



Searching for a Coherent and Strategic US Policy Framework for Higher Education Internationalization

*EAIE Annual Conference
Istanbul, Turkey, September 2013*

Prof. John K. Hudzik, Michigan State University

NAFSA Senior Scholar for Internationalization

Former Vice President Global Engagement and
Dean of International Studies and Programs, Michigan State University



The Environment for a U.S. National Framework and Policy

A mix of factors shapes and constrains development of a coherent national policy framework for US higher education internationalization—historically and presently.

- ✦ The U.S. Constitution.
- ✦ The funding carrot.
- ✦ The power of “national defense” arguments.
- ✦ Laissez-Faire market orientation: “built it and they came without one.”
- ✦ Relatively successful engagement of some US higher education institutions (uneven) for the last 60 years.
- ✦ But.... Potential winds of change?



Political Realities of the USHE System

- ⊕ No national system of education
- ⊕ Substantial Federal money for higher education, but minimal controls.
- ⊕ Great diversity among the 4,300 USHE institutions.
- ⊕ USHE Internationalization shaped less by government policy, and more by
 - ⊕ institutional values and core missions,
 - ⊕ market forces,
 - ⊕ USHE Associations
 - ⊕ Regulation through accreditation bodies.



The Power of “Defense” Rationales for Internationalization

- ⊕ Defense through **knowledge/understanding** of others.
- ⊕ Defense through **public diplomacy**
- ⊕ The **knowledge economy** and economic competition.
 - ⊞ Cutting edge labor force for global economic competition
 - Preparing the **domestic labor force**
 - Accessing the **global talent pool**



Government's Role in Advancing USHE Internationalization

- ⊕ Influence of government.
 - ⊕ Important roles and funding, but by themselves governments influence at the margins.
- ⊕ Roles of Higher Education Institutions.
 - ⊕ Higher education institutions are the key to driving internationalization beyond marginal growth and sustainability.



ACE 2011/12 Survey Of USHE Institutions and their Internationalization Efforts

- Percentage of campuses with an internationalization taskforce.
 - PhD =83%; MA=56%; BA=53%; CC=37%
- 55% of institutions working to internationalize the on-campus curriculum.



Respondents: The three most compelling reasons to focus on internationalization?

ITEM	PhD	MA	BA	CC
Improve student preparedness for a global era.	93	88	86	70
To diversify students, faculty, staff at the home campus.	42	60	58	45
To become more attractive to prospective students (dom. & Int'l).	33	35	39	19
Respond to public demand for global competitiveness in.....	59	48	52	46
To increase impact and outreach in international development .	36	20	16	14



Contemporary Forces Prompting Greater Internationalization

- ⊕ Positive rhetoric about HE internationalization from:
 - ⊠ Politicians and businesses (not government policy)
 - ⊠ The general public
 - ⊠ Institutional leadership
 - ⊠ Students and their parents.

- ⊕ Better understanding that envelop-pushing research and technology requires cross border engagement in:
 - ⊠ International education.
 - ⊠ Immigration reform.
 - ⊠ Inter-institutional collaborations.



A National Policy for USHE Internationalization?

- ❖ No strong national policy beyond occasional rhetoric.
- ❖ Continuing financial support, but this is at some risk because of current financial realities.
- ❖ No coherent or long-range strategic national policy for in-bound or out-bound mobility.
- ❖ Dept. of Education report (2012) *“Succeeding Globally Through International Education and Engagement.”*
 - ❖ Assessment of its impact....



US Policy and HE Internationalization

- ⊕ Federal IE initiatives, as they exist, tend to be linked to current foreign policy/diplomacy priorities: e.g., China, Latin America, “Arab Spring.”
- ⊕ Higher education internationalization does not have sufficient cache’ on its own, but must be tied to other ends for saliency.
 - ⊕ foreign policy, global markets, defense, economic competitiveness.
- ⊕ There are significant sources of Federal funding for IE.



Some Current Federal “Action” Examples

- Out-Bound Mobility initiatives linked to foreign policy
 - ⊠ Allowing academic travel to Cuba
 - ⊠ 100,000 strong in China
 - ⊠ 100,000 strong in the Americas
 - ⊠ Passport to India
- Critical Issue in all cases:
 - ⊠ Rhetoric v. follow through and funding.



For International Education Support (general sources)

Year	Dept of State	Dept of Education	Peace Corps
2007	\$445 million	\$106 million	\$300 million est.
2010	\$635 million	\$126 million	\$400 million
2013	\$587 million	\$75 million	\$375 million

Other funding for 2010

Category		
General Student Financial Aid	\$98 billion (2008)	\$250 billion (2012)
FIPSE International Consortia	\$10 million (2009)	\$0
USAID	\$1.4B (2010)	\$1.5B (2012)



Federal Funding for International

Dept of State Academic Exchanges	2008	2010	2013 (Pending)
Fulbright	\$223 million	\$254 million	\$251 million
Educational Advising and Student Services	\$11 million	\$13 million	?
English language programs	\$15 million	\$47 million	?
Benjamin Gilman Study Abroad Scholarships	\$6 million	\$10 million	\$10 million
Global University Innovation Fund	NA	NA	\$5million
"Simon" Study Abroad Scholarship	0	0	?????
Department of Education			
Title VI—Parts A & B	\$107 million	\$124 million	\$74 million for
Fulbright-Hayes Program	for both	for both	both



Would US Higher Education Benefit from a Coherent Policy Framework? Would it Matter?

- ✚ It is unclear what the benefits might be given the shifting vagaries of partisan and ideologically driven politics.
- ✚ It would depend on whether such a policy framework had long-term and stable strategy behind it, or whether driven by short-term public diplomacy goals and applications.
- ✚ It would depend on whether there was clear and relatively stable financial support to back it up in order to justify institutional commitment to sustain infrastructure.
- ✚ It would depend on whether such a framework recognized diversity in the means by which institutions could contribute to the framework.



A Few Areas of Potential Policy Reform and Benefit for a Start

- ⊕ A sensible **immigration policy** for:
 - ⊕ Students
 - ⊕ Scholars
 - ⊕ Strategic workforce development.
- ⊕ Targeted international student **long-term training and education grants** for leadership and capacity building in origin countries.
- ⊕ Support for **sustainable cross-border inter-institutional linkages** in education, research, development activity.