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7. **Global Engagement**

**At the University of Michigan**
7. GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

In chapters Two through Six, the focus has been on the Higher Learning Commission’s five criteria for reaccreditation. In chapter Seven, we present the University of Michigan’s Special-Emphasis Study on Internationalization. This Chapter introduces the rationale for the study, provides a range of observations on the topic, and offers sets of ideas and recommendations on how the University can further grow in this important area.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Our students are entering a world in which international connections are the norm. Already they collect information, news, data, music, and video from the Internet without concern for national boundaries. The companies they will work for and lead, the scholarship they will pursue, the policies and positions they will vote on or enact, the associations they will form via the Internet, the cultures they will meld in their own experiences, and the voluntary work they will engage in, all have global dimensions and global drivers to a degree not true for their parents’ generation. It is imperative that the University help our students, whether they are resident or non-resident, domestic, or international, to prepare for lives of significant international engagement. We must give them tools to understand, to appreciate, to critique, and to engage. To live, lead, and thrive in tomorrow’s world, it is more vital than ever for our students to have ample and robust opportunities to expand their international horizons, and to experience an education commensurate with those horizons. We know that many of them are eager for such opportunities.

Today’s University of Michigan students already have numerous ways to study abroad or to engage in international study on campus, as illustrated with examples below. Building on these strengths, we can do more to forge the kind of forward-looking education for our students that we envision and that they desire. This report presents an examination of the University’s goal to broaden the international experiences of our students and to deepen the global engagement of the University as a whole. These internationalization goals align fully with our institutional commitment to diversity and our belief that the encounter with diverse people, experiences, and perspectives is critical to intellectual development and progress.

7.1.1 The Internationalization Self-study

What is meant by internationalizing the University? Internationalization can be defined as the process of adaptation to different cultures, regions, and languages, but the concept’s meaning and interpretation varies across campus. To articulate what internationalization means at the University of Michigan, we asked campus units to respond to a set of related questions:
1. What does the concept of internationalization mean to the programs and activities in your unit?
2. What are the key measures by which the University of Michigan defines itself now or could further define itself as an internationalized institution?
3. What are the means by which you would be likely to broaden internationalization in your unit?

The results are collected in a supporting document (Units on Internationalization) that illustrates a deep commitment and urgency to internationalization activities, and that presents a range of unit-specific goals and plans.

The campus shares a set of common goals for internationalization efforts:
- Improve student preparedness for a global society.
- Internationalize the curricula and programs.
- Enhance the institution’s international profile and reputation.
- Grow international access and partnerships in research and teaching.

This chapter builds on, but does not summarize, the range of perspectives and approaches of units, recognizing our commitment to decentralization. The delicate balance between centralized and decentralized activities, however, will feature in a number of places in this chapter.
7.1.2 Approach

A campus-wide approach to understanding our internationalization goals and needs was established through the unit survey mentioned above and from the work of two accreditation working groups (AWGs) that were comprised of faculty and staff members with recognized international expertise. These AWGs formulated recommendations based on the premise that the University should be a leader in internationalization, consistent with a priority established by the president, provost, and the deans. An overarching goal identified by the AWGs is that our students should possess and be able to use knowledge of other places and cultures to articulate both comparative and critical perspectives about their own countries. Every student should have at least a minimum of internationally-focused coursework or curricular activity, on- and off-campus, and the University should aggressively seek to expand the scope, quality, and depth of the opportunities it offers to students who wish to make international issues a central part of their studies. The working groups’ activities were complemented by conversations with other campus constituencies, new surveys of students and alumni, and information from complementary reports with an international focus (such as the 2008 China Task Force Report, described more fully below; the International Center’s Annual Statistical Report; and the Senate Assembly’s 2008 Study Abroad Programs at Michigan).

Following a description of international students and alumni, international experiences, and example activities, the report offers four sets of recommendations within the following categories: curriculum, education abroad, people and partnerships, and organization. Key questions that guided the recommendations and that will also by themselves be a resource for future discussion and actions are included with each topic. Units and programs can also customize these questions for their own uses. Then, the closing sections will highlight several key recommendations that focus on centralized efforts, anchored by the creation of what we tentatively call the Center for Global Engagement. This new center would aggregate many of the recommended changes, meet the demands associated with anticipated growth in this area, host a webportal that would support campus information needs, and coordinate the University’s many outreach efforts to the state, the nation and the world.

7.2 A SNAPSHOT OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

The University of Michigan admitted its first international students in 1847, one from Mexico and one from Wales. Today there are well over 4,500 students from more than 115 countries on campus (see figure below). Dozens of international student organizations have been established in recent years, most of which are engaged in social activities and, increasingly, in the organization of outreach events designed to educate the University and local communities about different cultures from around the world. This international student population is one of University’s most valuable resources and ready to be engaged at all levels of our internationalization efforts.

International student enrollment in 2008 (Top Ten Countries).

Turkey (72)
Mexico (95)
Malaysia (135)
Japan (109)
Singapore (119)
Taiwan (231)
Canada (236)
South Korea (775)
India (803)
PR China (1,000)

The University of Michigan is renowned for having the largest number of living alumni in the world, with over 460,000 people worldwide holding University degrees. The number of alumni living and working abroad is already large, representing 170 countries, and it will continue to grow as more international students enroll at the University and more U.S. students move abroad. The University's alumni are as geographically diverse as the student population on campus (figure below). To facilitate communication and networking with alumni abroad, the Alumni Association of the University of Michigan has created a list of international alumni contacts in about thirty countries.

Alumni and Friends of the University of Michigan around the world (winter 2009).


In fall 2008, more than 7,000 international students, scholars, faculty, and staff were studying or working at the University of Michigan. Based on 2007-08 data from the Institute of International Education's (IIE) Open Doors 2008 report, the University ranked sixth nationally among U.S. universities and third among public research institutions in terms of international students.¹

Significant change has already occurred over the past decade. A comparison of enrollment, demographics, and related data for 2000, 2004, and 2008 is shown in the table below. Since 2000, the international student enrollment has increased by as much as 25%, while international scholars increased by an even greater percentage. Education abroad also increased significantly, although data for 2000 may suffer from incomplete reporting. In recent years, the University's International Center has been producing a statistical report that examines trends and demographics on students, faculty, and staff, allowing better insight into the scope of our various activities. The data in the table below are mostly from the International Center and the University's submissions to IIE's Open Doors reports.

¹ The Open Doors report includes both enrolled students and those on Optional Practical Training (one year work authorization after completion of studies). Therefore, Open Doors 2008 indicates that UM "hosted" 5,748 international students in fall Semester 2007, as opposed to 4,455 reported as enrolled by the Office of the Registrar.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>change since 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNATIONAL ENROLLMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% international of total</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>2881</td>
<td>2984</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate/professional</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>3221</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/Pacific</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>-24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/N. Africa</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY CITIZENSHIP (TOP TEN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC (incl. Hong Kong &amp; Macau)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION ABROAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% UM</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% non-UM</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% undergraduate</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% graduate/professional</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-curricular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% undergraduate</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% graduate/professional</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNATIONAL EMPLOYEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: International Center (Open Doors reports). Note: 2000 = AY98/99, 2004 = AY02/03, 2008 = AY06/07; totals do not add to 100% in all categories because of "unknown".
The 2008 record of our undergraduate and graduate students' experiences abroad illustrates that study-abroad experiences reflect a mix of curricular and co-curricular activities, and a mix of credit and non-credit experiences (figure below).

**Graduate and undergraduate educational experiences abroad.**

Co-curricular activities are not for academic credit. The data include 2,209 undergraduate students, 824 graduate students, 158 post-graduates; total: 3,191 students.


Limiting these data to undergraduate students only, we find that study abroad experiences include a considerable component of non-University offerings (figure below), possibly reflecting the type of offerings currently available and cost issues, which we can address in our future plans.

**Undergraduate educational experiences abroad.**

The data include 1,628 for credit, 739 co-curricular education (includes post-graduates); total: 2,367 students.


