

**AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
INTERNATIONALIZATION LABORATORY**

Report to the Peer Review Team

International Programs
The University of Iowa

October 8, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	V	Discussion 54	43
General Overview of The University of Iowa	01	Internationalization for the Many	43
University Mission and Strategic Plan	02	The Siloization of Internationalization	44
Internationalization and the University’s Core Values	04	Strategic Internationalization	45
Progress to Date: Strategies and Activities	05	Shared Language	46
Centralized International Programs	05	Diversity (Multicultural Education and Internationalization)	46
Faculty Development	08	Conclusion	47
Foreign Language Offerings	08		
International Curriculum	09	Appendices	
Study Abroad	11	The UI “At a Glance”	
International Students and Scholars	12	The UI Strategic Plan: <i>The Iowa Promise</i>	
Outreach	12	The UI Leadership Org Chart	
College and Department-Based Activity	13	IP Org Chart	
Best Practices and Comparisons to Peers and Internationalized Target Institutions	17	Executive Committee Manual of Procedure	
Internationalization Laboratory Background	19	List of IP Academic Units and Non-IP Affiliated Programs	
Recommendations of Fall 06 ACE Site Visit Team	19	List of Zero-percent Faculty Appointments	
Steps Taken and Steps Remaining	20	IP Strategic Plan	
Understanding “Internationalization”	23	IP Strategic Plan Implementation Document	
Emerging Themes	26	Summary of Grant and Fellowship Activity	
Faculty Survey	26	FL Resources	
Student Support Staff Survey	29	International Studies B.A., M.A. and Other IP Degree-granting Programs	
Focus Groups	31	IS B.A. Learning Outcomes	
<i>Outside Threats and Opportunities</i>	31	Study Abroad Statistics	
<i>Campus-Wide Issues</i>	33	Summary of IP Budget	
Resources		International Students and Scholars Statistics	
Funding Priorities		Outreach Programs and Activities	
Faculty Incentives		Peer Comparisons	
Internationalization and Diversity Issues		Faculty Survey and Summary	
Curriculum Issues		Faculty International Funding Sources	
<i>International Programs Issues</i>	40	Discipline-Based Differences in Internationalization	
Outreach to Professional Colleges		Correlation	
Collaboration with CLAS		Student Support Staff Survey and Summary	
Communication		IP Acronyms	
<i>Internationalization as a Core Value</i>	42		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In late summer 2006, The University of Iowa joined the fourth cohort of the American Council on Education's Internationalization Laboratory. The University's participation in the Laboratory has been an important part of a larger project to assess the campus's level of internationalization and evaluate International Programs' effectiveness in leading in this effort.

In fall 2006, two ACE consultants visited the UI campus and conducted a series of interviews with key campus leaders and stakeholders. Among their recommendations at that time was that the internationalization assessment focus on two questions:

- 1) How does IP function as a catalyst for internationalization on the UI campus? and
- 2) What are UI's unique assets for internationalization and how can these be maximized to overcome specific barriers?

The IP-based research team began its assessment by gathering relevant data from all IP constituent programs and collecting information about the climate for internationalization (through a study of the UI mission statement and strategic plan, curricular requirements, standards for faculty promotion, and related statements and policies). It also compared international activities on the UI campus to those at peer institutions. Next, the research team measured the level of international activity and international expertise among faculty with an online survey. The faculty survey was followed by ten focus groups composed of representative faculty members from each of the professional colleges, the International Studies program, and Foreign Language departments. Lastly, the research team

surveyed student services staff across campus who have a potential role in contributing to the internationalization of students' academic and extracurricular experiences.

A series of persistent themes emerged which, taken together, sketch out the profile of internationalization at The University of Iowa. Some specific observations include:

- 1) There is no shared definition of the term "internationalization," either across campus Colleges and departments or within them;
- 2) Many faculty have substantial international expertise and frequently engage in international activities; however, few of these faculty regularly incorporate international perspectives into their teaching;
- 3) Which kinds of international experiences and development opportunities inspire faculty members to incorporate internationalized perspectives into their teaching depends on their discipline;
- 4) As a whole, UI's student support staff are thinly internationalized (few have studied abroad or had significant interactions with international colleagues), and international perspectives or insights are not likely to inform their advising or other student interactions;
- 5) The lack of housing, office space and other forms of support for visiting scholars and the substandard housing available to international students create the impression that UI does not welcome international guests even though many campus programs and community organizations effectively promote cultural exchange and international learning;

- 6) Faculty believe that internationalization is hampered by inadequate: funding for faculty international research travel and professional development, support for international events and speakers, scholarships and graduate assistantships for international students, and strategic hiring of internationally focused faculty;
- 7) A commonly held opinion across campus is that faculty have little incentive to internationalize their teaching, research, or service; nonetheless, many faculty are finding ways to help internationalize their students and the campus as a whole;
- 8) There is a general confusion regarding how internationalization relates to multiculturalism or domestic diversity and concern that the two goals may be in competition for funding and other support;
- 9) Internationalization is an unimportant part of the curriculum, as evidenced by the lack of a meaningful foreign-language requirement, the lack of an internationally focused general education requirement, curricular impediments to study abroad, and the lack of “at-home” internationalization within majors; and
- 10) Despite many recent, positive developments and a steadily increasing level of international activity, internationalization is still not a core value at The University of Iowa.

In its role as a catalyst for internationalization, International Programs can take pride in many accomplishments, including: helping to develop a community of engaged and enthusiastic internationalized faculty; steady increases in study abroad participation; significant increases in the amount of funding available for study abroad scholarships; a successful and rapidly growing International Studies major; effective cross-cultural training programs; good opportunities for international students to interact with U.S. students; a strong record of collaboration with community organizations; and a demonstrated commitment to outreach and civic engagement. At the same time, many important challenges exist. Most importantly, IP must better

define its mission. Part of this effort should involve improving IP’s positioning as a critical, “value-added” resource for all UI colleges, offices and programs; reaching out to the professional colleges as partners in internationalization; and better communicating the compelling reasons for internationalization to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and other key collaborators.

At the University level, our analyses reveal a pressing need for greater attention to the goal of “internationalization for the many.” The University must find ways to ensure that international perspectives are incorporated into all degree programs and that all UI students (not only those who study abroad or major in International Studies or a foreign language) are exposed to cross-cultural perspectives and international experiences, both inside and outside of the classroom. This goal is closely related to another recommendation emerging from this study: for the UI to become a truly internationalized institution, its leadership--central, collegiate and departmental--must tangibly support collaborative and interdisciplinary international activity by faculty. This support should include strategic faculty hires and internationalizing professional-development opportunities that maximize existing strengths to build unique and sustainable scholarly communities with shared international interests.

These actions will be ineffective if any is taken up in isolation or lacks the unambiguous support of University leadership. UI leadership must articulate a vision for internationalization that includes both an operational definition and an expression of the rationales behind this goal. This vision must also clarify internationalization’s relationship to multicultural education and reinforce the interdependence of these two worthy goals. Internationalization must become one of our University’s core values.

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Founded in 1847, The University of Iowa (hereafter “UI”) is a comprehensive public teaching and research institution with a strong liberal arts emphasis and innovative undergraduate and graduate programs in the humanities, sciences, and professions. The UI was the first U.S. public university to admit men and women on an equal basis and the world’s first university to accept creative work in theater, creative writing, music, and art on an equal basis with academic research. It is home to the world-famous Iowa Writer’s Workshop as well as one of the country’s largest teaching hospitals. The University educates about 80% of the state’s dentists, about 50% of its physicians and pharmacists, and 40% of Iowa’s nurses.

Approximately 30,000 students were enrolled in 2006-2007, including about 21,000 undergraduates. Some 63 percent of these came from Iowa, and another 22 percent from adjoining states. In 2006-2007, international students from 106 countries made up about 7 percent of the University’s enrollment. Diversity at the University is fairly reflective of ethnic and racial diversity in the state as a whole. The state of Iowa has a white, non-Hispanic majority of 91.5%, with minority groups including Hispanics/Latinos (3.7%), African Americans (2.3%), Asians (1.4%) and Native Americans (0.3%).¹ At The University of Iowa, in 2006, 3.7% of the non-international student population was Asian or Pacific Islander, 2.7% Latino, 2.3% African American, and .5% Native Americans.

The faculty numbers about 2,000 and there are about 12,500 staff. The total annual operating budget is about \$2.3 billion, with approximately 45% of this coming from state appropriations. Total resident undergraduate tuition and fees for the 2007-2008 academic year will be \$6,290 (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences). [See Appendix A: “The UI at a Glance.”]

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, State and Country Quick Facts. 7 May 2007. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/19000.html>.

UNIVERSITY MISSION AND STRATEGIC PLAN

“Our country and our world are at an especially critical juncture—socially, culturally, and academically—that compels us to pay attention to educational exchange between the United States and our academic colleagues throughout the world.”

Especially in comparison to many of the University’s peers, such as Michigan State University and the University of Minnesota, the UI is a relative late-comer to the pursuit of internationalization.¹ In fact, the 2000-2005 UI Strategic Plan, despite its emphasis on “building bridges,” contained no mention of the words “internationalize” or “internationalization,” and the word “international” was used only once, in reference to the University’s “international prominence” in the area of interdisciplinary innovation.

Then UI President David J. Skorton, in his fall 2005 annual Keynote Address, emphasized “the critical importance of internationalization to our institution’s relationship with the world outside our walls, now and in the future.” He referred to ACE’s report, “Measuring Internationalization at Research Universities,” and noted that, while the UI currently utilized many of the strategies common to “highly active research universities,” there was still much to be done: “Our country and our world are at an especially critical juncture—socially, culturally, and academically—that compels us to pay attention to educational exchange between the United States and our academic colleagues throughout the world.”

¹ A full explanation of the use of this term will follow. See pp 23-25.

In the subsequently published 2005-2010 Strategic Plan, *The Iowa Promise*, the University states that it will work to improve the undergraduate experience by “providing curricular and co-curricular opportunities that will enable them to understand and succeed in a multicultural and global community,” and by “continuing to internationalize the educational experience.” While these strategies may seem ambitious, the only indicator of progress provided is the number of graduate (340) and undergraduate (1,000) students studying abroad on any type of program, for any length of time, in any given year. References to international activities and goals are included in only a few other sections of the document; such as the section on Graduate and Professional Research, which includes the strategy: “Improve the infrastructure and culture central to the growth of research, scholarship, and creative work, including interdisciplinary and international efforts, by ... facilitating national and international travel, collaboration and communication.”

Under the section on “Diversity,” we find a statement on the importance of equipping students to “live as members of an international community” and “negotiate difference on a global scale.” For the first time in a UI Strategic Plan, international students are specifically mentioned as contributing to the University’s diversity. The “Diversity” section of the Strategic Plan includes this strategy: “Promote a welcoming climate that enhances the educational and work experience for all members of the community and prepares our graduates to live in an increasingly global environment by... improving interaction among domestic and international faculty, staff, and students.” A specific indicator in this area is to increase the percentage of international students as a percentage of total enrollment to 9%.¹ [See Appendix B: The Iowa Promise.]

¹ This target percentage was based on the average percentage of international students at official peer institutions as determined by the Iowa Board of Regents (8.3%) and at other public institutions within the CIC (9.1%). The Committee on Institutional Cooperation is the academic consortium of twelve major teaching and research universities in the Midwest. Based on current staffing levels, an increase in international student advising staff is not expected to be needed in order to meet the higher enrollment level. It is possible that an influx of international students will result in staffing or other resource shortages in other parts of the campus, however, most notably in the Office of Admissions and the English as a Second Language program.

INTERNATIONALIZATION AND THE UNIVERSITY'S CORE VALUES

In fact, students may graduate from the University with no international experience at all.

Although the University's Mission Statement refers to its commitment to preparing students for success in an "increasingly global environment," the University lacks many of the key indicators of true, "deep" internationalization. International activity is not considered in faculty tenure and promotion cases and is not, in general, a factor in hiring. There is no uniform, campus-wide foreign-language requirement, and in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the four-semester requirement may be met with four years of high school foreign language study (untested).¹ In fact, students may graduate from the University with no international experience at all, since the Foreign Cultures and Civilizations General Education requirement is relegated to the category of Distributed General Education. This means that it exists as an option, along with "Fine Arts," "Historical Perspectives," and four other options, including U.S.-based "Cultural Diversity."² Finally, the University does not prominently state international goals or activities in its promotional materials, and the University Web site does not include an "international gateway" or a direct link to international activities.

¹ Majors in Business, Engineering, Nursing, Pharmacy, Radiation Science, and Nuclear Medicine Technology need only two years of high school study of the same foreign language; all other majors require four years of high school study of the same foreign language.

² 64 courses are currently listed as counting toward the FC&C option, at least 25 of which are Western European focused, 22 East Asian, 9 Eastern European, four African, four South/Central American, three Middle Eastern, and two South Asian.

PROGRESS TO DATE / STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES

Centralized International Programs

At The University of Iowa, International Programs (IP) functions as a catalyst for internationalization and a hub for international activities. In 1997, the Iowa Board of Regents brought international research, instruction and services together under the leadership of an Associate Provost and Dean for International Programs (AP/Dean). [See Appendix C: The UI Leadership Org Chart.] The Associate Provost and Dean is supported by three direct reports: a part-time Associate Dean (a faculty member who oversees all of IP's degree or certificate-granting academic programs and research centers/groups, as well as IP grants, fellowships, and faculty development programs); a full-time professional staff Director (who oversees most IP staff units, including the Offices for Study Abroad, International Students and Scholars, Communications, Events, IT, HR, and Outreach, as well as facilitating and administering formal linkages with foreign institutions); and a full-time Accountant. [See Appendix D: IP Org Chart.]

IP's administration receives guidance and input from an Executive Committee, which includes faculty representation from all of IP's constituent academic and research units, as well as from affiliated programs and colleges, including the International Writing Program, the Library, and the colleges of Law, Nursing, Engineering, Education, Public Health, Medicine and Business. [See Appendix E: IP Executive Committee Manual of Procedures.] Priorities for IP staffing units are informed by the IP Internationalization Committee, which includes the AP/Dean, Associate Dean, Director, and Accountant, as well as the directors of the Office

of International Students and Scholars (hereafter OISS) and the Office for Study Abroad (OfSA), and the coordinators for International Studies, Outreach, Grants, and Communications.

