

Taking a Fresh Look at Internationalisation in Higher Education

Exploring the Meaning and Practice of Global Engagement

Robin Middlehurst
John Fielden



This article describes changing concepts of internationalisation and what these mean for institutional strategies and practices. The direction has been towards more integrated strategies, drawing in research, teaching, business and community engagement, and towards more outward-looking strategies where external stakeholders are also involved. Most importantly, strategies are becoming more strategic and intentional, deeper and broader, and with greater attention paid to reciprocal benefits in partnerships, to working together across institutions and countries on global challenges and to ‘learning from the world’ for the benefit of students, research and society at large.

Content	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Changing Perspectives on Internationalisation	2
2.1 Changing Contexts: Internationalisation and Globalisation	3
2.2 Broader and Deeper Frames of Reference for Internationalisation	4
2.3 Complexity of Internationalisation: Values and Dilemmas	6
3. Global Engagement: Emerging Models	8
4. Institutional Choices	11
5. Leadership, Governance and Management of Global Engagement	13
6. Measuring Success	15
7. Conclusion	16

The binding of this supplemental volume enables you to remove each article from the cover and file it according to your needs. Also, for your convenience, all articles have been organised by chapter and subchapter online at www.handbook-internationalisation.com. This article, B 1.1-6, has been assigned to:

Chapter B: Institutional policies and strategies
Subchapter B 1: Policies and strategies

1. Introduction

The internationalisation of higher education at institutional, national and regional levels has continued apace over the last decade, as indicated in successive global surveys undertaken by the International Association of Universities (IAU) since 2003. In its most recent Global Survey published in 2014 (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014), the IAU comments that internationalisation is not only an integral part of a continuous process of change in higher education, but is becoming a central motor of change. Whether this is true in practice for all types of higher education provider may be debated, but it is certainly the case that models and processes of internationalisation remain dynamic, and their meanings, implications and impacts are constantly developing. As the modern facets of internationalisation – and their association with globalisation – have evolved, they have been subject to closer scrutiny, discussion and debate. It is therefore timely to review changing perspectives on internationalisation, emerging models and their strategic and operational implications for institutions and countries.

This paper builds on earlier ones by the authors (Middlehurst 2008, Fielden 2009) and draws on their own and others' research and consultancy in the field of internationalisation. Its focus is on internationalisation developments in higher education in the last 25 years, while acknowledging earlier traditions and experiences of international development in universities and colleges. The paper is aimed at those in institutions with the task of developing strategies and practices to support internationalisation and global engagement; it may also be of wider interest to policy makers concerned with internationalisation at national or regional levels. It begins with a brief conceptual discussion of internationalisation before illustrating models, strategies and operational details with case examples to inform and enhance practice.

2. Changing Perspectives on Internationalisation

Concept that is open to interpretation

While the term 'internationalisation of higher education' is now widely used, it is an umbrella concept that is open to interpretation in different countries, regions and institutions, as the IAU surveys illustrate. The history and trajectory of internationalisation varies across countries and regions and internationalisation approaches at institutional level are typically dependent on a range of factors including mission, external and internal drivers and priorities, levels of autonomy and resources. For example, the history of higher education internationalisation in the US and Europe was associated with significant political developments such as the building of nation states in the nineteenth century, the period of World Wars and the Cold War in the 20th cen-

tury, and subsequent efforts to sustain peace, promote prosperity and build greater understanding between nations (De Wit, Hunter, Howard & Egron-Polak, 2015). At regional and institutional levels, the development of the European Union and its economic, social and political goals, legal instruments and funded programmes has been influential in various stages of internationalisation across Europe and beyond. As Teichler (2008, p. 8) notes,

‘from the 1970s onward, the European Community became the most active political actor in stimulating cross-border mobility of students and reinforcing recognition of study in another European country . . .’.

A number of scholars have sought to analyse and categorise developments in the internationalisation of higher education in order to identify patterns, trends and changes over time. Some of the main themes in recent categorisations are presented below. These may help readers to assess how their institutions are or might be positioned.

