preclude individual faculty research in any area.

**The goal of the discussions is to provide a series of interdisciplinary research themes/areas in which MSU will invest resources and that are based on integrating the research priorities germane to multiple colleges.

**These themes/areas are to focus on MSU's research and scholarly strengths that fulfill MSU's mission to provide "practical uses for theoretical knowledge, and to speed the diffusion of information to residents of the state, the nation, and the world" (MSU Mission Statement). For example, a series of white papers is under development around the NIH "Roadmap" interdisciplinary themes for the health and biomedical research program.

(<http://www.msu.edu/unit/vprgs/RNfall04/nihfunds.htm>).

**In addition, a series of cross-college thematic areas has been identified for further development, including: families and communities, environmental science and policy (including major foci on land use and water), nanotechnology, homeland security, plant and animal sciences, renewable resources, molecular toxicology, and K-12 education. Many of these focal areas are inherently international with both international research partners and/or international connections through outreach and engagement. Specific research themes will be refined throughout the 2005-06 academic year.

**There must also be a strong international component of the “themes and teams” approach currently being implemented by the VP for Research. The first step is identifying the major international research priorities and aggressively organizing teams to better enable success internally and pursue outside funding.

This process should help provide adequate funding for start-up of international research projects and/or inclusion of international content in ongoing research, with a strong expectation of outside funding to follow and a process that assesses progress after 18 months. The Office of International Development (OID), created in January 2001, has made an important contribution in this area. OID works to facilitate cross-college collaborative research efforts and develop multi-disciplinary projects. OID serves all fifteen Colleges at MSU, with an emphasis on cross-disciplinary projects with faculty from the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the College of Veterinary Medicine, the College of Social Science, the College of Communication Arts and Sciences, and the affiliated Centers and Institutes of International Studies and Programs.

**MSU also has to communicate better internally its international research agenda, opportunities for collaboration on grants and projects, and upcoming visiting scholars. It should also provide through ISP and the VP for Research opportunities for support in seeking outside support, finding international partners, and communicating ongoing activities and research results to the campus community and beyond.

The Special Role of Area Studies—

It is impossible to be a leader in internationalization of higher education without a strong base in Area Studies. MSU has strong and vibrant centers in African, Asian, Canadian, Latin American, and European and Russian Studies, two receiving Title VI status. A wide range of area studies majors, programs, and specializations exist at the graduate and undergraduate level. A strong base of productive faculty supports these centers and programs, many of the faculty with international reputations. As noted above, area studies has been unjustifiably devalued within many disciplines over the past decades, as the focus has shifted to theoretical pursuits and quantitative models. However, without strong area studies, which provide the basic understandings of the history, culture, politics, and way of life and thought of specific groups, nations, and areas of the globe, internationally oriented programs run the danger of being overly sweeping and superficial in comprehension of events and peoples in their particularity.

Global processes and trends have area specifics of importance, and these regions in turn originate, reflect, influence, modify, and even resist these global trends and processes. Thus a core building block of international research at MSU is, was, and must continue to be support of Area Studies.

ISP and its Center Directors launched a large-scale review of area studies just after the NCA Self-Study got underway. That review is still ongoing, though reaching its conclusion. The review has suggested a number of specific recommendations that are now under discussion. Those most closely connected to research include the following:

- **Expansion of financial support for international thesis and dissertation research.
- **Improvement of language training options to support research.
- **Increase of individual and overall faculty engagement in international and area studies research.
- **Ensure that global and area research are a part of the university's research priorities and treated as such.
- **Create special Global Research and Futures Fund to provide seed money for international research projects.
- **Increase financial support and staffing of the Area Centers, in order to expand their services and support of MSU faculty engaged in international research.
- **Retain the current centers and their geographical scope, while being open-minded about realignment or expansion in the future.¹¹
- **Centralize international planning process and funding.
- **Increase and strengthen the role of ISP and Area Centers in hiring.

Expansion and Better Integration of MSU Strengths in Global Issues –

If there was a single issue that struck members of the Committee regarding research, it was MSU's very strong international capacity across a range of key global issues, from economic development and political reform to agriculture, education, poverty, health, and the environment. Many of these strengths lie in departments not usually associated with international education, especially agriculture and natural resources, the natural sciences, medical and other professional schools. The range of internationally relevant research, cooperation, and contacts is stunning, ranging from distance medical and veterinary education to a plethora of global research partnerships on the environment.

¹¹ A number of Committee Members and those who interacted with the Committee argue that realignment is a more urgent priority and that ISP needs to create a complementary global issues center. This issue will be treated in Chapter X below.

It would be foolish not to draw these activities and strengths more fully into international programs and planning. ISP currently has only one thematic center WID. CASID, a center of the College of Social Science, is physically located in the International Center. Both are focused on international development. It is imperative that ISP act vigorously to create a new center for global issues that, at the minimum, focuses on international health, education, economic, and environmental issues. Creating such a center and staffing it with internationally minded faculty and staff from the sciences and professional schools would better integrate ISP planning and budgeting. It would fill in some of the gaps and reduce frictions that currently exist between disciplines, especially between core international activities in the liberal arts and those of the professional schools.

Additional efforts should be made to better integrate existing centers throughout campus that focus on global issues in health, environment, education, business, and law into the ISP planning process and structure.

The Need for an International Public Policy Center and Program—

MSU already does a lot of international public policy research and outreach. There are indeed many unit-based centers that carry on this work, yet there is no major center or program that would bring public policy work to internationalization. This is the case, despite public policy research serving as an inherent synthesizer and disseminator of research done in many disciplines. Public policy work, done well, speaks directly to questions of legislators and publics about MSU's relevance. If we truly take on the task of being one of the leading interpreters of globalization and its impact, then we must have a corresponding public policy reach.

******The current budgetary environment limits our ability to conceive of a public policy school or large program, without outside funding or reinvestment from other parts of MSU. Nevertheless, ISP should also think about making global public policy a part of its programs and planning horizon.

******An interdisciplinary graduate program ought also to be on the agenda that draws upon a number of core liberal arts, natural science, and professional units. Existing programs in environment, health, food safety, criminal justice, political science, and other units already create a base for a Master's program with a global public policy focus.

V. Graduate and Graduate Professional Education

Graduate education prepares the leaders of tomorrow, not only the international students who return to their countries to assume leadership positions in academic, government and the private sectors, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), but also our U.S. students whose knowledge of the global context of our world will be critical to their success in the same set of career opportunities here and abroad. In fact, Jody Nyquist of the Re-envisioning the PhD Project has identified a “global perspective” as one of the core competencies now expected of all PhD candidates.¹² Given this context, it is important to examine the international aspects of graduate and graduate professional education at Michigan State University.