Our 2008 survey of graduating seniors (described below) sheds additional light on the choices of our students by including a specific set of questions on their international experiences.
7.2.1 Experiences abroad

The 2008 survey of graduating seniors, *The Michigan Experience I: Perspectives from the Class of 2008*, and the 2009 survey of alumni cohorts, *The Michigan Experience II: Perspectives from the Alumni*, give snapshots of our students' international experiences. The survey listed a number of experiences involving internationalization and then asked survey respondents how frequently, if ever, they had sought out or encountered them.

The University's population of international students plays a significant role in bringing an international component to the undergraduate experience (figure below). Almost all respondents to the 2008 graduating senior survey (93%) reported interacting with international students in class at some point, and these students were most likely to say this happened during most terms. Nearly as high a percentage (86%) also indicated that they interacted with international students socially, and 79% said they had a friendship with one or more international students. Three-quarters of the senior respondents indicated that they had enrolled in a course with an international focus, most commonly for one or two terms. Other opportunities commonly reported by students were cultural events (82%), and extracurricular lectures and workshops with an international focus (66%). A significant fraction of the 2008 senior survey respondents reported volunteer, intern, or work experiences that were international (41%), while projects with faculty members that had an international focus were less common (21%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Every Term</th>
<th>Most Terms</th>
<th>3 or 4 Terms</th>
<th>1 or 2 Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interacted with international students in class (93%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacted with international students socially (86%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a performance of international music, art, and culture (82%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a friendship with an international student (79%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in a course with an international/global focus (75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended internationally-focused lectures or workshops (56%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer, internship or work experience with international focus (41%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on an international-themed project (21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked the same questions, the alumni cohort respondents also valued the presence of international students on campus. Almost everyone reported interacting with international students in class at some point, typically in most of their terms on campus. Nearly as high a percentage indicated that they interacted with international students socially, and three-quarters developed a friendship with one or more international students. Over three-quarters of alumni indicated that they had enrolled in a course with an international focus, most commonly for one or two terms, and the same proportion of alumni reported attending a performance or other cultural event with a global theme. Almost a third of recent alumni respondents reported volunteer, intern, or work experiences that were international (31%), while projects with faculty members that had an international focus were less common (20%).

An important component to alumni responses is the way they differ by cohort (figure below). There is a distinct change over time, showing that recent alumni are more likely to have had international experiences than those who graduated a decade ago. Furthermore, recent alumni reported having had these experiences more often. To show these differences, the charts display alumni responses grouped by years since graduation. The results of the 2008 senior survey indicate that the University continues to make progress in this area.
Which of these activities did you participate in while at U-M? (% alumni who participated; n = 3097)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frames</th>
<th>Participation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interacted with international students in class</td>
<td>9-11 years out</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years out</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacted with international students in social settings</td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended an international cultural performance or exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in a course with an international/global focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a friendship with U-M international students</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended internationally-themed extracurricular lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a volunteer, internship or work experience with international focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with faculty on international project</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than half (51%) of the respondents on the 2008 graduating senior survey reported having traveled or studied abroad (defined as outside the U.S. and Canada). A fifth of the respondents stated that they participated in a study abroad experience that lasted for an academic term or more, while 9% reported study abroad that lasted for less than an academic term. Notably, volunteering or working abroad was reported by 14% of 2008 senior respondents, while 17% indicated they went abroad outside of a study abroad or work setting, but with the primary purpose of having a cross-cultural or educational experience (in contrast to travel for pure recreation). Most of the students who reported these experiences abroad had them in countries where English is not the primary language (figure below). The regions where students said they traveled to or studied were diverse. Western Europe was the most common (62% of the respondents), while Eastern Europe was visited by a much smaller number (17%). Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean were popular (50%), whereas Asia was a destination for 20% of the seniors.

Experiences in a foreign country (2008 seniors; n=1673)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>% who participated</th>
<th>% in non-English speaking country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any experience abroad</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel abroad for recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other travel abroad for cross-cultural experience</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer or work experience abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter-term academic experience abroad (e.g. GIEU)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal study abroad for a term or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under half of alumni from the last decade who responded to our survey reported that they had some experience traveling or studying abroad (again defined as outside the U.S. and Canada). About one alumnus out of seven participated in a study-abroad experience that lasted for an academic term or more, while 5% reported study abroad that lasted for a shorter period than an academic term. Volunteering or working abroad was reported by 8% of alumni. About one in ten indicated they went abroad outside of a study-abroad or a work setting, with the primary purpose of having a cross-cultural or educational experience (in contrast to travel for pure recreation). Alumni were asked about recreational travel abroad as well, and about 41% did this while a University of Michigan student. Most of the alumni respondents who reported time spent abroad did so in countries where English is not the primary language (figure below).
Did you have any of the following types of experiences in a foreign country while enrolled at U-M? (alumni; n=3097)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>% who participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any experience abroad</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in a non-English speaking country</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel abroad for recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in a non-English speaking country</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal study abroad for a term or more</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other travel abroad for cross-cultural experience</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer or work experience abroad</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter-term academic experience abroad (e.g. QIEU)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter-term academic experience abroad (e.g. QIEU)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Western Europe was the most common destination for our alumni survey respondents (nearly two-thirds), while Eastern Europe was visited by a much smaller number (16%). Mexico and Central America were relatively popular, with one-third of the travelers reported having visited that region. Asia was a destination for 16% of the alumni who reported travel and study abroad.

Based on the survey results, we find that international experiences between 2008 senior respondents and alumni cohort respondents are comparable in totals, but that based on this sample, their levels of international activities appear to be on the rise. Longer academic experiences (one term or more) seem to be increasingly common, as are international volunteering activities, possibly reflecting the evolving goals of today’s students and the available opportunities at the University of Michigan.

7.2.2 Example Activities

The University of Michigan has numerous strengths upon which to build its future internationalization efforts. These strengths include an already globally-engaged faculty, the ability to recruit and retain world-class scholars, professional schools with strong international components, a well-prepared and determined student body, a breadth of curricular and co-curricular programs, extensive student support services, a large international student and scholar population, the availability of many off-campus learning programs—both in the U.S. and abroad, and the commitment of the academic units and University leadership to become a premier global university. Example activities that currently promote international engagement are described below.

- Established within the College of LSA in the early 1990’s, the International Institute (II) develops and supports international teaching, research, and public affairs programming that helps students and faculty members see the world through a global lens. The institute currently houses 18 centers and programs focused on specific world regions and global themes, which bring together faculty experts from across the University community. Each year, the institute and its centers distribute more than $3 million to University faculty members and students, which includes funds for nearly 300 grants for international study and research.

- Established in 1946, the U.S. Fulbright Program aims to increase mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States and other countries through the exchange of persons, knowledge, and skills. The program provides funding for one academic year of study or research abroad, to be conducted after graduation. Award recipients undertake self-designed programs in disciplines ranging from social sciences, business, communication, and performing arts to physical sciences, engineering, and education. In the past 63 years, over 100,000 students from the U.S. have benefited from this experience. In 2008 the University of Michigan received the greatest number of Fulbright awards out of all participating research institutions. The Fulbright competition is administered through the University’s International Institute.

- The Engineering Study Abroad office is piloting software for managing information about education abroad. StudioAbroad is a web-based system that includes online student program searches, electronic applications, and tracking. The system is integrated with the University’s IT environment and combines existing data from the University’s information system with self-reported data that are not currently collected (e.g. health, travel, and insurance information needed for education abroad programs). The software will also be used to deliver pre-departure modules; launch program evaluations; maintain a shared electronic record for course approvals, advising correspondence, international internships, volunteer work, and research experiences; and to facilitate travel and emergency communications. Campus-wide application of this system is under review.
Established in 2002 and recently moved into the College of LSA, the Global Intercultural Experience for Undergraduates (GIEU) supports global educational projects that expand learning beyond traditional classroom boundaries by creating new opportunities for short-term (three or four week) intercultural study of a global nature at field sites. These intercultural endeavors are selected from proposals submitted by faculty members to cover project costs. Grants for faculty members and students are used to promote intercultural learning across campus and to support ongoing intercultural education and intellectual development of undergraduates.