**Trends and changes
over time**

2.1 Changing Contexts: Internationalisation and Globalisation

One of the most prominent and pervasive themes in current interpretations of internationalisation is the influence and impact of ‘globalisation’, a phenomenon that extends well beyond higher education. Globalisation – the flow of ideas, trade, finance, people, technologies and resources across borders – has added significant economic and social dimensions and drivers to earlier political and cultural drivers of internationalisation. It has emerged and is aided by rapid technological change offering opportunities for high speed travel, fast information exchange and new channels of communication. Globalisation, in parallel with converging digital technologies, is changing and reconfiguring, blurring and dissolving boundaries between countries, sectors, organisations, cultures and societies, as well as dimensions of time and space. This has profound implications for core higher education activities: research, teaching and service to communities and for higher education’s clients and stakeholders. Hudzik (2011) captures several significant implications for internationalisation too in noting that globalisation:

- Expands the scale and scope of internationalisation, shifting perspectives from international to global;
- increases the complexity, opportunities, challenges and dilemmas in dimensions of internationalisation;
- moves internationalisation from optional to imperative, from periphery to centre stage for institutions and countries; and
- has imposed urgency throughout the world regarding internationalising higher education.

2.2 Broader and Deeper Frames of Reference for Internationalisation

Knight (2003, pp. 2–3), a prominent commentator on internationalisation trends, has described internationalisation of higher education as one of the ways in which countries can respond to the impacts of globalisation. Her definition of internationalisation has been widely adopted by institutions as a guide to designing approaches to internationalisation:

'Internationalisation at the national sector and institutional levels is the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education.' (Knight, 2003, p. 2)

Multiple dimensions of internationalisation

There are a number of features of this definition that illustrate a move from few to multiple dimensions of internationalisation, representing a broadening of the range of activities that should become internationalised and a deepening of the levels at which internationalisation needs to be addressed. For example:

- Internationalisation needs to be broadly aligned in strategy and direction at national and institutional levels;
- internationalisation involves 'a process of integration', bringing strategies, structures, resources and practices together to achieve desired goals; and
- internationalisation needs to be understood holistically in terms of national aims and institutional missions, all the core functions of higher education, all modes of provision and delivery mechanisms across the diversity of higher education providers.

Internationalisation abroad

This conceptual framework and variants of it have sparked many useful developments. It has prompted institutions to pay attention to activities related to 'internationalisation abroad' (staff and student mobility; collaborative projects and partnerships; joint programmes and degrees; overseas campuses and centres) and 'internationalisation at home' (internationalisation of the curriculum, teaching and learning processes, services and extra-curricular activities)¹. It has promoted greater synergies between internationalisation of teaching, research, enterprise and community service; has encouraged mission-driven models of international and global engagement; and has necessitated

¹ See detailed list of activities in Middlehurst 2008, op. cit., Table B 1.1-1-2 and Table B 1.1-1-3, pp. 8–9.

involving all kinds of staff and institutional services in designing and implementing internationalisation strategies.

At national and regional levels, there is also evidence of expanding horizons of internationalisation. The UAE, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia, for example, have all welcomed foreign higher education providers on to their soil, typically with local partners, to boost and enhance higher education capacity and to promote the country as a global player. However, welcoming foreign providers is not universally popular as India's position reveals, and indeed, an early welcome in some countries is now shifting, as in China, as domestic provision expands and develops in range and quality. The concept of 'educational hubs' (Knight 2010, pp. 20–21) has emerged, with different rationales including international student recruitment (student hub), developing skilled labour for local and regional needs (education and training hub), and increasing regional economic competitiveness through activities associated with being a knowledge and innovation hub.

In the US, extensive work has been undertaken by NAFSA, the Association of International Educators (see Hudzik, 2011) and by the American Council on Education (ACE) to promote the concept and practice of *Comprehensive Internationalization* (CI) through guidance and knowledge resources (<http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>).

'Comprehensive internationalization is a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise. It is essential that it be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. It is an institutional imperative, not just a desirable possibility.

Comprehensive internationalization not only impacts all of campus life but the institution's external frames of reference, partnerships and relations. The global reconfiguration of economies, systems of trade, research, and communication, and the impact of global forces on local life, dramatically expand the need for comprehensive internationalization and the motivation and purposes driving it.' (Hudzik, 2011, p. 6)

There is much in common with Knight's definition, both examples illustrating the scale, scope and depth of the internationalisation effort. Important emphasis in CI is also placed on institutional commitment to action and to embedding internationalisation in institutional ethos and values, thereby locating responsibility for internationalisation firmly at leadership, management and governance levels. This theme is also picked up in the large-scale study of internationalisation in

higher education recently published by the European Parliament (see De Wit et al., 2015). The new definition of internationalisation that emerged from this research emphasises institutional commitment (and intentionality) to the process of internationalisation and a clear focus on the intended outcomes of internationalisation: enhancing quality and contributing to society, both at the heart of higher education's core purposes.