Graduate education at Michigan State University includes more than 120 departments, schools, and programs offering more than 200 different graduate majors at both the master’s and doctoral levels. Each program has its own set of goals and requirements for its graduate students, but generally speaking they fall into three types: coursework master’s, master’s programs requiring a thesis, and doctoral programs requiring a research dissertation. In addition, MSU offers several graduate professional degree programs, including: the MBA from the Broad Graduate School of Management, the M.D. from the College of Human Medicine, the D.O. from the College of Osteopathic Medicine, the D.V.M from the College of Veterinary Medicine, and the J.D. from the College of Law, among others.

Since the locus of graduate education is at the program level, it is not possible to mandate a curriculum or uniform set of experiences at the master’s, doctoral, and professional levels. Nonetheless, it is possible, and even necessary, for graduate students and their faculty mentors to engage in a wide variety of international experiences including collaborative research projects and field research/scholarship abroad, study abroad, participation in international conferences, publication in international journals, global outreach and engagement, research into globalization, as well as learning from and with the diverse group of international students and faculty involved in graduate education on campus. This section discusses how some of these activities are currently encouraged as well as provides suggestions to increase the internationalization of graduate education at Michigan State University.

¹² <http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/PDF/Change.pdf>.

Master's, doctoral, and professional graduate programs typically include a curricular component (graduate courses). In addition, a research/scholarly component is typical in all doctoral and some master's and professional programs (substantial innovative research for the master's thesis, doctoral dissertation, etc.). For this reason, this section on graduate education is inextricably linked to the research section and the faculty section (Sections III and IV). The academic work of graduate students is further complemented by the availability of rich intercultural experiences and support services. Thus, this section will address international aspects of graduate education in curriculum, research, and student life and support services.

Curriculum-

Faculty at the departmental and program, and sometimes subspecialty, level determine curriculum for graduate education. Given the necessary degree of specialization of graduate curricula, it is not feasible to suggest a single international curriculum requirement across all programs. However, it is important to note the extent and strength of the international curricular offerings already in existence at MSU. There are over 200 graduate courses across the university that have a significant international focus, in programs ranging from Agribusiness Management to Zoology. Many programs have emphasis areas that focus on international topics within their discipline, such as the Postcolonial Literature and Theory emphasis in the Department of English's doctoral program.¹³ There are entire graduate specializations and programs whose curricular focus is international, foreign language departments being the most obvious. Another example is the Graduate Studies in Education Overseas programs, which offer in-service, certificates, and master's degree programs at overseas locations. In addition to these course offerings, substantial opportunities for study, research, and/or presentations abroad are key to expanding an already internationally focused curriculum.

There is still a need to encourage greater internationalization and international experience in graduate education at MSU. Though this is not something that can be imposed as a general requirement, we can use the Graduate Council and other planning bodies to highlight job market, disciplinary, and global trends that reward international experience and competence.

Support for Dissertation and Other Research-

Support for international research and scholarship is broadly based at MSU. For example, for the 2003-04 academic year (including summer 2003), 106 graduate students were funded (in part) by the Graduate School to travel and/or to conduct research abroad. This was up from 86 the prior year. Of these 106 students, 65% were international students, though international students make up only 30% of the total graduate student population. Students visited 43 different countries. The total

¹³ <http://www.english.msu.edu/graduates/brochure.html>.

Graduate School investment in international research was \$42,450. ISP invested an additional \$18,150, and faculty, department, and college investment was \$74,173. Thus, \$134,773 was invested by these sources in international research and study for graduate students in 2003-04. In most cases, this is in addition to the support already provided by faculty research grants and other sources.

In addition to this independent student travel, approximately 224 graduate students participate in MSU study abroad programs each year, and many formal study abroad programs are available to graduate students interested in international learning experiences. These include a four week Nursing in London program, College of Human Medicine programs in Belize, Cuba, Costa Rica, and Peru, and College of Veterinary Medicine programs in India and Thailand. Whether learning about the role of culture in development and learning in Russian elementary schools or comparing the health systems and delivery settings for medical care in Belize, study abroad is a key component of internationally focused curricular opportunities for graduate education at MSU. Thus, through these programs, emphasis areas, courses, and study abroad, many graduate students take advantage of strong curricular offerings focusing on international issues.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities-

Graduate education, research, and in some cases, creative activity at the doctoral level (and in some master's and professional programs) is inextricably linked to faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities. Whether a graduate student is a part of a faculty led research project or runs an independently designed research project under the supervision of faculty, graduate and faculty research activities are mutually reinforcing. As with graduate curriculum, graduate research/scholarship with an international focus occurs in virtually every program, is specific to the interests of students and faculty, and follows from the particular international focus of a given discipline. Some of the existing activities and supports for involving international research and scholarship in graduate education are summarized below.

(a) **Faculty.** Support for graduate student research and scholarship, including internationally focused research, comes first and foremost from faculty. Again, this is an indication of the very program-specific nature of the graduate education enterprise and the fact that it is inextricably linked to faculty and faculty research/scholarship. Faculty who conduct research/scholarly activities abroad (approximately 1,200 faculty and staff) are likely to send their students abroad to engage in that research/scholarship. Faculty who operate in a global context in terms of their research topic (and may not necessarily travel abroad, .i.e., "big science") will also provide that overall context to their doctoral (and likely master's degree) students. To cite just one example, 28 graduate students in the department of Zoology recently participated in international research and/or presented their research at international conferences with funding from faculty grants. This research ranges from studying hyenas in Kenya to analyzing chemical compound composition in Onsan Bay in Korea. Often graduate student research such as this is the result of funding on faculty-secured research grants

from the National Science Foundation, Department of Natural Resources, NASA, and others. Thus, nearly everything recommended for faculty and research in this self-study will have direct benefits for doctoral students.

