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ABSTRACT

Since September 11, 2001 there has been a growing realization within the United States that in order to achieve better instruments to strengthen national security, compete and be successful within the global community, it has become vital to look at the American educational system which, according to some critics, presently is lacking the international elements in order to do so. With the advent of the educational reforms in Europe (Bologna Agreement, June 19, 1999), those nations that have embraced more uniformity amongst themselves have concluded that competition in the global market has made it imperative to make changes in the academic curriculum of colleges and universities. In accordance with the growing globalization movement of the last few years in regard to international education, the challenge for the United States is the pursuit of a national international education policy. Such an effort requires a mobilization and coordination concerning international education efforts and recourses at all levels. This study will provide suggestions for implementing the internationalization of our national higher educational institutions. In conjunction, there will be an analysis of the reforms presently being undertaken in the European Higher Educational System.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY


*Introduction:*

This research study is based upon two elements that are fundamental in the arena of international education on both sides of the Atlantic. On the European side the higher educational reform – Bologna Agreement and ERASMUS MUNDUS – has and continues to create a new era of internationalization and globalization. The classical structure that existed prior to the European Union (EU), has been chipped away during the process and re-sculpted in order to impart the knowledge needed to be a “global citizen”; additionally, impart a standard that would be recognized throughout not only in the EU but also globally. From the inception this vision, created in the European Union for a more cohesive higher educational system, has enabled students to study in other institutions within the community. This process set up an accreditation system which enabled students to have cultural experiences within their own continent without losing accreditation for course work done at other institutions. The ERASMUS MUNDUS has opened the door to the removal of regionalist and nationalist barriers. Another aspect that the EU has achieved with this reform has been to revisit the curriculum for careers/professions that now are outdated for the twenty-first century. As a result, there has been a move from other parts of the world to join in the venture, which will aid and enhance the education of the future global citizens faced with other challenges that would not be met if not for these reforms.
Only after the advent of September 11th, 2001 has there been a growing realization within the United States that in order to achieve better instruments to strengthen national security, compete and be successful within the global community, it has become vital to look at the American educational system which, according to some critics, presently is lacking the international elements in order to do so. Here higher education has to date not embraced more uniformity amongst professional training from State to State; the concept of internationalization of curriculum – including second language proficiency acquisition - has its attempts but there is no consistency. With the growth of the globalization movement of the last few years in terms of international education, the challenge for the United States is to pursue a national international education policy. The Lincoln Commission Fellowship, along with Fulbright Scholarships, has been encouraging the exchange of ideas and study abroad for students. These programs have been largely successful but still further exchanges to give U.S. students and faculty the opportunities to experience other cultures hence promoting global citizenry. Such an effort requires an alignment with the Bologna Agreement and strengthening the exchanges which would benefit all stakeholders in the long run.

The questions that are posed within this study are ones that are fundamental to the internationalization and later globalization of higher educational purposes in the formation of a generation facing the challenges of an ever diminishing global society. What was created by the technological advances such as the internet, you tube, I poding and other forms of communication has moved the educational process to another dimension. No longer will it suffice to have classroom lectures and textbooks to explore the cultures of the world; now the understanding and exchange of ideas, cultures, and
research has crossed the borders that years ago were costly or just for the privileged. With the educational reforms that the EU has implemented for a more homogeneous course of study for the Bachelors, Masters, and Doctorate the competition for students will increase. Higher education institutions in the United States will be increasingly find themselves competing for the European students for their own degree programs being offered. Other aspects that must be considered in the U.S. is the acceptance of three year degrees for graduate admission, recognition and credit bearing of the Diploma supplement [this will have to be dealt with on a country by country basis, since each member of the EU has a variant on what it entails], joint degree program, and the TOFEL/Cambridge proficiency levels.

This case study will indicate the strides made in the EU - three higher educational institutions in Spain - and how the U.S. has embraced the concept of internationalization in higher education so as to be aligned with the new reforms in the EU and the Department of Education international initiative in conjunction with the Lincoln Commission Fellowship. The methodology utilized will give insight to the process on both sides of the Atlantic, provide suggestions for implementing the internationalization in our national higher educational institutions, and finally impart possible solutions to close the gaps in the literature. Spain is still struggling with the implementation of the reforms and how to go about it aligning themselves so as to meet the goals. Selection of this country was based on observing this very traditionalist higher educational system will conform and meet the goal date of 2010. Observing the process at this point in time and expounding on it once it is completed will bring to the forth front the stages and strategies used to enhance the field of study and attract students to their institutions.
When discussing the gap in the literature, it entails the bridging of the two systems for mutual benefit of all the stakeholders. Additionally, recommendations and solutions that would enhance the academic experience and exchange of research, knowledge, and cross cultural experiences will be necessary.

**Definitions of Terminology**

**Bologna Declaration Agreement** (June 19, 1999): continued the evolutionary process of discussions held at the Lisbon Convention, and later the Sorbonne Declaration. It was a pledge, from the 29 original nations, “to reform the structures of higher education in a manner that would reflect a convergence of the expectations of the European Union’s Higher Educational System” (Bologna, 1999). This was a turning point in the EU; prior to this agreement no such undertaking was visualized. All the members have committed to this endeavor freely for the mutual development of European Higher Education at a higher level via the reformation of the systems already in place. When speaking of the Bologna Declaration Agreement there must be an understanding that it is not standardization or uniformity but an autonomy and respect of the diversity for acceptance of it as a means to integrate the course of studies mutually.

As stated in the declaration:

“The European process, thanks to the extraordinary achievements of the last few years, has become an increasingly concrete and relevant reality for the Union and its citizens. Enlargement prospects together with deepening relations with other European countries provide even wider dimensions to that reality. Meanwhile, we are witnessing a growing awareness in large parts of the political and academic world and in public opinion of the need to establish a more complete and far-reaching Europe, in particular building upon and strengthening its intellectual, cultural, social and scientific and technological dimensions” (Bologna, 1999).

In addition, the Bologna Declaration mentions the need to

“look objectively at increasing the international competitiveness of the European systems of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilization can
be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions” (Bologna, 1999).