The Global Scholars Program (GSP) is an academic living-learning community that provides sophomore, junior, and senior students the opportunity to engage with both U.S. and international students on campus and around the world. All GSP students, who are appointed as global scholars, are required to live together in the same residence hall, allowing them to learn from one another both academically and socially. Global scholars also have a significant role in planning and coordinating intercultural programs, with the support of their resident advisors. Required courses prepare students to address pressing global issues with diplomacy, to commit themselves to social justice, and to expand their intercultural awareness. To fulfill the academic requirement of GSP, students can choose between an Intergroup Dialogue or Global Understanding course. In addition to coursework, students attend monthly academic lectures and participate in collaborative group projects. These co-curricular program requirements allow students from a variety of majors to participate in a living-learning community that emphasizes interdisciplinarity. In 2010 GSP will move into the new North Quad Academic and Residential Complex.

The Program on Intergroup Relations (PIR) is a social justice education program that offers Intergroup Dialogues courses that are structured to help students explore social group identity, conflict, community, and social justice. The intergroup dialogues involve multiple identity groups, including those defined by national origin. Trained student facilitators—one from each represented identity group—encourage dialogue rather than debate, as participants explore similarities and differences among and across groups, and strive toward building a multicultural and democratic community.

The International Internship and Service-Learning Program is a program for students with internships or service-learning commitments abroad who will be returning to campus after the overseas experience. It brings together small groups of students to consider goals in going abroad, receive assistance in finding programs and funding, and to attend preparatory workshops before traveling. In addition, participating students share experiences while abroad and advise other students when they return the following year.

The International Institute (II) offers support to faculty members and students for research and coursework abroad through the Experiential Learning Fund and Individual Fellowships. The II’s Experiential Learning Fund supports faculty-led group travel for students that incorporate an education abroad experiential component into an ongoing course, group internship, or other academic program. Funded proposals promote student learning through participation in course-related activities outside the classroom and give students an opportunity to acquire and use insights about the society in which the program (or its overseas component) takes place. The II’s Individual Fellowship program supports students, regardless of citizenship, who are enrolled in a degree program and who wish to participate in internships or conduct research abroad. Funding is available for internships in private companies, government agencies, international organizations, or non-governmental organizations. The award also provides support for preliminary visits to prospective overseas dissertation sites by graduate students who are planning doctoral research on topics in area and international studies.

The Multidisciplinary Action Project (MAP) of the Ross School of Business represents an innovative approach to research and theory in real-world settings throughout the U.S. and the world. Offered in entrepreneurially focused assignments during the final seven weeks of students first year, MAP builds on the core curriculum by enabling students to work in teams on select in-company projects where they apply theory to help companies overcome challenges and to affect meaningful change in a workplace. Each MAP assignment involves cross-functional teams that work with a cross-disciplinary team of faculty members. Teams also work closely with a consultant on team effectiveness and project management, as well as with host company executives.

Beginning in 2010, all undergraduate students in the School of Art & Design will be required to complete an international experience. This change builds on an existing requirement for graduate students. Students can fulfill the requirement through credit for study abroad, research abroad, internship abroad, volunteering abroad, or through approved non-credit activity abroad. A three-week experience involving systematic reflection is the minimum requirement, and travel grants are available to all students in good academic standing. International students are exempt from the requirement.

The Center for Global Health was formally established in January 2009. The center builds upon an extensive portfolio of cross-disciplinary work of University faculty members to foster innovative ideas and applications for global health. The Certificate in Global Health, which offers a formalized set of courses and also support for field experiences, is dedicated to "engaging [students] in analysis and action toward understanding and improving how globalization affects human well-being." The Program in International Health takes a complemen-
tary approach to the study of relationships between developing and industrialized countries. A capstone project includes an internship in a developing country. Established in 2005, the Global Health Research and Training Initiative offers travel fellowships for students, faculty seed grants, and public presentations on campus. The initiative engages undergraduate and graduate students in multidisciplinary global health research, encourages innovative research collaborations across the University, and supports research and training partnerships with institutions in low- and middle-income countries.

- The Center for International and Comparative Studies provides a not-for-credit seminar for master’s and doctoral students intending to pursue field-based research outside the United States. The Graduate Seminar on Global Transformations offers students the opportunity to develop thesis projects, pre-dissertation proposals, and dissertation prospectuses with their peers in an interdisciplinary setting. The seminar increases students’ capacity for understanding research designs and systems of evidence in other professions and disciplines, examines ethics and values in the development and conduct of cross-cultural and cross-national research, encourages high-level critical discussion of methodology and epistemology, and exposes students to different qualities and characteristics of data in international research.

- The College of Engineering’s International Buddy Program acclimatizes incoming international students to their surroundings, allowing them to integrate into the University environment more rapidly, and provides the opportunity to develop a more global perspective and learn about other cultures. Each international student is paired with a current University student who volunteers to act as an International Buddy.

- Orientation programs for international students and scholars. The International Center (IC) provides a variety of services and programs for prospective, newly admitted, and current international and domestic students, scholars, staff, and faculty. These offerings include educational and social events and workshops throughout the year on topics of interest, such as intercultural adjustment, immigration requirements, study, work, volunteering, and travel abroad. The IC also provides leadership opportunities and contact information for international student associations, and information about immigration-related topics for students and departments.

7.2.3
The China Task Force

Before moving into findings and recommendations, we highlight a recent, complementary University initiative that underscores the depth of the University’s interest in and commitment to internationalization. Following her 2005 trip to China with a delegation of University leaders that included faculty members and administrators, President Mary Sue Coleman commissioned the China Task Force to examine the University’s long-standing connection with China. Although this study has a distinctly regional focus, the University’s many varied connections to universities, organizations, and people in China made it a broad University undertaking.

In 2008 the task force submitted its report on how to strengthen ties with Chinese institutions, according to the University’s culture of mutuality and reciprocal engagement. Some of the key recommendations in the report are:

- Create an Institute for Advanced International Studies.
- Launch an initiative to develop an interdisciplinary international curriculum.
- Enhance international visitor and scholar-in-residence programs.
- Create a University-wide facility in China as a platform for further collaborations.

The complete CTF report is available on the president’s China Task Force website.

The University’s current self-study on internationalization, as described in this chapter, takes a diverse and bold approach, and steers clear of any suggestion that the campus’s commitment is limited to one region. Indeed, while focusing its efforts on China, the China Task Force recognized that Asia is only one of several focus areas, and in many ways the group viewed China as an example of internationalization more broadly conceived. This study echoes several important recommendations made previously in the China Task Force Report.

7.3
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An increasingly interconnected world demands that our students and faculty members recognize and appreciate social and cultural diversity. Developing global awareness calls for campus discussion and, perhaps, enrichment and refinement of the teaching and research goals of the University of Michigan. Operating in today’s global environment requires ever-greater attention to developing the international knowledge and skills both of faculty members and of students in our undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs.
The two accreditation working groups (AWGs) on internationalization, focusing on academic dimensions and on organizational dimensions, were appointed as part of the University of Michigan's Special-Emphasis Study on this topic. This chapter incorporates both the findings and recommendations of these two groups. The recommendations in this chapter should be viewed within the context of the goals of a campus study. As demonstrated by the information in section 7.2 of this chapter, which is only a partial list of activities, the University already offers and supports a rich array of international experiences. In the spirit of the University's commitment to improvement and to become a leader in this field, both the general points of inquiry posed by the AWGs and their recommendations contribute to a broader vision for the future.

This chapter, incorporating and expanding on the outcomes of the two internationalization AWGs, presents recommendations in four categories: curriculum, education abroad, people and partnerships, and organization. Each of these categories includes a brief overview and some context for that particular set of recommendations, a set of questions for reflection, and the recommendations, which have been further divided in some cases.