IP's growing importance to the UI's mission was recently affirmed by its relocation to the central part of campus from a more peripheral location, at a cost of approximately \$6 million to the University. The new IP offices include dedicated meeting and events space and are located near classrooms, administrative offices and other relevant offices such as English as a Second Language, the Office of the Registrar, and the Graduate College.

International Programs supports three academic programs and research units that also receive significant external funding: the Center for Asian and Pacific Studies, the Confucius Institute, and the UI Center for Human Rights. Students, faculty, and community members benefit as well from over 15 other academic projects and programs within IP. [See Appendix F: List of IP academic units and non-IP affiliated programs.]

Academic projects and programs within
International Programs

African Studies Program

Center for Asian and Pacific Studies

Confucius Institute

Crossing Borders Program

Center for Russian, East European and Eurasian
Studies

UI Center for Human Rights

Foreign Language Acquisition Research and Edu-
cation Program

Global Health Studies Program

Latin American Studies Program

South Asian Studies Program

Opera Studies Group

European Studies Group

Caribbean, Diaspora and Atlantic Studies Pro-
gram

Middle East and Muslim World Studies Initiative

18th and 19th-Century Interdisciplinary Colloquium

[See Appendix F: List of IP academic units
and non-IP affiliated programs.]

At present, IP works directly with faculty from at least 40 disciplines in all 11 colleges on international dimensions of teaching, research, service, and extended education. Instructional staff in international studies stands at 103 formally appointed faculty members. [See Appendix G: List of 0% faculty appointments, by home department.] Another 200 UI faculty members (as affiliates of IP) join in various aspects of International Programs courses, projects, and activities. All formally appointed faculty have primary appointments within UI departments. The AP/Dean holds an incentive fund, which was initially used to provide three years of partial funding for new, permanent faculty positions of significant interest to IP, across colleges. After three years, the positions become fully funded by the home departments. Through this mechanism, nine new appointments between academic years 2002 and 2005 were brokered in the departments of Communication Studies, Asian Languages and Literatures, Spanish and Portuguese, English, Occupational and Environmental Health, German, Political Science, and Law. Beginning in fall 2006, the IP Executive Committee voted to reallocate most of this funding to support the hiring of a postdoctoral scholar to engage in research relevant to IP priorities and to teach International Studies courses. Some funding still remains available for searches.

Resources to bolster the Library's international collections have seen double-digit increases in recent years, and a new International Studies bibliographer was appointed in fall 2002.

IP's activities are supported by 42 permanent or specified-term staff, who oversee media relations, accounting, cross-cultural programming, grant preparation, outreach, events planning and instruction, as well as the Office for Study Abroad (OfSA) and the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS). IP support staff also includes about 15 graduate assistants and about 30 undergraduate employees. Many of IP's outreach goals are met in cooperation with community-based organizations, and with the help of volunteers affiliated with these organizations, including the Council for International Visitors to Iowa Cities, the Iowa City Foreign Relations Council, Friends of International Students, the International Women's Club, and the International Scholars Council. IP also provides guidance and other forms of support to formally recognized student groups, including the Organization for Active Support of International Students (OASIS), the International Studies student group (PRISM), and a wide variety of student cultural and nationality organizations.

Beginning in 1985 and until the most recent grant competition in 2005, IP consistently received federally-funded Title VI International Studies National Resource Center status. These grants allowed the University to develop its International Studies B.A. degree, enhance offerings in Global Health, provide FLAS scholarships for graduate students in a wide variety of fields, broaden outreach programming, especially to K-12 classes and teachers in the state of Iowa, provide international and interdisciplinary faculty development programs, and offer a variety of less commonly taught languages to UI students, faculty and staff. With the recent loss of Title VI funding, IP has absorbed an increasingly large share of the responsibility for supporting both international outreach programming and less commonly taught language instruction. (See relevant sections below.)

In 2006, IP developed its five-year Strategic Plan, which is based closely on the goals and strategies of the UI Strategic Plan. Development of the IP Plan was spearheaded by a committee of IP faculty and staff, in consultation with the IP Executive Committee and IP staff committees and offices. An implementation plan was recently completed, although the Peer Review Team may be able to provide additional guidance regarding specific implementation tactics during their planned campus visit in late October. [See Appendix: H: IP Strategic Plan; and Appendix I: IP Strategic Plan Implementation Document.]

IP is currently undertaking a major revision of its Web site to better reflect the priorities of the Strategic Plan and to make the site more user-friendly. In 2006, IP hired a full-time database developer to create a more dynamic Web presence and ensure effective utilization of data related to internationalization. The developer has recently completed searchable databases of International Studies faculty mentors and international course offerings and is currently working on several Study Abroad databases, an online study abroad application, a database of formal linkages, and an IP volunteer database.

Faculty Development

In addition to funding that faculty may receive from external sources or their academic units for international research, IP provides support for UI faculty for travel and internationally focused projects. These programs include: *Curriculum Development Awards* (to encourage the development of new courses that help reconceive international education at the introductory level, broaden the intellectual base of international studies, and most especially move beyond the paradigm of area studies); *Major Research Projects* (projects can include conference, symposia, overseas research and so forth); *Special Projects* (support for visiting speakers, film series, exhibitions, etc.); *International Travel Grants*; and *Summer Research Fellowships*. These programs are competitive and open to faculty from any UI College. More recently established competitive awards for faculty include the *Stanley International Programs-Obermann Center Research Fellowships* (developed to help internationalize the scholarly community at the Obermann Center for Advanced Study); and the *Provost's Forum for International Affairs* (established by the UI President in 2005 to support interdisciplinary exchange on international issues). Besides offering several internal grants and awards, IP strongly encourages faculty to pursue grants and other outside funding for international projects. To support this effort, in 2003, IP hired a full-time grants coordinator. [See Appendix J: Summary of Grant and Fellowship Activity.]

Foreign Language Offerings

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) offers language instruction in 18 modern languages, regularly or semi-regularly, on campus or through collaborative, long-distance learning consortia: 1 African (Swahili), 6 Asian/Eurasian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Hindi, Uzbek, Indonesian), 1 modern Middle Eastern (Arabic), and 10 European/Slavic/Latin American (Spanish, Portuguese,

French, Italian, German, Russian, Czech, Polish, Turkish, and Croatian). Several less commonly taught languages (including Kannada) have been offered in the past thanks to support from Title VI (NRC or UISFL) funding. Without Department of Education funding, the University has taken creative approaches to staffing less commonly taught language courses, often with financial or administrative support provided by International Programs. This has included utilization of the Fulbright FLTA program for the teaching of Indonesian, Turkish, Hindi and Arabic, and participation in consortia with other Regents or CIC institutions for the teaching of Czech, Polish, and Uzbek. The Croatian Ministry of Education has helped to support the teaching of Croatian on campus as well as student participation in an intensive language immersion program in Zagreb for the past several years. In 2007-2008, Modern Hebrew I and II will be offered on a pilot basis, through the Department of Cinema and Comparative Literature, funded as a Saturday and Evening course¹.

The University is particularly strong in the area of Second Language Acquisition. The Ph.D. program in Second Language Acquisition has graduated two cohorts of students and is well regarded nationally and internationally. The Colleges of Education and Liberal Arts and Sciences boast faculty with significant expertise in the area of less commonly taught language pedagogy. The University's strength in the area of Chinese language pedagogy, in particular, led to its recent recognition as one of only a few Confucius Institutes in the U.S. With funding from the Chinese government, the Institute offers accelerated Chinese language courses to UI stu-

¹ Saturday and Evening courses are offered through the Center for Credit Programs, a part of the Division of Continuing Education. These are on-campus credit courses or workshops offered on weekday evenings or Saturdays. Most faculty teach these courses as overload and are awarded extra-compensation. Occasionally, departments will arrange for these courses to be taught on-load. In this case, funding is remitted directly to the department and may be used to support faculty professional development or other functions benefiting the department as a whole.

dents as well as introductory courses to the larger community. Recently, CLAS has begun offering introductory Russian to the community, as well.

Students and faculty may study languages not otherwise offered on campus through IP's ALLNet (Autonomous Language Learning Network), a program that provides participants with tutors and instructional materials free of charge. With the support of ALLNet staff, learners can customize their study plans to learn basic language skills or improve upon existing skills in preparation for research and study abroad. The ALLNet program has offered 38 different languages (including Dutch, Norwegian, Ewe, Tibetan, Bengali, Swedish, Latvian, Hungarian, Romanian, Nepali, Icelandic and Dari) to nearly 90 students, faculty and staff.

The UI offers two foreign language incentive programs. In FLIP option one, entering students who complete an approved course at a level beyond the General Education requirement with a grade of B- or higher receive 4 semester hours of "retroactive" credit, in addition to credit for the course itself. In FLIP option two, students who completed four years of second-language study in high school (or who have completed the foreign language component of the General Education Program by some other means, including foreign language study at The University of Iowa), may, at any time before graduation, earn up to 4 s.h. of bonus credit for study of a language different from that which they studied in the General Education program. [See Appendix K: Summary of FL Resources.]

Currently, The University of Iowa does not offer its students any formal Languages Across the Curriculum (FLAC/LAC/LxC) or Cultures and Languages Across the Curriculum (CLAC) opportunities. Initiatives in this area have been isolated to individual faculty experiments, including a Mathematics course taught in Spanish, a Modern German History course with German language components, a Latin American Politics course with Spanish language components, and an Introduction to Marketing course with a special Honors section that

incorporated CLAC-style pedagogy. Although actual practice is quite limited, many UI faculty have expressed interest in LAC/CLAC, an indication of potential for growth in this area.²

International Curriculum

Over 600 non-language international courses (about 250 within a given semester) are offered at the UI.³ Many of these courses count toward completion of IP's 7 degree or certificate programs in Second Language Acquisition, Global Health Studies, International Studies, and Latin American Studies. At the graduate level, the Crossing Borders program runs innovative interdisciplinary seminars each semester on topics including "Diasporic Movements in the Pre-modern and Modern Eras," "Transborder Communications and its Discontents," and "Modes of Critical Analysis: the Black Atlantic." [See Appendix L: Description of IP Academic Programs.]

2 In May 2001, IP sponsored a day-long LAC workshop conducted by Rick Jurasek (Augustana College) and attended by 38 faculty and staff from 23 different departments and programs including History, Economics, Political Science, Mathematics, Cinema & Comparative Literature, Rhetoric, and the College of Business. In fall 2005, IP hosted the 1st national Cultures and Languages Across the Curriculum conference, co-sponsored by ACE, Baldwin-Wallace College, Binghamton University, and Portland State University. UI faculty, staff and administrators not only attended but delivered several presentations. (See <http://intl-programs.uiowa.edu/accents/2006/fall/LAC.html> and http://www.clas.pdx.edu/media/CLAC_2005.ppt.)

3 "Non-language international courses" are those that have been identified as such for the purposes of Department of Education, Title VI National Resource Center applications. Instructors of these courses indicated that the course content was at least 25% international in theme or perspective. Only a subset of these courses has been approved for credit toward the International Studies (IS) major. The IS course list was developed with the guidance of faculty in the various emphasis areas and was cross-checked to ensure that the courses are regularly offered and available to students outside of specific majors. For the complete list of courses approved for IS credit, see <http://intl-programs.uiowa.edu/studies/ba/courses.shtml>.

The development and growth of the International Studies B.A. program at the UI has been a particular success. In fall 2001, the UI offered B.A. degrees in Global Studies, Asian Studies, and Russian/East European Studies (as well as minors and certificates in these programs, and in Latin American Studies, Global Health Studies and African Studies), all administered by International Programs, with degrees granted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. These majors had relatively low enrollments.⁴ In early spring 2002, a proposal was approved by the IP Executive Committee and was later approved by the CLAS EPC to establish a new International Studies major and phase out the Global Studies, REES and Asian Studies majors. The new IS major was first made available to UI undergraduates in fall 2003.

As of the spring 2005 semester, International Studies was the 8th most popular major among all CLAS undergraduates and the 3rd most popular among international undergraduate students. The International Studies B.A. (IS B.A.) -- currently with over 475 majors -- offers tracks in eight geographical areas. IS B.A. students may also choose tracks from among ten thematic areas. A significant majority of IS majors are also pursuing a second major (66%).

Approximately 105 faculty serve as mentors, and a cohort of advisors in the University's Academic Advising Center are specially trained to work with IS majors. As all IS majors are strongly encouraged to study abroad, a scholarship of \$1,000 is offered to each major who completes a certain number of credit hours and studies abroad on an accredited, credit-bearing program. Since fall 2005, the program has offered a special course each semester for majors who are preparing to research and write

⁴ In spring 2003, the last semester before the International Studies major was offered, Global Studies had 77 declared majors. The various area studies programs were significantly smaller: Asian Studies had eight majors, and Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies had five declared majors. These enrollment figures were fairly stable for several years prior to the introduction of the International Studies B.A.

their final project. The course includes information on basic research methods and thesis development and provides practical tips for recognizing plagiarism, negotiating the Institutional Review Board process, and identifying and establishing a working relationship with a faculty mentor. In academic year 2006-2007, IP developed learning outcomes for International Studies majors as well as an e-portfolio based process to assess these outcomes. [See Appendix M: IS B.A. Learning Outcomes.]

IP also offers, in collaboration with the Graduate College, an interdisciplinary International Studies M.A. The B.A. and M.A. degrees are coordinated by two full time IP staff members, with part-time secretarial support.

The International Studies B.A.