The Declaration states its specific objectives are stepping stones to the work that must be done, so as to develop and establish a European higher educational system that will be global. The specific goals that have been the foundations of the process are as follows:

- “Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, also through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, in order to promote European citizens employability and the international competitiveness of the European higher education system;

- Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries;

- Establishment of a system of credits - such as in the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) - as a proper means of promoting the most widespread student mobility. Credits could also be acquired in non-higher education contexts, including lifelong learning, provided they are recognised by the receiving universities concerned;

- Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement with particular attention to the following:
  - for students, access to study and training opportunities and to related services;
  - for teachers, researchers and administrative staff, recognition and valorisation of periods spent in a European context researching, teaching and training, without prejudicing their statutory rights;

- Promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies;

- Promotion of the necessary European dimensions in higher education, particularly with regards to curricular development, inter-institutional
cooperation, mobility schemes and integrated programmes of study, training and research" (Bologna Declaration, 1999).

**Socrates**

This is a program of the European Union covers various levels of the learning spectrum – formal and informal - from nursery school to the university level which includes adult education. It is referred to as the life long learning program. As stated in the European Commission of Education and Culture (ECEC) “with Socrates, the school is no longer confined within four walls; it is opening up to the various components of civil society which are eager to take up the challenges of education: local and regional authorities, the social partners, associations, the business sector, etc.” (ECEC, 2000, p.2). There are eight steps that are dealt with via the Socrates program. The corner stone of the process reflects the three levels of education which constitutes the foundation: K-12, university, and adult education. Each one of these stages builds upon the other in a spiral movement. According to the ECEC the rest of the stages are based on a horizontal continuum which leads to “common priorities”. Those priorities are:

“The emphasis is on countering social exclusion and under-achievement at school by providing specific support for disadvantaged groups, and promoting equal opportunities for women and men. Special attention is paid to language learning, particularly the less widely used and taught languages. There is also emphasis on the importance of studying in a multi-cultural environment as one of the cornerstones of European citizenship. The new information and communication technologies (ICT) permeate the whole programme, as they have much to offer active teaching methods and contribute to innovation. Lastly, Socrates encourages broad dissemination of information, ideas and good practice, e.g. through the setting up of networks. European cooperation opens many doors to education” (ECEC, 2000, p.2).

The structure of the program has four main grants and subsidies. Each project enhances education and training through trans-national mobility. Those programs, one of
which is the ERASMUS, are the key to the EU Bologna Declaration Agreement educational reform. As per the European Commission (EC) the programmes are:

1. "The Comenius programme addresses the teaching and learning needs of all those in pre-school and school education up to the level of the end of upper secondary education, and the institutions and organisations providing such education;
2. The Erasmus programme addresses the teaching and learning needs of all those in formal higher education, including trans-national student placements in enterprise, and the institutions and organisations providing or facilitating such education and training;
3. The Leonardo da Vinci programme addresses the teaching and learning needs of all those in vocational education and training, including placement in enterprise of persons other than students, as well as the institutions and organisations providing or facilitating such education and training;
4. The Grundtvig programme addresses the teaching and learning needs of those in all forms of adult education, as well as the institutions and organisations providing or facilitating such education" (http://ec.europa.eu/education).

ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) is part of the SOCRATES program of the European Union. This declaration is not limited to students; it includes both staff and faculty. Participants in the ERASMUS program are encouraged to promote European cooperation in quality assurance and advances in research knowledge, as well as broaden the dimensions of European higher education. There are three objectives to the program:

1. "enable a growing number of students to acquire first hand experience of life in another Member State through a recognized period of study abroad.
2. ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experience of inter-Community cooperation, as a means of providing a boarder basis for intensified economic and social cooperation in the Community.
3. strengthen the ties between citizen of various Member States with a view to consolidating the concept of a People’s Europe" (Erasmus, 2003).
Internationalization: As per NAFSA, the term refers to "does much more than open eyes and broaden perspectives. In an increasingly interdependent world, it is essential to fostering the global and cross-cultural knowledge and understanding necessary for effective U.S. leadership, competitiveness, and security" (retrieved from the NAFSA website www.nafsa.org). Former Secretary of State Colin Powell made a poignant definition of the term:

"The more we know about each other, the more we learn about each other, the more we engage on differences that we have between our societies and between our social systems and between our political points of view, the better off we are. The more dialogue we have at every level, and especially at the academic level, where opinion-makers are located... the better off we are." March 18, 2004 (retrieved from the NAFSA website www.nafsa.org). We must be mindful that the term was created in the latter part of the twentieth century as part of the mind shift at the beginning of World War I. It was then that an acceleration of the global interaction came about at an unprecedented level. What it involves are broad and intangible goals that are institution wide rather than mission specific.

Lincoln Commission Fellowship was created and championed by the late Senator Paul Simon (D – Ill.), who believed that a more internationally educated citizenry would make the United States "more understanding of the rest of the world" and would create "a base of public opinion that would encourage responsible action..." (Lincoln Commission, 2005). Senator Simon proposed a study abroad fellowship program that "would provide 500,000 college students each year a stipend not to exceed $7,000, an
ambitious target that would more than triple the number of American college students studying abroad” (Lincoln Commission, 2005).

Goals of the program are:

1. “Create a more globally informed American citizenry.
2. Increase participation in quality study abroad programs.
3. Encourage diversity in student participation in study abroad.
4. Diversify locations of study abroad, particularly in developing countries.
5. Create an innovative partnership with higher education to open more doors for study abroad.
6. Internationalize U.S. higher education by making study abroad a cornerstone of undergraduate education” (Lincoln Commission, 2005).

**United States Department of Education International Education** has its bases on President Clinton’s International Education Policy which stated:

“It is the policy of the Federal Government to support international education. We are committed to:

- encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States;
- promoting study abroad by U.S. students;
- supporting the exchange of teachers, scholars, and citizens at all levels of society;
- enhancing programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise;
- expanding high-quality foreign language learning and in-depth knowledge of other cultures by Americans;
- preparing and supporting teachers in their efforts to interpret other countries and cultures for their students; and
- advancing new technologies that aid the spread of knowledge throughout the world “ (Clinton, 2000).

The following are the actions that President Clinton addressed:

1. “The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of schools and colleges to improve access to high-quality international educational
experiences by increasing the number and diversity of students who study and intern abroad, encouraging students and institutions to choose nontraditional study-abroad locations, and helping under-represented U.S. institutions offer and promote study-abroad opportunities for their students.

