



**Report on Central Michigan University’s
Participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory
by the American Council on Education Peer Review Visit Team
May 2018**

I. Introduction

In August 2017, at the invitation of the American Council on Education (ACE), Central Michigan University (CMU) joined the 14th cohort of ACE’s Internationalization Laboratory. The Lab, as it is known, engages a select group of colleges and universities in assessing their current international activities and considering how they might like to move forward with such work in the future. Institutions engaged in the Lab review their progress and consider recommendations in the six areas of ACE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization:



In addition to CMU, other institutions participating in the 14th cohort were University of Nebraska Omaha; Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Barranquitas; Lehigh University (PA); Loyola University Maryland; Missouri University of Science & Technology; Mount Saint Mary's University (CA); Northeast Ohio Medical University; Old Dominion University (VA); Southeast Missouri State University; and Universidad Antonio Nariño (Colombia).

This report is based on a two-day visit to CMU by an American Council on Education (ACE) peer review team on 30 April to 2 May 2018. The visit including meetings with: President George E. Ross; Provost Michael A. Gealt; members of the Internationalization Self-Study Committee; members of the Internationalization Strategic Planning Committee; Council of Deans; OIA staff and faculty, staff and students. A detailed schedule of meetings and list of attendees is included in the Appendix 1.

The Peer Review Report draws on: the *Mid-Term Report, Central Michigan University Internationalization Self-Study*, drafted by the Internationalization Self-Study Committee (ISSC), July 2017; the *CMU-ACE Internationalization Lab (2016-2018) Internationalization Strategic Planning Committee Strategic Plan, 2018-2023*, drafted by the International Strategic Planning Committee (ISPC), Spring 2018; and the *CMU Strategic Plan, 2017-2022: Advancing Excellence*.

This is a confidential report to CMU, designed to assist the institution with its internationalization efforts. We encourage wide internal distribution of the report so that it can assist the university community in these tasks. The contents will not be published or made public unless CMU chooses to do so or gives ACE permission to do so.

II. Peer Review Team

Dr. Vicki Hamblin, Executive Director, Institute for Global Engagement, Senior International Officer, and Professor of French, Western Washington University

Dr. Gil Latz, Associate Vice Chancellor for International Affairs and Professor of Geography, IUPUI; and Senior Associate for Internationalization, ACE, serving as Chair

Dr. Robert Wojtowicz, Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Art History, Old Dominion University

III. Overall Strengths

Senior Leadership

CMU is at a propitious moment in time to broaden and deepen its internationalization efforts. The institution already has high levels of international activity, in many of the schools, and this is a good foundation on which to build. Internationalization has received strong and engaged support from the current senior leadership. Because CMU now operates in a complicated institutional environment, in response to budgetary constraints and ongoing internal re-organization, including the search for a new president, senior leadership support is critical to the task of implementing the university's emerging new global vision. The Peer Review Team was impressed by President Ross's stated commitment to continue supporting internationalization amidst his changing role, a commitment that he has shared with the CMU Board of Trustees.

Committee Work

The two committees leading the Internationalization Lab, the CMU Internationalization Self-Study Committee Steering Committee (ISSC) and the CMU Internationalization Strategic Planning Committee (ICSP), respectively, were designed with a diversity of membership across the schools to ensure broad faculty and administrative buy-in, and the group has produced strong recommendations with focused goals. The ISSC in particular sought to create a set of exemplary practices, aided by a SWOT analysis, campus research and surveys, to propose recommendations for campus-wide internationalization. The ISSC was given an ambitious charge, one that was very well executed thanks to the excellent leadership of Christi Brookes and William Holmes, engendering broad discussion on the campus.

The ISSC, augmented by the ICSP, co-chaired by David Ash and Christi Brookes, dealt comprehensively with the various aspects of internationalization, gathering information, studying it in depth, analyzing current opportunities and challenges, and giving ample opportunity for people to participate in the process. The depth and breadth of information collected is impressive. We applaud the inclusion of a community member (the former mayor of Mt. Pleasant) as a strength vis-à-vis the ICSP. The two committees and their respective subcommittees gave balanced and sensitive direction throughout the Lab process. During the peer review visit, the scheduled meetings involved a wide spectrum of the campus community, including high-level academic officers and representatives of important administrative offices. The conversations we had during the peer review visit suggested that internationalization has increasingly strong buy-in on campus, but conversations about why internationalization is important must continue. They can shape everything the university does, and a committed core of faculty and staff members are in place and willing to work to achieve that vision.

Vision

In terms of the Committee work, the peer review team wishes to highlight that it was particularly impressed by the work of the ICSP and its formulation of a CMU International Strategic Plan (2018). The strategic plan establishes necessary connections between the *Internationalization Lab Self Study* and the three components that are identified in the new *CMU Strategic Plan, 2017-2022*: Nurturing Student Success; Fostering Scholarly Activity; and Strengthening Partnerships in Michigan and Beyond. Such thinking provides critical continuity between the past and present CMU strategic plans by identifying common elements such as: “global,” “international,” and “cross cultural.”¹

International Students and Faculty

The environment, on and off campus, appears welcoming to international students and faculty, a foundation to build on in terms of promising practices for integration of each into campus and community engagement. Cultural activities that bring faculty, staff, and international and domestic students into contact connote a pride of place, wonderfully illustrated by two slogans: ‘One CMU’; and ‘Putting your Stamp on the

¹ See Articulated Institutional Commitment section, p. 11, the *Mid-Term Report for the Central Michigan University Internationalization Self-Study*, drafted in July 2017.