The questions for reflection arose out of the AWG discussions. They are situated before the recommendations because they provide the larger points of inquiry from which many of the recommendations emerge. In the interest of subsequent review, planning, and action steps, they will serve other individuals and groups by inviting them to consider important topics and issues through further inquiry and exploration.

Since the work of the internationalization AWGs was perceived as a visioning activity, their reports mark the first step in a strategic planning process that will lead to change. The content of this chapter represents a second step that adds conversations with various leadership groups and others inside the University. We end with a set of recommendations that focus on the opportunity and need to coordinate and strengthen centralized activities and services in support of internationalization, within the framework of a decentralized institution.

### 7.3.1 The Curriculum

Students graduating from the University of Michigan should be able to succeed in a global environment as leaders, as workers, and as citizens. This requires that they be able to situate, understand, and think critically about global challenges and important international problems. They should also be able to work in settings that are linguistically, culturally, economically, and politically diverse. Thus, the University should offer a curriculum that provides and expands opportunities for all students to be exposed to and engage in international experiences and learning opportunities. Our students should leave the University with a considerable level of knowledge, insight, and experience pertaining to the broader world community.

Despite the widespread and growing use of English throughout the world, the prospects for success and advancement in many professions are greatly enhanced by the knowledge of a language other than English. In addition the United States has far too few citizens capable of working in a language other than English. This reduces our country's overall effectiveness in such fields as international business and commerce, international relations and diplomacy, media relations and journalism, and many others. Knowledge of one or more foreign languages broadens a person's outlook, perspective, and horizon, enhancing his or her prospects for a successful and satisfying life in a society that is increasingly diverse and in a world that is increasingly interdependent. Indeed, more than two-thirds of the 2008 graduating seniors and the alumni who were surveyed in 2009 reported that they had studied a foreign language at the University on average just under two academic years. For all of these reasons, the University should reject the view that the widespread use of English around the world means that knowledge of a foreign language has become less important. Rather, the University should continue to encourage language learning and ensure that students have the broadest possible array of opportunities to study and achieve proficiency in one or more languages other than English, including less- and least-commonly-taught languages.

Another key issue that needs to be addressed for students is course and credit pre-approval for international education. The current system provides few guarantees to our students and their parents. Other universities have resolved this issue by allowing students to take academic classes abroad to "complete" college requirements, and by aligning study abroad with departmental credit. The University should develop an efficient and transparent system for pre-approval of credit, as well as comprehensive articulation tables for courses taken abroad, which would take this uncertainty and worry out of education abroad and thereby increase the rate of participation.
Questions for Reflection

- Should the University require a minimum amount of coursework with international content for graduation? What level of internationally-themed coursework should be considered the minimum necessary to prepare students for global engagement?
- How should the University implement a minimum level of international engagement for students who are not necessarily interested in international issues, and also provide a robust set of classes and co-curricular activities for students with a strong interest in international issues? Additionally, what are the best ways to increase student appreciation of the importance of learning about international challenges and about other societies and cultures?
- In what ways, and to what degree, should the University engage the local community in its internationalization efforts? For example, can initiatives on campus to enrich the curriculum provide new opportunities for collaboration and local educational systems in order to deepen the exposure of pre-collegiate students to international perspectives and concerns?
- How ambitious should the University be in working to increase the proportion of students, particularly undergraduates, who achieve or at least approach proficiency in a language other than English? What are ambitious, yet realistic, goals and expectations in this regard?
- How can the University ensure high-quality, on-campus instruction at an acceptable cost in low-enrollment, less- and least-commonly-taught languages? In what ways, if any, are the challenges in this regard different than those associated with other specialized and advanced courses that have low enrollments, but that are essential for students in a particular field?

Recommendations

Course Offerings

- Develop and offer a broad array of internationally-themed freshman seminars, and encourage (or require) all incoming freshmen to take one of these courses. The purpose of these seminars is not only to impart knowledge about a particular topic or world region, but also to develop among students appreciation for international studies more broadly, including the value of education abroad. Giving students this experience early in their academic careers would encourage them to take fuller advantage of the many opportunities for international learning offered by the University.
- Where possible, include segments on internationalization in introductory courses within specific disciplines—considering, for example, how these disciplines do or do not differ across countries in their curricular content and associated careers for students. In addition to other initiatives, this would encourage students to consider taking more courses with an international focus. Equally important, if not more so, it would enable them to better understand the international significance of their disciplinary studies and to resist an inappropriate distinction between knowledge of other countries and regions on the one hand and disciplinary specialization on the other.
- Require undergraduate students to take at least one course selected from a specified suite of substantive upper-division courses with an international theme. In addition to the possibility of motivating students to take additional courses with an international focus, this would ensure that every student has at least a minimum of exposure to a topic or problem of international significance or to another country or world region.
- Encourage the faculty to identify or develop one or more coherent sets of courses with an international focus, which students would enroll in to fulfill the requirements of a concentration. In particular, an interdisciplinary approach to such internationally-themed, upper-level courses should be encouraged. This will not only guide students in selecting courses that, taken as a group, provide an integrated learning experience, but it would also enable them to more fully connect international learning to their disciplinary specializations.
- Expand opportunities with other universities to share courses with international content—particularly, but not exclusively, with other Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) institutions. This would enable students both at the University of Michigan and at other participating institutions to benefit from their collective faculty resources. The University should also look for opportunities to develop and expand course sharing with partner institutions in other countries.
- Promote and support a research agenda around international education and student learning outcomes. The number of students going abroad for educational purposes is an important measure of campus internationalization. In addition to this "output" measure, important measures that are often not assessed are the impact of those students on the institution upon their return, and what students actually learn while abroad, both inside and outside the classroom. A commitment should be made to measuring these outcomes to place the focus of education abroad not on the numbers exclusively, but also on the learning and development of students and how the global education of students effects the entire campus.
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- Include graduate education when considering and implementing recommendations related to curriculum development. Although many of the preceding recommendations focus on undergraduates, each department, school, and college should be encouraged to develop, implement, and adapt any of these recommendations they find relevant to their graduate programs. It is important that graduate students be knowledgeable about the ways that their fields of study are understood and practiced in other countries and about the possible ramifications of their own research and professional work for other societies.

Language Learning
- Develop curricular and co-curricular programs that help students to appreciate the importance of learning a language other than English and that stimulate interest in an education-abroad experience with a foreign language component. This might include short-term overseas "exposure" programs for freshmen and sophomores on the order of weeks. It might also include expanding and adding the use of foreign languages in on-campus meetings and other activities that involve international students or other native speakers of a language other than English.
- Offer students varied and multiple opportunities to use a foreign language in their coursework and research, including a language-across-the-curriculum (LAC) program. Elements of an LAC program might include history, social science, and professional school courses taught in a language other than English; foreign language discussion sections in some of these same courses; and team-taught courses in which one or more instructors are proficient in another language. Also of value would be a "trailer course" program, in which a language department and a non-language department jointly plan and offer a pair of courses addressing the same subject matter, encouraging students to enroll in both courses during a given semester.
- Continue to offer on-campus instruction in a broad array of less- and least-commonly-taught languages. Particularly important are languages that are important to the research undertaken by faculty members and students and/or that the U.S. government has identified as critical for national needs. This is important despite the low enrollments in some less-commonly-taught language courses, especially in the third- and fourth-year classes that are needed for proficiency. The potential for new collaborations and expanding existing collaborations, such as CIC's CourseShare initiative with other institutions, should be explored as cost-effective approaches.
- Offer a selection of foreign language immersion courses in the summer and provide increased support for students to participate in these programs for languages that are not already taught during the summer.

