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University of Minnesota Characteristics: A major land-grant and research university that is one of the largest single campuses in the U.S. with about 51,000 students and one of the five or six most programmatically diverse campuses in the world. This research university has a long history of giving special attention to undergraduate teaching, and operates with a resource centered management financial model, where for example the majority of tuition is returned to the college that generates it. The study abroad office is one of the largest in the US with 98% of its support from student program fees. In recent years all student and scholar visas also trigger a fee. About 75-80% of the budget for the Office of International Programs and its units come from fees, grants, gifts and contracts. This has worked very well.

Summary of Presentation:

I. Definition: "Internationalization is the process of integrating international and multicultural perspectives and experiences into the learning, discovery and engagement mission of higher education." Knight 1994

II. Administrative Challenge: International programs cut across all academic units such as departments and colleges. Therefore in an organizational chart, the senior international officer is administers "row programs" rather than "column programs" like those in departments and colleges. However, higher education institutions and their academic programs are primarily budgeted through the "column" units. These columns include disciplinary clusters (departments) of faculty that have responsibility for the curriculum, teaching, research and outreach programs. The major exception is interdisciplinary programs that are also "row programs," but unlike international programs these seldom involve all departments or colleges. In research and land grant universities, the graduate school, continuing education and extension programs are similar to international programs in being major "row" units. In summary, a "dean of international programs" has a larger challenge than a "collegiate dean," because the latter has major responsibility for faculty hires, academic programs, and as a "column dean" is in the normal channels of campus planning and budgeting.

III. Some Examples of Common Roadblocks to Advancing Campus Internationalization

- President, chancellor, provost and deans have not made internationalization a major priority in academic programs and funding allocations
- The campus has some significant international program initiatives, but they have no central coordination or broad visibility because they involve individual faculty or single unit international initiatives that are not broadly known and therefore make little impact on the collective significance of international programs to the education and research programs of the campus. There is frequently no focus or budgeting priority for such programs beyond the department. As a result the international program visibility and impact on campus is less than the sum of its program parts.
- Many administrators, faculty and advisors may not be well informed about the significance of study abroad programs, international students on campus, and international program collaborations to the campus's educational, research and outreach programs. When this is the case, it should be no surprise that international programs do not have a significant priority on campus.
- The chief international officer (CIO) lacks a significant title and regular interactions with key administrators (provost and deans), and therefore has little or no role in key planning and budget decisions, and in drafting job descriptions and hiring faculty that collectively could make a significant difference to the internationalization of campus programs.
- Many key international program units on campus are not appropriately staffed to take a major leadership role on broader international programming issues. As such they do their daily work
and management of their units and the campus is left with little or no leadership for a more comprehensive international vision.

International program units are commonly portrayed on campus as “service units,” and need to take steps to be more clearly position themselves as partners in the academic mission of the campus.

International program units are typically staffed by many non-faculty appointments that love their work, but have little or no opportunity for job mobility to other international positions on campus. Consequently, many become long-term employees of their unit “doing their job.” This situation is not helpful in integrating international dimensions into the academic programs of the campus.

IV. Leading vs. Managing International Programs

Simply defined, “Leadership is doing the right thing” and “Management is doing things right, (Cronin, 1984).” Both are essential in the administration of any unit, but for some of the reasons above, the leadership of international programs is frequently in short supply in the internationalization of colleges and universities. It is not uncommon that management dominates leadership, because it is easier to determine how to do things right and the skills that are needed, than it is to know the right thing to do, but this is no excuse for diminishing the need for visionary leadership. Likewise, great managers should not mislead themselves into thinking that management is the same as leadership because different and less obvious skill sets are required.

As indicated a few years ago by Earl Kellogg (colleague at the University of Illinois), Wayne Gretsky’s ability to “skate to where the puck was going to be (or should be going) rather than skating to where it was,” provides a meaningful metaphor for what is needed in the internationalization of our campuses. This requires visionary leaders, who are organized, highly respected, frequently think and work “outside the box,” and serve unselfishly as effective spokespeople for international programs.

V. Some Examples of Navigating Roadblocks to Campus Internationalization

The CIO should take the lead in identifying and working closely with respected, key people who can also “speak” for international program needs and benefits. This can be formalized in an “International Program Advisory Committee (IPAC)” (or equivalent) of 10-15 people that includes some key faculty, students, alumni and private sector employers. If the group gets too large it will normally be less effective. Term limits and a rotation of members should be established at the outset. Such a group expands the diversity of inputs, the “voice” for international programs on campus, and can be more effective than a single voice to inform and advance the administrative and academic priority for internationalization of programs.