World'. In both vision and practice, such thinking engenders a foundation for continuing campus internationalization; the involvement of a community member in the ISCP, noted above, suggests that community engagement opportunities are recognized as mutually beneficial.

IV. Observations & Recommendations

Based on documents developed by CMU as part of the ACE Internationalization Lab, and as a result of the peer review team site visit, the university seeks to better coordinate internationalization activities. The original and continuing motivation for CMU to join the Lab is recognition that while international activity was taking place in various parts of campus, the activities were not necessarily leading to greater internationalization. That is, there was a desire for the whole to be greater than the sum of the parts.

As noted in the CMU Internationalization Lab Self Study Report,to govern this *institution-wide* endeavor CMU, in consultation with ACE, decided upon a two-part structure with committees responsible for each. During the first year of the Lab, the Internationalization Self-Study Committee (ISSC) gathered data needed to inform the publication of this initial white paper analysis of CMU's current state of internationalization (See Appendix 2).² A second committee, the Internationalization Strategic Planning Committee (ISPC)³, will use the information gathered within the following mid-term report to fully develop the comprehensive internationalization plan over the following year.⁴

The ISSC and the ISPC documents take a number of important steps forward in addressing the need for and ways to accomplish a greater degree of campus internationalization. The reports are extremely well organized. In the Self-study Report, a SWOT analysis combining campus research and survey findings, is linked to the comprehensive internationalization model recommended by ACE.⁵ The Internationalization Strategic Plan thoughtfully outlines a series of strategies for each of the three components that are identified in the *CMU Strategic Plan, 2017-2022*: Nurturing Student Success; Fostering Scholarly Activity; and Strengthening

² CMU leadership of the ISSC Mid-Term Report, 2017, notes: 4/14 people of color; 7/14 women; and 3/14 international.

³ The CMU-ACE Internationalization Lab (2016-2018), Internationalization Strategic Planning Committee Strategic Plan, 2018-2023, was drafted by the International Strategic Planning Committee in Spring 2018. CMU leadership of the ISPC notes: 5/22 people of color; 16/22 women; 3/22 international; 2 students; and 1 community member.

⁴ ISSC Mid-Term Report, 2017, p. 6.

⁵ Based on the leadership provided by the Steering Committee, each campus participating in the Lab adapts the ACE Comprehensive Internationalization Framework to meet its campus needs (the framework can be found on p. 1 of this report, Central Michigan University's Participation in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory). In CMU's case, the six-part framework was organized in the Self Study into five sections, as follows: Articulated Institutional Commitment; Curriculum, Co-Curriculum, and Learning Outcomes; Administrative Structure and Staffing; Faculty Policies and Practices; and Student Mobility & Collaboration and Partnerships.

Partnerships in Michigan and Beyond. Interviews during our visit confirmed the value and impact of these two documents. In the meetings with the Deans and faculty, there was recognition that from a history of ‘operating in our own corners’ we are now ‘talking more across the line’; in short, the work of the Lab contributes to important cross-campus conversations, allowing a focus on broad initiatives rather than one offs.

The intention of this section of the report, based on observations at CMU and internationalization theory and practice, is to help CMU move from a strong program of international education (successful, but disparate activities) to strategic internationalization. We devote particular attention to what we see as the primary questions, attention to which promises to make the most difference, but also offer some questions/suggestions about supporting activities. Publications and supporting information for the observations to follow are noted in the text and in footnotes. In particular, we include longer comments on Goal Prioritization, Global Learning, International Partnerships, Study Abroad, and International Students, followed by shorter sections on other important observations.

Goal Prioritization

The CMU Internationalization Lab Self-study makes appropriate recommendations as part of its report, and the CMU Internationalization Strategic Plan has the benefit of adopting a framework for each initiative that includes: strategies, targets, actions, timeline, and metrics and responsibility. However, CMU’s internationalization recommendations are not prioritized. Prioritization of recommended actions is unfinished business for the steering committee.

No-cost or low-cost items could be dealt with first, and those items requiring significant funding later, with a clear plan for reallocating and/or securing new resources. Such steps will better integrate the Self-study Report and the Internationalization Strategic Plan, particularly in terms of an implementation plan for comprehensive internationalization, a road map for the future that can occur hand in hand with the other components of the evolving strategic plan for the university, *Advancing Excellence: CMU’s Strategic Plan, 2017-2022*. As noted earlier, the fact that CMU developed an Internationalization Strategic Plan in addition to completing an Internationalization Lab Self-study deserves high praise. The soon-to-be appointed Executive Director for the Office of International Affairs will be well positioned as a result of such thoughtful preparatory work completed by the ISSC and the ISPC.

Two specific and important goals for prioritization pertain to the campus and OIA web pages, and to risk management planning. In the case of the former, the Deans and the faculty interviewed encouraged creation of more functional information portals for the university, of value to supporting global awareness on campus, confirming progress indicators for strategic plan implementation, recruiting students and faculty, and nurturing community partnerships. In terms of the latter, there is a pressing need to put in place a comprehensive risk management plan that addresses CMU’s safety, security, and liability responsibilities and how to best formulate scenarios to deal with crisis management.