(b) Area Studies Centers. As noted above, Area Study Centers play crucial roles in area studies at MSU and in furthering many of MSU's broader internationalization objectives, including in graduate education. The centers facilitate inter-disciplinary exchange and collaboration among faculty, strengthen curricular offerings in area studies and foreign languages, establish collaborative relationships with universities abroad, undertake outreach to broader U.S. publics, and procure external resources. Two of MSU's centers - the African Studies Center (ASC) and the joint center of the Center for Advanced Study of International Development (CASID) and Women and International Development (WID) are designated Comprehensive National Resource Centers, with responsibility for graduate as well as undergraduate education. The Center for Latin American Caribbean Studies (CLACS) also has a director of graduate studies. CASID and WID coordinate undergraduate and graduate specializations in International Development (administered by the College of Social Science), and WID coordinates a graduate specialization in Gender, Justice and Environmental Change (sponsored jointly by the College of Agriculture & Natural Resources and the College of Social Science). ASC and CLACS offer Graduate Certificates in the studies of their respective world regions. MSU's Area Studies Centers are a primary source of support for graduate student international research and scholarship as well, including Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) International Pre-dissertation Fellowship Program (IPFP).

Student Life and Support Services-

Graduate students at Michigan State University can avail themselves of the same opportunities as undergraduate students to engage in international experiences on campus through cross-cultural and educational contact between U.S. and international students and faculty. Moreover, in many ways graduate student life contains even more opportunities for internationalization as a result of the high number of international graduate students and faculty with whom graduate students interact on a regular basis.

Approximately 9,428 graduate and graduate/professional students attend MSU. Of those, approximately 30% are international students from 140 countries. In addition, 481 ranked faculty (17.5%) are either non-U.S. citizens or are now U.S. citizens but received their highest degree from abroad. The nature of graduate study and research leads to frequent interaction between domestic and international students and faculty. Programmatic level and other interactions between these populations must be assessed to provide long-term benefits to the MSU community through engagement for international awareness, special skill acquisition (e.g., language help) and global perspective building.

Support services available to all graduate students at MSU, offered through The Graduate School, often deal with issues of internationalization as well. The Graduate

School at MSU has a rich history of sponsoring workshop programs for its 9,428 graduate and graduate-professional students to enhance their research and teaching experiences while they attend MSU and as preparation for professional positions. Throughout this workshop series students interact with successful, nationally known professionals in academia (i.e., 2- and 4-year institutions), industry, state and federal agencies, and nonprofit organizations to gain a greater understanding of what it will take to enable them to meet their respective career and professional objectives.

Another support service available to domestic and international graduate students is the Teaching Assistant Program (TAP). The mission of TAP is to improve graduate student professional development and undergraduate instruction by providing a wide variety of resources and services in support of the teaching and learning development of all MSU teaching assistants (TAs).

In all of these efforts it is critical to remember that the international graduate student's primary reason for being at Michigan State University is to earn an advanced degree. Although they are generous with their time, MSU must protect their academic effort and focus, including, to the extent possible, their right to academic freedom.

Recommendations for Further Discussion -

Given the decentralized nature of graduate education, how might we encourage international experiences for our graduate students in order to expand their global competence? What are some of the ways to leverage existing opportunities? How might we increase the number of graduate students participating in international travel and research opportunities? Some suggestions follow, but they are not meant to be exhaustive.

****The best way to effect the internationalization of graduate education is through the internationalization of the faculty and faculty research (see Sections III and IV). Faculty with a substantial focus on international issues will attract internationally focused students, teach graduate courses with significant international content, and increase opportunities for internationally focused graduate research.**

****Another recommendation might be to expand the opportunities for graduate students to participate in Study Abroad and/or for international travel to conferences and/or for research. The Graduate School already provides some funding to select departments with Fulbrighters who return to write their dissertations as recognition of the work abroad and the extra time it takes. This could be regularized. Similarly, graduate students can (and do) serve as instructors for study abroad programs; this should be encouraged and/or regularized. Finally, graduate students who study abroad should be offered assistance upon their return to help them integrate their experiences into their graduate programs.**

****The Graduate School should augment its Career and Professional Development Program to include more examples of international opportunities as**

well as include workshops for faculty and students on mentoring relationships with international students.

**The Graduate School can (again) highlight international activities in the Graduate Post. See <http://grad.msu.edu/all/gpf00.pdf> (Fall 2000 Post carried a feature article entitled: "Making Their Mark at Home and Abroad" on MSU graduate student research and scholarship abroad).

**While informal interaction between U.S. and international graduate students is common, international graduate students are an often-underutilized educational resource on campus. How can their experiences be integrated into the formal curriculum and/or pedagogy of graduate education?

**Is there a role here for Graduate Program Directors? For discussing and trying out best practices across departments?

VI. Undergraduate Education: Building “Global Capacity”

The conversation about global or international education and those broad or liberal aspects of education central to the undergraduate experience often rests on *four* kinds of ideas about global education and education for global citizenship.¹⁴

****First, by education for global citizenship, we sometimes mean *raising students’ consciousness and intellectual horizons*, i.e., opening up students to what is happening around them, to others with different views and ways of being in the world, and to knowledge about festering problems and issues in the world. If liberal learning often means freeing students from received ways of thinking and parochialisms (those of the family, region, nation, or the moment), we mean by internationalizing education or education for global citizenship something like “opening students to the world and its interconnections and to the varieties of peoples and ways of being in the world.”**

****Second, we sometimes mean something more than this like *attuning students to difference* and instilling a happy multiculturalism, helping students to function more sensitively, hence effectively, in a global world comprised of difference. That is, we seek in this version of global education to acknowledge the world’s diversity and to encourage and nudge students toward acceptance, tolerance, and the positive embrace of difference. Here, writers often neglect to talk about intractable differences and implacable hatreds that cannot be tolerated or abided and envision a world where people can “simply get along” better.**

¹⁴ For a rich discussion of the notion of global capacity in a globalizing world, see Kenn Waltzer and Brian Silver, “Globalization and Increasing Student Global Capacity: Thoughts on a Global University and Curriculum,” **Working Paper 08**. The four ideas about global education come from Kenneth Waltzer, Elizabeth Heilman, and Assefa Mehretu, “Educating Students for Engaged Citizenship in a Changing Global Context,” American Association of Colleges and Universities meeting, January 23, 2004, Washington D.C.

Third, writers sometimes talk about education for global citizenship as **helping students to know and think critically about the world, increasing relevant knowledge, capacities, and skills to comprehend an increasingly interconnected world and its complex interrelations, issues, and problems. Here, the goals are small and large. They involve concrete geographical, historical, cultural, and political knowledge. They also involve big questions on important global themes – modernization, migration, colonialism, independence. Attempts to internationalize the curriculum by filling in coverage gaps in faculty expertise, strengthening language offerings and upping requirements and strengthening the academic content of study abroad can be seen as part of developing relevant knowledge, expertise, and skill to function effectively in and act knowingly in the world.