Internationalization is 'the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society.*' (De Wit et al., 2015, p. 29)

2.3 Complexity of Internationalisation: Values and Dilemmas

Means to meet these multiple objectives

With globalisation has come an increase in demand for higher education and research to support knowledge economies, as well as a need to build higher education capacity. Both political drivers to maintain and expand national and regional influence, and economic drivers to enhance local, regional and national competitiveness in the global economy, place significant expectations on the contributions of higher education to the global positioning of countries and regions. At the same time, institutions are also expected to contribute to improving the local labour force to enable local economic competitiveness in a global marketplace. Higher education also has its own competitive drivers through rankings and league tables that position institutions in a marketplace of academic prestige and reputational advantage. Global connectivity has also fuelled opportunities for collaboration between institutions on a wider, global scale with benefits and challenges for research, education, enterprise, and community service. In parallel, such opportunities require expanded cross-cultural knowledge and understanding given the potential range of global contacts and relationships. Internationalisation, as a means to meet these multiple objectives, is growing in complexity and has thrown up a number of strategic dilemmas, for example:

- Balancing local and global needs and aspirations;
- sustaining competitive and collaborative dimensions;
- pressures for homogeneity in parallel with diversity and heterogeneity;
- weighing up costs versus benefits and levels of investment;
- developing multiple or focused partnerships; and
- prioritising certain regions or going for multi-lateral engagement.

Entwined with strategic dilemmas, internationalisation today also brings to the fore potential conflicts of values. These take many different forms, for example:

- A shift from freely offered academic co-operation and exchange towards fee-based services and income generation targets;
- unequal access to international opportunities for education and research for the majority of students;
- movement of talent and intellectual assets from poorer and developing countries to developed countries;
- challenges to traditional and positive values of mutual understanding and reciprocal gain from internationalisation; new associations with negative values of exploitation, inequality and brain drain; and
- clashes of value systems: religious, economic, political and social, raising issues in relation to institutional autonomy and academic freedom, and posing challenges for curricula, staff and students in ‘global classrooms’.

Potential for clashes of value systems

Recognising the importance of addressing values in designing strategies for internationalisation, the IAU has been campaigning for ‘Inclusive Internationalisation’ (Egron-Polak & Green, 2015), publishing a ‘Call to Action’ in 2012 (IAU). This Call asked institutions to embrace and implement a set of 12 values and principles to underpin their approach to internationalisation to ensure that social responsibility, standards of integrity and ethical behaviour were upheld alongside affirmation of reciprocal benefit, mutual respect and fairness as the basis for partnership. A useful resource from ACE’s Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement continues the IAU’s emphasis on ethical practices providing practical guidance to institutions as to how they can build such values and principles into the development and management of international partnerships (Helms, 2015).

Hudzik (2011) also emphasises respect for the values of others in approaches to internationalisation, notably those involving development aid projects and programmes. He argues for greater emphasis on *learning* from and with others in place of a model of *teaching* (or preaching) a single approach to higher education and to internationalisation. Shifting the emphasis from teaching others to learning from others is echoed in a recent critique of internationalisation in higher education institutions (Hawawini, 2011). The author argues that the ultimate benefit of internationalisation for an institution should be

Learning from the world

‘to learn from the world, and not just to teach the world what the institution already knows in order to satisfy some educational and economic motives’ (Hawawini, 2011, p. 9).

In emphasising learning, the author proposes re-orientating Knight's definition of internationalisation as follows:

'The internationalization of higher education institutions is the process of integrating the institution and its key stakeholders – its students, faculty, and staff – into a globalizing world.' (Hawawini, 2011, p. 5)

This revised definition and emphasis offers a rationale for new approaches to internationalisation that emphasise 'global engagement'.