We recommend, as has been true from the outset of CMU's involvement in ACE's Internationalization Lab Cohort #14, utilization of the ACE model for comprehensive internationalization in order to maintain balance among CMU's international activities. Comprehensive internationalization, as defined by ACE's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), is a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions. The CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization is comprised of six interconnected target areas for institutional initiatives, policies, and programs: (1) Articulated Institutional Commitment; (2) Administrative Structure and Staffing; (3) Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes; (4) Faculty Policies and Practices; (5) Student Mobility; and (6) Collaboration and Partnerships.⁶

Global Learning⁷

Global learning objectives are a necessary part of comprehensive internationalization. Because not all students will be able to study abroad, campus curricular and co-curricular initiatives are key to graduating students with the knowledge, skills and attitudes to function successfully in an increasingly globally interdependent world. We recommend that CMU initiate the process of internationalizing the curriculum and co-curriculum as soon as possible. This is a long-term process, involving iterative discussions with stakeholders throughout the university to determine the desired student learning outcomes, creating opportunities in all programs for students to acquire and demonstrate, assess, and use this learning for continuous improvement, and integrating student study abroad experiences into the curriculum (both prior to departure and once they return). General education is a prime location for an international focus in the curriculum, though internationalization of the curriculum must go beyond general education. The global learning envisioned is outlined persuasively by the SWOT analysis found the CMU Self-study Report.

⁶ <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>
Other resources that provide excellent guidance for internationalization include: *Association of International Education Administrator's* definition of the SIO (<http://www.aieaworld.org/sio>) as well as John Heyl's 2007 monograph on *The SIO as Change Agent* (Available at <http://www.aieaworld.org/aiea-books>). *NAFSA: Association of International Educators* supports a knowledge community devoted to senior leadership in internationalization, and publishes relevant resources on the community's webpages. The *ACE's CIGE* also supports the development of leadership in internationalization by bringing presidents, provosts, and SIOs together in an annual Executive Forum, and by inviting campus teams of faculty and administrators to participate in its *Internationalization Collaborative*.

⁷ Global learning is defined as "[. . .] the critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people's lives and the earth's sustainability. Through global learning, students should 1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, 2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and 3) address the world's most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably." See: <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/global-learning> Additional resources include *Purdue University's* global learning faculty development program, see: <http://www.purdue.edu/cie/learning/global/>.

The chief resource needed to accomplish curricular and co-curricular internationalization is the faculty, both those currently at the institution and those who will be hired in the future. They need to be incentivized to do this work.

Internationalization cannot be accidental—it must be intentional. Advertisements of new positions can emphasize that international experience or background is preferred so that the institution can augment its internationalization agenda. Professional development at various levels will be necessary to help faculty members, department chairs, and deans identify international and/or intercultural learning outcomes, enhance the international/intercultural content of current programs and create study abroad opportunities that will give global perspectives to the majors. Those responsible for staffing the residence halls also need to be included in order to pursue co-curricular global learning opportunities; our meetings led us to conclude that this aspect of global learning is underdeveloped at CMU, i.e., lack of coordination between units and co-curricular activities on campus, including soft funding for the latter.

For some faculty and staff, this will not be new work; for others, it will be. In either case, it is a means to give the faculty new ways to think about their current teaching and research in a more nuanced way. As the university's international agenda continues to develop and incorporate graduate education as well as faculty research, the possibilities for productive linkages between undergraduate and graduate training as well as research should be enhanced as much as possible.

Internationalizing the curriculum is not just a responsibility of the language departments; a global dimension can be infused in all academic disciplines, general education requirements, and majors and minors, and some programs at the university already do this. Given the nature of CMU, and its evolving campus strategic plan, the STEM disciplines and the health sciences need to be on board in the curriculum discussions. It is helpful to have scientists talking to scientists about the value of internationalization.

To pursue the imperative that all disciplines need to understand the major in terms of local, national, and global dimensions, interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary as well as cross-unit collaboration in curriculum development will be especially important in a university such as CMU with its very strong constituent schools and units as well as its commitment to addressing the global issues facing central Michigan. To realize aspirational goals associated with global learning curricular work, documentation should be specifically asked for in faculty and department and school annual reports. Such documentation aids and abets two observations from interviews while on the CMU campus: an opportunity has been identified, although not yet realized, to create a repository to track academic department/center-level internationalization efforts; and some younger faculty, including international faculty, do not encounter consistent support for their global interests.

Many resources are available to assist the faculty in internationalizing the curriculum. ACE has posted or published successful programs from several projects: “Where Faculty

Live”, for example engaged disciplinary associations (American Political Science Association, American Psychological Association, American Historical Association, and the Association of American Geographers) in a discussion of what an internationalized major would look like in their fields.⁸

In addition, ACE has sponsored three technology awards about bringing the world into the classroom, and these models are available on the ACE website.⁹ A technique to boost faculty involvement in international education efforts is to use technology to greater advantage. At a much lower cost than faculty travel, technology offers faculty and their students the opportunity to engage with colleagues overseas. Co-teaching courses with faculty from abroad using video/Internet technology, for example, can help fill gaps in international expertise at an institution and enhance the internationalization of the curriculum. This will require having technical capacities in areas of the two campuses that are convenient for faculty and students. It will also require support for developing the relationships that can lead to such cooperation, and the university will need to recognize that this will require face-to-face contact for cooperating faculty (and possibly administrators) at some points.