A fourth way in which we talk about education for global citizenship concerns *shaping a cosmopolitan spirit and identity and a sense of commitment and responsibility*** for others, for all humanity, and for the planet. This relates to the connection between education and identity and involves ethics. In some guises, this emphasis appears to be a way of encouraging students to recognize the condition of “multiple belongings”¹⁵ in an increasingly integrated world. In other guises, it involves an emphasis on purposefully cultivating cosmopolitanism. This emphasis, then, goes beyond raising horizons or awareness, beyond encouraging tolerance and positive orientation to difference, and beyond even expanding knowledge, skills, and critical analytical capacities; it extends actually beyond “knowing” or “orienting toward difference” to actively seeking to impact student “becoming,” or student identities--to shaping attitudes, values and dispositions among students. It moves beyond emphasizing competence to commitment.

In thinking about the internationalization of undergraduate education and the cultivation of global perspectives at MSU, the Committee kept these four perspectives in mind and often found the debate among experts over new directions in international education resulting from the frictions between these perspectives or preferences for one approach over the other. We decided to adopt a more eclectic approach, presenting for wider campus discussion a model of building the global capacity of undergraduates, ranging from a broad base of small changes that would affect nearly every undergraduate to focused options for the most internationally motivated of students. While the report presents these ideas as a package, each proposal may also stand on its own, separate from its role in building “global capacity.”

The Robust International Base of Undergraduate Education at MSU—

Whatever we decide to do to expand internationalization at the undergraduate level, we need to recognize that we have already built up a robust international base in the undergraduate curriculum:

**In the past decade, we have created the nation’s largest study abroad program.
16

¹⁵ “Peripheral Visions: Towards a Geoethics of Citizenship” Liberal Education (Summer, 2003).

¹⁶ From an overview of this program, see **Working Paper 21**.

**Approximately 530 courses that are predominantly international in content have been taught on the MSU campus during the past three years. Another 150-200 courses, containing at least 25% international content, bring international content into broader topical courses. These courses do not include independent study or study abroad courses.¹⁷ Many of the internationally-focused courses at MSU are in disciplines in the social sciences and humanities. This includes about 25 courses in the integrative studies curricula of the Colleges of Social Science and Arts and Letters. There also are numerous courses with significant international content in the professional colleges, particularly in Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Eli Broad College of Business, Communication Arts and Sciences, and MSU College of Law.

**MSU has taught 31 modern foreign languages during the past three years, including 13 African languages (including Arabic) and nine Asian languages (including Kazakh, used in Eurasia¹⁸.)

**In international studies, MSU offers two undergraduate degree programs: the College of Social Science Interdisciplinary Studies major with a concentration in International Studies and the James Madison College major in International Relations. A new major in Global and Area Studies in the College of Social Studies will soon be available as well. Area studies programs also offer specializations, which have rigorous requirements and are comparable to minors at other institutions. These specializations are available on Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Western Europe, Russia and Eastern Europe, and Canada. MSU offers a language-focused undergraduate major in East Asian Languages and Cultures with concentrations in Chinese and Japanese as well as in several European languages (Spanish, French, German, and Russian). In addition, there are international thematic undergraduate specializations in International Business, International Development, Muslim Studies, Jewish Studies, Peace and Justice Studies, and International Agriculture¹⁹.

A Pyramid of Internationalized Curriculum—

¹⁷ For a list of courses already in the curriculum with international content, see **Working Paper 22**.

¹⁸ For an overview of foreign language offerings at MSU, see **Working Paper 12**.

¹⁹ For a complete list on international majors, specializations, and programs, see **Working Paper 23**.

In the years ahead, MSU needs to expand upon this rich international base by creating a true pyramid of internationalized curriculum that reaches from modest but broad-based exposure of every undergraduate to international issues to an expanded capacity to train a small but steady number of global and regional experts, particularly in the regions and issue areas of special strength. Many courses relevant to this new pyramid already exist at every level of the curriculum and throughout the major academic units on campus, especially those responsible for general and liberal education. Indeed, MSU is in some sense already providing key elements of the proposed pyramid to its undergraduates.

**First, though the size, diversity, and interests of its undergraduates should encourage focus on creating an expanded set of options for students, not a range of new and burdensome requirements, there is merit in considering a requirement for every undergraduate to take at least one global issues course. The main vehicle for implementing this requirement is integrated studies, where a wide range of courses are already on the books that could fit within the requirement already. There are other courses scattered throughout the academic units that could supplement integrated studies options. The purpose of this course requirement would be to expose students to the key issues of a globalizing planet and how globalization influences local, regional, national, and international issues. Important vehicles for implementing this notion are integrative studies courses and 300- and 400- level liberal arts courses.

**Second, MSU needs to continue to expand its study abroad opportunities, especially broadening the level of participation and expanding the number of extended research opportunities and semesters abroad, especially in a second language. Students should be encouraged to go abroad earlier so that they can integrate their international experience into their experiences at MSU earlier and thereby profit more fully from them, and options should be made available for them to fulfill integrated studies and other general requirements. In relation to this, standards for rigorous coursework during study abroad should also be examined. There has to be new efforts to prepare students before they go abroad and to integrate their experience back into the classroom when they return. MSU should also aim at placing an increased percentage of its students on internships in international settings.²⁰

**Third, the University has to reevaluate how and to whom it teaches foreign languages, and which languages should be offered on campus or off. We require every entering student to have high school foreign language, yet few units require or even encourage students to build on these skills. Some on the Committee believe the University needs to think about a wholesale restoration of some foreign language training. Others argue that a two-pronged strategy is best, aiming to reinstitute foreign language requirements in the liberal arts core (Arts & Letters, Social Science, Natural Science) and expand incentives and opportunities for everyone else through diversifying delivery, modes, and options for acquiring foreign languages. Everyone agrees that we need to expand the range of options for delivering foreign languages and do more competency testing.

²⁰ Some on the Committee suggested a figure of 20%.

**Fourth, the University should provide the opportunity for willing undergraduates to develop “global capacity” through a variety of approved thematic and regional courses (distributed among methodological, historical, regional, disciplinary, and thematic clusters), a study abroad or international internship experience, exposure to foreign languages, and significant cross-cultural volunteer work on or around campus. The university would certify the successful student’s achievement of “global capacity.”

****Fifth, the expansion of international majors and specializations needs to continue.** The successful effort by the College of Social Science, and ISP to establish a major in Global and Area Studies, which will be promoted as both a primary and additional major, is an important model, as is the recently-established and already quite popular International Business Specialization²¹.