2. The Secretaries of State and Education, in partnership with other governmental and nongovernmental organizations, shall identify steps to attract qualified post-secondary students from overseas to the United States, including improving the availability of accurate information overseas about U.S. educational opportunities.

3. The heads of agencies, including the Secretaries of State and Education, and others as appropriate, shall review the effect of U.S. Government actions on the international flow of students and scholars as well as on citizen and professional exchanges, and take steps to address unnecessary obstacles, including those involving visa and tax regulations, procedures, and policies.

4. The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of State and local governments and educational institutions to promote international awareness and skills in the classroom and on campuses. Such efforts include strengthening foreign language learning at all levels, including efforts to achieve bi-literacy, helping teachers acquire the skills needed to understand and interpret other countries and cultures for their students, increasing opportunities for the exchange of faculty, administrators, and students, and assisting educational institutions in other countries to strengthen their teaching of English.

5. The Secretaries of State and Education and the heads of other agencies shall take steps to ensure that international educational exchange programs, including the Fulbright program, are coordinated through the Interagency Working Group on United States Government-Sponsored International Exchange and Training, to maximize existing resources in a nonduplicative way, and to ensure that the exchange programs receive the support they need to fulfill their mission of increased mutual understanding.

6. The Secretary of Education, in cooperation with other agencies, shall continue to support efforts to improve U.S. education by developing comparative information, including benchmarks, on educational performance and practices. The Secretary of Education shall also share U.S. educational expertise with other countries.

7. The Secretaries of State and Education shall strengthen and expand models of international exchange that build lasting cross-national partnerships among educational institutions with common interests and complementary objectives.

8. The Secretary of Education and the heads of other agencies, in partnership with State governments, academic institutions, and the business community, shall
strengthen programs that build international expertise in U.S. institutions, with the goal of making international education an integral component of U.S. undergraduate education and, through graduate and professional training and research, enhancing the Nation’s capacity to produce the international and foreign-language expertise necessary for U.S. global leadership and security.

9. The Secretaries of State and Education, in cooperation with other agencies, the academic community, and the private sector, shall promote wise use of technology internationally, examining the implications of borderless education. The heads of agencies shall take steps to ensure that the opportunities for using technology to expand international education do not result in a widening of the digital divide.

10. The Secretaries of State and Education, in conjunction with other agencies, shall ensure that actions taken in response to this memorandum are fully integrated into the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) framework by means of specific goals, milestones, and measurable results, which shall be included in all GPRA reporting activities, including strategic plans, performance plans, and program performance reports” (Clinton, 2000).

Justification

Within the last few years the topic of the European Union’s Bologna Agreement/Process has augmented into a worldwide point of discussion. In Europe, like other regions of the world, there has been a movement toward educational reform in order to ascertain a larger portion of the global market both in the academic and business realms. The role of international education and globalization is to gain a better understanding not only of one’s own heritage but of other cultures, traditions, and languages which the Bologna Process, in conjunction with the Erasmus Mundus program offers students and faculty.

In the United States the topic of international education has become an emergent evolution since the Woodrow Wilson administration, presently in the forefront, as a direct result of the terrorist attack on September 11th. As Rep. Rush Holt stated on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives (November 16, 2005) “Whether it is a matter of
competitiveness, economics, national security, in this era we must understand other cultures, their languages, their traditions, as quite literally now anyone on this planet could be our collaborators, our colleagues, our competitors, our customers.” (retrieved from the NAFSA website www.nafsa.org). If the institutions of higher learning in the United States do not align themselves with the educational reform movement in order to remain competitive with the European Union’s process, they will be left behind. This is a critical point in the maintenance of the nation’s position on the world stage.

As an educator it is important to understand the emerging changes in Europe, (Latin America, Asia and the rest of the world) in order be a guiding light and leader within the field of international education. This literature review and critical analysis concludes with a synopsis and interpretation of empirical and methodological literature, conclusions and recommendations for future scholarly inquiry within the internationalization and globalization of institutions of higher learning in the United States. This review is also in conjunction with the final implementation of the Bologna Declaration Agreement/Process set to take place in 2010.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review, Theoretical Framework

International Education in the United States

Introduction:

What are the Bologna Declaration Agreement/Process, Socrates, and Erasmus Mundus of the European Union? Why does the United States need an international educational policy? How important is it for the U.S. to align its higher education curriculum with the outcomes of the Bologna Process? What are the risks that the United States may incur if it fails to acknowledge this European educational reform development? Is the Lincoln Commission Fellowship for Study Abroad enough of an effort for U.S. internationalization? These are some of the questions that should be addressed in the wake of the Bologna Process and historical events that have brought about a new awareness of the lack of language acquisition and cultural awareness in institutions of higher learning in the United States.

There is a tapestry of elements that emerge from this topic which converge, although on the surface they appear to be interchangeable; in truth, it is an evolutionary process – internationalization and globalization. Each has its own distinct criteria emerging within the confines of the implementation. The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) defines internationalization as a process of integration at an international, intercultural, proficiency in a second and/or third language, and comparative perspective within all the units of a higher educational institution (www.nafsa.org, 2006). These integral parts will lead to what Sadkaj calls “transnational education” which refers to gaining access to the next level/step, which is the globalization
issue. The term coined by Sadkaj indicates that there is a phenomenon which "transcends traditional form of education and increasingly operates in the form of various types of distance learning" (Sadkaj, 2001). It is under this premise that the term globalization needs to be implemented.

It is from the bottom up that globalization rises as a phoenix to embrace education that will determine the future of each society and, in turn, that of the global citizen of the 21st century. Additionally, Jan Sadlak (2001) maintained "theoretical and empirical evidence unequivocally proves the importance of "human capital" in the individual's and society's well being, as well the correlation between the level of participation in higher education and economic development." Access to higher education should be open for the societal good, whereupon the first step is internationalization of the population serving as a portal to the process of globalization.