Yet, to be successful, technology must serve specific objectives of the international education, and not simply “build it and they will come.” Technology, at its best, needs to be used to integrate classroom and educational experience across the disciplines. Technology can prove to be very costly, and if it is not designed to clearly support the international program, CMU may find that these scarce funds have not been most effectively utilized.¹⁰ Such curricular work should be specifically asked for in faculty and department and school annual reports.¹¹

International Partnerships

Over the course of CMU’s participation in the Internationalization Lab, and during the site visit, questions were raised about the purpose and potential of international partnerships. While long-standing partnerships exist, Provost Gealt charged the internationalization lab committees to identify prospects for strategic and sustainable opportunities for the campus. The peer review team therefore focused on this element of campus internationalization efforts. Questions raised were largely strategic in nature and included: How can partnerships be conceptualized and organized as more than faculty and student exchange; what is an appropriate role for alumni and the advancement office in support of partnership development; what criteria should be used to assess current partnerships as well as those under consideration (where are we, where do we need to be)? The review team agrees that CMU has a unique and valuable

⁸ <https://bookstore.acenet.edu/products/where-faculty-live-internationalizing-disciplines-pdf>

⁹ <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/ACE-Tech-Award-International.aspx>

¹⁰ See also SUNY Center for Collaborative On-line International Learning (COIL) (<http://coil.suny.edu/>).

¹¹ Additional resources include: <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/publications/essential-global-learning>; Dawn Whitehead, ed. *Essential Global Learning: A compilation of seminal AAC&U articles about global learning*. AAC&U, Washington, D.C., 2016. Note especially the VALUE Rubric discussion on pp. 29-32. See also: <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/developing-global-learning-rubric-strengthening-teaching-and> and <https://www.aacu.org/value>; and the CLAC Consortium, <https://clacconsortium.org/>

opportunity to leverage its most significant existing partnerships and to identify 2-3 strategic partnerships that will help move the internationalization initiative forward for both institutions. Here, we present an approach to partnership development consistent with these questions.

Strategic partnerships are those with campus-wide significance that involve multiple schools and units. They represent an institutional commitment to a long-term, sustainable relationship. They are intended to provide platforms for deep, cumulative learning, research, and engagement, such that new projects build on previous ones, students encounter the partners in a wide variety of courses and co-curricular activities, and long-standing relationships are fostered between each institution in the relationship and their respective partner communities.

Susan Sutton has written persuasively on the value of academic partnerships to pursue internationalization goals. She notes,

The forces now impelling internationalization have dialogue and collaboration at their core. This realization moves the exchanges and partnerships in which our institutions have long engaged to the center of any internationalization strategy. And these relationships, in turn, can become the means by which our institutions collectively move forward together. For international partnerships to play such a role, however, we must rethink what they are about and how we can best develop and sustain them . . . by transforming . . . traditional modes of exchange into more full-bodied relationships, moving from what might be called *transactional* partnerships to *transformational* ones.¹²

The distinction between transactional and transformational partnerships is crucial as CMU further develops a strategic approach to internationalization.

Historically, most international academic partnerships can be characterized as follows: supported by only a few faculty members (or even a single faculty member); sending a few students/faculty back and forth; occasionally engaged in joint projects; and lasting as long as their original proposers were interested and often (sometimes immediately) idle thereafter. In short, such partnerships were transactional, that is, simple give-and-take relationships where neither institution is much changed by the exchange; in effect, instrumental in nature and predicated on trading resources.

Transformative partnerships, on the other hand, can be distinguished as follows: change occurs in both institutions as they work together; common goals, projects and products are generated through combined resources; there is an emphasis on the relationship as much as the product; the relationship expands over time; and a dialogical basis for global learning takes place. In short, transformative partnerships are bi-national

¹² Susan Buck Sutton. "Transforming Internationalization through Partnerships." *International Educator* 19 (1): 60–6, 2010.

communities of higher education in which there is a constant flow of people, ideas, and projects back and forth, as well as the development of new projects and common goals.¹³

The recommended academic partnerships to be shaped through strategic planning are established by a steering committee guided by a set of criteria, applied selectively on a case-by-case basis, ideally represented in concrete form by a map or inventory, that expects:

- Campus-wide conversation, engagement, and approval that result from lengthy discussions with partner institutions,
- Long-term commitments to develop the relationship over time through identification of new projects and common goals,
- Involvement of faculty with international expertise as well as faculty who know little about the partner country or have no international background,
- A deepening over time of complex understandings and a sense of mutual responsibility,
- Student learning across the curriculum for both institutions by modeling the cross-national competencies we want for our students,
- Joint research and development projects on new topics,
- Creative interdisciplinarity,
- Involvement of administrators and staff,
- Economies of scale/synergies of effort,
- Concentrations of activity that attract external funding,
- Community engagement on both sides,
- Resource allocation from both institutions through sharing and collaboration, and
- Persistence of the partnership over time and beyond the original proposers.

Because they are so intensive as well as extensive, strategic international partnerships that really involve the whole campus are almost by definition few in number. Prospective partnerships have to be selected carefully and pursued patiently and persistently. It is a strategic investment in a relationship that will involve the whole campus, as distinct from an overseas study program or exchange program that might involve a single department or degree program. Such outward-looking internationalization reflects an academic organization's engagement in the global construction of knowledge as well as a willingness to grow from dialogue and exchange. The role and nature of higher education in a globalizing world places reciprocal, transformative partnerships at the center of campus internationalization.