Infrastructure
- Develop an efficient and transparent system for pre-approval of credit for education abroad. The current process is a barrier to education abroad, as it is cumbersome, time consuming, and provides few guarantees to students and their parents. A system is needed that enables students, staff, and faculty to know before a student goes overseas how courses and credits taken abroad will apply toward graduation requirements. Work should also be done to develop and maintain online comprehensive articulation agreements with partner and peer institutions.
- Assist students in organizing themselves into cohorts that share an interest in a particular international issue, country, or world region. Toward this end, the University should provide support, structure, and resources for activities with an international focus that are planned either by the students themselves or by the University. In some cases, it may be desirable for cohorts to form living-learning communities with an international orientation, such as LSAs Global Scholars Program. By participating in the activities of these cohorts, students can work together over a sustained period to exchange ideas and perspectives and to deepen their understanding of, and their commitment to, those international issues in which they have a particular interest.
- Increase opportunities for international visitors—including scholars, authors, artists, and performers—to visit classes and to supplement their public lectures or performances with Q&A sessions for interested students. This would not only enrich the experience of the visiting scholars, it would also give students direct contact with individuals who may introduce them to different cultural, political, or intellectual perspectives and help them to appreciate the differences and similarities between themselves and people in other societies.

7.3.2 Education Abroad

As other nations emerge as economic powers and our society grows more international, so, too, must a student's education. There is so much to be learned from observing, from interacting, and from listening to people who live and work in different cultures than ours. Two years ago, a bipartisan congressional commission called for 1 million American students to be studying abroad by 2017. The year 2017 has special significance on our campus because it is our bicentennial, and I want the University to be a leader in reaching this study abroad goal. At least 1,800 University of Michigan students take advantage of study abroad pro-
grams annually, and I want us to double that number in the next five years. I am intentionally setting the bar high because I believe this is critical to preparing tomorrow’s students for a more culturally diverse and more cooperative world. We must find ways to make the international study experience more flexible, creative, and affordable. Our future and the future of our nation depend on it.

President Mary Sue Coleman, Five Years Forward: An Address to the University of Michigan Community; November 15, 2007.

According to the University’s 2007 First Year Student Survey, 38% of incoming freshmen indicated that they planned to study abroad at some point during their undergraduate careers. This reflects about a 20% increase in just four years, and this trend shows no sign of declining. To meet the growing demand, it is essential for the University to lower, if not remove, barriers that interfere with students achieving their goal of participating in high quality and affordable overseas learning programs.

One major barrier is lack of easy access to comprehensive information about overseas programs and related financial support. Currently, students must visit a number of offices in various locations on campus to collect information and to get answers to their questions. With today’s technology, the University could eliminate this barrier quite easily by investing in software that effectively houses, organizes, and makes readily available all education abroad information in one interactive web environment. Such a resource would put students in contact electronically with education abroad advisors; enable them to apply for programs online; and provide necessary information about passports, visas, living expenses, travel arrangements, health insurance, safety issues, credit transfer procedures, and pre-departure as well as re-entry programs. Examples of such web portals elsewhere are Duke University, the University of Minnesota, and many others.

The University should increase the number of students having an education abroad experience. Toward this end, the University should develop activities that increase students’ interest in having such experiences and should identify and remove any factors that discourage students from going abroad. As part of this effort, the University should also increase the range, type, and location of the education abroad opportunities it offers. These education abroad experiences are likely to be most beneficial if they have strong connections to the students’ coursework and if they are available early in the student experience.

Questions for Reflection

- Should there be a campus-wide education abroad office? If so, what concerns related to education abroad should be administered centrally and assigned to this office? Alternatively, what matters related to education abroad are best dealt with at the level of the schools, colleges, and other academic units?
- What is the appropriate balance of centralization and decentralization in the development and administration of education abroad programs?

Recommendations

Offerings

- Develop and expand short-term education abroad opportunities for first-year and second-year students to increase their interest in including a fuller overseas experience in their programs of study at the University. This would help students to think about and plan for an education abroad experience early in their academic careers. It would also encourage them to think about international aspects of their chosen field of study and to consider taking more courses with international content.
- Expand and diversify the range, location, and type of education abroad opportunities for students. This includes developing more opportunities to study abroad in non-traditional settings and creating programs that appeal to students with a broad range of disciplinary, professional, and area interests. The Global Intercultural Experience for Undergraduates (GIEU) program, and the International Internships and Service Learning Programs and Experiential Learning Fund of the International Institute are examples of innovations that expand the range of education abroad opportunities.
- Encourage undergraduate students to participate in education abroad programs that maximize their interaction with educators from other countries, including, but not limited to, attending an overseas university and taking classes with the instructors and students of that university. Education abroad experiences that include significant and regular interaction with classmates and professors from another country would also increase the likelihood of continuing international relationships.
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- Promote undergraduate student participation in education abroad programs that involve the use of a foreign language in ways that help them to achieve foreign language proficiency. Toward this end, the University should expand on-campus activities that motivate students to enroll in overseas programs in non-English speaking areas, and that help to prepare them. Adequate language preparation makes students’ education abroad experiences more satisfying, expands and deepens their opportunities for learning while overseas, and allows them to more fully realize the benefits of an education abroad experience.

- Encourage individual academic units to play an active role in helping to establish, administer, and sustain education abroad programs. This would expand and diversify education abroad opportunities by encouraging programmatic innovation and the development of education abroad opportunities that meet particular and specialized needs. Equally important, it would motivate faculty members and departments to become more involved in the education abroad experiences of their students. To increase and diversify partnerships with overseas institutions could also strengthen the interest and involvement of departments in the overseas study and research of their students.

- Create greater faculty involvement in building interest among and advising students with respect to education abroad experiences. This should include helping students to think about the relevance of education abroad for their programs of study and advising students on matters of curriculum and research while they are abroad and after they return. Not only would this provide a more seamless transition between on-campus and overseas study, it would also help students to make decisions about the opportunities they will find overseas and about ways to incorporate what they have learned into their studies after they return to campus.

- Offer one or more “virtual education abroad” semesters that, in a given semester, would involve offering an integrated suite of classes with a common international thematic or regional focus, some or even all of which would include the use of a foreign language. Completion of a virtual education abroad semester might be noted on the student’s transcript.

Infrastructure

- Establish a system of pre-approval for the courses that students take as part of their education abroad programs. Ensuring that students receive appropriate and anticipated credit upon the completion of an education abroad program, and that study abroad does not lengthen time-to-degree, would increase the number of students seeking a study abroad experience and would greatly improve students’ ability to incorporate an education abroad experience into their academic plans.

- Develop an institutional platform for international project-based learning, in which students explore real-world, community-based problems in small collaborative groups. This would require a coordinating entity that manages partnerships, ensures continuity, evaluates success, and offers logistical and financial support.

- Make financial support for students to participate in overseas programs one of the University’s priorities. Students consistently indicate that cost is the biggest barrier to their participation in an education abroad program. Eliminating or lowering this barrier would dramatically increase student participation in this increasingly necessary educational opportunity. To lower this barrier, the University should examine alternate tuition models, contain the cost of current programs, create new low cost programs, and raise allocate funds to support every student who wants to participate in a University international program and who demonstrates financial need. The University should also look for ways to remove the financial disincentives for out-of-state students who are interested in study abroad to enroll in University sponsored programs, as such disincentives often lead them to enroll in programs at other universities instead.

- Improve the preparation of students for participating in education abroad programs, which would include standardizing pre-departure orientations and risk-management procedures. The University should ensure that students are fully and appropriately informed about all relevant concerns pertaining to their education abroad experience. Both online- and classroom-based orientation sessions should be available.