**E.U. Historical Efforts**

Initiatives and processes have emanated from the concept of international education creating an intertwined jargon from the areas of language acquisition, sociology, and multicultural education. Each contributes to the fabric that radiates the goals of the reforms that are presently being worked upon in the European Union (EU). Since the inception of the EU there has been a call for a master plan that will enable the members and nonmembers to participate in an educational venture that would cross the national boarders, allowing for a linguistic and cultural awareness of their citizens. The EU Bologna declaration is a document that created the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) whose purpose is to enhance the employability and mobility of European citizens and increase international competitiveness of the European Higher Education.
The Bologna Declaration of June 19th, 1999 in Bologna, Italy was the effort of the Ministers of Education to construct a “European Higher Education Area” (EHEA) based on the fundamental principles of university independence and autonomy, but maintaining that higher education and research in Europe needed to change and adapt to the growing global perspective. This was the culmination of prior years of agreements that set the stage for what we are now witnessing as a work in progress of educational conformity and advancement of the internationalization, and later, the globalization efforts. The 1999 agreement adopted a two-cycle system of undergraduate and Master’s degrees. What was additionally agreed upon was the establishment of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) enabling easy transferable accreditation of courses -in one or more universities- to promote student mobility. With this, students will gain opportunities in training, language acquisition, cultural awareness and greater understanding of the importance of a wider vision of the world through ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students). This declaration is not limited to students; it includes both staff and faculty. Participants in the ERASMUS program are encouraged to promote European cooperation in quality assurance and advances in research knowledge, as well as broaden the dimensions of European higher education.

ERASMUS is headquartered in Brussels, Belgium, the brain child of the Council of Education Ministers of the European Community’s member states which jointly took the first step toward globalization in June 1987. In practice its purpose was to provide grants to assist university students within the community to take part of their academic requirements in another member state without losing credits. The Council of Ministers...
wanted to continue the concept of a united Europe by linking it to academia via the initiative of producing a “People’s Europe” that would cultivate a genuine sense of European identity. As Granville mentioned in his article, “Trading Places”: “one of the impulses at work here – referring to the ERASMUS program - is clearly a spirit of rivalry with the U.S., perhaps, even of anti-Americanism” (1991). Cooperation and reorientation, particularly in business management and technological disciplines, need to be refocused toward EU members, while steering away from the dominating force of the U.S.

The grants that are provided consist of the following two categories:

1) “free movers”: students apply independently and must meet various conditions attached to the award. These students embody more the visionary inspiration of Erasmus, harking back to the education sans frontières of the Middle Ages (ERASMUS, 1991).

2) travel grants: awards that help finance the study at other institutions of higher learning under the auspices of an already established Interuniversity Cooperation Program (ICP), which is approved by the ERASMUS administration and financially assisted by the ERASMUS budget (1991).

As predicted by Granville in 1991, this program would force major changes in European education thus enabling Europe as a single entity to become superior to the gross national product of the United States. What became apparent, even at the inception of the idea, were the goals of breaking down the following concepts: local attachment, regional chauvinism, and nationalism. Launching a wider global vision has increased
threefold as the process continues. Granville (1991) stated that “ERASMUS will contribute to the creation of the new, supranational European outlook envisioned by its EC creators.” What he predicted then is evident today as the process continues to gain momentum and strength amidst the growing pains of the traditionalists that need to assimilate the changes. The changes involve pedagogy, additional technological instruction, and the student body. From this process, knowledge and advances cross the borders for the improvement for all the stakeholders within the EU spilling over onto the global market. From these reforms stems a greater sense of global community, aiding, sharing of expertise, and bridging cultural /ethnic barriers created by ignorance.

It is from this program that the ERASMUS MUNDUS emerged in order to branch out and increase European visibility in graduate degree programs. The program enables non European students to take advantage of the opportunities that European universities have to offer. On July 2001, the European Parliament and Council received a Communication from the Commission of Higher Education regarding the strengthening of EU-third country cooperation in higher education. Following the positive reception of the Communication, in July 2002, the Commission adopted a program that was at the outset named, Erasmus World and was later renamed Erasmus Mundus. Central themes from the program are in line with those of the Bologna Process, thus pushing national educational reforms in higher education from all of the Member States.

Erasmus Mundus complements the European Union's existing regional programs in higher education to include other countries that are not part of the Union. Erasmus Mundus, however, is a new global scheme, providing a distinctly «European» offering in
higher education. What it hopes to achieve is the attractiveness for research cooperation. It seeks, primarily, to enhance the quality and attractiveness of European higher education world-wide. Secondly, Erasmus Mundus Masters courses and scholarships provide a framework to promote valuable exchange and dialogue between cultures. “By supporting the international mobility of scholars and students, Erasmus Mundus intends to prepare its European and non-European participants for life in a global, knowledge-based society” (European Commission, 2005).

The program comprises four concrete actions as presented by the European Commission (2005):

- **ACTION 1 - Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses:** these constitute the central component around which Erasmus Mundus is built. They are high-quality integrated courses at the master’s level offered by a consortium of at least three universities in at least three different European countries. The courses must be "integrated" to be selected under Erasmus Mundus, which means that they must foresee a period of study in at least two of the three universities and that it must lead to the award of a recognized double, multiple or joint diploma.

- **ACTION 2 - Erasmus Mundus scholarships:** in order to give the Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses selected under Action 1 a strong external projection, a scholarship scheme for third-country graduate students and scholars from the whole world is linked to them. This scholarship scheme addresses highly qualified individuals who come to Europe to follow the Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses or to work for them.
• **ACTION 3** - Partnerships: in order to encourage European universities to open themselves up to the world and to reinforce their world-wide presence, Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses selected under Action 1 also have the possibility of establishing partnerships with third-country higher education institutions. These partnerships allow for outgoing mobility of graduate EU students and scholars involved in the Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses.

• **ACTION 4** - Enhancing attractiveness: Erasmus Mundus also supports projects aimed at enhancing the attractiveness of and the interest in European higher education. It supports activities that improve the profile, the visibility and the accessibility of European higher education as well as issues crucial to the internationalisation of higher education, such as the mutual recognition of qualifications with third countries.”

The duration of the program is a span of five years (2004-2008) with a planned financial backing of 230 million Euros. Afterwards there will be an evaluation in order to look at the feasibility of continuing the funding and looking at the outcomes achieved during those five years. To date there has been additional funding to maintain the program that falls under the auspices of the SOCRATES program. This program has as its objective “life long learning” which covers all of the age groups: elementary, secondary, university, and adult education. Each program has specific goals and objectives to meet the needs of the group targeted.