****Sixth, in support of an ongoing university priority, special efforts must be made to expand international research opportunities for undergraduates, both on campus and abroad.**

****Seventh, the new residential college, aimed in part at expanding opportunities for international and global education, would be an important building block of this pyramid,** giving special opportunities to around 1,000 students (on the models of Lyman Briggs and James Madison). Madison is also expanding its size, study abroad and international internships, and expanding its faculty with international relations or other global expertise. These residential programs are a special point of access to the international pyramid. Adding a third major residential option creates new opportunities for Madison-Briggs-new program cooperation, especially on international curriculum and co-curricular options (e.g., Madison-Briggs-FW STEPPS programs).

²¹ Coincident with the area studies review, the need for a new internationally-focused undergraduate major that would allow MSU students to concentrate on area studies was identified. In consultations with area studies center directors, faculty and administrators from the Colleges of Social Science, Arts and Letters, and James Madison, a major in Global and Area Studies has been designed. This major will be grounded in a common foundation of understanding global systems and processes as they are expressed in local places, and it will offer students a choice of two types of concentrations - on world regions and relevant foreign languages and on global themes. Concentrations will be available in all of the world regions of the existing specializations except for Canada.

**Eighth, departments and regional and thematic centers need to increase their capacity to produce a steady stream of highly qualified graduates trained in the strategically important languages, countries, regions, and global issues identified as the university's international focus. These students should be given substantial research and travel opportunities. Our aim should be nothing less than that MSU should be a recognized leader in undergraduate students accepted at premier graduate programs and winning Fulbright and other major international fellowships as well as a leader in training graduate students. A related issue here is the languages we teach. The university covers a wide range of languages, from the most common standard options for students (Spanish, French, German, and Russian) to less commonly taught languages (especially in African languages and in a growing number of Southeast Asian languages), but languages in the Muslim World, especially Turkish, Persian, and the languages of South and Southwest Asia are underemphasized. We are making strides in this direction with a new hire in Hindi. More common languages like Spanish remain an integral part of the future of the U.S. and should obviously not be discouraged. However, we cannot create the steady stream of highly qualified graduates without some serious soul searching on both the range of languages we teach and how we teach them.

**Finally, this international curriculum should be one of the three or four key selling points in recruiting prospective students and their parents.

Foreign Languages—

Beyond the debate over foreign language requirements or the number and kinds of languages we teach, virtually everyone on the Committee and everyone who spoke to the Committee on foreign language acquisition agreed that MSU must expand opportunities for foreign language acquisition beyond the traditional 100- and 200-level language class. A new effort has to be made to encourage students to build upon and expand the language skills that they bring to the university, whether or not we expand language requirements. Incentives to pursue competency in a foreign language are already out in the world and ought to be reinforced in a university that sees one of its primary missions as international:

**First and foremost, the university should expand the number of voluntary academic options that enhance a student's education or preparation for the working world. These include programs modeled on the International Business Specialization and new Global and Area Studies major in the College of Social Sciences.

**Second, MSU should expand the options available for students to fulfill their foreign language work outside the traditional "two-years in class" model. We believe the university has to encourage a wider range of summer and study abroad options, as well as the computer and tutor model used for less commonly taught languages. Study Abroad programs where language and disciplinary issues are combined, as in our Volgograd offerings for engineering students, are important models. The University should invest in the studies and support required to determine the effectiveness of these alternative models of instruction and convince those who provide governmental and foundation support of the utility of these alternative models.

**Third, MSU also has to expand the opportunities students have for acquiring practical foreign language skills through travel and internships and to document these capabilities where they have reached a significant level of competency. Greater encouragement needs to be given to foreign language facility relative to the workplace or environment. Nursing in fact has a program that exposes students to real world health care in Mexico and thus to the importance of functional second-language capabilities that can be brought back to the workplace.

**Fourth, key departments have to expand offerings of basic disciplinary courses that are taught in a second language. The cutting edge of support for foreign languages at other universities is offering sections of courses like Latin American politics or German history in Spanish or German. We have the capacity to launch a pilot set of offerings of this type, and we should move to do so.

**Finally, MSU ought to take on the task of being a national leader in preparing a small but significant number of students in the less commonly taught languages, especially those with growing strategic significance. Special support should be extended to encourage students to take on the task of learning a less commonly taught language, and MSU should attempt to become a leader in producing a small but steady stream of undergraduates specializing in important but less commonly taught regions and languages.

VII. International Outreach

Outreach and service are critical to the land grant mission of MSU, and international outreach is a valuable vehicle for extending the reach of MSU faculty into the world and fulfilling a land grant vision that is not bounded by Michigan's borders. There are substantial opportunities in this area, and there are substantial obstacles as well, key among them being adjusting institutional expectations and language to reflect MSU as a global land grant for the 21st century.

Background and Highlights—

Below the Committee has selected a set of examples that illustrate the breadth and depth of MSU outreach.

**MSU was involved in the planning and implementation of the U.S. Peace Corps around 1960 and was immediately involved in the recruiting and training of Peace Corps volunteers. As early as 1961, volunteers bound for Nigeria were being trained on the MSU campus. Since that time, approximately 2,000 MSU alumni have served or are currently serving as volunteers in more than 120 countries. MSU ranks fifth nationally in the total number of graduates who have been Peace Corps volunteers. As of March 2004, 80 were currently on assignment, with 36 serving in Africa, 22 in Europe/Mediterranean/Asia, and 22 in Latin America. [New yearly rankings will be announced in mid-February.]

**MSU has an extensive outreach to K-12 teachers, schools, and students, from internationally oriented teacher preparation classes to on-line and in-house professional development. Of special note is the international "study group" for local teachers, known as LATTICE.²² In recognition of this outstanding work with K-12 programming, in November 2004, MSU received the prestigious Goldman Sachs Foundation's Prize for Excellence in International Education.

**The African Studies Center (ASC) has one of the strongest outreach programs on Africa in the U.S., serving more than 70 higher education institutions in the past 20 years. In 2001-02 alone, 45 MSU faculty from the agriculture, business, education, medical, and professional colleges, as well as the humanities and social sciences made 145 presentations on Africa off campus. The ASC has cooperated with teachers to create *Exploring Africa* [<http://exploringafrica.matrix.msu.edu/>], an on-line curriculum for middle and high school teachers and students. The ASC also is known for its research in creating quality on-line databases about African media, African journals, and higher education.²³

²² A concise overview of internationally related K-12 outreach is at **Working Paper 16**.