Geographical Areas:

- South Asian Studies
- Latin American Studies
- African Studies
- European Studies
- Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies
- Caribbean Studies
- Middle East and Muslim World Studies
- East Asian Studies

Thematic Areas:

- International Politics and Relations
- Global Artistic Tradition and Change
- International Business
- Development
- International Communications
- Human Rights
- Global Resources and Environment
- Global Health Studies
- Postcolonial and Diasporic Studies
- War, Peace, and Security

Study Abroad

Undergraduate participation in study abroad programs has risen dramatically in the last ten years and steadily over the last five years. There were 406 participants in 1995-1996, compared to 1,103 in 2005-2006, representing an overall growth of 172%. In 2000-2001, about 694 UI students participated in study abroad programs in 50 different countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. In 2004-2005, 1,078 UI students studied in 79 different countries. Each year, the Office for Study Abroad adds several new programs in non-traditional locations such as Southeast Asia and Central and South America as well as programs that specifically appeal to students in under-represented disciplines such as engineering and the sciences. The UI currently maintains about 120 distinct study abroad programs in 50 countries. Because not all students can study abroad for a full semester or academic year, the Office is developing more programs of shorter length, including summer and “winterim” programs, as well as programs that incorporate a study abroad component into a semester-long course. To make study abroad an option for as many students as possible, the UI allows students to participate in any accredited study abroad program (not only those administered by the UI), to apply financial aid toward study abroad and to count study abroad courses toward fulfillment of major and General Education program requirements, upon review and approval of the OfSA and home departments. In 2006-2007, the Office initiated a curriculum integration project, similar to the project designed at the University of Minnesota.⁵

⁵ Approximately 10 years ago, the University of Minnesota initiated a pilot project to seek ways to integrate study abroad into academic programs across the curriculum. Beginning with students in the IT program, UM saw a doubling in study abroad participation for this group. Funding from FIPSE and the Bush Foundation allowed for significant growth and enhancement of the program. Today, study abroad curriculum integration plans have been developed for nearly all academic programs on all four campuses. Min-

Funding for study and research abroad scholarships has risen fairly dramatically over the last several years, with a total of \$272,000 awarded in fiscal year 2003 (\$116,000 administered by the Office for Study Abroad/OfSA) as compared to \$393,000 available in FY 2006 (\$281,000 out of OfSA). In the current fiscal year, over \$500,000 (from all sources) will be available for study and research abroad scholarships. The increases in study abroad scholarship funding have resulted from increased support from the UI's financial aid office, the generous support of private foundations and individual donors and the reorganization of OfSA's administrative fee structure (which, per UI policy, sets aside a certain percentage for scholarships).

Each year, over 50 of the UI's first and second-year students with an interest in studying abroad choose to live in the International Crossroads Community (ICC), a living-learning center administered by IP. The ICC is a housing option open to any UI student interested in foreign cultures, languages, and international issues. A special one-credit experiential education course has been offered to residents of the ICC and discussion is underway to align the ICC more closely with the IS major.

Another option for returned study abroad students is participation in the Global Buddies Program, which pairs U.S. students with incoming exchange students for mentoring and language practice. Returned study abroad students also may serve as peer advisors in the Office for Study Abroad's resource room, as volunteers at the annual Study Abroad Fair and at international student orientation. [See Appendix N: Summary of Study Abroad Activity.]

nesota also supports discipline-targeted site visits for faculty, yearly workshops on the topic of study abroad curriculum integration, faculty/adviser training, and workshops and training programs on internationalizing on-campus courses, in cooperation with the University's Center for Learning and Teaching. For more on this project, see: <http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/index.html>.

International Students and Scholars

Given the context of international study in a post 9/11 world, the University has placed a new emphasis on recruitment and retention of international students. In fiscal year 2005, the UI Provost provided funds to create an informational CD, to be distributed to international partners and shared by UI faculty and staff with their colleagues overseas. In fiscal year 2007, a campus-wide international student recruitment committee was established and, in the current fiscal year, funding has been provided to allow participation in overseas recruitment fairs and other recruitment activities. [See Appendix O: IP FY08 budget summary.]

The Office of International Students and Scholars places a high value on providing excellent service to the students and scholars already in residence at the UI, including over 2,000 students and their dependents, as well as about 400 international scholars and their dependents. In response to changes brought on by new Department of Homeland Security (DHS) regulations, including the SEVIS system for tracking students, the Office created RELAY, an original web application which allows students and scholars to see the information related to their SEVIS records and notify advisors of any errors or changes. The Office also developed online forms to expedite departments' processing of immigration paperwork for visiting scholars.

The OISS provides more than comprehensive immigration advising. It offers three orientation programs each year (in the fall, spring and summer); an extended orientation series throughout the fall semester (the "Life in Iowa" series, which includes programs on topics ranging from resume building and career development to dating and slang in the U.S.); and special workshops, programs and field trips for international students and scholars throughout the year. OISS staff members also liaise with student nationality groups and with community organizations such as Friends of International Students and the International Women's Club to

provide holistic support for students and their families and provides tax advising for non-residents. Staff from the OISS collaborate with community organizations and services such as local police, landlords and banks to make these groups aware of the special challenges faced by international students and scholars.

One of the OISS's most successful innovations to date has been the development of the "Building Our Global Community" program. This program was originally designed to instruct UI staff in basic cross-cultural skills and teach them about the challenges facing international students, as a way to promote excellent service and create a welcoming environment for all international visitors to the UI campus. The program has been so successful that UI Hospital staff and physicians, HR administrators, UI faculty, community organizations, area community colleges and area businesses are requesting specialized cross-cultural training. To address this expanding need, the Office has initiated a new sliding scale, fee for service program for off-campus clients. [See Appendix P: Summary of International Students and Scholars.]

Outreach

Each year, IP funds and organizes more than 150 events, free and open to the public, that contribute to the university and its surrounding communities by offering enriching educational experiences about regions of the world and geopolitical issues that are often under-represented or not represented at all in local schools or other community venues. K-12 outreach programs include annual field trips to the UI campus, including Global Exploration Day (for grades 2 – 5), and International Day (a human rights conference for middle and high school students). The International Classroom Journey sends international students and returned study abroad students to make presentations in area schools and provides interactive programs for

children throughout the state via the Iowa Communications Network. Each summer, IP sponsors a one-week, credit-bearing workshop for in-service high school teachers on various international topics. During the academic year, IP offers a free luncheon lecture series, *International Mondays*, which takes place at the Iowa City Public Library and invites members of the campus and larger community to learn about the international research projects of UI faculty, staff and students.

IP collaborates with many other UI departments, colleges and units, as well as community organizations, in delivering quality international outreach programming. IP partners with the non-profit organization, Iowa City Foreign Relations Council, to offer a luncheon lecture series which is broadcast on local radio and television, reaching thousands of listeners and viewers. Each spring, IP joins offices across campus in organizing and hosting the annual Celebrating Cultural Diversity Festival, which attracts nearly 5,000 participants each year. [See Appendix Q: List of Outreach Programs.]

International Accents is a 20-page journal published twice each academic year by the University of Iowa International Programs' Communications office. The purpose of this publication is to provide a vehicle for University of Iowa faculty, students and international visitors to describe their research and programs of study and to inform readers of the contributions the university makes internationally. 16,000 copies are sent to a specially targeted group of alumni, colleagues at other institutions, UI faculty, staff and students on campus and friends of International Programs (i.e.: general public with international interests or connections). *Accents* was the first project developed as part of a long-term fund raising campaign for IP.

College and Department Based Activity

While many of the activities listed above are administered by International Programs, other colleges and offices contribute independently to internationalization goals. **The College of Law** hosts the International and Comparative Law Program.⁶ It also offers a small (about 15 students) Master of Laws (LLM) program, primarily for lawyers from other countries. The journal *Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems* is published twice a year, giving students with international interests an opportunity to receive credit for service on the TLCP editorial board. International Law Society members arrange and organize both a yearly speakers program and a bi-annual symposium on international issues. Members also promote the Iowa-Bordeaux Summer Program in Comparative and International Law, participate in the annual Philip C. Jessup International Moot Court Competition, and serve a social function by bringing together faculty and students who share an interest in international affairs.

The Institute for International Business coordinates and augments resources at **the Tippie College of Business** in order to enhance and promote the growth of international business education at the UI. The IIB sponsors guest lectures and seminars on a variety of relevant topics and supports international internship opportunities for undergraduates. Each semester, the MBA Association, the Institute for International Business and the Tippie School of Management host an international luncheon that features two countries represented in the Tippie

⁶ Particular areas of focus have included comparative law, European Union law, international business law, the law of international economic institutions, international environmental law, the law of international finance, international human rights law, the law governing international organizations and the conduct of United States' foreign policy, the law of war, and legal reform in Africa and the Near East, East and Southeast Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and the successor countries to the Soviet Union. About seven faculty make up the ICL program. Several other Law faculty are counted as "international" in their focus, although they are not formally part of the ICL.

MBA student body. At these luncheons, students, faculty and staff are given the chance to sample ethnic recipes while their classmates give overview presentations on the business and social cultures of their respective countries.

In the College of Business's Executive MBA program, a one-week international experience is integrated into the program, beginning with the introduction of a representative of the host business school during residency week. Mini sessions discussing the culture, economics, politics, legal structure, and business practices of the focus country are integrated into regular courses. Each study group identifies one company they would like to visit during the trip, and, as a team, they research and plan logistics. Students in the MBA for Professionals and Managers program have the option of participating in a two-week international study trip, offered twice a year. A Business and International Education grant helps to internationalize parts of the Business curriculum and supports faculty and student travel abroad. The International Business Certificate is open to undergraduates who are enrolled in CLAS or College of Business programs.⁷ The College of Business was the first UI College to offer an offshore degree program with its International Executive MBA program, based in Hong Kong and Beijing.

The College of Engineering has been successful in developing formal linkages with foreign institutions, including a Global Faculty Exchange Fellowship with Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology and a Student Exchange with Middle East Technical University. Recently, the College has begun developing dual degree programs, including one with Dharmsinh Desai University in Gujarat, India.⁸ The College's IIHR-Hydroscience and En-

⁷ Requirements for the IBC include at least one foreign language course above the CLAS FL minimum or 5th semester proficiency, as well as two area studies courses.

⁸ Under this agreement, DDU students complete their first three years of study at DDU, then enroll at in the UI Graduate College to complete work toward a MS in Engineering.

gineering program has offered a multidisciplinary study abroad short course since 1997. Each year, the program focuses on a country or world region for an intensive and in-depth exposure to technical, cultural and environmental issues that impact planning and execution of water projects.

College of Nursing students can participate in cross-cultural nursing experiences in Iceland and Jamaica. Nursing also maintains a shared Ph.D. program with Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand. The Shared Program enables selected Thai students to spend one year at the UI College of Nursing.

The Barry Freeman Fellowship provides funding for **College of Medicine** students to spend eight months abroad at an underserved location, becoming familiar with the culture, society and medical problems of the site. Medical students are encouraged to consider State Department and Peace Corps medical internships as well as fellowships through the Fogarty International Center and medical missions through Rotary, and to participate in student exchanges with institutions in the UK and Sweden. The College of Medicine provides a list of international opportunities on their Global Programs Web site.

Under **the College of Public Health**, the Center for International Rural and Environmental Health promotes greater understanding and awareness into the causes, consequences and prevention of communicable, chronic, environmental, and occupational diseases in all regions of the globe, focusing on nations with substantial agrarian economies. The Iowa-Fogarty Training Program in Environmental and Occupational Health provides opportunities for scholars from Central and Eastern European countries to continue their training by pursuing research topics at Iowa. The College of Public Health also offers a Master of Public Health degree with an emphasis in Global Health, in collaboration with IP's Global Health Studies certificate program.

The College of Education maintains its own Office of International Students and Programs, which helps to support international students in the College and pursues new linkage and exchange opportunities with foreign partner institutions. Each year since 1996, the College of Education hosts an International Education Day for area middle and high school students, in collaboration with International Programs, the Office of Admissions, the Stanley Foundation, the Iowa City Community School District, and other campus and off-campus offices and organizations. A keynote speech is followed by interactive large group activities and small group workshops. International Education Day themes range from “The Human Right to Food” to “Health is a Human Right.”

The College of Education’s Belin-Blank International Center for Gifted Education and Talent Development collaborates with related institutions in Australia, Canada, Chile and Israel to provide leadership in gifted education. It has partnered with Hangzhou Harvest Consulting to offer the China BESTS talent search, which brings about 50 top academic students from China to attend a three-week gifted program at the UI. From the 2008 summer program participants, Belin-Blank and the Office of Admissions will select approximately 25 China BESTS students for early admission to the UI as undergraduates. The Belin-Blank International Center was recently awarded a John Templeton Foundation grant to provide an intensive educational experience for 50 educators from around the world.

Faculty from the School of Journalism and Mass Communication in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences have initiated a number of important international projects, including, most recently, the signing of an agreement with the Beijing Olympics Committee which provides at least 26 UI students the opportunity to work as media volunteers at the 2008 Summer Olympics and Paralympics.

Other UI programs contribute to the internationalization of the campus in significant ways. The International Writing Program, founded in 1967, was the first writers’ residency program to reach out across national borders. For three months each fall, established writers from countries around the globe come together in Iowa City to give and attend talks and lectures, meet with U.S. peers, and engage in educational outreach to the larger community. The program is funded primarily by the U.S. Department of State, along with the support of a number of corporate and foundation grants. Over a thousand writers from over 120 countries have participated in the program.

The WiderNet project, under the School of Library and Information Science in the Graduate College, provides outreach and service to institutions in Africa as well as other locations. Its eGranary Digital Library provides millions of digital educational resources to institutions lacking adequate Internet access. By garnering permissions, copying Web sites, and delivering them to intranet Web servers inside partner institutions in developing countries, WiderNet allows patrons to access the eGranary's resources over their local area networks at no cost. Other WiderNet projects include: Building Digital Technical Capacity at Nigerian Universities; the Nigerian Decision Makers Program (an annual conference for 40+ administrators from African universities); the Techno Tour (an annual intensive workshop for 10 – 20 international administrators); and the Computer Donation and Shipping Project (which benefits higher education institutions in Nigeria).

Internationalization of the campus would be impossible without the support of several service units on campus. University Counseling Service offers group counseling for international students and publishes its informational materials in five languages. The Women's Resource and Action Center offers free support and discussion groups for international women and for students dealing with reverse cultural shock after returning from study or work abroad. Other critical offices include: the Office of the Registrar, Office of Admissions (which processes international admissions), Student Health Services, the English as a Second Language and Iowa Intensive English programs (housed in the department of Linguistics), Academic Advising, Immigration Services for UI Employees (housed in UI Human Resources), University Housing, the Office of Student Financial Aid, and the Cashier's Office. All of these offices assist in various ways in the administration of study abroad, academic programs management, and international student and scholar advising and programming. In recent years, multicultural and diversity offices on campus have collaborated with the Office of International Students and Scholars to provide cross-cultural training and leadership development opportunities to UI students.