Standards and practices are now evolving for international partnerships, as found in a number of key references. ACE's International Higher Education Partnerships (2015) is

¹³ This definition serves as the basis of strategic partnership activity at *IUPUI's Office of International Affairs*, see: <http://international.iupui.edu/partnerships-initiatives/partnerships/index.html>.

a comprehensive review of “standards of good practice for international higher education partnerships set forth by a variety of organizations (in the United States and around the world)”.¹⁴ The publication’s focus is twofold: Program Administration and Management (transparency and accountability; faculty and staff engagement; quality assurance; and strategic planning and the role of institutional leadership); and Cultural and Contextual Issues (cultural awareness; access and equity; institutional and human capacity building; ethical dilemmas and “negotiated space”). The Institute for International Education also has conducted research on strategic international partnerships that includes case studies from around the world.¹⁵

Study Abroad

CMU should consider how study abroad can further expand the curriculum by providing content learning (through courses not available on the CMU campus but which deepen learning in the disciplines). There also should be a continuing effort to address alternatives to traditional study abroad such as internships and research experiences abroad. Germany’s RISE program (Research Internships in Science and Engineering) comes to mind, as does Spellman College’s G-STEM program, which combine studies and mentoring during the academic year with summer research experiences abroad, and post-study opportunities for reflection on the experiences. These approaches to study abroad and international experiences might be quite attractive to some departments, particularly in disciplines that nationally (and perhaps locally) have been less commonly closely associated with study abroad.

While study abroad leadership can inform the campus of the wide range of possibilities for such global learning, basic separation of responsibilities should be respected; study abroad initiatives in most offices of international affairs are primarily engaged in supporting the organization of programs, and safety and security; the academic content and financial planning aspects rest with the Schools and their respective departments.

Additionally, study abroad is increasingly understood as helping students to develop the operational skills valuable in the workplace and life (flexibility, confidence, problem-solving, self-knowledge, curiosity, tolerance). These are, of course, also closely associated with global learning. Are these skills strongly associated at CMU with study abroad? Are they promoted in descriptions of study abroad? The application process? Post-study abroad reflection activities (beginning but not ending with study abroad

¹⁴ Robin Matross Helms. *International Higher Education Partnerships: CIGE Insights; A Global Review of Standards and Practices*, ACE, 2015. See also: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/CIGE-Insights-Intl-Higher-Ed-Partnerships.pdf>. ACE's Internationalization in Action series on partnerships – particularly the installment on strategic planning: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Internationalization-in-Action.aspx>.

¹⁵ Claire Banks, Birgit Siege-Herbig, and Karin Norton. Eds. *Global Perspectives on Strategic International Partnerships: A Guide to Building Sustainable Academic Linkages*. Institute for International Education, 2016. This publication includes a review of the Indiana University/Moi University strategic partnership, dating from the late 1980s. See *AMPATH: A Strategic Partnership in Kenya* by Ian S. McIntosh, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis and Eunice Kamaara, Moi University.

evaluations)? Career planning? Engagement with alumni, who can offer examples of the value of both content and operational skills learning in study abroad to careers and life?

Students at CMU, as is true elsewhere, are increasingly interested in short-term study abroad. How do CMU faculty want to structure these programs and help students make connections to pre- and post-experiences (courses, the co-curriculum) to ensure that learning and engagement with the subject and/or host communities abroad are meaningful? How is assessment embedded in the design of short-term study abroad programs? How are available scholarships leveraged? A number of institutions are offering international experience grants to students for self-designed activities abroad during winter breaks and summers. Such experiences raise questions about risk-management and educational oversight, but are increasingly offered by U.S. colleges and universities, and are being seen by some advocates for international education as viable alternatives to traditional study abroad.

Nationally, there is interest in making study abroad learning outcomes more visible. A number of colleges have responded to this concern by providing students with opportunities to discuss their study abroad experiences publically. Some do this in departmental colloquia, others through poster sessions, others via institution-wide symposia.¹⁶ Such events facilitate shared understandings of study abroad, and can lead to steps to strengthen learning outcomes. Examples include changes to application processes and advising, and the introduction of post-study abroad activities to build on study abroad.¹⁷

The availability of line-budged study abroad scholarships is one of CMU's strengths. While CMU's population demographics work against major increases in the number of students participating in study abroad, the CMU Self-study notes a 40 percent increase in students studying abroad since 2010; the availability of scholarships for this form of international education, at present and through future philanthropic activity, can further demonstrate the institution's support for this kind of activity. In this regard, the "study abroad at home" movement should not be overlooked. The peer review team noted in its interviews that questions were raised about the small size of the Mt. Pleasant community, limiting the possibility of creating "study abroad" opportunities in the immediate area for students who are unable to travel outside the U.S.. While opportunities with immigrant communities nonetheless are worthy of exploration, as are Mt. Pleasant's Sister City relationships, this fact calls attention to the significance to CMU of creating creative programs for international and domestic students to explore cultural differences on campus through curricular and co-curricular activities.

¹⁶ Beloit College's annual [International Symposium](#) is one such example.

¹⁷ Twombly et al's research report, *Study Abroad in a New Global Century – Renewing the Promise, Refining the Purpose* makes strong cases for incorporating learning goals into program design and providing opportunities, post-study abroad, for meaning making. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, v38 n4 p1-152 2012.

International Students

CMU has an impressive history of recruiting students from around the world. Further clarification of what is attractive about CMU to this particular set of stakeholders can lay the foundation for diversification and expansion of international student numbers. Can the university learn from these students how to continue recruiting them in spite of the present-day geopolitical changes now occurring?