3. Global Engagement: Emerging Models

Responding to the many challenges described above, institutions are adopting a range of strategic approaches to 'comprehensive internationalisation'. Three such approaches can be identified, although they are not mutually exclusive. For example:

1. Achieving global reach through a few strategic institutional partnerships

This can be achieved by creating a portfolio of well-targeted partnerships in key countries. The aim of this model is to enable an institution to develop joint approaches to common research challenges and to strengthen its own capacity to address these challenges. Whereas it is not unusual for universities to have many hundreds of smaller-scale partnership agreements related to student exchanges and teaching links, 'global reach' is research-centred and involves a much smaller number of strategic institutional partnerships. Considerable time and effort is needed to keep such partnerships alive and focussed on the research outcomes. One variant of this approach is for the choice of strategic research partner to cover different cultures with an option to create subordinate teaching exchanges.

2. Establishing a physical presence overseas

Another approach involves establishing a physical presence in overseas' countries. For example, in the mid-1990s, Monash University, Australia, declared its ambition to have six campuses in different continents. It currently has five overseas' operations (not all full campuses) in Malaysia, South Africa, Italy, India and China, typically working with overseas' partners. New York University has a declared strategy to develop as a 'Global Network University that is both in and of the city, and in and of the world' (<http://www.nyu.edu/global.html>). It has two overseas degree-granting campuses in Abu Dhabi and Shanghai and 11 international academic centres in Africa, Asia, Europe, North America and South America. The University's emphasis is on

offering an international education to its students and a variety of international research opportunities for its academic staff. Several Indian universities (such as Manipal and Amity Universities) are following the model first developed by Nottingham University in the UK.² In this model, while the syllabus is based on that of the home campus, the institution attracts international students from its national or regional catchment area and also seeks to develop a strong research capacity for the host country.

The ‘international centre’ variant of a physical presence overseas can often be a multi-purpose location with various aims, such as:

- Managing local teaching or research partnerships and all relevant staff and student mobility activities with the country or region
- Providing a base for researchers from the university
- Identifying potential research partners or funding opportunities
- Establishing contacts with governments and donor agencies in the country/region
- Identifying talented researchers
- Supporting the recruitment of local students
- Managing local alumni networks so as to bring maximum benefit to the individuals and the institution.

Columbia University in the USA has summed up its overall aim in establishing such international centres as ‘it is about the world changing what Columbia knows, studies, teaches and learns’ (<http://globalcenters.columbia.edu/content/about-1>) echoing Hawawini’s call to learn from the countries in which the centres are based. Other universities that have created similar offshore bases with a mixed range of functions include Stanford University, Kings College London and the Free University of Berlin.

3. International networks or consortia

A third approach to achieving global engagement is to rely on partnership networks such as Universitas21 or the International Association of Research Universities (IARU). The latter, with a membership of 11 leading research-intensive institutions, states that its role is to ‘work together to address the major challenges of our time’ (www.iaruni.org/about-us/iaru). As well as research collaboration, its activities include ‘inter-university networking at many levels, institutional learning and

² Both these named Indian institutions have more than one campus in host countries according to OBHE (2012) *International Branch campuses: data and developments*.

staff development. IARU's projects cover a broad range of topics, ranging from equal opportunities, technology transfer, technology-enhanced learning, research administration, libraries and open access. The advantage of such a collaborative network is that all the members have a serious commitment to working closely together for the long term; however, there is a consequential need for network members to invest a lot of time understanding the capabilities and interests of the partners before productive collaboration can take place.

Globally engaged institution

Returning to the wide definition of internationalisation given earlier (De Wit et al., 2015), we can consider which of the three approaches above best leads to a globally engaged institution. This requires an understanding of just what 'global engagement' means in practical terms. University College London (UCL) provides one answer. The institution has just gone through a major review of its internationalisation strategy and now has a renamed 'Global Engagement Strategy' that is designed to 'generate practical impact and not expand the global footprint' and that 'builds on a small number of strategic "anchor" partnerships, to co-create mutually beneficial solutions.' (<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/global/strategy>). UCL has adopted the first model described above based on an outward-looking philosophy that follows the theme described by Hudzik (2011) of being engaged with the wider world, learning from it, and being committed to changing it for the better. As part of its new approach, UCL has exited from two of its offshore campuses.

Using the UCL example, a definition of 'global engagement' could be:

Definition of global engagement

A comprehensive approach to internationalisation that engages staff, students and partners in learning from the world and delivering benefit to the world, drawing on the institution's talents and resources to address global challenges.