BEST PRACTICES AND COMPARISONS TO PEERS AND INTERNATIONALIZED TARGET INSTITUTIONS

The Iowa Board of Regents defines six other CIC institutions, University of Arizona-Tucson, UCLA, University of Texas-Austin and UNC-Chapel Hill as UI peers. A survey was conducted with a slightly modified list of peers, including nine of the CIC institutions, UCLA and UNC-Chapel Hill. ¹[See Appendix R: “Peer Comparisons.”] The UI is similar to its peers in most respects. All of the campuses have a designated Chief International Education Administrator (CIEA), most of whom report to the Provost.² The CIEA in all cases oversees the office for study abroad and, in most cases, also oversees the international students and scholars office. ³ The CIEA usually oversees academic or research centers and programs.⁴ All peer institutions have at least

one internationally-focused endowment supporting at least part of their international activities. All of the institutions offer some form of engagement program for returned study abroad students, promote attention to diversity in classroom teaching, offer some form of specialized training for international T.A.’s, and boast a variety of international student clubs and associations, as well as a number of international and intercultural campus events.⁵ All of the institutions provide some kind of incentive for international course development. Nearly all of the campuses claim that they promote the infusion of international content into existing courses in some way. No CIEA at any of the peer institutions has her or his own reporting faculty. Only Iowa, PSU and Purdue lack a Title VI-funded national resource center.

Marked differences between the institutions occur in several areas, including: 1) a development officer dedicated to funding for internationalization; 2) the prominence of international programs on the University web site’s home page; 3) rigorous foreign-language requirements; 4) the particular functions and structure of International Programs; and 5) the existence of scholarships for international students. Indiana, MSU, Minnesota, Purdue,

¹ The 11 public universities that are considered members of the official UI Peer Group are: University of Arizona-Tucson, UCLA, University of Illinois-Urbana, Indiana University, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, UNC-Chapel Hill, Ohio State University, University of Texas-Austin, and University of Wisconsin. The institutions that were surveyed for the purposes of this report were recommended by the Office of the Provost: University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, University of Wisconsin, UCLA, and UNC-Chapel Hill.

² Exceptions to this rule: Indiana University (CIEA reports to President), Minnesota (reports to VP for System Administration); Penn State (reports to VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education); and UCLA (reports to Executive dean of The College, with dotted line to the Provost).

³ The CIEA does not oversee the International Students Office at the following institutions: Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and UCLA. In these cases, international student advising falls under the responsibility of the dean of Students or Student Affairs.

⁴ Exceptions: Indiana and Penn State.

⁵ It should be noted that yes/no responses to questions such as “Do you offer international T.A. training?” can be quite misleading. For example, at The University of Iowa, this training is limited to programs offered through the Office of International Students and Scholars or ESL. The training is usually targeted to new international students and is focused on overcoming cultural and linguistic differences rather than infusing international perspectives into teaching. At Michigan State, Minnesota and UNC-Chapel Hill, on the other hand, ongoing pedagogical training is offered in conjunction with the universities’ centers for teaching and learning.

Wisconsin, UCLA and UNC all have a dedicated international development officer; Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, OSU and PSU do not. Iowa, Ohio State, Penn State and Purdue are the only peer institutions that do not have an international link on the University's home page. Iowa and Illinois are the only peer institutions that do not have an on-campus foreign language study or tested foreign language proficiency requirement.

INTERNATIONALIZATION LABORATORY BACKGROUND

The University of Iowa was one of the first institutions to join the ACE Internationalization Collaborative, and has sent faculty and/or staff representatives to the annual meeting every year since 2002. In the summer of 2006, the UI was invited to participate in the fourth cohort of institutions involved in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory, an outgrowth of the ACE Collaborative. The other members of this cohort are Arcadia University, College of Charleston/University of Charleston, New Mexico State University, and Park University. Previous participants have included California State University, Sacramento, Kansas State University, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, the University of South Florida, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

At the time the UI joined the cohort, International Programs, as well as the University more broadly, had gone through five years of changes in leadership and rapid growth in the area of international activities. Before launching any new, major initiatives, it seemed essential to evaluate the current situation and establish long-range goals. To this end, International Programs developed an ambitious plan for evaluation and assessment and initiated or completed the following steps:

- Completion of the 2005-2010 IP Strategic Plan, responding to the priorities set forth in the University Strategic Plan.
- Participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory.
- Initiation of a series of formal reviews of IP offices and functions, including broad reviews of unit directors.
- Development of desired learning outcomes for students in the International Studies B.A., as well as procedures for assessing outcomes, and initiation of discussion regarding learning outcomes for the IS M.A. program and for other IP degree- and certificate-granting programs.

Recommendations of the Fall 2006 ACE Site Visit Team

In August, 2006, the IP ACE Lab Leadership Team (AP/Dean William Reisinger, IP Director Diana Davies, Associate Dean Jane Desmond, and International Studies Coordinator Martha Greer) attended a one-day meeting of the Internationalization Laboratory hosted by ACE in Washington DC. Cohort members reviewed their progress to date, shared their challenges and best practices, and discussed next steps.

In September, Dr. Madeleine Green and Dr. Barbara Hill visited the University of Iowa to conduct an initial site visit. During their stay, they met with the ACE Lab Leadership Team as well as Vice Provost Pat Cain, the IP Executive Committee, Provost Michael Hogan, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Thomas Rocklin, Dean of the College of Engineering P. Barry Butler, Associate Dean for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Helena Dettmer, Dean of the College of Business William Hunter, Dean of the Graduate College John Keller, IP staff leadership, and selected IP-affiliated faculty members.

Following this visit, Dr. Green and Dr. Hill sent a letter to AP/Dean William Reisinger, which included the following observations and recommendations:

- Due to the decentralized complexity of the UI, cooperation and collaboration across campus will be critical to making internationalization “more central to the mission of the university,” as well as a mark of distinction.
- In order for internationalization to be realized, it must be “prominently addressed in the strategic plans submitted by every college and professional school.”
- IP should “initiate a broad discussion of the IP strategic plan, which should be seen as a ‘document in process,’ throughout the university.”
- IP should “frame a common agenda for the university that will necessarily find different expressions in different colleges and departments, but that will offer opportunities for inter-unit synergy and coordination.”
- The IP ACE Leadership Team should “generate many opportunities for the campus community to discuss this plan and to act as the coordinating center of a complex network of faculty, staff, and students.”
- “Address outreach to international alumni and development of overseas programs and linkages.”
- IP should assess how it functions as a catalyst for internationalization on the UI campus.
- The Lab should address “what are the unique assets for the UI for internationalization, how to maximize those assets and how to overcome barriers.”
- The Lab should assess the curriculum of some internationally-focused programs and “seek ways of infusing the general undergraduate curriculum with international content and cross-cultural perspectives.”

In addition, the ACE consultants advised that IP leaders should be involved in key committees dealing with the review of general education and the establishment of assessment of student learning outcomes for all programs and should bring global learning issues into these discussions, since “institutions that worked separately on these issues have found it difficult to align them afterward.” The University was also advised to be pro-active and strategic in seeking external funding for internationalization; should develop short- and long-term goals with clear priorities and appropriate rationales; and should seek synergies between multicultural education and internationalization.

Steps Taken and Steps Remaining

Several of IP’s evaluation and assessment goals have already been met. The IP Strategic Plan was completed in 2005-2006 and a full implementation plan in fall 2007. Formal learning outcomes for the IS B.A. and a plan for assessing these outcomes were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. Unit-by-unit and supervisor evaluations were initiated in fall 2005, with reviews of the Communications and Grants units completed by spring 2006, a review of Outreach completed by summer 2007, and an evaluation of the IP Director completed by spring 2007. A Business Plan was developed for the Office for Study Abroad in 2006-2007, in consultation with an independent firm.

Some evaluation and assessment goals will need to be addressed in the near future, including the development of learning outcomes for the IS M.A. degree as well as the Ph.D. in Second Language Acquisition, the Crossing Borders Fellows program, and the certificates in Global Health Studies and Latin American Studies. Each of these processes may be based on the successful process used to develop outcomes and assessment tools for the IS B.A., which involved the leadership of a faculty and staff committee, as well as the IP Executive Committee.

Other evaluation and assessment goals identified in the earliest stages of the ACE Lab will need considerably more time to develop. We see the ACE Lab process itself as the starting point for further discussion of these goals, including:

- developing international learning outcomes for IP's constituent programs and for all UI students;
- reviewing programs to determine where students might achieve this learning;
- determining the faculty development and support needed to embed international perspectives in the non-IP curriculum; and
- considering the role of language learning and technology in global learning;
- considering opportunities for further presence overseas through research and exchanges;
- creating more ways for international students and scholars to contribute to "internationalization at home;"
- understanding how IP can best coordinate this wide array of international activities.

In implementing the ACE Internationalization Laboratory assessment (known on campus as "International Iowa!"), the IP-based research team needed to focus its efforts on investigating a few key questions. Ultimately, two of the ACE consultants' original recommendations were selected for special consideration: 1) How does IP function as a catalyst for internationalization on the UI campus? and 2) "What are UI's unique assets for internationalization and how to maximize those assets and overcome barriers?"

The IP-based research team began by gathering relevant data from all of the programs currently under the auspices of International Programs. Each of the units gathered several years of statistical data. These statistics were compared to peer institutions chosen by the Provost's Office, including the CIC institutions (all but the University of Chicago), UCLA, and UNC-Chapel Hill, in order to give the research a broader context. The information gathered in this way has been posted to the "International Iowa!" web site and has been included in the form of appendices to this document.

Next, the research team measured the level of international activity among faculty in teaching, research, and service by surveying all UI faculty, with the exception of visiting faculty or adjuncts who also hold staff positions.¹ 776 responses were received, out of 2,886 possible, for a response rate of just over 27%. The faculty survey was followed by ten focus groups composed of 4 – 10 representative faculty members from each of the professional colleges, the International Studies program, and the Foreign Language departments and Foreign Language support units.² Lastly, the research team

1 Survey questions were developed by the research team with input from numerous individuals familiar with survey research design and were vetted by the Associate Provosts. After several iterations, the anonymous online survey was launched via email in late March, 2007. 2886 email invitations were sent to all tenure track, clinical track, and emeritus faculty at the University of Iowa. In addition, surveys were sent to paid adjuncts who do not also hold staff positions at the University. An announcement from Provost Hogan requesting participation was sent out a few days before the actual survey invitation, and three reminder invitations were sent out over a period of four weeks.

2 The intent of the focus groups was to determine in detail: 1) the ways in which faculty understand internationalization; 2) institutional policies, curricular issues or resources that either support or inhibit internationalization efforts; and 3) "best practices" in internationalization as perceived by faculty in each focus group area. The research team conducted three "practice" focus groups with staff and faculty from the IP Office for Study Abroad, the Office of International Students and Scholars, and the IP Executive Committee in order to determine the effectiveness of the

surveyed student services staff across campus who have a potential role in contributing to the internationalization of students' academic and extracurricular experiences. 374 individuals were invited to participate, and 187 responded, for a response rate of 50%. A careful analysis of the responses from both surveys as well as the comments from the faculty focus groups revealed a series of persistent themes. These themes will be described and discussed below.

focus group structure and key questions. The research team also consulted with focus group experts from the College of Education. The actual focus groups were implemented, then, late in the spring 2007 semester. Each group included at least one faculty member who has had some involvement in IP programs or activities over the past several years. These faculty were encouraged to invite others who may have particularly valuable insights in this area. In this way, each group included some faculty who were very familiar with IP, and others who were unfamiliar with the IP mission, programs, and services. Because the IS faculty cohort is so large, focus group participants were randomly selected. In the case of the Foreign Language group, faculty were invited to ensure representation from several languages as well as different Foreign Language pedagogical and scholarly perspectives (those with literature and translation emphases as well as Second Language Acquisition faculty). Two members of the research team conducted all of the focus groups, keeping meticulous notes of the conversations and consulting afterwards to ensure accuracy.

UNDERSTANDING “INTERNATIONALIZATION”

We use the term “internationalization” as it is defined by ACE: “processes that lead to enhancing the international, global, or intercultural dimensions of an institution or system.”

In most cases, however, “internationalization” was defined as a list of (not necessarily connected) activities and resources.

Terms such as international education, internationalization, globalization, and transnational education have been used interchangeably to describe institutional levels of activity, strategic plans, content knowledge, learning outcomes and core values in various articles, studies, and reports.¹ Shifting terminology can impede effective communication about internationalization. Moreover, it may be very difficult to internationalize an institution if leadership does not decide and thoroughly publicize what internationalization will mean, operationally, for the institution.

We use the term “internationalization” as it is defined by ACE: “processes that lead to enhancing the international, global, or intercultural dimensions of an institution or system.”² This definition emphasizes ongoing and intentional processes over any specific strategy or activity (such as study abroad, international student recruitment, or credit-bearing international programs).

In conducting the focus groups, the facilitators intentionally avoided providing the participants with a definition of the term “internationalization.” This is because the researchers wanted to avoid planting an idea in the heads of the participants and also wanted to get a sense of the variety of definitions for this term that are held by individuals in different parts of the campus.

¹ See: Hans DeWit, *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002).

² Christa Olson, Madeleine Green, and Barbara Hill, *A Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization* (Washington DC: American Council on Education, 2006), vi.

We found that there is, in fact, no shared definition of this term, either across Colleges, units and departments, or within them. Responses ranged from “I haven’t heard the term used before, don’t have a context, but it seems to imply making everyone in the world do the same thing,” to “The term sounds too big, bureaucratic, hollow. How could that possibly happen? Could be a buzz word.” While some faculty clearly conflated “internationalization” with “globalization,” others connected the term with anti-globalization, or with “political correctness.” As one faculty member put it: “How do I incorporate all cultural perspectives in my class? You’d end up with ‘vanilla yogurt!’” In most cases, however, “internationalization” was defined as a list of (not necessarily connected) activities and resources.

For some faculty, “internationalization” is not so much a set of activities as a philosophical approach. Not surprisingly, that underlying philosophy varies substantially from one department to another. For some, internationalization equals good business practice (“It’s related to marketing”). For others, it “should subvert patriotism, overcome narrow lenses.” Some were able to include both opinions in their definition: “Internationalization is a reflection of business and philosophical realities. On the business side, we need to fill up our programs with a cadre of the best and brightest from around the world. At the same time, we need to make the world a better place. We send our best students overseas to study and work. These students want to help, make a difference.”

“Internationalization” defined as a list of activities and resources.

Partnerships between institutions, programs, classrooms

Research collaboration, exchange of scholars

International Programs

Students studying abroad, faculty teaching abroad, faculty doing research on international topics

The things a university does outside U.S. borders

Practitioners coming here, from abroad

The existence of international degree programs, Foreign Cultures and Civilizations courses

Courses specifically about other countries and courses that infuse international content into course content

The institution exporting expertise abroad and international students coming here for education

Incorporating international students’ ideas into courses

Programs and procedures that enhance sensitivity to international students

Some faculty provided comprehensive definitions that included both activities and philosophical approaches: “There are multiple components: the education students get (what do you learn on a day to day basis, how does that relate to people outside this country?); experiential education (face to face interactions, study abroad, or interacting with international students here); faculty collaborations (many experts are outside the country); and reputation of the university (all the top universities in the country are global – you can’t be a local/regional place and be known as one of the best).”