Questions of who and which offices at CMU will best serve international students resonate with questions posed on campuses across the country. Students can find comfort and a sense of belonging when supported by a strong, multi-function international student office, and other campus units may feel well-served by this kind of structure. Reference to the literature on belonging is worthy of review. Indeed, the personal story related by President Ross in our interview, concerning the enduring relationship he and his wife have established with a Saudi student, is an excellent example of the benefits of careful integration of international students on campus, allowing international students and their hosts to learn from each other. In addition, international students can be uniquely helpful in assisting domestic students seeking to obtain a global perspective outside the classroom. Research is making clear that global learning – and student success – in college are closely linked to belonging. When students do not feel they belong, they either do not remain or they do not achieve their potential.¹⁸

A practical aspect of integrating international students is to more proactively recruit students to CMU's Intensive English program and, in the process, more intentionally expose these students to the opportunity to matriculate into a CMU degree program.

Because of these and other factors-to-be-considered, we recommend development of an enrollment management plan with the following features. First, it needs to set intentional numerical goals for both domestic and international students. Second, it needs to address the quality of entering students, ensuring that there is equal attention to this issue for both domestic and international students. Third, it needs to address the diversity of both domestic and international students and to be intentional about ensuring that diversity. Fourth, and equally important, steps must be taken to ensure that international students are distributed widely across the schools so there is no disproportionate impact on any one of them.

¹⁸ The authors of *Belonging: The Gateway to Global Learning for All* (Braskamp, Braskamp & Glass) suggest that students in general feel they belong when “(1) they feel part of a close and supportive community of friends, (2) they believe their institution honors diversity and internationalism, (3) they understand the mission of their institution, (4) they are challenged and supported, (5) they are encouraged to develop their strengths and talents, and (6) they have a strong sense of affiliation with their institution.” However, findings from the authors’ research using the Global Perspectives Inventory indicate that along with first-generation and transfer students, international students are less likely to feel they belong compared to other students. Braskamp, D.C.; Braskamp, L.A.; & Glass, C. R. (2015), *Liberal Learning*, AAC&U, <https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/2015/summer/braskamp>

Advisory Group

The work of prioritization and implementation suggests that there is a need for a continuing advisory group or council at CMU. We commend Provost Gealt for endorsing this idea in the peer review team meeting. The current steering committee(s) could form the basis for such a group. It should be given a clear charge from the Provost and the leadership role of the incoming Executive Director for International Affairs should be delineated. In addition, the peer review team strongly endorses, looking forward, careful utilization of the experience and leadership skills of Drs. David Ash and Christi Brookes as campus work on internationalization shifts to the implementation stage.

Data Base Needs

The Self-study Report gathered much information about the international activity of the faculty and staff. The use and updating of internationalization data can be an on-going legacy of the Lab's work. We recommend that the data collected during the Lab process be organized into a data base and made available so that faculty and administration have access to it for their internationalization efforts, as recommended by the Self-study SWOT analysis. Noteworthy points to keep in mind in developing a data base include: its capacity to track research, in support of recent reports that indicate 75 percent of research and development funding is now found outside the United States¹⁹; tracking of partnerships; and mechanisms to enable collaborative teaching. Some thought must be given to how the data can be updated, perhaps by structuring year-end reports from faculty and deans to make this possible. See also the International Partnerships section, above; and the International Alumni section, below.

Rewards for Curricular Development

We recommend that there be a plan for curricular enhancement grants and course releases to further the work of internationalization, and also to emulate existing awards in order to bring attention to internationalizing the curriculum and to showcase successful practitioners. CMU also has untapped potential to compete for Fulbright awards in three respects: increasing the number of incoming and outgoing Fulbright faculty scholars; increasing outgoing Fulbright student scholars; and tapping into the Fulbright Program's Outreach Lecture Fund which supports short-term travel by visiting scholars already in the US.²⁰ Celebrating the history and potential of current and prospective Fulbright participants is an opportunity for the incoming Executive Director for International Affairs.

Diversity/Internationalization

Collaboration between diversity initiatives and internationalization efforts is ripe for further development at CMU. This is an area of significant growth on other campuses, and CMU should keep this issue on the table.²¹ Indeed, the recent hiring of a senior

¹⁹ AIEA Regional Forum, SUNY Albany, 2018.

²⁰ See Fulbright in general, as well as the Outreach Lecture Program: <https://www.cies.org/>; [CIES Fulbright](#).

²¹ Thoughtful examples of such collaboration can be found in the *ACE At Home in the World References Toolkit*, <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/AHITW-Toolkit-References.aspx>, particularly Olson,

officer for diversity leadership on campus is promising; a meeting with this individual is a high priority for the incoming Executive Director for the Office of International Affairs.

International Alumni

CMU should explore the question of how international alumni can be engaged to further the university's internationalization. A process for tracking all international alumni needs to be developed. Alums are valuable to institutions for recruitment, the development of exchange programs, providing international internships, and potentially for funding. As a first step, the university should obtain names of recent graduates and hire a graduate assistant to search for international graduates on the Internet as professionals are relatively easy to track. This can form the basis for building a more comprehensive data base.

Communication Strategies and Making the Case for Internationalization

As the internationalization Self-study and Strategic Plans move forward in the implementation stage, a concerted effort to build common cause across the campus is an essential next step. This can be accomplished by intentionally bringing together internationalization leadership and communication specialists at CMU. An important preliminary effort to be undertaken by the Office of International Affairs is that of assuming responsibility for developing a written statement on the rationale for campus internationalization.²² More broadly, as reported to the peer review team by several faculty and administrators, the prioritization of student success in the *CMU Strategic Plan* can be tied directly to the effort to make the case for internationalization, i.e., through student and faculty profiles.