7.3.4 People and Partnerships

International students, visiting scholars and artists from other countries, and faculty members who come from other countries all contribute significantly to the international character of the University. These individuals bring information, insight, and perspective both from and about other societies and cultures. They represent a valuable, underutilized resource for the University’s efforts to strengthen and expand programs and activities with an international focus. Employing graduate student instructors (GSIs) from other countries in ways that are effective and that address learners’ concerns is particularly important, both to accomplish the University’s instructional mission but also to foster positive student attitudes toward people from other societies and cultures.
Partnerships with overseas universities and other educational institutions deepen the international character of the University of Michigan, as well as facilitate student study and faculty research in other countries. With the production of knowledge in all fields more than ever a worldwide phenomenon, contact with faculty members and students in other countries expands learning opportunities, broadens intellectual horizons, and helps students to contextualize the information and insights to which they are exposed. The University has established study abroad agreements with many institutions around the world. More noteworthy, however, are the partnerships based on cooperation and collaboration that the University has developed with major overseas educational institutions. For example, the University has established two joint institutes in China, the University of Michigan-Peking University Joint Institute for Interdisciplinary Humanities and Social Sciences and the University of Michigan-Shanghai Jiao Tong University Joint Institute. These programs and others like them serve as international platforms for research and training that are open to undergraduate and graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and faculty members.

All the University's interactions with internationals and with international partnerships should be guided by the principles of reciprocity and mutual value, of maintaining academic quality and scientific and ethical integrity, and of the projection and protection of the University of Michigan brand. These criteria should also govern the University's response to invitations to establish a branch campus, a degree-granting program, or project-based experiences in other countries.

**Questions for Reflection**

- How can the University make information about international visitors and international students more widely and readily available, so that they may be identified and invited to participate in programs and activities that increase interaction with other members of the campus community? What other uses might be made of a database constructed and maintained for this purpose?
- Does the University currently provide adequate support services for international students and visiting scholars? What would contribute to giving international students a more satisfying and productive experience at the University of Michigan?
- How should the University think about partnerships with non-peer institutions in other countries? Are there some countries or world regions in which such partnerships might undermine the University of Michigan brand?
- How should the University think about partnerships that enhance research and academic capacity at universities in countries that are important economic competitors of the United States?
- What is the role of project-based international experiences?

**Recommendations**

**Interaction with Internationals**

- **Increase and expand opportunities for international scholars and artists to visit campus** and increase and expand opportunities for these visitors to interact with the broader campus community, especially with undergraduate students, during their time at the University. Particularly useful in this regard would be in-class presentations and/or discussions, as well as other meetings attended by students who might not otherwise have an opportunity to interact with international visitors. Students who have frequent opportunities to interact with people from other countries are likely to develop a deeper global interest and understanding, and at the same time the international visitors will have a richer experience at the University and a better sense of the importance of their visits. More generally, beyond the benefits to individual students and visitors, activities that expand opportunities for interaction with visiting scholars and artists from other countries will help create a more robust international community on campus.

- **Develop new support services and learning opportunities for international visiting scholars.** Like international students, international scholars and employees need more opportunities and planned programs to become involved and integrated into campus life. Programs such as a campus-wide research forum, a scholar-in-residence program, and specially designed faculty development programs would prove beneficial for these individuals and the campus community as a whole.

- **Encourage and support extracurricular and classroom activities that increase interaction between international students and other students.** As described with respect to international visitors, this interaction would broaden the perspective and horizons of our students from the U.S. and give international students additional opportunities to meet others and deepen their ties to the University. This would also reduce the need for international students to depend so heavily, and sometimes almost exclusively, on their own ethnic or national communities for campus involvement and life beyond the classroom. Efforts to increase interaction between international students and other students at the University should not be limited to periodic meetings.
of an ad hoc nature. The University should sponsor and support groups and cohorts that bring international and other students together for sustained activity relating to problems or issues in which they share an interest. The University offers an ideal setting for such exchanges, which would expand the “bridging” social capital of all participants and increase their appreciation of other cultures.

- Develop opportunities to benefit more fully from the knowledge and experience of the University’s international faculty members, beyond that associated with their academic specializations. International faculty members bring a valuable cross-cultural dimension to the campus, even if their academic or research interests do not focus on international issues or are associated with language departments. To explore ways to capitalize on this asset, the University might organize meetings with interested international faculty members to discuss whether and how members of the University community coming from other countries could more fully share their experiences and perspectives with others at the University and could contribute more fully to its internationalization efforts. It may be appropriate for some of these efforts to include University staff members as well.

- Take steps to address the difficulties that are associated with the use of international Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). These difficulties may result from English language limitations, differing teaching styles, or a lack of sensitivity on the part of the students being instructed. Such steps might include a more thorough orientation for international GSIs, at which topics such as undergraduate student expectations and the teaching styles familiar to them receive attention. Some of this enriched orientation might be organized centrally rather than being left to the GSIs’ departments. The University should also explore ways to foster among our students greater sensitivity to the challenges faced by GSIs who are unfamiliar with American higher education, and to encourage students to reflect on the ways their own attitudes can help to make the teaching experiences of international GSIs a positive, value-added learning opportunity.

International Partnerships

- Expand and promote diversity in international partnerships with respect to location, type of partnering institutions, type of collaborative activities, and the innovative use of new technologies. The University should not limit its partnering activities to familiar regions and well-established institutions, but should include partnerships for mutually beneficial engagement and exchange throughout the world. In particular, the University should increase its programs and partnerships in developing countries.

- Assess and exploit opportunities for cooperation with other U.S. universities, including Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) universities, in the development and administration of international partnerships. Such cooperation would increase the range of possible international partnerships, permitting activities and exchanges beyond the capacity of a single U.S. university.

- Make greater use of information technology and communications innovations in the University’s international partnerships to deepen and sustain interaction with faculty members and students at overseas partner institutions. Among other things, new technologies expand the possibilities for curriculum enrichment through course sharing, distance-learning, and international team-taught instruction.

- Take fuller advantage of the University’s international partnerships to organize major and well-publicized on-campus scholarly conferences and public affairs programs. This would increase the national and international visibility of the University and at the same time enable the University community and the constituencies it serves to benefit more fully from connections with scholars and institutions in other countries.

- Provide seed money for research or pilot projects involving collaboration with overseas partner institutions. In allocating such funds, beyond scholarly merit the University should consider the potential for subsequent external funding and for additional collaborative opportunities with the partner universities.

- Create a database of the University’s currently active (and perhaps inactive) international partnerships and develop criteria for assessing the benefits and costs of these associations. Understanding the scope and value of existing partnerships would better position the University to make long-term, strategic plans in this area and help to ensure that the University’s international partnerships are of the highest quality.

- Coordinate centrally the University’s processes for reviewing, approving, and managing international agreements. Information and procedures related to all international agreements, such as Memoranda of Understanding, should be available in one place to guide academic units in creating them, and to provide all entities on campus with information about the number and scope of all active agreements at the University. This would also enable the University to be strategic in forming international agreements and ensuring that international agreements are mutually beneficial.
7.3.5
The Organization

As noted in many places in this report, the University of Michigan has a strong and successful tradition of decentralization. This practice has been important in fostering effective program development and administration, and has provided the latitude needed for innovation. It is important to recognize and continue to capitalize on this tradition. However, it is essential that a university as large and complex as the University of Michigan, and one with as many international programs, has well-functioning mechanisms in place to broadly communicate and share information about its internationally-themed activities. It is also important to have administrative arrangements that coordinate activities, thereby minimizing undesirable duplication; that provide access to common policies; and that facilitate collaborations to expand or enrich international activities and programs.

A new University-wide operation charged and supported to enable and enhance international engagement, located in a prominent facility that houses units dedicated to international experiences and collaborations, would provide heightened visibility, both on campus and beyond, for the University's commitment to the global dimension of its teaching, research, and service missions. Such an operation would better serve students with international interests, and would significantly increase opportunities for interaction among faculty members, students, and visitors involved in international activities and programs. A central facility could also provide space for international visitors, who are currently scattered in offices across campus with minimal interaction, as well as host cultural experiences through the offering of gatherings and performances. Additionally, the cultural dimensions of an international center would present a novel opportunity for outreach to the citizens of the state of Michigan, offering education about and exposure to international societies and cultures. The top ten institutions ranked by the Institute of International Education, which includes the University of Michigan, typically have a coordinating international office headed by a dean, vice-chancellor or vice-provost who oversees international activities. In a growing number of cases, this central office is housed in a dedicated facility to reflect the commitment to international experiences, such as UNC/Chapel Hills FedEx Global Education Center and Michigan State University's International Center (complemented by campus-wide web portals). Many other schools are in the process of reorganizing their international structures. A new center at the University of Michigan (possibly called the Center for Global Engagement) would demonstrate a commitment to our students, faculty, and staff, and would provide a path to nationally and internationally recognized leadership in internationalization.