Building on this definition, we consider the various internal and external factors that are likely to feature in a university's decision as to how (or whether) to adopt a policy of global engagement. Clearly, not all institutions will have the status or resources of Columbia University or UCL to achieve truly *global* engagement. For many institutions, internationalisation will have narrower goals.

4. Institutional Choices

The three main strands of internationalisation activities in most outward-looking institutions involve the recruitment of international students, the appointment of international staff and the development of one-to-one international partnerships. All these provide a basis for more comprehensive internationalisation, since they help to create a campus institutional culture that thinks internationally.

- An increasing number of institutions in the developed (and some middle income) countries are seeking to recruit international students for a variety of reasons – such as providing an intercultural basis for campus life or to generate income. The scale of international student recruitment is significant in some cases: in ETH Zurich in Switzerland, for example, 37% of students on campus are international, in EPF Lausanne it is 50%, in the National University of Singapore it is 30%, and in the London School of Economics it is 70%.³
- Similarly, it is clear that academic recruitment has become mobile and global. Many institutions source their key appointments via advertisements in American or UK newspapers or web based recruitment sites. Some of the leading research universities have very high proportions of international staff; the Australian National University has 50% of its academic staff from countries outside Australia, EPF Lausanne in Switzerland has 60%, and McGill University, Canada, has 35% of its staff categorised as international.
- International partnerships are the third core element of these main strands of internationalisation activity. Such partnerships are usually of two kinds: those aimed at facilitating student mobility through academic exchanges and study abroad, and those centred on personal or institutional collaboration in research. Few institutional managers know the full extent and number of *active* international partnerships as many are based on personal or politically-inspired Memoranda of Understanding that are never consummated or developed further. Many institutions are striving to gain information about, and then seek to exert some control over the growing numbers of academic international links forged at individual, team or departmental level, since it is important to identify those that can develop into deeper and possibly strategic partnerships, moving beyond the initial set of relationships to involve wider groups of academics and academic activities.

³ Statistics provided to the authors in a recent unpublished research study.

Necessary internal characteristics

While these three strands may offer a foundation for developing a strategy of global engagement, there are some important and necessary internal characteristics, including:

- A clear strategic commitment to comprehensive internationalisation and an eagerness to operate globally. This commitment should ideally be shared – beyond the leadership of the institution – by the majority of academic and professional staff with an appreciation that it affects all aspects of their teaching, research and professional activities.
- A strategy that has identified the institution's research strengths and matched these to an awareness of how they can be used to tackle global challenges and an appreciation of where the help of a suitable partner is needed.
- A reconciliation of the institution's goals for its work nationally and in its region or city with its wish to play a global role. Sometimes these strands of ambition can usefully be brought together with the university sharing and building on the international links that its city or region has in other countries. The national or regional funders of the institution, and indeed other stakeholders including students, must feel comfortable with these global aspirations and understand that they will not affect (but could strengthen) the university's local and national work.
- A track-record of co-operative research in other countries, showing the flexibility and sensitivity that such work requires. There also needs to be adequate research capacity and depth of staff coverage for the core task of teaching so as to be able to provide input to research collaborations at times – and within project deadlines – set by international governments or donor funding agencies. These issues of scale are material, as is research reputation at an international level, either across the whole institution or in significant niche areas. A known-track record and reputation in the field are likely to be pre-requisites for accessing any governmental or agency funding for research in overseas' locations.
- An understanding that international partnerships must benefit both parties equally, if they are to be fully effective. This has implications for the way that partners are selected and 'managed'. The choice of partner should involve a mutual and shared due diligence process seeking out the common key aspects of culture and research strategy that are desirable. Some institutions have carefully defined the characteristics they wish to see in potential partners; they may also have set geographical boundaries for their international partnerships so that the insights from a variety of cultures can benefit these collaborative ventures.

5. Leadership, Governance and Management of Global Engagement

The most common leadership model for international activities is for the President/Rector of the university to select a small senior management team where one member has overall responsibility for managing the international strategy. However, there are also examples where the President/Rector retains this role. The strategy itself is usually developed through a community-wide consultation in order to gain commitment to it before the strategy is confirmed or modified by the university's Board or Council. There are few examples of the Council or Board itself taking the lead in such exercises. However, several leading universities have established advisory mechanisms to support their Board or senior leaders. For example, Yale has a President's Council on International Activities, ETH Zurich has a Global Advisory Board and the Free University of Berlin has an International Council of eminent external members.