A continuing challenge facing CMU is a campus narrative that argues that the university's responsibility centered management (RCM) budgetary model discourages internationalization. The peer review team observes that there are exemplary approaches to internationalization in universities throughout the country that utilize RCM. As the Provost seeks to recentralize certain aspects of CMU's decentralized governance structure, there is a need to reconsider the 'RCM does not support internationalization narrative'. Steps include: modest set aside funds in the Provost's office to encourage cross-campus collaboration between Colleges; charging the new Executive Director for International Affairs to address the issue in partnership with a Provost-established Deans subcommittee, to include an annual report of promising practices; and augmenting the awards bestowed on CMU faculty to recognize cross-campus and interdisciplinary projects with exemplary global themes.

Conclusion

At its core, the ACE Internationalization Lab engages an institution in crafting and implementing a strategy for academic change. As such, it encourages individual as well

Evans, R., and Shoenberg. *At Home in the World: Bridging the Gap Between Internationalization and Multicultural Education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. 2007.

²² For a thoughtful discussion of internationalization communication strategies aimed at multiple audiences, see Making the Case for Internationalization: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Making-the-Case-for-Internationalization.aspx>

as institutional entrepreneurial thinking based on the recognition that colleges and universities: place “sense making” at the center of planning; are value-driven institutions where words, goals, and mission matter; are predicated on distributed leadership structures, embrace the ideal of shared governance; and recognize different constituencies with different goals. In this framework, comprehensive internationalization must answer the question, why are we doing this? Answers include:

- enhancing institutional reputation and competitive position;
- preparing students for global citizenship;
- making students more competitive in the global marketplace;
- generating revenue;
- enhancing the research agenda;
- and making a better, more understanding world.

In aspiring to achieve these goals, CMU has the opportunity to embody the branding discussion the peer review team heard while on campus, particularly the slogans ‘One CMU’ and ‘Putting your Stamp on the World’. In line with these values, individuals, faculty, students and staff should feel empowered to propose specific initiatives, particularly if they do not require significant resources. For example, a proposal for a new internationalization award for faculty (or staff) can be advanced for consideration. Such proactive initiatives should be encouraged and supported by the administration, acknowledging that the individuals and units charged with specific missions know best the kinds of changes and improvements that can and should be made.

CMU is clearly fortunate to have strong support for internationalization from many faculty and administrators. Of course, conversations about internationalization must continue, in order to widen this base of support so that the university can effectively achieve its vision and mission in terms of internationalization and to prepare its students to be leaders in a global world. While CMU has made remarkable progress over the course of its participation in the ACE Internationalization Lab on developing a set of recommendations for supporting internationalization, the academic content of these efforts – whether curricular, research or programmatic – needs to follow closely behind. The institution is well-positioned to continue its work in internationalization because it has all the key ingredients: leadership, energy, and a sense of direction.

Internationalization is a long-term project that requires commitment from senior administrators who regularly provide reasons why the campus and its programs (like all of higher education) must become more fully internationalized. This requires adequate resources, accountability, and regular evaluation and assessment. By developing and continuing an intentional process, CMU will make balanced internationalization goals part of its everyday operations, continuing to reinforce its status as a distinguished and distinctive institution.

The American Council on Education and its Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement stands ready to continue to support CMU in the years ahead through its research, institutional and leadership programs.²³

Appendix 1: CMU & ACE Internationalization Laboratory
Peer Review Visit²⁴
Schedule

Monday, 30 April 2018
6:30 PM

Dinner @ Midori with David Ash & Christi Brookes
105 E. Broadway, downtown Mt. Pleasant

Tuesday, 1 May 2018
8:00 AM

Meeting with Internationalization Strategic Planning Committee & Internationalization Self-Study Committee
Participants: Lab committee: David Ash, Elaine Betts, Christi Brookes, Phame Camarena, Laura Cochrane, Cassie Dehaan, Dianne Desalvo, Megan Doerr, Claudia Douglass, Caitlin Hamstra, Anne Hornak, Kathy Ling, Heidi Mahon, Tracy Nakajima, Tony Voisin, Ellen Wehrman

9:00 AM

Council of Deans
Participants: Provost, all deans (academic and other), administrative fellows, P&A staff, Christi Brookes, David Ash

10:00 AM

Open coffee discussion (UC Terrace)
Participants: Christi Brookes, Cassie Dehaan, Megan Doerr, Rae Buchholz (Director of the English Language Institute), Jessica Harman (Associate Director of ELI), Greg Smith (chair of History), Tracy

²³ See: <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Center-for-Internationalization-and-Global-Engagement.aspx>; <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Programs.aspx>; and Internationalization Lab 2.0, <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Final-Meeting-of-Internationalization-Lab-Cohort-14-Asks-Where-Do-We-Go-From-Here.aspx>.

²⁴ Prior to arrival on campus, campus dialogue and outreach as part of the Lab process included the following meetings: Council of Deans: fall 2016, fall 2017; Open forums: 4 in spring 2017 (prior to self-study); 4 in spring 2018 (after release of strategic plan); Council of Chairs: spring 2016, spring 2017; Academic Senate: 3 presentations in fall 2016, spring 2017, and spring 2018; Enrollment & Student Services: special roundtable spring 2018 (after release of strategic plan); Individual meetings throughout the Lab with Bill Holmes, and post departure, Christi Brookes.