In the International Quality Review (2004) a brief chronology of the agreements was presented which will indicate the progression that the EU has forged:
**Lisbon Convention** (April 1997): an agreement concerning recognition of qualifications—degrees and diplomas. This superseded the former “equivalence” of degrees and diplomas. It assumed that there would be trust between all participating countries of the quality assurance and accreditation in each of the member countries. What this also entailed is the “diploma supplement” issue that would be issued to students in order to obtain their respective degree in their home institution. European Commission, Council of Europe and UNESCO/CEPES have formulated the guidelines that describe the type, level, context, and status of diplomas or degrees (CHEA, 2004). What this implied was that there would be reciprocal recognition of the degrees for all nations that have been admitted as members of this agreement.

**MERCOSUR** (1991, 1996, and 1997): as is evident concerns the Latin American Treaty of Asuncion signed by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay in 1991. Chile and Bolivia succeeded in joining the agreement in 1996 and 1997 respectively. Within this treaty the concerns were first economical and the apex was the integration of educational accreditation. Fundamentally there was a push to mutually recognize degrees, in addition to establishing a Commission made up of officials from the respective Ministries of Education, to set the standard and develop the guidelines that must be met for equivalencies between the educational systems and formulate initiatives like ERASMUS in Latin America.

**Sorbonne Declaration** (May 25, 1998): stressed the central role of universities in the development of European culture. This was agreed upon by the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Italy. It was from this agreement that the inception of a more advantageous reform of the educational systems to become more uniform—yet maintain
their own national identity – was staged as the Bologna Declaration. “The essential key

is the creation of a higher educational system that allowed the mobility and employability

amongst Europeans” (Sorbonie, 1998). In this declaration those nations that were not

part of the EU were invited to join in the effort.

**Bologna Declaration Agreement** (June 19, 1999): continued the evolutionary

process of discussions held at the Lisbon Convention, and later the Sorbonne Declaration.

As stated in the declaration:

“The European process, thanks to the extraordinary achievements of the last few

years, has become an increasingly concrete and relevant reality for the Union and

its citizens. Enlargement prospects together with deepening relations with other

European countries provide even wider dimensions to that reality. Meanwhile, we

are witnessing a growing awareness in large parts of the political and academic

world and in public opinion of the need to establish a more complete and far-

reaching Europe, in particular building upon and strengthening its intellectual,

cultural, social and scientific and technological dimensions” (Bologna, 1999).

In addition, the Bologna Declaration mentions the need to

“look objectively at increasing the international competitiveness of the European

systems of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilization can be

measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure

that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of

attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions” (1999).

The Declaration states its specific objectives are stepping stones to the work that must be
done, so as to develop and establish a European higher educational system that will be
global. The specific goals that have been the foundations of the process are as follows:

- “Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, also
  through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, in order to
  promote European citizens’ employability and the international
  competitiveness of the European higher education system;

- Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate
  and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful
  completion of first cycle studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The
  degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European
labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries;

- Establishment of a system of credits - such as in the ECTS system - as a proper means of promoting the most widespread student mobility. Credits could also be acquired in non-higher education contexts, including lifelong learning, provided they are recognised by the receiving universities concerned;

- Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement with particular attention to:
  - for students, access to study and training opportunities and to related services;
  - for teachers, researchers and administrative staff, recognition and valorisation of periods spent in a European context researching, teaching and training, without prejudicing their statutory rights;

- Promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies;

- Promotion of the necessary European dimensions in higher education, particularly with regards to curricular development, inter-institutional cooperation, mobility schemes and integrated programmes of study, training and research” (Bologna Declaration, 1999).

The above goals have recently been amended to include of the third cycle designated for the Ph.D. which, presently, is being adjusted and discussed in order to set specific standards and criteria. This European process is a work in continual progress dealing with specific objectives for each course of study. Thus, it will be modified in order to meet the growth, demands, and needs of globalization for the twenty-first century.
Relationship between the United States and ERASMUS

On the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, there has been both a growing interest and concern regarding the best manner to implement international education within the curriculum of higher education institutions. Internationalization and globalization in the United States has not been a phenomenon that emerged recently. The historical beginnings originated in the Woodrow Wilson Administration at the beginning of the twentieth century. What has been a debated issue is the terminology that is implemented. Since internationalization is the first step to becoming globalized, only in this century can that term be truly utilized as a direct result of the advances in technology that enable instantaneous communication around the global community. This dialogue on the topic of internationalization, has been brought to the forefront in order to respond to various waves of historical circumstances. Recently there has been a greater push by international educators to address the challenges that are a concern in regard to the U. S. lack of second and third language acquisition and cultural awareness.

Cultural awareness and language acquisition have been mutually linked by the nature of the discipline. There is a vital connection that is formulated in the expression of ideas in relationship with societal mores. Language acquisition and proficiency are the elements that need to be addressed in order to ascertain a comprehensive understanding of the cultural values and norms that make up a particular society. When one speaks of proficiency the dilemma becomes: what are the guidelines, whose criteria does it refer to, and should there be benchmarks to determine the levels. For the purpose of this dissertation, the proficiency examinations that have been established by the Ministries of Education and Culture of the following European countries are: France – Diplôme
d’Études en Langue Française, Diplôme Approfondi de Langue Française (DELF/DALF); Germany – Zertifikat Deutsch, Großes Sprachdiplm, TestDaF (ZD/GDS); Italy – Certificazione di Italiano come Lingua Straniera (CILS); and Spain - Diploma de Español como Lengua Extranjera (DELE) which has three proficiency levels. Each of the aforementioned has established benchmarks that determine the proficiency level ascertained by the candidates to the examinations. Within the context of the examinations there are cultural aspects that are presented to the candidates that are marked by the level that they have completed. This is not to say that the cultural aspects cannot be achieved via other means such as videos, internet and courses. What must be clear is that cultural values must take into account the societal norms and mores that stem from the history, politics, and religious beliefs of a particular group/nation. In Learning Across Cultures it is mentioned that there are several factors that influence the adjustment to a new culture, such as:

1) situational
2) awareness of one’s own and new culture
3) individual characteristics, and
4) communication patterns (1981, p 7-8).

All of these comprise what the Bologna Process is striving to achieve and what the U.S. needs to address within the scope of language acquisition.