Once the strategy has been agreed, the appropriate Vice President/Vice Rector will be its guardian or champion and will create a suitable infrastructure (see below) to oversee it. A major challenge for the leadership is obtaining commitment from senior academic colleagues to a strategy of global engagement. Since most academic innovation is driven by the ambitions and efforts of academic staff, it is essential that they are supportive of such a major institutional strategy. For example, Kings College London aims to ensure that a global mind-set is 'embedded in the very fabric' of the College and its international strategy 'sets out a vision for taking advantage of the overwhelmingly positive impact that thinking globally has on our students, our staff, our research and the world at large' (<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/international-strategy/index.aspx>). Achieving this goal will require focused staff and organisational development to build the capability and capacity of staff to build this 'global mind-set'.

Internally, committee structures or networks have been developed to provide input to the strategy, to co-ordinate international activities, and communicate with schools and faculties. Examples include: 'Country expert teams', Regional Advisory Groups, an International Co-ordinating Council to bring together all the relevant support functions, and an International Advisory Group of Deans.

Traditionally, internationalisation activities within the university have been heavily devolved, with the centre playing a role that supports 'bottom-up' activities. However, a policy of global engagement is likely to change this because:

- Strategic partnerships with the breadth and depth expected to permit 'global engagement' have to be co-ordinated and led centrally if they are to command full authority and the necessary financial

Shifting policy nexus

and administrative resources. They will typically involve several schools or faculties.

- Global engagement cuts across teaching and research activity since these have to be integrated in ways that bring benefits to curricula and pedagogy from the learning and participating in collaborative global research. The experience of working with staff from other cultures can also directly influence international student exchanges, work placements and co-operation with international sponsors.
- Fully supporting the global engagement strategy requires central institutional funding (because of the continuing travel and co-ordination costs) and this goes beyond the capacity of most devolved budgets. Taking care of strategic international collaborative relationships is an important, resource intensive and long-term agenda.

Moving from a position of relatively loose and uncoordinated international activities to active management of a wide range of interconnected international activities requires the creation of new support structures and different models are emerging. The key functions that are being grouped in various ways include:

- Overall direction and monitoring of the strategy;
- selection and oversight of international partnerships and collaborative teaching and research activities;
- management of staff and student exchanges and mobility;
- transnational education (TNE) delivered offshore;
- the management of offshore campuses or multi-functional centres;
- all aspects of the recruitment of, and support for, international students on campus, including welfare, counselling and language training.

Grouping all these functions into one administrative support department would produce a very large and disparate entity which would be hard to manage (although there are some examples of this in the UK). The more common solutions are to separate the strategic function from the operational ones and then to further subdivide the operational tasks. UCL for example (see box) has grouped the strategic and partnership functions in a Global Engagement Office with the other tasks handled by different support offices.

‘UCL’s Global Engagement Office (GEO) is dedicated to delivering the Global Engagement Strategy (GES) (<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/global/strategy>). GEO works with colleagues across all departments and faculties to bring GES to life – leading on the development and implementation of global opportunities as well as offering professional support and advice on potential and existing projects, partnerships and collaborations all over the world.’
(<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/global/about-us>)

6. Measuring Success

When international strategies focus on the numbers of international students or the mobility of domestic students, it is not difficult to measure success. Targets are easily quantifiable. However the more diverse the international strategy becomes, the harder it is to know whether success has been achieved. How can one assess the effectiveness of a global engagement strategy? Some intermediate Key Performance Indicators can include:

Key performance indicators

- the number of active academic partnerships;
- the numbers of internationally-funded research projects and the income generated for the institution;
- the number of published papers co-authored with international partners; and
- growth in staff and student exchanges with strategic partners.

Qualitative feedback should also be obtained through regular staff and student surveys. Questions relating to perceptions about (and involvement) in the global engagement strategy can be included in such surveys. Client satisfaction surveys (which are common in the professional world) can be used to assess the reactions of international clients to any collaborative research projects. In addition, the Board or Council should establish a regular (triennial) review process looking at the effectiveness and outcomes from each of the university’s key partnerships. Such reviews are likely to involve visits from a team including external advisers.