A number of focus group participants pointed out that, without a clear definition of internationalization, it can be hard to assess success in this area. “In Europe, the term ‘international’ means the mixing of peoples. Here, any boundary crossing is ‘international.’ That leads to very simplistic goals (the number of students going abroad, etc.), not a very enriching activity.” A faculty member from the College of Dentistry suggested that, without clear goals for internationalization, faculty could be credited as being highly international just for “parachuting in and retracting a lot of teeth ... You need to decide how you want to be known and recognized.”

Beyond the differing understandings of internationalization, we found significant confusion about the rationale for the process. Several faculty members argued that, without a solid reason why we should internationalize, there is very little motivation actually to pursue it.

Beyond the differing understandings of internationalization, we found significant confusion about the rationale for the process. Several faculty members argued that, without a solid reason why we should internationalize, there is very little motivation actually to pursue it. Faculty noted: “We need to show our students it really matters. They say... ‘and so?’” “We all know the world is flat. That doesn’t cut it any more.” “Everyone should be on the same page as to why we want to do this.” “Is internationalization good just because we think it’s good, because it’s good for our students, or good for the (foreign) institutions we work with? It could be hard to justify the expense and effort of internationalization if we are looking for short-term measurable gains or quick pay-offs.”

EMERGING THEMES

The information gleaned from the surveys and focus groups is rich in detail and complexity. We therefore describe specific themes and trends. The significance of these themes will be discussed in the “Discussion” section that follows.

Faculty Survey

Table 1 shows the response rate by faculty type. [See Appendix S: “Faculty Survey Summary” for a break-down of responses based on faculty rank and college or discipline area.] The survey started with six “filter” questions. If a respondent answered “No” to all of these questions, s/he was done. If the respondent answered “Yes” to any of the questions, s/he continued on with the rest of the survey. The filter questions asked if they had ever traveled outside the U.S. for volunteer, work, study or research purposes; if they had ever collaborated with someone from another country or researched a topic with international implications; if they had ever compared or contrasted two or more different cultures while teaching a course; if they had ever resided outside the U.S. for at least three continuous months, for any reason; if they had ever utilized a second language in teaching, research or service; and if they

had ever taught a course that focused on a non-U.S. country, culture or region of the world. Some of these questions were revisited later in the survey as “how often” as opposed to “yes/no” questions.

In addition to providing a filter, these initial questions also reflected various levels of international experience and cultural understanding, from “shallow” (activities that happen to be international but may involve only a limited exposure to other cultures) to “deep” (activities that actively focus on the international, especially on a particular country or culture). For example, a faculty member might travel internationally to pursue a research agenda, but the research topic may not be international in theme and the research conducted might not have involved any significant cultural interaction. On the other hand, teaching a course that focuses on a particular country or culture indicates a “deep” knowledge of that culture. Following this line of reasoning, the researchers found a generally inverse relationship between the depth of international experience and the number of faculty providing an affirmative response. The question on travel produced about 85% affirmative; on collaboration, about 69% affirmative; comparing and contrasting, 54%; residence, 52%; language use, 44.2%; and targeted international course, 25.4%. Among all

Table 1: Response Rates to Faculty Survey

	Respondents	UI Faculty	Response Rate
Tenured or tenure-track	524 (67.5%)	1673 (37%)	31%
Clinical	106 (13.7%)	421 (9%)	25%
Adjunct	101 (13%)	2049 (45.3%)*	N/A
Emeritus/-a	43 (5.5%)	237 (5.2%)	18%
Visiting	N/A	140 (3.1%)*	N/A
Total	776	2886/4520*	27%

* Visiting faculty and unpaid adjuncts, or adjuncts with non-teaching appointments were excluded from the survey.

colleges, travel was most common international experience (with only Law drawing a tie between travel and collaboration as the most common activity/experience) and targeted courses were the most rare (with only Engineering drawing a tie between targeted courses and language use as their most infrequent activity). Collaboration was the second most common international experience across all colleges, except for Public Health, Nursing, and Education, which reported residence abroad (for Public Health) and language use (Nursing and Education), as their second most common international experience.

Several ordinal questions were asked (these are questions #5, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 8.2, 10, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5 in Appendix S). These questions attempted to determine the level of activity in several different areas. Of all faculty responses, nearly 75% reported the ability to read or speak at least one language. Of these, a little less than half claimed to have a proficiency level of advanced to complete fluency. Responses to the language proficiency question did vary from college to college, from 86% (Law) to only 52% (both Pharmacy and Education) of respondents reporting proficiency in at least one language. Of faculty who did report having proficiency in at least one language, the highest percentage of faculty claiming advanced or native proficiency could be found in the College of Engineering, with 72%. The biggest gaps between likelihood of knowing another language and having advanced or native proficiency in that language were found in the Colleges of Law, Business, and Medicine.

The international activities that emerge as fairly common for UI faculty, are: 1) attendance at international conferences (75% reporting activity in this area over the past five years); 2) international service (a majority reporting activity in this area over the past five years); and 3) other professional experiences outside the U.S. (almost half reporting activity for the period in question). The international activities that are least common for UI faculty are: 1) sponsoring international visitors (66% reporting they have

never done this); 2) using languages other than English in teaching, research or service (67% never); 3) conducting internationally focused or internationally collaborative research grants (72% never); 4) teaching a course that focused on a particular non-U.S. country, region or culture (73% never); 5) serving as a visiting professor in another country (76% never); 6) leading study abroad programs or conducting study abroad program site visits (86% never); and 7) teaching long-distance courses to students in overseas locations (91% never). When breaking responses down by college or department, these statistics did fluctuate, although certain trends continued: international conference travel was consistently the first or second most common international experience among faculty in all colleges, and long-distance international course instruction was the least common experience, with the notable exceptions of Public Health and Nursing.²

We also asked faculty to estimate the approximate percentage of international content and international collaboration in their research and/or creative projects. The largest number of respondents (37%) said that one-fifth or less of their research relates to international topics. Another 36% said that none of their research is international. In terms of collaboration with international research partners, 47% responded that this applied to less than one-fifth of their total research work, and another 37% said that they have never engaged in international collaborative research. Again, results varied between Colleges, ranging from just 24% of

1 Faculty who indicated that they had applied for or received one or more internationally focused or internationally collaborative research grants in the past five years listed a variety of funding sources. See Appendix T: Faculty International Funding Sources for a full list of these sources.

2 The least common international experience for Public Health faculty was non-service oriented professional work outside the U.S., followed by teaching a course focused on a particular country or culture and utilizing foreign languages in teaching, research and service. The least common international experience for Nursing faculty was participating in internationally collaborative research grants.

respondents reporting that their research “never” includes international topics (CLAS) to over 55% making the same claim (Medicine). An even greater range can be found in responses dealing with internationally collaborative research, with Engineering faculty reporting that fully 87% of their research is internationally collaborative in nature, while Education faculty report that 55% of their research involves no international collaboration.

Question #8.2 (“How often have you taught a course that incorporated multiple international, intercultural, or global perspectives into the course content?”) emerges as a key indicator of internationalization. Since faculty impact students primarily, and in some cases exclusively, through their interaction in the classroom, the responses to this question illuminate efforts to internationalize the undergraduate experience at The University of Iowa.

The frequency with which faculty members incorporate international perspectives does correlate with the depth of their internationally related teaching, research and service. The correlations between this question and selected other measures are:

Frequency of teaching non-U.S. courses	(.54)
Amount of time spent on international research topics	(.48)
Number of languages used in teaching, research or service	(.28)
Frequency of international professional research experience	(.25)
Frequency of leading study abroad programs	(.23)
Frequency of participation in international service projects	(.21)
Number of international grants applied for or received	(.20)
Number of languages other than English read or spoken	(.19)
Amount of collaboration with international researchers	(.16)

The frequency with which faculty members incorporate international perspectives does correlate with the depth of their internationally related teaching, research and service.

The first correlation may indicate that much of the presentation of international perspectives in the classroom comes via courses on a specific non-U.S. country or region or that faculty who teach this kind of course are also more likely to incorporate international perspectives into their courses that are not specifically focused on a non-U.S. country or region. The second shows that such international perspectives are provided by those instructors conducting international research. When comparing the relationship between the same set of questions and question #8.1 (“How often have you taught a course that focused on a particular non-U.S. country, region or culture?”), all correlation values were clearly higher.

Responses to our questions about whether faculty have ever taught a course that focused on a non-U.S. country, culture, or region of the world and whether they have ever compared or contrasted two or more different cultures while teaching a course were likewise related to the depth of the faculty member’s international activities. The correlation values were higher when exploring the relationship between teaching a course regarding a non-U.S. topic and the other faculty activities listed above than they were when exploring the relationship between teaching a course that incorporated multiple internationalized perspectives and the faculty activities listed above.

These patterns do differ by College. These, in some cases, dramatic differences suggest that faculty members from different disciplines learn or otherwise come to integrate international perspectives into their teaching in different ways. [See Appendix U: Discipline-Based Differences.] That in turn suggests that internationalization should not be approached as “one size fits all,” and that different incentives

to internationalize might be applied in different discipline-based contexts. [See Appendix V: “Correlations to Question 8.2 by College Affiliation.”]

Student Support Staff Survey

Ideally, everyone who plays a role in the educational process inside or outside the classroom should value international perspectives and the University’s goals for campus internationalization. With this in mind, we surveyed staff members across campus who are in a position to directly influence a student’s academic and extracurricular choices or to set policy for an office that influences those choices.³ A total of 374 staff were invited to participate in the survey. Survey questions measured these key support staff’s level of internationalization (in part, by measuring their exposure to international experiences and perspectives) and their likelihood of incorporating international and cross-cultural perspectives into their interactions with students. Of our 184 respondents, the majority identified themselves as working in the area of academic advising, programs and services (32%) or in admissions, financial aid and registration (25%). Other groups included student life, recreational services and residence life (10.3%), library and research services (10%), counseling services and student health services (9%), diversity and enrichment (5%), and career advising (4%). Nearly half of all respondents indicated that their responsibilities included both some administrative duties and direct service to stu-

³ Staff were targeted based on job description (rather than pay grade or rank). Surveys were sent to staff who have direct interactions with students, as well as those who are in a position to influence student experiences based on their policy and financial decision-making roles. These staff are employed by the following units: Academic Advising, Academic Services and Programs, Career Advising, Counseling and Student Health Services, libraries, centers for teaching, Admissions, Registrar’s, Financial Aid, Women’s Resource and Action Center, Student Disability Services, ESL, Center for Diversity and Enrichment, Office of Student Life, Residence Life, and Recreation Services.

dents. Most of the respondents (54%) reported that they work with both undergraduate and graduate or professional students, while another 32% reported that they were exclusively with undergraduates.

The amount of international activity among student services staff in all the fields above is relatively low. 56% had never supervised an international student; almost half (47%) had never planned or implemented a program for students that highlights cultural diversity; and an even larger number (69%) had never planned or implemented a program highlighting a specific non-U.S. culture or planned or implemented a program specifically for international students (71%).

We asked the staff members some of the same questions we asked the faculty members: had they ever traveled outside the U.S. for volunteer, work or research purposes (only 38% responded in the affirmative, as opposed to 85% of the faculty); had they ever lived outside the U.S. for at least three continuous months (27% as opposed to 52% of the faculty); had they ever collaborated with a colleague from another country (35% as opposed to 69% of the faculty); how many languages other than English they are able to read or speak (55% reported at least one language as opposed to 75% of faculty); and the level of proficiency they had attained in a foreign language (23% indicated an advanced or native level, as opposed to 48% of faculty). This relatively low level of international experience among staff raises the question of how these staff are prepared to infuse international perspectives into their interactions with students. Overwhelmingly, the most common international educational experience for staff was study of a foreign language (76%). Only 39% of respondents had taken more than one course on a non-U.S. country or culture; only 25% had ever had a short-term international experience (which might have included a short-term volunteer or study abroad program or study tour); only 17% had a major or minor in a foreign language; and only 15% had participated in a study abroad program or exchange of a semester or longer.

Unfortunately, staff are not, as a rule, actively pursuing international continuing education or professional development opportunities. Seventy-two percent of respondents indicated that they had never participated in a UI Building Our Global Community workshop and nearly 60% had attended not a single conference or presentation that focused on international education issues within the past five years.

Just as we hope that faculty will internationalize the educational experience through their incorporation of international elements into their teaching and mentoring, student services staff should infuse their advising and other student contact with international perspectives. Here, the results were somewhat more promising. 36% of respondents indicated that they frequently promote study abroad to the students they serve. Another 30% indicated that they do so “occasionally.” Unfortunately, these leaves about a third of respondents indicating that they never or almost never promote study abroad to their students. Even fewer staff have promoted international curricular opportunities to students (42% said that they never have done this, and another 31% indicated that they have done this only occasionally). A surprisingly large number (29%) indicated that they have never directly or indirectly promoted international events on campus or in the community to students.⁴

⁴ As with the faculty, responses varied significantly depending on department. Between 47.5 and 61.1% of staff in academic advising, career advising, counseling and health services, and library and research services had traveled outside the U.S. for purposes other than tourism, compared to only 20% of admissions, registrar’s and financial aid staff. Career advising staff were significantly more likely to have collaborated with someone from another country than staff in all other areas (75% as opposed to 10% in admissions, financial aid and registrar’s). At the same time, career advising staff were significantly less likely to speak or read a language other than English (75% speak no other languages, as opposed to only 16.7% in library and research services). Staff in library and research services and career advising were significantly more likely to have studied abroad (long-term or short-term) than all other staff.

Unfortunately, staff are not, as a rule, actively pursuing international continuing education or professional development opportunities.