Increased support for activities and programs that strengthen the University's international character should be among the top priorities of the University's development efforts. Our alumni and friends from and/or living in other countries are an important source of support for the University and the many constituents it serves. Their involvement could be significantly enhanced.

Questions for Reflection

- Would the creation of a central facility dedicated to international experiences be consistent with the decentralization that characterizes the University? Is there any danger that this would reduce the interest or involvement of schools and colleges in international studies and programs?
- Which units with an international focus should be brought together in a single physical space? Should a central facility dedicated to international engagement be the home of both academic and administrative units? Would the creation of a central facility dedicated to international experiences isolate the units it houses? Would it become an unused "second home" for University faculty members and graduate students with international interests?
- What are the roles of the International Institute and the International Center, as well as unit-based programs (such as LSA's Office of International Programs or the International Programs in Engineering)?
- How can we best develop a virtual environment (web portal) on internationalization that supports our students, faculty, and staff? Where will this web portal be housed? Who should administer and maintain it?
- Should there be any change in the responsibilities, staff, and resources of the vice provost for international affairs?
- The University's schools, colleges, and departments have widely differing priorities and needs for development, and also differing kinds of alumni and friends in other countries. Given these circumstances, how can we cooperate more fully yet avoid competition in the area of development? Will increased attention to development efforts that strengthen the international character of the University--both in general and when working with alumni and friends in other countries--require any changes in the ways that the University currently organizes development and alumni relations?

*In fall 2009, LSA's OIP merged with the GIEU program into the Center for Global and Intercultural Study (CGIS).*
Recommendations

Click and Mortar

- Establish a well-located facility that houses units and programs with an international focus. Such a facility would showcase and give prominence to the importance the University attaches to its international activities and the pride it takes in the high quality and extensive character of these activities. Moreover, a dedicated space centered on international programs would permit deeper and more regular interaction among faculty members and students with international interests, as well as with and among visiting international scholars and artists. Such interaction would not only enrich the international dimension of campus life, but would also encourage and facilitate conversations that can lead to programmatic innovations and to collaborations that transcend disciplinary boundaries and regional specializations. A campus facility would foster communication and collaboration among the schools and colleges, limit duplication of effort, create organizational efficiencies, and better utilize resources.

- Offer internationally-themed outreach and public affairs programs that are dedicated to international experiences. These would serve and deepen engagement with campus communities but also with other constituents of the state and nation. Such activities would broaden the role and value of a centralized international facility.

- Continue to develop living-learning spaces and integrate international themes into existing ones, where applicable. While living-learning spaces with an international component exist on campus today, the University should do more to engage students in this type of environment with internationally-focused themes and topics. Today’s rapidly evolving communication and technology environments, including social networking, allows further expansion of these efforts through the creation of Internet-based international spaces.

- Create a campus-wide interactive web environment related to global engagement. The University needs a campus-wide international web portal, Michigan International, to (1) illustrate and promote the broad array of educational programs, activities, and events that define and support the University’s global community; (2) to inform students of all education abroad opportunities that the University offers (e.g., study, research, internships, and service-learning), as well as funding options; and (3) to provide unified information and publicity regarding the value and importance of international education at the University and the extent of its global engagement and initiatives. We envision that school, college, and central administrative international offices would be linked to this web portal, including campus-wide software for education abroad. Examples of successful web portals elsewhere include Stanford’s Global Gateway and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign’s Illinois International.

Support

- Centrally coordinate procedures for safety, security, and emergencies, as well as shared databases of contact information for all students and all education abroad programs. Ensuring the safety and wellbeing of students, faculty, and staff while abroad on University-related programs and activities is of the highest importance. Therefore, University-wide policies and procedures related to health, safety, and security must be designed, implemented, and enforced for the benefit of those involved in overseas activities, and for the institution as a whole. In the event of a crisis abroad, an emergency team and well-defined procedures must be in place in order for us to act quickly on the best information available, and to monitor the situation as it unfolds.

- Create standard processes, procedures, policies, and support services for education abroad (study, research, internships, and service learning). It would be beneficial to students and to staff and faculty members if certain operational functions that cut across the University were handled centrally. This would provide a great service to students by simplifying their search for the right overseas program, and to faculty members, academic units, and college/school international education offices by enabling them to focus more on academic matters and less on logistical/administrative matters. For example, the University’s international web portal, travel policies, emergency procedures, pre-departure and re-entry programs, student peer advising, data collection, and assessment of student learning would benefit from central coordination.

Alumni and Friends

- Mobilize alumni and friends in other countries for purposes of development, not only for fund-raising but also to increase international awareness of and appreciation for the University of Michigan. In many parts of the world, the University is not as well known and respected as it could be, or as it is, by comparison, in the U.S. Continued engagement beyond academics enables overseas alumni and friends to remain connected to the University and to assist in building its international visibility and reputation. It also opens or expands channels of communication that allow the University to stay more fully informed about regional and global trends and opportunities, including new international partnerships and fundraising. The University has made significant progress in undertaking these efforts with respect to alumni and friends in China, and to a lesser extent in
some other countries in East Asia. It lags with respect to other world regions, however, and needs to engage more fully with alumni and friends in these areas as well.

- **Leverage the knowledge and contacts of international alumni and friends.** In establishing and maintaining ties to alumni and friends in other countries, and also in defining objectives and identifying opportunities for development and other programs in certain countries, the University should take advantage of the deep knowledge and broad contacts of the University’s international faculty and its area studies centers. The University faculty members who are affiliated with these centers represent most or all the University faculty members who have teaching or research interests in the relevant country or world region. In the International Institute’s Center for Chinese Studies, personnel in development and alumni relations are already working productively in this capacity, and their work could be used as a model for other area centers. Such increased efforts could require additional dedicated staff in alumni relations, development, and/or the area studies centers.

- **Work with overseas alumni and friends beyond country-specific projects.** Many of the University’s friends in other countries have an interest in global themes and international problems of more general relevance, such as international human rights, economic development, environmental change, democratic governance, poverty reduction, and health care delivery. The University needs to give such themes a prominent place in conversations with, and programs organized for, alumni and friends in other countries. It also needs to find ways to foster and coordinate conversations among groups of alumni and friends who share an interest in a particular global theme or issue to which the University also wishes to devote greater attention—despite the fact that they live in various countries. Centers and institutes with an international thematic focus, such as the area centers that are housed in the International Institute, could assist in identifying and shaping such thematic international development efforts.

### 7.4 KEY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

#### 7.4.1 Centralized Support to Benefit a Decentralized Community

Perhaps the biggest barrier to implementing many recommendations in this chapter and advancing the University’s vision for the future is also our greatest strength: decentralization. In the University’s campus culture, decentralization promotes academic excellence and innovation. As a result, academic aspects of international education will and should continue to originate in the schools and colleges. However, it also appears that an openness exists among many campus groups for a greater degree of central infrastructure that will foster communication and collaboration among our programs, that eliminates redundancies and inconsistencies, that conserves increasingly stressed resources, that enhances the quality of student services and programs, and enables the schools and colleges to focus their energies on academic issues. A more central approach to internationalization would ultimately support the diversity of offerings and activities that are the hallmark of an otherwise decentralized institution.

Many of the recommendations in this report focus on units and disciplinary activities. Our organizational culture has time and again demonstrated that our decentralized structure is optimally suited for a diverse approach to change. However, today’s lack of coordination and cooperation limits the impact and efficiency of the University’s enhanced vision for internationalization, as envisioned in this study. Below is a list of key recommendations that, if implemented, would significantly help to address the disadvantages of our decentralized environment, but in ways that respect and do not dampen in any way its benefits.