As a “row” administrator, the CIO needs to build “social capital” on campus to increase overall influence and effectiveness with departments, colleges and central administration. In moving internationalization to a higher campus priority, the general approach should focus on benefits to academic programs, better preparation of students for living and working in a global era, and consequences to the reputation of the campus and its programs if nothing is done, rather than on the immediate budget needs of the international program office(s). The latter will normally follow programmatic decisions, but internationalization efforts need to avoid perceptions that the initiatives are “self-serving” requests for the international programs office.

Ideally, every campus should develop a strategic plan for its international programs. The sum of all faculty and other international programs is not equal to a campus strategic plan with goals and expected outcomes. Ideally, the task force responsible for drafting such a plan should be appointed by the president, chancellor or provost. Membership should include some key faculty, staff, students and study abroad alumni who are internationally involved and well-respected. The task force should have only few, if any, key central administrators.

Prior to the appointment of such a strategic planning task force, it may be advantageous for the chief international officer (CIO) to draft a statement for the president, chancellor or provost that provides: a) a draft vision for further internationalization of the campus, b) the justification for internationalization and the planning task force, c) examples of such efforts and outcomes at peer institutions, d) reference and copies of relevant national reports, and e) some of the potential consequences to academic programs and the campus’ reputation if internationalization is not given higher priority in campus planning and budgeting. Ideally, the CIO should work with an IPAC or similar individuals in drafting such a statement.
If the best efforts of the CIO and others fail to get a meaningful strategic plan and funding for campus internationalization, then there are other alternatives that can be pursued. In fact prior to the late 1990’s, the University of Minnesota failed to act on at least three major campus-wide international initiatives that were proposed by key faculty and CIO’s during the previous decade or so. In 1998, the new CIO came with significant “social capital” on campus and took a very different approach that proved to be very successful. The approach was also greatly facilitated by a more receptive administration. Rather than start with a university-wide strategic plan for international programs, the decision was made to try and greatly increase study abroad enrollment through curriculum integration (CI) of study abroad through extensive work with faculty, advisors, departments and colleges on all four U of M campuses. FIPSE and Bush Foundation grants of about $1.2m were obtained and matched by more than twice this amount through in-kind and cash support. The cash support came from the chancellor or provost offices on each campus with the majority of this dedicated to a significant expansion of study abroad scholarships on each campus. This was an extremely successful project because: a) study abroad enrollment between 1998-99 and 2005-06 increased significantly on all campuses with an increase from 715 to 1572 (220%) on the Twin Cities campus, b) hundreds of faculty, advisors and administrators were involved in regular workshops, facilitated study abroad site visits, and development of study abroad advising sheets for what is now the majority of 204 undergraduate majors, c) new collegial networks were established across four campuses of the U of M and with colleges/universities in other countries, d) survey data followed evolving student and faculty/advisor attitudes related to study abroad, e) multiple year data demonstrated that students who studied abroad graduated significantly sooner with higher GPA’s regardless of their incoming qualifications, gender or ethnic group, and f) the CI project was so encompassing and significant that it was difficult to dismiss. This helped to establish a new campus attitude and priority about internationalization of our campuses that went beyond study abroad. In other words, the CI project became an effective tool in expanding engagement of faculty and administrators on a more comprehensive international agenda. The main aspects of this CI project continue now after three years since the last grant was completed. Finally, it is important to note, that this major CI project was bottom-up in the absence of any central plan from the university.

In addition to the CI project, the following instances were used to leverage additional attention to international program initiatives: a) SEVIS, 9/11 and demands of the new PeopleSoft system were used to justify fees for all visa services and this provided funds for improved services and what is now basically a paperless International Students and Scholar Services office that is about 50% supported by fees, b) a low ranking among Big 10 universities and the need for cultural diversity on campus that comes with international undergraduates was used to justify funding ($100,000) for the first ever major central recruitment initiative for international undergraduates on the Twin Cities campus, c) increasing concern about student safety, insurance and waivers, and legal issues in other countries related to employment law, rental agreements, etc was used to engage key central administrators in a major way about international issues important to students, faculty and the legal exposure of the university, d) in 2005 an international task force was one of many task forces appointed to develop a strategic plan for the university’s international programs, e) a major ($470,000) international grants program for faculty and graduate students was started in 2006 with an additional expansion in 2007 because of the need to expand international collaborations and understanding, and f) as a result of high non-resident tuition rates (about $21,000) and no undergraduate international scholarships, the CIO requested and received $500,000 in scholarship waivers for international undergraduates. However, it is even more significant that this June the Board of Regents will act upon a proposal from central administration to permanently reduce non-resident tuition to “resident tuition plus $2000,” which would be about a $10,000 reduction. This will greatly facilitate U.S. and international recruitment initiatives important to geographic and ethnic diversity of undergraduates on U of M campuses.