As with the faculty survey, staff members’ behavior and background are related. In answer to the question, “Reflecting on the educational, personal, and professional experiences you identified in the previous questions, how often do you draw upon your knowledge of international issues to influence your work?” respondents could select “Often,” [etc.] This question provides a useful measure of the overall level of “infused internationalization,” as shown by how the responses correlate with other international characteristics and experiences:

Frequency of professional collaboration with a non-U.S. person	(.47)
Fluency in foreign language read or spoken	(.44)
Non-U.S. topics courses taken	(.43)
Frequency of attending conferences on international topics	(.42)
Likelihood of promoting international curriculum opportunities	(.41)
Frequency of developing cultural diversity programming	(.37)
Likelihood of promoting international events on campus	(.37)
Frequency of planning events about specific non-U.S. cultures	(.36)
Majored or minored in a foreign language or non-U.S. studies	(.33)
Frequency of programming international student events	(.32)
Likelihood to promote study abroad	(.31)
Resided abroad	(.15)
Foreign language study	(.12)

The strong correlation between employing international knowledge in one's work and frequency in collaborating with people from other countries suggests possible action steps, for internationalizing staff and reinforces the conclusion that internationalization is not a matter of "one size fits all." Those who stated that they collaborated with someone from another country "more than once but not every year" or "every year" were more likely to give an affirmative answer to all questions regarding international activities and experiences than the student services group on average. Perhaps most importantly, staff with international collaboration experience were more likely than other respondents as a group to promote study abroad, international curricular opportunities, and international events to students, and they were more likely (65% as opposed to 33%) to draw upon their knowledge of international issues in the course of their work "frequently" or "all the time." These results suggest that the UI would benefit from programs that put its staff members into collaboration with those from other countries.

Focus Groups

We conducted separate focus groups for faculty from five professional colleges (College of Law, College of Pharmacy, College of Business, College of Engineering and College of Education), one combined group of related colleges (Colleges of Nursing, Medicine, Public Health and Dentistry), a randomly selected group of International Studies faculty, and a group of foreign-language faculty (selected to represent different languages and different pedagogical/scholarly approaches). We prompted each group with the following questions: "What does internationalization mean to you?" "In what ways do campus resources help or hinder internationalization efforts?" "In what ways do institutional policies and procedures at UI help or hinder internationalization efforts?" "In what ways do curriculum issues at the UI help or hinder internationalization efforts?" "In what ways does the mission of International Programs align or not align with the mission of the X College/Department/Program?" "What do you consider best practices or role models for internationalization in your field of study?"

Responses fell into four primary areas: 1) threats and opportunities that are primarily outside the immediate control of the University or any constituent part of the University; 2) campus-wide issues; 3) college or department-specific issues; and 4) issues relevant to International Programs. We do not discuss issues limited to specific colleges or departments.

Outside Threats and Opportunities

After September 11, 2001, new security measures posed a major challenge to international student enrollment for nearly all U.S. campuses. Long delays in visa and other immigration document processing, special hurdles for students and scholars

from particular countries and in particular academic disciplines, new requirements for in-person visa applicant interviews, the implementation of complicated new tracking and reporting systems, and many other, related problems, had a chilling effect on international student recruitment and retention.⁵ At The University of Iowa, post-9/11 changes slowed international student enrollment, followed in 2005 by a slight decline that continued through 2006-2007. [See Appendix P: International Students and Scholars Statistics.] The development of a campus-wide International Student Recruitment Committee is, in part, a response to this problem. Other programs (such as the expanded orientation program, “Life in Iowa”) and organizations (such as the Organization for the Active Support of International Students) were created or enhanced after 9/11 to help create a more welcoming environment for international students and scholars. Thankfully, the U.S. State Department and Department of Homeland Security have made certain changes recently to make the international student visa application process somewhat less cumbersome.

Focus group participants commented that, while Homeland Security regulations still pose problems for students and departments, they had noticed significant improvements in the speed and ease of international student and scholar visa processing and in other immigration processes, thanks, in large part, to the effectiveness of the UI Office of International Students and Scholars. Other federal regulations, however, were cited as barriers to internationalization. These included: 1) export control laws, which impede research collaboration and exchange; 2) restrictions against international students working in labs; and 3) restrictions regarding international medical training, according to which visitors can only observe but not participate in medical procedures. Faculty also noted that federal funding agencies can make it difficult to

appoint international graduate students to work on research or other projects, since some federal grants stipulate that funds can only be used to support U.S. citizens.

Other impediments to internationalization relate to the restrictions of the disciplines themselves. Faculty noted that licensing is a major concern for the Health Sciences. One faculty member said: “We’re teaching for a state license, which requires a narrow and restrictive focus.” Another commented, “Certification requirements for licensure are a major barrier to internationalization.” A similar concern was raised by Law faculty, who are often compelled to restrict the scope of their teaching to national or even state law: “Some legal theory restricts you from even looking at external law. If you try, students think, ‘This is irrelevant, you’re wasting my time, and therefore you are a bad teacher.’”

State-level politics were also a source for concern, as faculty noted: “There’s a danger of appearing too international. How will this play to the state?” and “There’s a tendency to shy away from the international image when working at a state level. ‘How many of your students are international?’ is asked with suspicion.”

A final external threat mentioned in the focus groups was culture itself. Some faculty who have tried to incorporate international students’ perspectives in their classes have felt stymied by these same students’ desire to emphasize assimilation over cultural difference. One international faculty member mentioned that he is reluctant to bring international aspects into his classes simply because he is international: “I have to worry about offending certain national feelings. International faculty may be accused of ‘U.S.-bashing.’”

Beyond these external threats to internationalization, focus groups did acknowledge that the current political and economic climate, with its “flat world” focus, does offer certain opportunities. An Engineering faculty member pointed out: “The number one skill set employers want now is mul-

⁵ See 2005-2006 IIE Open Doors Report, “International Students in the U.S.” <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=89251>

ticultural communication skills.” Another commented: “In the last 40 years, things have changed so much. . . . We have to work with people in other countries for everything. It’s not just about technology but also understanding cultures.” A College of Education faculty member described “non-intentional” processes of internationalization: “The media facilitates crossing borders. . . . You can get CDs and movies from all over the world. This affects the way we live.”

Campus-Wide Issues

Resources

Focus group discussion of campus resources tended to center around the theme of “hospitality” or “creating an environment that welcomes international guests.” Faculty participants in all focus groups (as well as faculty and staff in the “practice” groups) identified the lack of resources for welcoming visiting international faculty, scholars and students to campus as a significant impediment to internationalization. Repeatedly, group participants complained of the lack of housing and office space for visiting faculty and scholars. They pointed out that such space is commonly found in Big Ten and other peer institutions and that it is nearly always provided to UI faculty and scholars when they are the guests at overseas institutions. Comments along these lines included: “Respected scholars have to scramble to find a place to live.” “In Hong Kong, all the universities have housing for short-term visitors. We don’t even have office space.” “High quality scholars are willing to teach a course for free, but they need housing and other support. It would be a big relief for faculty and DEOs to not have to find housing, childcare, etc.” “Sponsored scholars are seen as trouble and are actively discouraged. . . . department secretaries and chairs complain about the paperwork.” One faculty member noted that this lack of support for incoming scholars can be a real cause for embarrassment when dealing with colleagues from institutions with which the UI has a formal linkage: “Foreign partners will provide

“Foreign partners will provide support for visitors, but we can’t reciprocate. There is no reciprocity in linkage agreements. They pay for everything.”

support for visitors, but we can’t reciprocate. There is no reciprocity in linkage agreements. They pay for everything.”

Faculty concerns about the lack of resources for incoming international guests extended to students. Several group participants pointed out that housing options for international students are not satisfactory. Hawkeye Court and Hawkeye Apartments were frequently singled out for criticism, with faculty describing them as “run down,” “off the beaten path,” “isolating,” and “not conducive to integration.” Other problems noted as contributing to an unwelcoming environment for international faculty, students and scholars included the lack of a means for connecting international faculty and scholars with one another or with U.S. faculty with related interests a University Web site that is unfriendly to international users; and the lack of support for the dependants of international students and scholars.

On the positive side, faculty are aware of several resources that promote a more welcoming environment for internationals, including community-based foreign language courses, the International Writing Program, strong student nationality groups, international cinema series, community groups like the Council for International Visitors to Iowa Cities and the Iowa City Foreign Relations Council, having an international bibliographer in the Main Library, and advising services and other programs offered by the IP Office of International Students and Scholars.

Funding Priorities

Faculty argued that internationalization was hampered by inadequate funding in four areas: 1) faculty international research travel and other international development (including foreign language study);

“Why should top international students come here when other places will offer them scholarships?”

2) support for international events and invited speakers/scholars; 3) scholarships and graduate assistantships for international students; and 4) strategic hiring of internationally-focused faculty.

Faculty in most of the groups agreed that there is insufficient support for faculty international travel in both directions (incoming and outgoing). Related to the concerns noted above, under “Resources,” faculty argued that colleges and departments are too often forced to rely on the generosity of foreign partners when it comes to supporting faculty exchange. One group participant stated: “We go there and they come here on their buck. It’s embarrassing that the foreign partner has to pay for everything.” A common refrain was that, when funding to support international travel is available, it is issued in amounts too small to have any significant impact. “They give you \$100 in support of a \$1,000 flight.”

Faculty in several of the focus groups stated that lack of funding for international lectures and other events hampers initiative in this area. Several faculty complained that the University’s apparent philosophy of event fundraising (“lots of little contributions from lots of different people”) doesn’t work. These same group participants argued instead for more centralized resources: “It would be great if there were one big pool of funding to provide a major event such as an international speakers series with very big names.” “What about an international Ida Beam⁶, one designated for international visitors?” One professional college fac-

6 The Ida Beam Visiting Professorship supports visits by individuals who are likely to have an impact in the liberal arts or in areas where professional specialties interact with liberal studies. Sponsoring departments also must arrange for a public lecture so that students and faculty in other disciplines may participate in the exchange of ideas. IP academic programs sponsored or co-sponsored at least one Ida Beam Visiting Professor each year since 2004-2005.

ulty member argued for more centralized resources by explaining, “If you try to hit both birds with a pebble, you just miss both birds.”

Funding for international students was one of the most common concerns raised by faculty in all the focus groups. Group participants pointed out that there is no UI-based funding or financial aid available only to international undergraduates. One International Studies-affiliated professor suggested there should be a Presidential Scholarship⁷ or other funding award specifically designated for international students. Other comments along these lines included: “Why should top international students come here when other places will offer them scholarships?” “Even with undergraduate international enrollment at a low, static level, we can’t get one dollar of support for [top international students]. It’s embarrassing that we...can’t fund even one student’s tuition.” “This university has difficulty in the area of economy of scale and principles. What would it cost the University to fund room and board for a few stellar international students?” Exacerbating the lack of scholarships for international students, faculty argued, is the recent reduction in support for graduate assistantships, which unfairly punishes international graduate students. Faculty pointed out that “International students rely on T.A.ships to get in-state residency.” “Taking away G.A.ships hurts departments and has taken away opportunities for international students.” Related to concerns about diminishing G.A. funding was concern about the cost of ESL for international graduate assistants. One faculty member summed up the problem: “UI no longer pays for T.A. prep courses for ESL. This is paid at the department or program level. It’s having a chilling effect on international admissions because departments don’t want to risk having to pay the bill if students don’t test well out of ESL courses.”

7 The University offers twenty \$13,000/year Presidential Scholarships each year to first-year students. While international students are not specifically excluded from consideration for these awards, the award criteria make it difficult for international students to qualify.

It is worth noting that comparatively little concern was expressed about the costs associated with study abroad. When concerns were raised, they usually related specifically to faculty-led study abroad programs. “These programs are expensive. There’s a fear that they’re only available to students with money.” In general, however, faculty perceived impediments to study abroad as more curricular in nature than financial. This problem will be discussed in the section on curriculum and internationalization, below.

Faculty in several of the focus groups made the suggestion that, in order to internationalize the campus, more internationally-focused faculty should be hired. In making this suggestion, faculty were quick to point out that this should be done strategically, to have the greatest effect, and that the successful UI diversity hire program could serve as a good model.⁸ Several faculty suggested that the university should consider cluster hiring around themes or regional areas and that these clusters should be supported by expertise in key foreign languages. By recognizing the strength of departments on campus and emphasizing hires according to themes and areas of specialization (for example, China, India, and the Middle East), the University might address the problem of international “thinness”: “There’s not enough people in any area, not enough depth in programs.”

Across colleges, faculty pointed to external and internal, IP-administered grants, as positive forces for internationalization. Some faculty suggested that more attention should be paid to both grant-getting and fundraising from donors and corporations. One faculty member asked: “Has anyone tried to make a pitch for just a ‘global fund’ or just a ‘diversity fund’ with the Foundation?”

8 The Faculty Diversity Opportunity Program helps colleges hire diversity faculty by supporting part of their salary. Recent reinvigoration of this program was credited as largely responsible for a record number of minority hires in fall 2006.

“Faculty know how to get ahead – that tends not to be by focusing on international issues, but tends to be by focusing on ‘national’ issues (numbers, statistics, etc.). International research may be seen as ‘soft.’”

Faculty Incentives

A commonly held opinion across colleges is that there is little incentive for faculty to internationalize their teaching, research or service. “You do this (international activity) essentially as an overload. It doesn’t lead to recognition for tenure or raises.” Some connected this problem to the lack of support for interdisciplinary or other less traditional forms of teaching: “There’s discouragement of team teaching. It hinders development and teaching of interdisciplinary, international courses.” “I don’t see any incentives to start international courses through partnering to co-teach, linking with courses abroad (for example, co-teach with German faculty via synchronous or asynchronous technology).” Others argued that, because small enrollment courses are discouraged, it may be difficult to offer less commonly taught languages or courses with more experimental topics or formats. Still others stated that the biggest barrier to international and interdisciplinary teaching was the problem that, as budgets are cut, departments must focus in on covering their core, discipline-based courses. “Core courses are covered. Everything else is a frill.”

The lack of incentives for internationalization is not limited to teaching, according to group participants. It extends to research, as well. As one professional college faculty member put it: “Faculty know how to get ahead – that tends not to be by focusing on international issues, but tends to be by focusing on ‘national’ issues (numbers, statistics, etc.). International research may be seen as ‘soft.’” Another noted: “The UI has a model of scholarship that is parochial. If I publish abroad, they don’t know how

to evaluate it. If I collaborate with faculty abroad, do I get credit for it?”

Finally, international faculty exchange, in general, was seen as something that is not strongly supported by the University’s leadership. “There is an expectation that faculty have to be internationally known, but it doesn’t require international activity.” In spite of a multitude of stories about the value of work and study abroad, as well as meaningful interactions with international colleagues, faculty voiced frustration when it came to getting recognition for this activity. “We excuse the internationalization rather than applauding it.”