In the United States there has been an underlining belief that the mastery of another language – other than English- is of little value. Language educators classify people as bilinguals, multilingual, and monolinguals – Americans fit the latter category. This attitude must be changed in order for U.S. students to be equipped to compete in the
global marketplace, upon graduating from a four-year institution. In the United States education has evolved from the Agricultural Age to the Industrial Age and now to the Information Age that has also been coined the Global Age (Sanders & Stewart, 2004). With this change there is a greater need to look at the status of each State, territory, and the national policies that affect the capacity to fulfill the current trend of internationalization and globalization across the board.

One of the manners of gaining a foothold on internationalization was the creation of the Lincoln Commission of Study Abroad, the legacy of Senator Paul Simon (D-IL) who had a bold vision for American renewal driven by international education. Elements of his vision included:

- "an understanding of diverse cultures; direct exposure to foreign languages;
- a greater understanding, and sensitivity to, the peoples of other nations as achieved through study abroad;
- a massive intervention through study abroad on par with the Morrill Act of 1862, the GI Bill, and the Marshall Plan. Noting the connection with the Morrill Act and approaching the 200th anniversary of Lincoln's birthday in 2009, the Senator proposed that the initiative be called the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, passed by the Congress on January 22, 2004" (Lincoln Commission, 2004).

John Yopp, the Project Coordinator, Lincoln Fellowships Advisory Council to the Commission, stated: "He – Senator Paul Simon - understood how knowledge of foreign
languages and cultures supports U.S. national security and global competitiveness, and he never stopped advocating for its support. He saw this Commission and its unanimous support by the study abroad education community at this particular point in the world history as an ideal legacy to leave the nation he served so well” (Lincoln Commission, 2004). One of the ironies is that, on September 12, 1985, 16 years and a day before 9/11, the Senator introduced S. 1631 "to further the national security and improve the economy of the United States by providing grants for the improvement of proficiency in critical languages, for the improvement of elementary and secondary language instruction, and for per capita grants to reimburse institutions of higher education to promote the growth and improve the quality of postsecondary language instruction" (Lincoln Commission, 2004).

With the advent of the European Union, the United States, like Asia and Latin America, have come to the realization that in order to compete and be successful within the global markets the challenge is to include foreign partnerships, to augment innovation within traditional administration and curriculum, setting educational goals that will allow for the process of internationalization leading to globalization at a further date. Among the diverse program activities that were of an “international element,” the reality was a weak integration of internationalization within the core academic mission. It became evident that there is a serious disconnect which needs to be bridged. What initially started as an integration of language and culture in the previous programs, became the opposite: no solid foundation of cultural and linguistic purpose were fulfilled. Research indicates there are two elements that have been discussed: internationalization and globalization as it pertains to the Bologna Agreement. (Merkx, 2003). In Europe the
reforms that are projected to be completed in 2010 have had their own difficulties, as the changes slowly become implemented amongst the nations that form part of the agreement. The Bologna Process consists of 45 European nations1 – some not included in the European Union – who see the reforms as a manner of creating an integrated European higher educational area beneficial to all those who participate. One of the major components that the recent literature on the topic stresses is the necessity of the United States to reform the educational system where there is an incorporation of international education which consists in second and third language acquisition and cultural sensitivity. What is also commented in the literature is the impact on the United States directly related to the recruitment of European students, which already has been on the decline during the last couple of years (Johnson, et al, 2006). Another aspect is that students from other parts of the world will find Europe more attractive, affordable, and challenging (Gonzalez, J. & Wagenar, R. 2003). Due to the internationalization and globalization of academia and business organizations, a shift from traditional practices toward a worldly vision is critical. Analyzing what is presently in place in the United States determines how it relates to the shift: first, to internationalizing and second, to globalizing higher educational institutions, resulting in an effective manner to stay abreast of the European reforms. Long gone are the days when colleges and universities pumped out graduates for the benefit of local or regional economies; with the click of a mouse the workforce has become both expansive and immediate. Competition has

---

1 Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia-Montenegro, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Swiss Confederation, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. (European Union countries are in bold)
extended itself outside of the national borders; thus, the vast differences in education, culture and social backgrounds will be present (Deardroff & Hunter, 2006).

Some questions to be answered through this critical analysis of literature are:

1) What will be the implications of the Bologna Process with reference to internationalization and globalization reforms concerning U.S. higher educational institutions?

2) How can the U.S. higher educational institutions align themselves with the European Union’s educational reform to compete with the vision that is being delivered in the process?

3) What can be done to actively assist in the processes needed in order that all the stakeholders in the U.S. educational system will develop an international curriculum to maintain abreast with the reforms via the Bologna Process?

4) How can the institutions of higher education in the United States incorporate the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush initiatives for international education in the curriculum?

5) Will the Lincoln Commission efforts match those of the ERASMUS MUNDUS?

The dramatic shift in workforce conditions coupled with the European reforms requires a radical shift in the educational philosophy of the United States. In addition, there are implications regarding the how and what should be incorporated in the pedagogy within all of the disciplines. The primary focus is on the acknowledgment of the United States’ need to confront the serious gaps in its educational system, and American’s understanding of international relations as it pertains to geography, cultural mores, and foreign language. The researcher believes that what is lacking is the commitment to an expansive goal that goes beyond simply enhancing a student’s ability
to comprehend cultural diversity. To enable said student to become globally ready with second and/or third language ability in order to face the demands of the twenty first century is the crux of both the United States and European Union rationale and objectives (Deardorff & Hunter, 2006). The purpose of this review is to critically analyze empirical literature concerning the Bologna Agreement/Process of the European Union and how it will force the reshaping of the United States higher educational curriculum in order to remain competitive globally, and to identify areas of future scholarly inquiry.