“Lessons Learned” in Relation to Leading International Programs

Success of a key “row administrator” on campus, such as the CIO is more dependent upon "persuasion" than "control." This requires many campus partnerships and increasing the number of “voices” who also identify with the needs and benefits from expanded internationalization of the
campus and its programs. This includes faculty, staff, students, and administrators from ideally across many different units of the campus.

- Do not assume that all problems and challenges are primarily related to or can be corrected by funding. Non-financial issues related to organization and administration of international programs, title and stature of the CIO, access to key administrators, etc are critical to successful international programs. More so than for most colleges, social capital and multiple supporting voices are important in leading international programs at a large and highly decentralized research university. Sometimes this is more important than funding because dollars alone seldom change important attitudes, perceptions and the culture of such institutions.

- However, administrators who pretend that meaningful and sustained internationalization initiatives can always be “done-on-the-cheap” or worse are “cost-free” are doing their students, faculty and institutions a serious disservice in this global era when most of our graduates cannot predict where they will live and work in their lifetimes, and many local or regional issues are global issues.

- Convincing the president, chancellor, provost and deans to make facilitated international visits to sites related to study abroad, international collaborations, alumni chapters, and faculty/student exchanges are frequently much more effective than long reports and numerous meetings. These can be “infective experiences” for faculty and administrators with less familiarity about such programs. Unfacilitated visits to other countries that involve more protocol and business in nice hotels are generally less effective. The challenge is making sure that these administrators do not sign agreements that will be meaningless or problematic for campus programs.

- Informative emails to key administrators with some continuity of message drawn from relevant national publications (like ACE and NASULGC), news articles and internal news stories can be very helpful in making and strengthening the case for internationalization of campuses. However, some face-to-face communication about key issues with decision makers is critical.

- Promote International Education Week by encouraging faculty, students and colleges to become sponsor activities of interest to them during the week --- This is a great way to educate & increase visibility of different opportunities and programs.

- Major international awards sponsored by the central international office in partnership with the appropriate central officer can be very helpful in elevating the visibility and recognition of contributions by international alumni, and faculty and staff who have made significant contributions to the campus' international programs.

- Internationalization of a campus is sufficiently specific to each institution, its culture, etc. that “one size” does not fit all, but there are many concepts, ideas and programs that can be adapted from one institution to another. This is especially true for institutions with many similarities. Thus, institutions should increasingly work together and share in the cost, administration and benefits of some programs.

- Look for opportunities in many different locales and then take action on them!! Examples of such opportunities could be in grants, academic planning discussions, national publications, newspaper articles, additional voices for internationalization, or testimony of returning study abroad students, etc.
PERSPECTIVES ON LEADERSHIP

The sign on the door of opportunity reads PUSH.
Unknown

It's hard to lead a cavalry charge if you think you look funny on a horse.
Adlai Stevenson

You do not lead by hitting people over the head - that's assault, not leadership.
Dwight D. Eisenhower

I start with the premise that the function of leadership is to produce more leaders, not more followers.
Ralph Nader

Good leaders must first become good servants.
Robert Greenleaf

A leader takes people where they want to go. A great leader takes people where they don't necessarily want to go, but ought to be.
Rosalynn Carter

The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on.
Walter Lippman

The manager asks how and when; the leader asks what and why.
Warren Bennis

Management is doing things right; leadership is doing the right things.
Peter F. Drucker

Don't tell people how to do things, tell them what to do and let them surprise you with their results.
George S. Patton

Leadership is the art of getting someone else to do something you want done because he wants to do it.
Dwight Eisenhower

The best executive is the one who has sense enough to pick good men to do what he wants done, and self-restraint to keep from meddling with them while they do it.
Theodore Roosevelt

To lead people, walk beside them ... As for the best leaders, the people do not notice their existence. The next best, the people honor and praise. The next, the people fear; and the next, the people hate ... When the best leader's work is done the people say, 'We did it ourselves!'
Lao-tzu

A desk is a dangerous place from which to view the world.
John Le Carré

The conventional definition of management is getting work done through people, but real management is developing people through work.
Agha Hasan Abedi

Be the change you wish to see in the world.
Mahatma Gandhi