7. Conclusion

An increasing emphasis on developing and establishing a global orientation, outlook and profile is the hall-mark of emergent ‘global engagement’ strategies within institutions of higher education in different countries. Such strategies have broad scope in terms of global reach and include a range of academic activities. They involve internal and external stakeholders and a variety of collaborative activities and arrangements. Importantly, integration of activities, structures and processes requires intentional commitment, resources and action at strategic and operational levels of the institution. Building the capability, capacity, mind-set and relationships for global engagement requires different leadership and governance arrangements. It also demands taking a fresh look at values and behaviours that have featured in internationalisation approaches in the past. To address the challenges of globalisation, institutions are seeking to work more closely together – and with a range of partners – to promote reciprocal benefits and mutual learning from diverse cultures and contexts. Through engaging globally, they not only aim to enhance the quality of core academic activities, but also to contribute to addressing global challenges that affect all societies.

References

All electronic sources were correct on: 04.03.2016

- [1] De Wit, H., Hunter, F., Howard, L. & Egron-Polak, E. (2015). *Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Brussels: European Union. Available at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/studies>
- [2] Egron-Polak, E. & Hudson, R. (2014). *Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing Expectations, Fundamental Values. IAU 4th Global Survey*, Paris: International Association of Universities.
- [3] Egron-Polak, E. & Green M. (2015). Inclusive Internationalization: An Initiative of the International Association of Universities. In: M. Stiasny & T. Gore (Eds.), *Going Global: Inclusion, Innovation, Impact. Volume 4*. London: IoE Press.
- [4] Fielden, J. (2009). The Management of Internationalisation in Universities. *Internationalisation of Higher Education*, 3, B 2.2.
- [5] Hawawini, G. (2011). *The Internationalization of Higher Education Institutions: A Critical Review and a Radical Proposal. Faculty and Research Working Paper*. Paris: INSEAD. Available at <https://www.insead.edu/facultyresearch/research/doc.cfm?did=48726>
- [6] Helms, R.M. (2015). *International Higher Education Partnerships: A Global Review of Standards and Practices*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. Available at <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/CIGE-Insights-Intl-Higher-Ed-Partnerships.pdf>

- [7] Hudzik, J. (2011). *Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action*. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA, Association of International Educators. Available at https://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/2011_Comprehen_Internationalization.pdf
- [8] IAU (2012). *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call to Action*. Paris: International Association of Universities. Available at http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/Affirming_Academic_Values_in_Internationalization_of_Higher_Education.pdf
- [9] Knight, J. (2003). Updated Definition of Internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33 (Fall 2003), pp. 2–3. Available at https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/IHEpdfs/ihe33.pdf
- [10] Knight, J. (2010). Regional Education Hubs – Rhetoric or Reality? *International Higher Education*. 59 (Spring 2010), pp. 20–21. Available at <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/8491>
- [11] Middlehurst, R. (2008). Developing Institutional Internationalisation Policies and Strategies: An Overview of Key Issues. *Internationalisation of Higher Education, Basic Edition*, B1.1-1.
- [12] Teichler, U. (2008). *Internationalisation of Higher Education: European Experiences*. Available at https://www.utwente.nl/bms/cheps/summer_school/literature/internationalisation.pdf

Biography:

Robin Middlehurst is professor of Higher Education and External Policy Adviser at Kingston University London and the Higher Education Academy. Robin has focused her research on borderless and trans-national education, leadership and governance, quality assurance and enhancement, the growth of private higher education and internationalisation policies at national and institutional level. She has undertaken commissions for UNESCO and the IAU, OECD/IMHE, CHEA, COL and EUA as well as national governments.

John Fielden has practised as a management consultant in higher education policy and management since 1969. He runs CHEMS Consulting as an independent consultancy and has carried out over 250 higher education projects in over 40 countries. He has specialised in HE policy studies for agencies such as the World Bank, and governments, covering internationalisation, governance issues, business plans for innovations in higher education and programme evaluations.

For further information, we recommend the following Handbook contributions:

- A 1.3 Mapping the Future. An 'Inclusive' Approach to Internationalisation
Razak, Dzulkifli Abdul
- A 2.1-9 From Transnational to Multinational Education: Emerging Trends in International Higher Education
Healey, Nigel Martin; Bordogna, Claudia
- B 2.3 The Management of Internationalisation in Higher Education
Taylor, John, Lisa Laeber
- D 4.14 Strategic Partnerships and Thematic Networks
Kooij, Yasemin