²³ <http://www.isp.msu.edu/africanstudies/resources.php>.

**The Asian Studies Center (ASN) links with more than 150 K-12 educators through annual Bringing Asia into the Classroom conferences held in conjunction with the Midwest Conference on Asian Affairs, cooperates with the Michigan 4-H China Project that has involved approximately 200,000 K-12 students, and provides faculty outreach to smaller post-secondary institutions through the Michigan Global Awareness Consortium and other organizations. ASN has recently created an on-line resource for teachers and students, Windows on Asia.²⁴ Part of the ASN's outreach mission is performed by privately endowed organizations the China Council, Japan Council, India Council, and Council on Korean Studies which are under the jurisdiction of the ASN and are chaired by ASN core faculty. Several other private endowments support lecture series and undergraduate and graduate student awards.

**The Center for Advanced Study of International Development (CASID) and Women and International Development (WID) programs are a joint NRC whose outreach activities focus on providing international development and gender-related resources and information for K-12 and junior college teachers and for representatives of local agencies, state and national organizations, and the media. Workshops are conducted for faculty at post-secondary institutions on topics such as globalization and the changing political, economic, and social environments throughout the world. Also, the *WID Bulletin*, published three times a year, is a resource guide for academics, students, development practitioners, and policy makers interested in the latest books, articles, videos, conferences, and websites on gender, development and globalization. The *WID Working Papers Series* has published externally-reviewed scholarly papers for more than 20 years and is highly regarded in the field.

**The Center for International Business Education and Research in The Eli Broad Graduate School of Business at Michigan State University (MSU-CIBER) was designed in 1990 as one of the pioneer National Resource Centers in international business by the U.S. Department of Education. In this capacity, the mission of the MSU-CIBER is to provide world-class education, research, and assistance to businesses on issues of importance to international trade and global competitiveness. Under the guidance of its Business Advisory Council, the MSU-CIBER is dedicated to:

- Carry out research that generates best-practice knowledge on global business operations and global competitiveness.
- Offer professional development and academic outreach programs on contemporary international business techniques, strategies, and methodologies.
- Provide innovative, technology-driven dissemination of international business knowledge to business executives, public policy makers, scholars and students.

**The Environmental Sciences in Japan (ESJ) Internship program, administered by ISP/the Japan Center for Michigan Universities allows students to further their knowledge and broaden their experience in Japanese language and environmentally-

²⁴ <http://www.isp.msu.edu/asianstudies/wbwoa/index.html>.

related topics beyond what is covered in the classroom. The internships allow MSU students to interact with environmental experts and Japanese students about common environmental problems. Cross-cultural team-building skills and collaborative problem-solving techniques emphasize practical solutions for global environmental problems. The opportunity to identify and address environmental problems, and their global interdependence, from a cross cultural perspective is a unique educational experience for the students.

Disincentives/Obstacles to Global Outreach and Service–

At all faculty career stages, obstacles to participation in global outreach include lack of exposure, lack of interest, lack of international issues as a priority, and lack of resources to undertake such activities. An additional obstacle, or challenge in any case, lies in the apparent – though not necessarily real – conflict between providing outreach to local and state constituencies and providing outreach to global interests. In some strict interpretations of MSU as a land grant institution, outreach in the state of Michigan should be the highest, perhaps only, priority. Coming to see ourselves – and having others see us as – as globally engaged university *servicing the interests of Michigan* through that engagement will be a challenge.

VIII. Strategic Partnerships

An internationalized MSU at the forefront of understanding the impact of globalization should have 10-20 strategic partnerships around the globe with key universities and institutes. These institutions should be major collaborators on research, outreach, and teaching. They should not be dependent on MSU support, as were such collaborations in support of new universities in the developing world undertaken under former President of MSU, John Hannah. Instead, each partner should bring strengths to the table and extend the capacity of the other. These partners should provide substantial additional assets to MSU's teaching, research, and outreach.

These partnerships could also play an important role in the recruitment of international undergraduates. This will require targeted recruitment efforts with alumni assistance abroad, maintaining strong relationships with staff at American degree programs in select countries, and forming deep relationships with select high schools abroad and domestic community colleges that have a significant international student population can provide a prospect base of international students currently in the U.S

These strategic partnerships differ from the normal linkage agreement. MSU has more than 160 active linkage agreements with international higher education institutions, professional, and research organizations. These linkages, which extend to about 50 countries, include approximately 50 student exchange agreements and well over 100 general agreements or memoranda of understanding. Strategic partnerships should not disrupt these existing arrangements or any faculty based collaboration.

Issues for Consideration--

**In an era of scarce resources and global competition, it makes good sense for MSU to find specific partners internationally that can extend MSU's research, teaching, and outreach, complement strengths and fill in gaps.

**These arrangements will necessarily be broader and deeper than those that now exist between units, faculty, or research projects. These partnerships aim at extending MSU as an institution. They will necessarily be few in number and necessarily not reflect fully the existing range of MSU contacts, programs, and collaborations.

**Consideration of potential partners should take into account MSU's academic objectives in that world region, academic program compatibility and complementarities, rankings of potential partners (and compatibility with MSU's reputation), potential for multiple partner arrangements in the country/region, operational and financial arrangements, geographic suitability to MSU faculty and students, among others. The vagaries of the state budget in Michigan make this approach the only fiscally viable one for expansion of MSU programs abroad.

**These partnerships ought also to reflect a strategic view of the world as we see it. We have long-standing institutional interests and commitments in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. World political, economic, and cultural developments also recommend particular countries or regions as likely of great importance in the

coming century. China is an obvious example.

******Given the wide range of existing linkages and interests across campus, it is important that consideration of strategic partnerships, both target regions and institutions, be part of an open and extensive process engaging the faculty, staff, and administration of MSU.

******Strategic partnerships will necessarily begin as pilot efforts. For example, MSU might well develop three to four new programs of research, teaching and outreach in fields where we can make a difference with institutions in three to four different countries.

******Given the wide range of existing linkages and interests across campus and the goal of creating broader institutional partnerships, it is imperative that consideration of strategic partnerships, both target regions and institutions, be part of an open and extensive process engaging the faculty, staff, and administration of MSU.