Organization of the Review

The approach chosen is to first look at the components of the Bologna Agreement/Process from its inception to the present – an ever changing process -- in order to meet the goal of 2010 with the full integration of the Process throughout the member nations Higher Educational Institutions. A research map (Figure 1) was utilized to focus the research of literature concerning the topic. On those bases, the map, simplifies the conceptual arrangement of the areas to discuss and suggests some possible solutions for institutions of higher learning in the United States. The purpose of the literature review is to understand the European Union’s educational reform and the effects it will have on the U.S. educational system in the near future. The literature map also enables the identification of areas in need of clarification, definitions of terminology, and connections among several components that will organize the review. Historical components of international education in the United States will be investigated so as to indicate the tradition of that train of thought. Gaps within the educational system in the United States will be discussed in relation to the European Union’s Commission of Higher Education.
Research Map
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Figure 1. Research Map
Scope and Context

The scope and context of this literature review present the inception of international education in the United States, the effect of September 11th, and the connection with projected trends that most probably will emerge in response to the need of a wider participation in the global markets. The Bologna Agreement and Process of the European Union will be looked at beginning with the first initiatives, to the present realities, and moving to the projected implications for 2010 when it is to be implemented in its totality. The review focuses mainly on the Bologna Agreement/Process and the state of international educational reform in the United States. As the literature discussed, there is yet another aspect that has emerged. Other areas of the world have implemented lateralization of educational reforms. These educational reforms allow regions in proximity of each other to initiate and continue articulation and bilateralization; thereby allowing their student to cross geographical, educational, and economical boundaries to produce a diverse workforce with a uniform educational system in place. To illustrate this is the Asian-Pacific Rim, wherein students educated and prepared in their home institution are also accepted in other regional institutions for graduate studies and, or workforce (Smith, 2006).

What is evident in the literature is the vital need for educational reform in the United States if the country does not want to lag in the academic global market. The building block for this consists of the following: Bologna Agreement, President Clinton's International Educational Policy, Department of Education's International Education Initiative/Recommendation, and core curriculum that will permeate the fundamental
general educational goals coupled with the international objective. Upon looking at the various levels of the topic, the predominant library search needed to cover literature from 1990 to 2006 to address the current issues that are emerging. Although changes and implementation of the European Higher Educational Reform are still in progress, and the structure of Higher Education in the United States is fostering changes to meet goals set by various institutions in accordance to their mission statement, this dissertation will only study the topic until June 2007.

This review includes a wide variety of literature: journals (electronic and hard copy), books, conference proceedings, government documents, newsletters, personal discussions with experts in the field, audio-visual, and European newspapers.


*Bologna Agreement/Process*

In the process of ascertaining the literature for this study it became apparent that although the umbrella is the Bologna Agreement/Process, international educational goals have a direct correlation affecting the educational systems across the world. As a direct result of trying to create a more user friendly educational system that allows for both additional language acquisition and cultural awareness, those not in the European Higher Education community must re-evaluate and meet the challenge that will make their nation attractive to European students. The correlation between the Agreement/Process and the U.S. Department of Education’s International Educational initiative/mandate of 2000 creates the reevaluation of how institutions of higher learning in the U.S. address the internationalization and globalization of the curriculum.
Upon the formation of the European Union (EU) – primarily done for economic reasons – there was also the exchange of educational opportunities such as research development and professional training which would strengthen the EU even further if the educational systems had a criteria for mutual recognition. A major consequence resulted in reforms and changes in the relationship between higher education and the EU member states (Henkel, 2002). As the expectations of higher education in the EU have augmented, the coordination and regulation by their own respective governments had to be altered, thus giving the institutions the power over their institutions and courses of study. (2002) Whilst the Bologna Agreement/Process started back with the Lisbon Convention of 1997, the evolutionary process has been increasingly snowballing with adjustments to achieve uniformity in the exchange of an educational scope that would benefit all of the stakeholders and reach beyond the local/regional arena towards the global arena.

As was discussed by Corbett, this process of revitalizing the educational system of Europe dates back to 1955 (2003). This being the case, it is evident that visionaries were attempting to set the groundwork for further enhancement of the system and foresee elements that would benefit European nations. Looking at this chronology of the process, four elements were pre-known:

1) “The promotion of closer relations between educational systems in Europe.

2) Increased cooperation between institutions of higher education.

3) Better possibilities for academic recognition of diplomas and the length of time of study.
4) Encouragement of the freedom of mobility by teachers, students and research workers, in particular; with the removal of administrative and social obstacles to allow movement by such people, while improving the pedagogy of foreign languages" (2003).

Criteria of members were:

- "Progressive harmonization of the economic and social policies of the Community must be adapted to the specific objectives and requirements.

- Under no circumstances must education be regarded merely as a component of economic life.

- Educational cooperation must make allowance for the traditions of each country and the diversity of their respective educational policies and systems.

- Harmonization of theses systems or policies cannot therefore be considered an end in itself.

- This cooperation must not hinder the exercise of the institutions of the European Communities" (2003).

Corbett (2003) argued that the reforms challenged the traditional concepts, replacing them with innovative ideas that would strengthen the previous agendas that were introduced.

Another result of this occurred in 1955 when the foreign ministers of Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, and Germany indicated that there was a need for European integration in the area of higher education. They proposed a European
University created by the members whereupon a European mission would evolve and promulgate the vast knowledge and technology available. It was not until 1961 that the European Community (EC) agreed that “decision-making on education was to pass from Community institutions to national governments cooperating on an intergovernmental bases – that is operating as sovereign States, rather than bound by Community rules” (Corbett, 2003). By offering a uniform basis for higher education that was idealistic for that time period, the EC has continued the progressive movement towards that goal because the members and stakeholders are willing to relinquish some of their authoritative powers.

As this literature on the historical chronology indicated, it was not until 1969-1971 that the subject of a European University was re-addressed. Ministers of Education of the EU, agreed in establishing the European University Institute in Florence, Italy. Here the key word was Institute, which insinuated a variant of the traditional university. The Italians would provide the place, and the signatories would oversee and finance the venture (Bologna, 2003). From this evolved the policy design of EC Education of 1973-1976. This design created the Resolution of the Ministers of Education; as well as the principles of cooperation, which later added the progressive stages to be laid out for the initiative. These priorities of cooperation were the backbone in the preparation for the policy guidelines that lead to the Bologna Declaration and the development of the Erasmus Proposal (1977-1981). As the process evolved both the ideas and instruments to be used demanded approval of all ministers yet allowing some room for compromise. When the Erasmus decision was initiated there was a challenge on the part of the European Commission to locate financial resources and conjoin the goals with those of
the EC procedures already in place. Establishment of ERASMUS consisted of three objectives:

1) "enable a growing number of students to acquire first hand experience of life in another Member State through a recognized period of study abroad.