The main recommendations for centralized action are:

1. **Create a Center for Global Engagement** with a team of professionals to coordinate support systems and processes for education abroad, as well as to build, promote, and institutionalize campus-wide international programs and activities. The center would be headed by the vice provost for international affairs (expanded from today’s role), supported by a global engagement council made up of faculty and staff members.

2. **Create a centrally-supported international web portal** that would include interactive software that provides comprehensive and up-to-date information for students interested in education abroad, as well as a web magazine format for publicizing individual experiences and highlights, documenting international research activities and listing relevant campus events. In addition to information sharing for campus constituents, this web portal would make our commitment to internationalization to the outside world more visible.
3. **Remove cost barriers to education abroad** for both in-state and out-of-state students in a variety of ways (e.g., through alternate tuition models, grants, scholarships, and fellowships), and increase the number of short- and long-term international offerings through new University partnerships, both educationally- and project-based.

4. **Leverage our international cohorts.** Capitalize on the presence of international students and faculty members on campus and the commitment of our international alumni, and attract more international visitors to campus through University fellowships and hosting activities. Adding an international "backflow" to campus would complement our efforts toward our students' off-campus experiences.

### 7.4.2 Measurement, Tracking, and Accountability

The findings and recommendations in this chapter form an enhanced vision for the University's commitment to internationalization. As we look ahead to the process of reviewing, planning for, and implementing these recommendations, it is important to reflect on the ways in which the University will measure not only its progress in this regard, but also to consider the ways in which we will measure the degree to which we are achieving our goals.

Measuring the success of internationalization efforts and drawing comparisons with other institutions is a complicated but critical matter. One ready measure, which the U.S. News & World Report has used in its rankings, is the number and proportion of students and faculty members at the University whose citizenship is outside the U.S. While highly ranked overall with respect to international activities, the University of Michigan scores in the lower range for this particular measure, showing that considerable progress can be made here (see 2008 World's Best Colleges and Universities). Increasing the number of international citizens in the University community would improve our international reputation and expand our growing international alumni network.

However, assessment of success should have a much broader base than the national origin of students and faculty members, and a first attempt at measures of internationalization is offered below. Ultimately the range and nature of our offerings, the make-up of the University, and our international reputation are measures that will assess the impact of our activities.

Earlier in the report, we described a set of questions that we asked each of the schools and colleges to respond to about their internationalization activities (see Units on Internationalization report). One of the questions was, "What are the measures by which the University of Michigan defines itself now or could further define itself as an internationalized institution?" Drawing directly from these responses, a summary set of measures was created for students, for faculty members and for the University. In each of these main categories, measures were sorted by type. Below is the overall structure for this summary, along with one or two sample measures within each type, representing a widely varied set of both quantitative and qualitative measures. As the University takes the next steps toward the recommendations in our self-study, this list of measures will be a useful tool to assess the progress toward meeting our goals.

### Students

**Incoming Students**
- International students who enroll.
- Students who test out of school/college language requirements (e.g., in LSA).

**University Programs and Practices to Support International Students and Internationalization**
- Funds for international student travel (e.g., to attend an international conference, participate in or undertake international research, or participate in an international service activity).
- Survey results about students' international interests, values, and concerns (e.g., students' ability to participate in international programs).

### Student Accomplishments and Outcomes
- Alumni who obtain positions in international settings or with international organizations.
- Ph.D. students who write their dissertations or produce creative work on international topics.

### Faculty

**Composition of Faculty and Scholars**
- Non-U.S. born faculty members on campus.
- Faculty members who do international research.
- Visiting scholars at the University (either international scholars or scholars with an international focus).
Faculty Activities, Accomplishments, and Honors
- Faculty members who apply for external funding to do international research.
- Faculty presentations for an international audience (e.g., at international conferences, universities, institutes, government entities, or businesses).

Support for Faculty Involvement in International Research or Creative Work, Teaching, and Service
- University funds that support faculty members in their international endeavors, for example to travel internationally, to do research, or to develop and teach courses.
- Efforts to help faculty members identify, articulate, and use competencies for internationalizing the curriculum.

University
History and Mission
- Articulation of critical areas of focus by central administration, and by schools and colleges.

Institutional Rankings and Prominence
- Placement in international rankings of universities (e.g., rankings by institutes).
- Description of key accomplishments in areas of international research, teaching, and outreach/engagement.

Structure & Organization
- International development initiatives.
- Interdisciplinary activities that support or contribute to international scholarship.

Curriculum
- Undergraduate concentrations or minors/specializations with an international focus.
- Foreign language requirements (by school/college or program).

Research and Creative Work
- Research initiatives and creative activities with an international focus (e.g., international populations or international matters).
- Visiting scholar programs open to international scholars.

Academic Resources
- Foreign language collections held in the libraries.
- Information technology resources that enable international communication and collaboration (e.g., classrooms with the necessary technology to enable international communication and collaboration among students and faculty members).

International Partnerships and Agreements
- Formal collaborative programs and partnerships developed with other international institutions.

Other Outreach Activities
- International conferences on international topics or issues, hosted by the University (e.g., to further international collaboration).

Funds for International Initiatives and Activities
- Amount of Title VI and Fulbright-Hayes funds (Federal Department of Postsecondary Education—International Education Programs Service) received by the schools and colleges or academic programs.
- Amount of competitively awarded funds for international activities.

7.5 CONCLUSION

The University of Michigan is already a premier global university. However, we must continue to commit our energy and resources to advance the internationalization of the curriculum, our research, and the campus. The University must continue to build on its ability to compete for the best and brightest students and faculty members from around the country and the world. Through a new commitment to global engagement, the University will provide its students with a wide range of international educational opportunities to prepare them to be global citizens. Our students represent the next generation of leaders, inventors, problem solvers and teachers, and for them to be successful it is essential to understand the interconnectedness of our world. By enabling students, staff, and faculty to work collaboratively with partners across the globe, more informed, creative and incisive contributions will be made to the campus and the world. Therefore, the University must bring the same level of excellence to global engagement as it does to other University-wide initiatives, such as diversity and interdisciplinarity.
Centralized campus strategies are organized under (1) click-and-mortar and (2) people. Click represents the electronic world, and particularly an interactive database and information portal for international experiences. Mortar represents the campus footprint of internationalization, advancing the creation of an academic, service, and cultural center with recognizable international focus. It also focuses on the opportunities and removal of cost barriers for international experiences, both short and long-term, growing the stream of international students, researchers, and visitors to campus; and on leveraging the extensive international character of our alumni.

Embedded within our evolving conversations, as expressed in this report, is a belief that every student who completes a University degree should have at least a minimum of exposure to the international dimensions of his or her field of study, that the University should encourage students to seek more than a minimum level of exposure, and that the University should increase the scope, quality and depth of the opportunities available to students and faculty members seeking to engage more fully with international themes and issues.

Our focus on internationalization should start with our applications process and emphasize "when" rather than "if" our students have international experiences. Early exposure to international people, issues, and cultures, both on and off campus, are key toward a more international University of Michigan. Throughout the curriculum we should emphasize the international dimensions of our education. We are already uniquely positioned to leverage our international students and faculty members, as well as our international alumni and friends, for this purpose.

Some of the observations and perspectives in this report are by necessity general and sometimes bold. Additional work will be needed to determine whether and how each of the recommendations might be implemented. Some of this future work can be undertaken by a presidential or provost-appointed task force on internationalization, comparable to the presidential task force on multidisciplinary learning and team teaching that was established to address issues of implementation associated with interdisciplinarity—the focus of the University's special emphasis study for reaccreditation review in 2000. A campus-wide effort as part of a presidential internationalization initiative that includes educational, research, and engagement elements has great potential to quickly elevate the University of Michigan among the leaders in this important area.