Incentives/Opportunities for Global Outreach and Service--

In addition to adapting suggestions for incentives for global teaching and research, to service and outreach activities (e.g., recognition, funding, increasing exposure, etc.), adopting strategies to reframe MSU's land grant mission as one of global engagement in the service of the state of Michigan could increase support for internationalizing outreach activities. Building rewards for such outreach into the hiring, merit, and reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes would help us attract and retain faculty who are engaged in global outreach. Creating faculty development programs that emphasize the international nature of MSU outreach (imagine "Meet Michigan Meets the World") would support these efforts as well. To be sure, not all "global outreach" must occur off campus; much of it is and can be conducted using technology and by bringing the world to Michigan through local outreach activities, just as teaching and learning can be internationalized on campus.

Goals for global outreach and service--

In a leading Global Land Grant University, internationalization is built into research, scholarly, and creative activities. These activities will:

**** Be reciprocal and collaborative**, calling on scholars to work together to address global issues in interdependent contexts. Achieving this goal will involve activities on and off campus in partnership with colleagues and students from departments and schools across MSU and around the globe.

****Involve students in efforts to provide outreach and service**, modeling for domestic and international students the ways in which collaboration can be an asset in developing engaged communities that work across differences to improve quality of life. Achieving this goal will require leadership training and support for students, involvement of domestic and international students, and ongoing evaluation of community service and service learning activities locally and abroad.

****Have applications in Michigan, the US, and the world**, fulfilling our land grant mission to local, regional, and international constituents. Achieving this goal will require ongoing, coordinated efforts across the institution to understand the needs of the state, nation, and world.

****Bring the world to MSU and to the state of Michigan**, ensuring that we fulfill our historic and ongoing commitment to the people of Michigan by maintaining a leadership role in internationalizing the state. Achieving this goal will require ongoing evaluation of the state's economic, social, ecological, and educational needs as well as up-to-date knowledge of international developments that might benefit the people of Michigan.

****Rely on new and developing technologies**, linking campus to communities, both in Michigan and abroad. Achieving this goal will require appropriate software, hardware, and connectivity, as well as training and support for those on campus and off.

IX. Campus Life

Internationalizing the extracurricular experiences of MSU students, faculty, and staff is an important part of overall internationalization. The Self-Study Committee had a chance to explore this issue at a number of meetings over the last two years, following closely a still ongoing joint study between ISP and Campus Life. In deference to this study, this section highlights only a set of general observations and principles and points that have emerged from our discussions, discussions that benefited from the presence of many of the people most connected with the ongoing study.²⁵ These general observations and principles include the following:

****First and foremost, realizing the goal of “internationalizing student life” at MSU would result in a climate saturated by multi-cultural opportunities, integrated into the various dimensions of student life: courses and curricula, experiential learning opportunities, extra- and co-curricular experiences, social and civic experiences. The goal of internationalizing student life is to promote global competencies across all of their dimensions (skills, knowledge, and attitudes) beyond what is possible merely as part of the formal curriculum.**

****Currently, at MSU there is no comprehensive picture of the range of opportunities available; no strategic plan for creating new experiences; and no coherent plan for connecting existing experiences.**

****Internationalizing student life requires a partnership among Student Life, Undergraduate Education, and International Studies and Programs. Although leadership could be located at any of these three points, the success of integration across the undergraduate experience requires collaboration.**

****Moving ahead with the goals of internationalizing student life will require that the following issues be addressed/work be pursued:**

- (a) create and expand links between formal and non-formal learning experiences (i.e., international speakers, performances or events to classroom activities);
- (b) better use of living and learning communities where students are “round-the-clock” learners;
- (c) better use of the residence hall experience (beyond the international food themes); the living environment creates unique opportunities to develop awareness of cultural diversity;

²⁵ ISP Background papers on internationalizing student life may be found at **Working Paper 05** and **Working Paper 24**.

- (d) create opportunities for immersion experiences other than traditional study abroad;
- (e) coordinate substantial “training” not traditionally included in the classroom (inter-cultural communication, preparation for international travel);
- (f) identify and connect with additional campus partners (e.g., Olin Health Center does a great job in preparing students for overseas travel);
- (g) focus on some sustained student life experiences; not just “one shot” deals;
- (h) intentionally connect students who have had international experiences – including international students – to other students for peer learning;
- (i) strategically coordinate/encourage/invest in the development of additional out of class experiences that meet particular campus goals;
- (j) plan out-of-class experiences that are developmentally appropriate for students; and
- (k) provide a mechanism for students to reflect on international experiences and to document (perhaps through the use of portfolio) development of their global competence

The Self-Study Committee is confident there is already a strong base for taking account of these observations and looks forward to reading the recommendations of the ISP-Student Life Study.

X. Administrative Structure & Support

As stated previously, there can be no “command model” internationalization at MSU. Great teaching, scholarship, and outreach depends primarily on great faculty and staff. Yet administrative structures and support also play a crucial role. This section presents a range of notions for enhancing or altering existing administrative supports for internationalization, especially in light of a potential embrace of a more focused global vision for MSU’s various international missions and corresponding options for change in international research, teaching, and outreach.

We believe a newly defined vision of the various international missions of MSU is not—nor can it be—a marketing ploy or simply a way of justifying the international work we already do. Redefining internationalization involves making choices regarding faculty and fiscal resources and key program directions. It requires an appropriate set of administrative structures, policies, and actions to support it. Obviously, many administrative supports for internationalization already exist, so this section will consider ideas for improving or even transforming them, as well as alternative models at a time when the very structure of the colleges may well be changing.

The Need for Presidential Leadership—

An institutional embrace of internationalization and particularly a new statement of the international mission of MSU starts at the top. It must be one of a handful of stated priorities of President, Provost, and Deans. It must also be one of a limited number of Presidential and Provost development priorities.

The Need for Faculty Voice and Support—

It cannot be stated often enough: any move in the direction of a new mission needs faculty input and support. The greatest single factor in the success of new efforts in internationalization will be an enthusiastic, supportive, and productive faculty. To be a success, the MSU community, its external stakeholders, and key external audiences need to see the link between rhetoric at the top and day-to-day actions by faculty and staff.

Organizing to Support Internationalization—

MSU already has organized itself to support internationalization by creating a Dean for International Studies and Programs (ISP) and placing leadership for study abroad, international cooperation agreements, issues associated with international students, area studies centers, and much else under ISP’s administrative oversight.

The Self-Study Committee did not carry out a review of ISP. However, it was impossible to examine any international issue on campus and not find significant ISP input and influence, whether in the form of setting policy, conducting overall management, providing financial support, or providing an interdisciplinary and integrated forum for discussion and decision.