Internationalization and Diversity Issues

Questions regarding the relationship between internationalization and multiculturalism, or domestic diversity, came up in nearly every focus group. Faculty voiced concern that these two goals either are or are perceived to be in conflict, at least when it comes to seeking funding for student scholarships and academic initiatives. The source of some of this conflict is federal, rather than institutional or departmental, but it affects all levels of the campus. Faculty in the health sciences gave several examples of how federal definitions of diversity can have a chilling effect on the pursuit of international grants: “NIH grants only care about distribution of U.S. diversity; they don’t care about the international. Some [UI grant applications] have scored poorly because of the UI’s lack of domestic diversity. International students don’t count in diversity numbers. U.S. citizens only.” Others pointed out that the domestic vs. international diversity conflict left international students without federal or campus-based funding opportunities: “My lab looks like the UN, but we can’t get them scholarships.” “It’s hard to get scholarships for international students. It is pitted against funding for domestic minority students. International students are expected to pay for everything (as opposed to inner city kids from Chicago). One shouldn’t be at the expense of the other.” “The University pays lip

||| *“The UI is in a diversity quagmire. ... We need a fundamental discussion about what we mean by diversity.”*

service to the international in diversity, but there is no real support.”

For some, the real or perceived conflict between international and domestic diversity goals has created much deeper problems than just a lack of funding for international students: “The UI is in a diversity quagmire. ... We need a fundamental discussion about what we mean by diversity. I have an African student who has to function in the U.S. as an African – but we can’t talk about that. If we can’t talk about the role of international students in diversity, we can’t talk about the role of race in America.”

On a positive note, several focus group participants did point out that they have begun to see some positive change in this area, both at the level of individual colleges and the University as a whole. Participants from one college were happy to note that their dean has put diversity in the forefront of that college’s strategic plan, and that their definition of diversity specifically includes the international. Other faculty expressed optimism that “the University is moving toward recognition that international students and faculty contribute to diversity on campus (without taking away from the value of domestic, underrepresented groups).”

“At some schools, FL classes are basically study halls. We don’t know what’s happening in the high schools. What does FL mean there?”

Curricular Issues

Discussion regarding the relationship between curriculum and internationalization revolved around four main themes: 1) the absence of a meaningful foreign language requirement; 2) the lack of a mandatory internationally-focused general education requirement; 3) curricular impediments to study abroad; and 4) the lack of “at-home” internationalization within majors.

Foreign language (FL) faculty, in particular, but not exclusively, were highly critical of the University’s policy of accepting four years of high school foreign language credit as the equivalent of the two-year FL graduation requirement, especially since this credit is given on a “seat-time” rather than actual proficiency basis.⁹ According to one FL faculty member: “The FL requirement does not signal a dedication to internationalization. [Requiring] one semester here would validate the four years in high school. Or require students to pass a placement test. People who’ve completed three years in high school are frequently placed at the beginning level.” Another group participant noted: “High school FL credit is accepted without question. At some schools, FL classes are basically study halls. We don’t know what’s happening in the high schools. What does FL mean there?” Several individuals noted that the UI is something of an anomaly among its peers when it comes to the absence of a university-level foreign language requirement. [See Appendix V: “Peer Comparisons” for a comparative view of foreign language requirements.]

⁹ The two-year requirement is specific to CLAS students. Professional colleges such as the College of Business require only one year of language. Most students are able to complete this requirement in high school.

Without a university-level FL requirement, faculty argued, students have little incentive to incorporate language study into their coursework, especially since a significant number of students are already pursuing more than one major: “The troubles begin if a Biology major wants to take Chinese. They don’t have time in their schedule. Students have double or triple majors, too many conflicts.” On the other hand, faculty did acknowledge that it might be very difficult to change the existing policy on foreign languages: “Placement tests are very political. They would validate good teaching at the high school level, but they could postpone graduation...”

One faculty member pointed out that the UI FL requirement has had unfortunate consequences beyond the immediate scope of the university: “The unintentional consequence of changing to make four years of high school study equal the GE FL requirement at the UI was that schools canceled languages that couldn’t be offered for four years. This led to Spanish only in [Iowa] schools, and lots of poor teaching.”

Other concerns about foreign language at the UI were less commonly voiced but are worth noting here. These included concerns about 1) disincentives for students to learn a new language, especially a less commonly taught language;¹⁰ 2) the fact

¹⁰ The University offers two Foreign Language Incentive Programs to promote continuance of a language studied in high school or study of a new language not studied in high school. FLIP 1 credit (up to 8 semester hours) is offered to entering students who complete an approved course at a level beyond the final course in a General Education Program-approved foreign language sequence with a grade of B- or higher. To be eligible for this credit, students must take the Foreign Language Placement Test for the language (or languages) in which the credit is sought. FLIP 2 credit (up to 4 semester hours) is offered to students who completed four years of second-language study in high school (or who have completed the foreign language component of the General Education Program by some other means, including foreign language study at The University of Iowa), and who, at any time before graduation, study a language different from that which they studied in the General Education Program (if completed with a grade of B- or higher). Opinions vary among FL faculty as to whether or not FLIP 2 (established in 2001) has had an impact.

that international students are not required to learn a third language but can test out of the FL requirement in their native language; 3) the paucity of opportunities for students to use their foreign language skills in classes across the curriculum; 4) too much decentralization and variability among programs' FL requirements for graduate students; and 5) too many students who complete their foreign-language requirement by studying Spanish through Kirkwood Community College, because "they think that's easier." On the positive side of the issue, faculty did point to the International Business Certificate and the International Studies major as successful programs that require foreign language study beyond the University minimum.

The University's general education program (GE) includes a category entitled Foreign Cultures and Civilizations (FCC). Faculty do not see the FCC option as having any significant effect on campus internationalization. In fact, most faculty listed general education requirements as an impediment to this goal: "The general education program is not friendly to internationalization. It was more so 21 years ago, when the FCC was required. Then, it became a [part of a] menu of options in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This affected enrollment dramatically." One faculty member pointed out that the fact that students can elect to take either an FCC course or a course on domestic diversity reinforces the "either/or" problem described above.

Even if FCC were to be a requirement (rather than an option), faculty are not convinced that this would represent a great advancement toward better internationalization of the curriculum: "Hundreds of courses can meet the FCC GE requirement and no one course has a real effect. Other GE requirements have limited courses that are specifically designed to meet that requirement." "FC&C courses are not always relevant to international education.

"The general education program is not friendly to internationalization.

"Many programs are so structured that they don't offer flexibility. It makes international content courses and study abroad difficult for these majors."

What is the substance of the class? Maybe there should be a specially designed GE course, such as "America in the World," "The Global and the Local," "How the World System Works," etc. It should be an international and interdisciplinary, team-taught course that is required."¹¹

Study abroad generated much discussion. One faculty member expressed frustration that more students are not studying abroad, in spite of apparent broad interest: "When you ask a freshman seminar how many are interested in study abroad, a huge number of hands go up." The focus group participants identified curricular constraints as key: "Many programs are so structured that they don't offer flexibility. It makes international content courses and study abroad difficult for these majors." Specific hurdles mentioned were: 1) problems with course credit transfer ("We have a list of pre-approved courses from institutions we have a relationship with, but it can get sticky dealing with institutions that aren't known to us. Then, we need to get a course catalog, confer with faculty..."); 2) problems with crediting for students in professional programs ("It's difficult for pre-licensed nursing students to get credit for studying abroad."); 3) sequencing issues ("Students who study abroad get out of sequence. The curriculum is different, and they won't be able graduate in four years."); and 4) lack of relevant internship abroad

¹¹ The professional colleges vary significantly in terms of international General Education or distribution requirements. The College of Nursing requires all majors to take either a Cultural Diversity course or an FCC-qualifying course. Nursing students must also take at least one Cultural Anthropology course and must complete two years high school or one year college level foreign language. The College of Business requires a Cultural Diversity course, an FCC course, or a 5th semester foreign language. Engineering and Pharmacy have no international or diversity course requirement.

“International specializations within colleges with interdisciplinary approaches could help recruit students.”

opportunities or conflicts with summer internships (“The most difficult challenge is finding internships and co-ops abroad that are engineering focused.” “What turns most students off is sequencing of courses, or deciding, ‘Do I study abroad or take an internship?’”). Other problems noted were: 1) the interview calendar (“Students don’t want to take an international internship. They want to be here to interview.”); 2) restrictions on international students studying abroad (“They are afraid to leave the country in case they can’t get back.”); and 3) the University’s four-year graduation program (“The four-year graduation program doesn’t encourage study abroad, especially for double majors.”).

Just as focus group participants were quick to list these problems, though, they provided a variety of potential solutions, including: 1) mandating that every department have a study abroad policy for undergraduate majors; 2) finding ways of incorporating study abroad into the major, as in the case of the Chinese language major; 3) identifying or developing more summer program options and other programs specifically for students in professional programs (including programs at College-specific linkage partner institutions); 4) encouraging students to study abroad earlier, in order to get General Education requirements abroad; and 5) developing “road maps” for students in specific majors, to inform them of how to fit study abroad into their academic plan (especially for students outside of CLAS).

Many focus-group participants pointed to the popularity of the International Studies B.A. as indicative of its value to students: “It meets a need.” [See Appendix L: “IS B.A., M.A., and Other IP Degree-Granting Programs.”] Still, some frustration was expressed regarding the lack of internationalization in other colleges and across the curriculum:

“International specializations within colleges with interdisciplinary approaches could help recruit students.” Several faculty noted that the University seems to have moved backwards, in this regard, in recent years, rather than forward. It was pointed out, for example, that the Honors program once promoted teaching of topics from a comparative (international) perspective but that this expectation no longer seems to exist. Other faculty noted that the loss of major grants such as the NRC has led to a weakening of internationalization of the curriculum, as courses that were developed with the support of grant funding are no longer taught, as that same grant funding dries up.

Faculty recognized several impediments to internationalization of the general curriculum. “Having few electives in requirements makes students stick with courses close to major requirements.” “Some majors are set up to discourage students from taking collateral or linked courses.” “It’s tough [to internationalize] disciplines like Economics, Sociology, and others that are based on a ‘universal’ methodology.” “Students want courses in their functional areas, to develop technical skills, not courses that won’t ‘count.’”

While many challenges remain for broader internationalization of the curriculum, faculty did make several suggestions about how this situation might be improved, including the development of theme-based cluster courses and more freshman seminars with an international focus. Some faculty pointed out that the situation is not hopeless, because the University can look to past examples of success in achieving curricular goals, when there is a true, broadly held dedication to that goal. One example given was the four-year graduation plan. “When [that plan] went into effect, departments planned out how students could finish in four years. It was seen to be a value. Pre-planning and specific information distributed to students and parents worked.”

International Programs Issues

The focus group discussions revealed many important insights into International Programs' role as a catalyst for internationalization on the UI campus. Focus group participants were generally complimentary about the services and other benefits IP offers to the campus. The following IP functions were specifically identified as resources that support internationalization: international student orientation; international student advising; administration of study abroad processes; support for IP sponsored events; cross-cultural programming (especially the Building Our Global Community program); a central location on campus; and support for the less commonly taught languages (Arabic, ALLNet, Kannada, Hebrew, Turkish, etc.). Faculty also mentioned less tangible but real benefits offered by IP, including: energizing faculty, providing grant opportunities, leveraging support for development of courses and faculty expertise in particular areas, and facilitating brainstorming sessions to help determine what resources are needed to meet goals. When it came to recommendations for change, however, three primary themes emerged: 1) outreach to professional colleges; 2) collaboration with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS); and 3) communication of goals and mission.

Outreach to Professional Colleges

A common opinion stated during the professional college focus group discussions was that IP is primarily concerned with the liberal arts and sciences and does not serve the professional colleges in the same way it serves CLAS faculty and students. Comments along these lines included: "Everything in IP is geared toward liberal arts..." "IP is not perceived as having an interest in dealing with [X professional college] in a meaningful way." "It would be nice to have an IP committee that was thinking strategically, and that could meaningfully engage graduate professional students and programs. IP seems to have a focus on undergraduate and small certificate programs that are not relevant to the

"IP is not perceived as having an interest in dealing with [X professional college] in a meaningful way."

professional schools." "IP needs to do a better job of getting [professional college faculty] to want to go to IP Executive Committee meetings." Some faculty pointed out that this problem goes beyond International Programs, specifically, and is endemic to the University of Iowa: "There is an East Campus/West Campus divide. Another way to think about it is undergraduate/graduate vs. professional. It is hard to bridge this divide." "There's a tendency in any program that reaches across campus (IP, Honors, Academic Advising) that it becomes liberal arts-centric."

A few specific impediments to IP collaboration with professional colleges were mentioned. Both CLAS and College of Business faculty pointed out problems caused by real or perceived duplication between the international business track of the International Studies major and the International Business Certificate: "The growth of the IS major is connected to the decline in the IBC." "There's no incentive for Business faculty to work with IS majors when they have their own international certificate in the College." Faculty also suggested some possible solutions to this problem, including making the IS business track and the IBC each more unique and meaningful to students in CLAS and Business, respectively, or allowing students to get a dual IS/IBC certificate.

Faculty in the College of Engineering focus group pointed out that IP should be more inclusive in the language it uses to promote study abroad and other internationalization activities: "Things are cast into one size fits all. We need to think beyond the liberal arts."

Collaboration with CLAS

Ironically, while faculty in the professional colleges tended to see IP as serving CLAS interests, CLAS faculty identified some problems in the relationship between CLAS and IP. This included a concern that CLAS may see IP as a competitor rather than an ally. “They see IP as something that takes resources away from CLAS. There is a perception of IP as an unregulated, rival force.” CLAS faculty pointed out that, although there is no inherent competition between the IS major, for example, and related CLAS programs (such as Comparative Literature), CLAS administrators see IP as a competitor for funding. These same faculty suggested that, because IP exists, CLAS may be more likely to cast off responsibility for internationalization onto the shoulders of IP: “It’s your affair, your look-out. That’s unfortunate, because 75% of IP faculty are in CLAS.” Suggestions for bridging this gap included enhanced communication between the deans of CLAS and IP and better use of IS majors as promoters of internationalization: “International Studies has real clout with CLAS.”

“They see IP as something that takes resources away from CLAS. There is a perception of IP as an unregulated, rival force.”

“IP’s mission is very generic; this could apply to any institution.” “It states who we are and what we do, but doesn’t address why does it matter? Why is it important we do this? There’s no ‘brand essence.’”