Nakajima, Kathleen Gardner (Director of Residence Life), Shaun Holtgrieve (Director, Student Success), student (World Languages & Cultures), Tom Rohrer (Director, Great Lakes Institute for Sustainable Systems), Dianne Desalvo, Raye Walraven (Recruiting), Tisa Thompson (Recruiting), Ellen Wehrman, Tyler Morkin (SEVIS coordinator), Tom Gilsdorf (chair of Mathematics), Julie Zuo (Interior Design)

11:30 AM – 1:30 PM

Lunch with students, OIA staff & others (UC Terrace)
Participants: Christi Brookes, David Ash, Cassie Dehaan, Megan Doerr, Rae Buchholz (Director of the English Language Institute), Caitlin Hamstra, Amy Ransom (chair of World Languages & Cultures), Tracy Nakajima, Tom Rohrer, Dianne Desalvo, Raye Walraven (Recruiting), Tisa Thompson (Recruiting), Tyler Morkin (SEVIS coordinator), Prakash Adhikari (Political Science), David Jesuit (chair of Political Science/Public Administration), Krystyna Nowak-Fabrykowski (Teacher Education), Richard Ren (Journalism), Evelyn Seitz (OIA)

2:00 – 3:30 PM

Meeting with President George E. Ross and Provost Michael A. Gealt

3:30 – 5:00 PM

Coffee with other interested parties/ISPC/ISSC (UC Terrace)
Participants: Christi Brookes, Megan Goodwin (Associate Dean), Marcello Graziano (Geography), Dianne Desalvo, Hannah Faustmann (Study Abroad), Asia Bennett (Study Abroad), Marko Schubert (Study Abroad), two students from Ed Leadership, Cassie Dehaan, Ari Harris (University Communications) + 1 more from UCOMM, Megan Doerr, Laura Cochrane, Tracy Nakajima, Tyler Morkin

6:00

Peer reviewer dinner @ Soaring Eagle Casino

Wednesday, 2 May 2018

8:00 AM

Preliminary Debrief
Breakfast at Soaring Eagle Casino with David Ash & Christi Brookes

Peer Reviewers

Dr. Vicki Hamblin, Executive Director, Institute for Global Engagement, Senior International Officer; and Professor of French, Western Washington University

Dr. Gil Latz, Associate Vice Chancellor for International Affairs and Professor of Geography, IUPUI; and Senior Associate for Internationalization, ACE, serving as Chair

Dr. Robert Wojtowicz, Dean of the Graduate School; and Professor of Art History, Old Dominion University

Appendix 2: CMU Internationalization Self-Study Committee (ISSC)

- David Ash, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies;
- Christi Brookes, Committee Co-Chair and Chair of World Languages and Cultures;
- Justin Bruner, Teaching and Learning Consultant of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning;
- Phame Camarena, Director of the Honors Program;
- Debasish Chakraborty, Economic Faculty Member;
- Cassandra DeHaan, Special Projects Coordinator, Office of International Affairs;
- Dianne DeSalvo, Director of Study Abroad;
- Megan Doerr, Director of International Recruiting and Outreach (ex-officio);
- Claudia Douglass, Vice Provost of Academic Effectiveness;
- Bill Holmes, Committee Co-Chair and Executive Director, Office of International Affairs;
- Susan Naeve-Velguth, Communication Disorders Faculty Member;
- Tracy Nakajima, Director of International Student and Scholar Services (ex-officio);
- Eric Tucker, Music Faculty Member and College of Communication and Fine Arts International Fellow.

Appendix 3: Internationalization Strategic Planning Committee (ISPC)

- David Ash: Co-chair OIA/ORGS, Dean, Office of Research and Graduate Studies; Interim Executive Director, Office of International Affairs;
- Elaine Betts, CHP, Professor of Rehabilitation and Medical Sciences;
- Christi Brookes: co-chair, CHSBS/WLC, Professor of French; Interim Associate Dean, College of Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences;

- Rachel Brown, CMED, Associate Dean of Student Affairs, College of Medicine; Diversity and Inclusion Officer;
- Laura Cochrane, CHSBS, Professor of Anthropology;
- Cassie Dehaan, OIA International Student Coordinator;
- Dianne Desalvo, OIA Director of Study Abroad;
- Megan Doerr, OIA Director, International Outreach and Recruitment;
- Caitlin Hamstra, CHSBS/ELI, Associate Director, English Language Institute;
- Anne Hornak, EHS, Professor of Educational Leadership;
- Kathy Irwin, LIB; Associate Dean, Libraries;
- Kathy Ling; Community Commissioner & Former Mayor, City of Mount Pleasant;
- Diane Marble, CETL, Interim Director/Teaching & Learning, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning;
- Heidi Mahon, CSE, Director of CSE (College of Science and Engineering) Student Services;
- Chuck Mahone, Student Activities & Involvement; Graduate Assistant for Student Engagement;
- Tracy Nakajima, OIA Director, International Student & Scholar Services;
- Eugene Roh, CBA; Professor of Hospitality;
- Mariam Saad, Grad student/international, Graduate student (MSA);
- Eric Tucker, CCFS, Professor of Music;
- Tony Voisin, ESS, Vice President, Student Services;
- Ellen Wehrman, Leadership Institute, Assistant Director;
- Sarah R. Opperman Leadership Institute.