ISP provides much of the organizational impetus, synergy, and public face for MSU’s international programs and activities. It has its own dean and a capable staff,

which have successfully managed both the full array of international programs at MSU and special efforts, such as the impressive growth of study abroad over the last decade. The Committee considered options that would move away from the ISP structure but found them unpersuasive. The most likely alternative—an international center within a large literature, science, and arts college—would be impossible at MSU without creating the LS&A structure. Even then Committee members were concerned that this alternative would not be in as strong a position as a unit like ISP is to build bridges across and between key liberal arts, professional, natural science, technical, and applied programs. Therefore, below we provide a set of options for maintaining and enhancing ISP's effectiveness, including different options for structuring ISP itself.

Create a Global Themes Center. A key reform of the current ISP structure would be to enhance the role and visibility of global themes, bringing a new center or centers and programs into the current mix of area studies, development, and gender. The existing centers do indeed do global issues, but ISP needs to create multiple entryways and a corresponding internal structure that engages a wide variety of international practitioners who simply do not see the current mix as reflecting their own views and work on internationalization. At a minimum, a new center should focus on the environment, health, and education. Ideally, its director would be from the natural sciences or professional units.

Enhance the Role of the Dean of ISP. The Dean of ISP could be given a variety of new responsibilities which would enhance internationalization on campus. These include the following:

**the title and responsibilities of Vice President and Assistant Provost for International Studies and Programs;

**shared responsibility and input on the management of internationally designated faculty lines and on internationally significant promotion and tenure decisions.

**an expanded role in establishing research and funding priorities, working with the Vice President and Assistant Provost for Research to establish international research priorities and ensuring adequate support for them. This broader research role offers the opportunity to expand the mission and priorities of ISP beyond current Title VI priorities and to integrate these priorities into a more balanced portfolio of MSU and outside foundation, and governmental research support.

Enhanced Position Monitoring Options. Another idea that has been regularly suggested here and elsewhere is the creation of an active system of position monitoring to ensure coverage and encourage synergies among units related to internationalization. In priority areas of research, teaching, and outreach, such as internationalization, there may well need to be a process above the unit and college level that monitors the use of positions designated for specific tasks and has an active role in assessing where these positions

are best used when vacancies occur. An idea that is offered either as an alternative to position monitoring or as an addition to it focuses on providing a career management input for ISP in the case of a set of identified positions on campus. ISP would work with units to develop a clear set of unit expectations for faculty in these positions that create a place for international program, research, teaching, and outreach goals. Such expectations could be formalized in a memorandum of understanding. Both of these options grow out of the concern on the part of both faculty and administrators involved in internationalization that international expectations exist apart from ordinary unit expectations, that these different expectations are not always well managed, to the detriment of all parties, and that a more formal role for ISP or its successor would help deal with this problem.

Create a Senior-Level Internationalization Planning Group and Appropriate Sub-Groups. The Dean of ISP should create a special sub-group for planning composed of deans and directors of units deeply engaged in the international mission. There are already many planning and advisory groups within ISP, but this group would function like the regular meetings of the bio-medical deans, namely as a regular group for planning, assessing progress, and discussing strategy. One theme that emerged from the Committee's deliberations is a concern that too many issues are handled solely as unit-to-unit transactions, without wider vetting. Committee interlocutors regularly cited the China Initiative as an example of the need for a planning group and wider consultation. No one dissented from the notions that China was of central importance or that MSU should make a special effort there, but many questioned how much consulting was carried out beforehand, including with some units already heavily engaged in China. Why should these fundamental issues of strategy, resources, and emphasis be made without broader consultation? The enhanced administrative responsibilities for the ISP Dean recommended above require enhanced planning and consultative structures.

Review ISP Staff Resources and Responsibilities in Light of Changes.

The ISP Dean and senior staff already maintain a staggering set of national and international travel obligations. The changes suggested above, if adopted, would founder without a corresponding re-examination by the Dean of ISP of staff resources, responsibilities, and assignments. Members of the Committee have suggested more than once—not simply tongue in check—that someone at ISP needs to be in charge of the home front. Our ability to deliver on new programs and initiatives will increasingly depend on creating, sustaining, and managing coalitions inside MSU. New responsibilities for the Dean and enhanced consultative mechanisms will necessitate as much effort here as with international partners. Addressing this issue may require expanded staff resources, a change in the structure or responsibilities of the existing staff, or a combination.

Supporting “Virtual” Internationalization—

Internationalization needs technological support, including a technology initiative to support “virtual internationalization.” Such an initiative includes the growth of on-line repositories, journals, and other important and recognized web resources, such as MSU’s CIBER. In areas where the university is asserting its leadership, there must be an on-line component. Another aspect of the technology initiative is the acquisition and distribution of web collaborative software to support the virtualization of international [and other] classes, meetings, and outreach. The software needed to create virtual classrooms or symposia across continents has many applications and is also a priority for the sciences, engineering, business, and elsewhere across campus.

MSU should set the goal of making “virtual internationalization” of courses, research, and outreach a regular part of campus experience within the next three to five years.

Enhancing Communication Internally and Externally—

Another important element of administrative support is an enhanced ability to communicate internally and with external stakeholders and the public at large. A number of people mentioned the difficulty of navigating a large university with so many visitors and activities taking place at any given time. There seems to be a clear need for a single web portal and supporting LISTSERVs where one-stop information could be found on international activities, events, seminars, opportunities, and programs. The Committee has only begun to think about this issue and has simply flagged it here for further discussion. The redesigned ISP website, with its calendar of international events, is a start in this direction.

Pursuing an International Admissions Strategy—

If internationalization is a major mission of MSU, then we need to adapt admissions efforts to reflect this priority, both in how we market to prospective students in the U.S. and in expanding the number and improving the distribution of foreign students. Origin diversity for the undergraduate international population at MSU enriches the undergraduate experience for all students, faculty and staff. Over 56% of

the MSU international students today come from Korea, China, India, Japan and Taiwan. The Asian markets provide MSU with volume in student enrollment; however, MSU gains much from student diversity from other world regions. The Strategic Plan for Undergraduate International Recruitment for Michigan State University was designed to provide a multi-year plan for recruitment of undergraduate international students, with long and short term objectives tied to appropriate strategies, performance indicators, and assessment of outcomes that will enhance MSU's position in a competitive international admissions environment. The plan has a recruitment goal to increase the number of high quality international undergraduates overall.

XI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Though the current draft of the Self-Study includes quite a few options, ideas, and even suggestions, the Committee chose not to provide a detailed set of its own recommendations before a sustained discussion in the MSU community. We intend to fill in this section as we receive feedback during the fall semester.