Communication

Focus group participants echoed the comments of the fall 2006 ACE evaluators in noting that IP is especially important as a focus for international activities, given the decentralized nature of the UI campus. Unfortunately, it appears that IP must do a better job in explaining its mission to other parts of the University, beginning with communication of its mission statement and strategic plan. While this is especially true of IP’s relationship to the professional colleges, it is also true of its communication with its own faculty: “IP is not known to us, even after leading study abroad programs, signing MOUs, and applying for international grants.”

Near the end of each focus group, participants were asked if they knew of the IP mission statement or strategic plan. They were given a copy of the documents, at that point, and asked to consider how the IP mission does or does not align with the mission of their own college or department. Very few faculty outside of International Studies knew what the IP mission was. Upon reading the statement, several group participants voiced their opinions: “The mission statement needs more character, a little more definiteness. There is no rallying cry in the IP mission statement. Nothing to get behind. The UI mission statement ties diversity to academic excellence...so why is ‘international’ important?” “IP’s mission is very generic; this could apply to any institution.” “It states who we are and what we do, but doesn’t address why does it matter? Why is it important we do this? There’s no ‘brand essence.’” “The IP mission implies ‘we do all the international stuff on campus.’” On the other hand, none of the

focus group participants suggested the IP mission in any way conflicts with the mission of their own college or program, and some suggested that the IP mission actually enhances the missions of other colleges and programs by encouraging interdisciplinary activity, for example.

As expected, focus group participants tend to be unfamiliar with the IP Strategic Plan, even Foreign Language and International Studies faculty. Nonetheless, upon reading the document, several individuals bemoaned the fact that other colleges were unable to refer to the IP Plan when they were developing their own plans, and vice versa. “There should be consistency among college strategic plans.”

In the discussions of IP’s mission, one caveat was repeated: IP should be diligent in retaining its catalyst role, rather than becoming the single force for internationalization on campus. “A strong IP can lead other colleges to leave internationalization up to IP.”

||| *“Internationalization is seen as a luxury rather than a core value.”*

Internationalization as a Core Value

A theme running through many of the focus group discussions was that internationalization is not a core value at the UI: “Internationalization is seen as a luxury rather than a core value.” Faculty were able to point to a number of individual successes in this area, including the College of Engineering’s strategic plan, which specifically addresses global issues, and the English Department’s mission statement, which promotes the development of “citizens of the world.” Unfortunately, these models for effective internationalization have not been emulated by other colleges and departments across campus.

Several focus group participants declared that advocacy for internationalization should be more overt among University leadership. “You worry when you don’t hear “international” mentioned in every other sentence.” “You don’t see the president, deans, etc. promoting the values of internationalization.” At the same time, other faculty argued that effective internationalization must start from the bottom-up. “Internationalization has to come from the faculty and demand from the students.” “When a directive comes from the top-down – ‘We will be diverse, we will be international, we will be high tech...’ – it doesn’t work. It has to be natural.” Either way, a common opinion was that the UI is falling behind its peers when it comes to effective internationalization: “We just missed what our competitors are already doing. The day is coming when ranking will include how international you are. The UI is falling behind.”

Our findings suggest a series of challenges and possible actions for The University of Iowa community to pursue.

DISCUSSION

While the UI should continue to promote study abroad, foreign language study and international or area studies, it must help more of its students fit these experiences into their degree programs.

Internationalization for the Many

While the International Studies major continues to grow, interest in study abroad remains strong and international student recruitment and retention numbers remain stable, exposure to international and cross-cultural perspectives remains too rare among the overall student population. As the faculty survey indicated, only a small percentage of faculty regularly incorporate international elements into their courses. Likewise, we have found that most student services staff are not infusing their interactions with students with international or cross-cultural perspectives. Because the UI as a whole requires neither on-campus foreign language study nor a globally or interculturally focused General Education course, UI students can graduate from the University without a single significant international experience. While the UI should continue to promote study abroad, foreign language study and international or area studies, it must help more of its students fit these experiences into their degree programs.

Of course, some individuals have found ways of introducing international perspectives and concepts to students who would not otherwise have this exposure. For example, last year, a faculty member in the College of Business offered a special section in his Introduction to Marketing course, which was infused with international content. The section was led by an international graduate student who received training in cross-cultural communication and learned ways of utilizing his own cultural perspectives in his teaching. In Engineering, international perspectives have been integrated into a course on water resource management. Faculty in the College of Pharmacy teach a course that asks

students to role play, trying to get a prescription filled from a pharmacist who doesn't speak English. International students are asked to play the role of translator in this exercise. A professor in the College of Education uses comparative examples as much as possible, and incorporates his experiences as a Peace Corps volunteer into his teaching. A faculty member in Journalism provides opportunities for his students to speak via videoconferencing to Communications students in the Middle East about issues like the Danish cartoonist controversy. All of these faculty are finding ways of making international education real to their students and exposing their students to perspectives they would not otherwise encounter in their discipline-based classes.

Ten proposed action steps in the current IP Strategic Plan address the issue of "internationalization for the many." These are: "Ensure the inclusion of IP in the curriculum for all College Transitions courses;" "Seek IP sponsorship of First-Year Seminars;" "Expand high quality programming on internationally oriented career options throughout the undergraduate experience;" "Expand the Ofsa's Curriculum Integration Project by 20 degree programs;" "Advocate for the involvement of IP in the revision of the General Education program;" "Offer incentives to faculty to... develop innovative means of introducing international dimensions into the curriculum;" "Increase the number of cross-cultural programs offered each year that bring together international and U.S. students, faculty and staff, including in the residence halls and other University housing;" "Collaborate with UI professional schools to fund international curriculum development within the majors;" "Minimize barriers to collaboration with professional degree programs..." and "Provide more opportunities for domestic and international faculty, staff and students to interact..." In addition, the University may work toward the development of a more worldly faculty and staff through the development of short-term "study abroad" opportunities, including exchanges.

While these successes are worth celebrating, the lack of cohesive, strategic, campus-wide collaboration presents a hurdle for effective internationalization of the campus.

The Siloization of International Education

Our assessment shows clearly that The University of Iowa benefits from a wealth of international resources and activities, ranging from faculty with significant international interests and expertise to effective international education staffing units, creative cross-cultural training programs, a variety of college and department based international initiatives, strong support from internationally-focused community-based programs, effective outreach programming to schools and organizations, growth in funding for study abroad scholarships, and increasing student interest in international issues, as evidenced by the significant growth of the International Studies major and the more measured growth in study abroad participation. While these successes are worth celebrating, the lack of cohesive, strategic, campus-wide collaboration presents a hurdle for effective internationalization of the campus. A refrain heard throughout the focus group process was that individuals or groups that are working to promote the values of international education are, all too frequently, operating from within their own disciplinary, organizational or philosophical siloes. This has a number of unfortunate outcomes. It limits possibilities for interdisciplinary international grants, since faculty in different colleges and disciplines do not know about shared international interests. It impedes collaboration between International Programs and the professional colleges in the offering of interdisciplinary majors and the promotion of study abroad for all students. It can lead other academic and administrative units on campus to assume that internationalization is

someone else's (i.e. International Programs) job. It can lead to "dead ends" (when internationalist faculty or staff leave or retire and no one is willing or ready to take their place). In terms of undergraduate learning, students may experience internationalization in isolated segments, rather than holistically, and as an integral part of their UI education.

Again, numerous action steps already in the IP Strategic Plan aim to reduce siloization: "Systematize collaboration with University offices to make all potential and newly arrived undergraduate students...aware of international opportunities on campus...;" "Expand high quality programming on internationally oriented career options throughout the undergraduate experience;" "Provide support to nourish key interdisciplinary graduate programs, including Crossing Borders and the PhD in Second Language Acquisition;" "Encourage ... applications for non-IP grants that will support international scholarship and creative work;" "Collaborate with faculty and administrators in [STEM fields] to encourage students in these academic areas to study abroad;" "Work with the dean of each college to define mechanisms for recognizing and rewarding faculty teaching, scholarship and service related to IP and international studies;" and "Strengthen and support existing campus and community organizations through effective collaboration, liaison and logistical support." In addition to these action steps, International Programs might offer a series of "best practices" seminars that would bring together faculty from disparate disciplinary areas, but with shared international interests.

In addition, IP could help support internationalization in a strategic way by better targeting the resources and incentives it offers, including foreign language learning resources such as ALLNet and the FLTA program, internal grants such as Special Projects, Major Projects, and Curriculum Development awards, and campus-wide events such as the Provost's Forum.

Strategic Internationalization

A key insight from the faculty and staff surveys is that "one size does not fit all" when it comes to internationalization. [See Appendices U and V.] Highly internationalized faculty (faculty who are likely to incorporate international elements into their content courses, or to teach entire courses on international topics) are involved in different types of international activities and have had different kinds of international experiences, depending on the college or discipline. In the same way, particular kinds of training and incentives may be required in order to internationalize staff, who have highly varying levels of international experience and understanding. The current IP Strategic Plan contains few action steps that address this issue. Relevant ones, however, are: "Regularly prepare analysis of data (regarding funding for faculty research and travel abroad) and use to review the effectiveness of IP programs," and "Assess the impact of IP support for lectures, seminars, symposia and conferences to guide reallocations that will produce the optimal impact." In addition, IP could help support internationalization in a strategic way by better targeting the resources and incentives it offers, including foreign language learning resources such as ALLNet and the FLTA program, internal grants such as Special Projects, Major Projects, and Curriculum Development awards, and campus-wide events such as the Provost's Forum.

Shared Language

As the focus-group sessions revealed, UI faculty (even those within the same college) define “internationalization” disparately. The University’s mission statement refers to “continued internationalization” without ever describing what this means. Unless the UI articulates what it means for this university to internationalize, internationalization will be understood to be of secondary importance among the University’s many worthy goals. In addition, the University must articulate both its chosen process for and long-term goals of internationalization. Otherwise, individual international activities are free floating, difficult to justify over the long run, and difficult to prioritize.

The current IP Strategic Plan pays very little attention to this problem, although it does address the larger issue of communication in several points: “Continue enhancements to the IP website so that information for both external and internal users is easily accessible, informative, and up-to-date,” “Collaborate with other UI media units to produce seamless, mutually-reinforcing news releases that further the mission of UI,” and “Work with University Relations and Governmental Relations to raise awareness among state and federal officials of the vital need to support strong international education.” While IP should not attempt to establish goals or define internationalization for the entire University, IP can serve as a catalyst and facilitator for sustained discussion that will lead to a shared operational definition of internationalization and agreement on goals.

The University’s mission statement refers to “continued internationalization” without ever describing what this means. Unless the UI articulates what it means for this university to internationalize, internationalization will be understood to be of secondary importance among the University’s many worthy goals.

“What’s the College’s international mission? It’s a good thing to be involved in, but why? We’ve never been told what the big picture is. Like diversity on campus, what is the end point?”

Diversity

Internationalization and multicultural education are less mutually reinforcing on the UI campus than they should be. Certainly, examples of good collaboration exist in this area, particularly among staffing units, such as the Office of International Students and Scholars, the Office for Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the Office of Student Life, and the Center for Diversity and Enrichment, through programs like the Global Retreat¹ and the “Bridging Domestic and Global Diversity” program. At the same time, faculty in the focus groups (as well as faculty and staff in the “practice” focus groups) repeated their concern that domestic diversity and internationalization are perceived to be (or may actually be) in competition for funds and for the attention of University leadership. A possible source of this concern is the lack of definition of either “diversity” or “internationalization” among campus leaders. As one faculty member put it: “What’s the College’s international mission? It’s a good thing to be involved in, but why? We’ve never been told what the big picture is. Like diversity on

¹ Global Retreat is an overnight weekend retreat for UI students designed to increase awareness and understanding of diversity issues on The University of Iowa campus. Goals of the retreat include creation of a better understanding of leadership in a global society, understanding cultural identity and how it influences perspectives, viewing cultural differences as an asset, and increasing knowledge and understanding of the issues related to privilege, equity, discrimination and cultural competence. The International Students and Scholars office has been involved in planning and implementing this program only very recently.

campus, what is the end point? How diverse should the campus be? How diverse can it be? If we were working with – say, six different groups, is that international enough? One from each continent?”

This issue is clearly addressed at many points in the IP Strategic Plan, constituting an entire, special section of the document. Prescribed action steps include: “Establish connections with relevant groups across campus in order to recruit more students from abroad [increase to 9% of student body],” “Provide leadership to all University student-services units to ensure excellent services are available to a growing number of international students,” “Collaborate with staff from campus diversity offices to encourage students from traditionally underrepresented ethnic, racial, and cultural groups to study abroad,” “Collaborate with staff from Student Disability Services to encourage students with disabilities to study abroad,” “Develop new methods to create a more respectful and inclusive climate on campus and in the community,” “Explore collaboration with state and local diversity initiatives,” and “Establish an IP Diversity Committee.”

Conclusion

In its role as a catalyst for internationalization, International Programs can take pride in many accomplishments, including: helping to develop a community of engaged and enthusiastic internationalized faculty; steady increases in study abroad participation; significant increases in the amount of funding available for study abroad scholarships; a successful and rapidly growing International Studies major; effective cross-cultural training programs; good opportunities for international students to interact with U.S. students; a strong record of collaboration with community organizations; and a demonstrated commitment to outreach and civic engagement. At the same time, many important challenges exist. Most importantly, IP must better define its mission. Part of this effort should involve

improving IP’s positioning as a critical, “value-added” resource for all UI colleges, offices and programs; reaching out to the professional colleges as partners in internationalization; and better communicating the compelling reasons for internationalization to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and other key collaborators.

At the University level, our analyses reveal a pressing need for greater attention to the goal of “internationalization for the many.” The University must find ways to ensure that international perspectives are incorporated into all degree programs and that all UI students (not only those who study abroad or major in International Studies or a foreign language) are exposed to cross-cultural perspectives and international experiences, both inside and outside of the classroom. This goal is closely related to another recommendation emerging from this study: for the UI to become a truly internationalized institution, its leadership--central, collegiate and departmental--must tangibly support collaborative and interdisciplinary international activity by faculty. This support should include strategic faculty hires and internationalizing professional-development opportunities that maximize existing strengths to build unique and sustainable scholarly communities with shared international interests.

These actions will be ineffective if any is taken up in isolation or lacks the unambiguous support of University leadership. UI leadership must articulate a vision for internationalization that includes both an operational definition and an expression of the rationales behind this goal. This vision must also clarify internationalization’s relationship to multicultural education and must reinforce the interdependence of these two worthy goals. Internationalization must become one of our University’s core values.