2) ensure the development of a pool of graduates with direct experience of inter-Community cooperation, as a means of providing a broader basis for intensified economic and social cooperation in the Community.

3) strengthen the ties between citizens of various Member States with a view to consolidating the concept of a People's Europe" (ERASMUS, 2003).

The contribution of the ERASMUS MUNDUS program is the enabling of a distinctive cooperation policy unlike anything that was previously conceived in the international educational arena.

Erasmus Mundus was created to strengthen European co-operation and international linkages to enhance higher education at the Masters Level. This was to enable students and visiting scholars around the world to engage in post graduate studies at European institutions of higher learning. It was a formula to promote intercultural understanding and foster co-operation globally.

**International Education in the United States**

In the field of international education there have been certain assumptions that the program is part of various disciplines. Those disciplines are international studies, international relations, global education, modern language, exchanges and study abroad. What has been emerged in the effort of integrating the concept of internationalization is adding the prefix "international" to a discipline – such as "international communications,
or international business” – justifying it with some cultural element. In some institutions of higher learning a language component is required. Proficiency levels are not being assessed in a standardized format. Additionally, students are not taking advantage of the opportunities to study or participate in internships abroad. “In an increasingly interdependent world, it is essential to foster the global and cross-cultural knowledge and understanding necessary for effective U.S. leadership, competitiveness, and security.” (NAFSA, 2007) Keeping this as a focus, the tide of evaluating the core knowledge in a globalized twenty-first century higher education institution is imperative to maintain the leadership position in the United States.

**U.S. Historical Efforts**

In the United States the effort for internationalization higher education is not a concept that was created in the latter part of the twentieth century. Expectation of internationalization was part of the mind shift at the beginning of World War I. Gilbert Merkx (2003) discusses the contrasts of the dimensions of international education prior to the twenty-first century. Discussed in the article were how the dimensions have been renovated and what the expectations were. What emerged resulted in a change of focus to that of a global citizenry. That is a reality that will no doubt continue to evolve in the future as reforms are implemented. World War II brought about a shift from the mentality created during World War I. There was a realization that there was a greater need to embrace international knowledge in an attempt to bridge differences and focus on similarities. “A new model for cooperation between government and academia emerged from the establishment in 1942 of Army Specialized Training Programs (ASTP) at a large number of universities” (Merkx, 2003). From ASTP grew the model for the
National Defense Education Act (NDEA). Thus, the importance of understanding and
gaining knowledge of the world outside of the United States was recognized. Isolation
was no longer an option for the United States. The nation was thrust into the role of
leadership in the fields of higher education, bridging misconceptions, and governmental
model (Merkx, 2003). This is still to be seen, the EU reforms are setting a precedent in
the reconfiguration of the higher educational system and governmental involvement in
providing opportunities for both student, faculty, and researchers.

Merkx indicated the internationalization of U.S. higher education began with
World War II, and was divided in two phrases he named “waves”. The first “wave” grew
out of the direct outgrowth of the Second World War experience. It awakened the United
States from the mindset that Europe and Asia were far and unimportant to the realization
that they were closer than ever before. This led to the second wave, reflecting the
acceleration of the global interaction to an unprecedented level (Merkx, 2003). The first
wave gave rise to internationalization of higher educational institutions via foreign aid,
study abroad programs, foreign student enrollments, and international studies -foreign
language, international and foreign area studies (Merkx, 2003). During this period, more
American students were studying abroad but there was no strategy or assessment
instrument to indicate the international educational experience. Unfortunately, the idea
that internationalization meant having international students on the campus, establishing
an international office to aid foreign students, and instituting a chief international
education administrator was considered a formula for creating the illusion of an
institutional global /international aspect (Merkx, 2003). That is still the practice today on
many higher educational institutions in the United States.
In the mid 1980s, according to Merkx, emerged the “second wave” but it was not until the 1990’s that the momentum increased and continues to grow (2003). What Merkx fails to focus on is that the acknowledgement of what elements are needed to first create an international campus. An institution should first have the ability to reevaluate the status of what is their mission statement. From the statement goal establishment and criteria in the implementation will catapult them from the present state of a make shift international institution to being one. The ability to reach the next level, globalization, has been demonstrated by the University of Singapore. Merkx (2003) defines the salient aspects of the ‘second wave’ as being: “driven by diverse and diffuse influences that affect many colleges and universities similarly; many of these driving forces come from outside academia. Inside the campus, non-traditional constituencies are involved, such as the professional staff and the trustee. The new internationalization involves broad and intangible goals that are institution wide rather than mission specific; central administrations are involved; and administrative concern is now focused on coordination and integration of previously disparate units.” What has been presented is a process that must involve a paradigm shift across higher educational institutions. This must be presented in a forum that will enable faculty to embrace the challenge of visualizing a new focus of their course material, to change toward cooperative cross disciplines, internationalization, and globalization of education in the twenty-first century.

Legislation Efforts

Efforts on the part of United States Congress have been based on individual foresight for the need to bring forth international education to the citizenry. An educational shift from the old mentality of “American only” to one of
"internationalization and globalization". “One of the initiatives for the paradigm shift has been the creation of the Fulbright scholarship, which promotes exchanges, supports the field of international educational and cultural exchange, and, in addition, promotes governmental policies that will foster U.S. leadership and engagement in the global world” (Fulbright, 2007).

Another initiative comes from the Department of Education’s International Education Programs (appendix G). These International Educational programs are defined as follows:

“Combination of institutions of higher education means a group of institutions of higher education that have entered into a cooperative arrangement for the purpose of carrying out a common objective, or a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution designated or created by a group of institutions of higher education for the purpose of carrying out a common objective on their behalf.

Critical languages means each of the languages contained in the list of critical languages designated by the Secretary pursuant to section 212(d) of the Education for Economic Security Act, except that, in the implementation of this definition, the Secretary may set priorities according to the purposes of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

Institution of higher education means, in addition to an institution that meets the definition of section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, an institution that meets the requirements of section 101(a) except that (1) it is not located in the United States, and (2) it applies for assistance under title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, in consortia with institutions that meet the definitions in section 101(a).

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1121-1127, and 1141)

President Clinton's International Educational Policy was the cornerstone and leading support for the push for the incorporation of internationalization in the arena of higher education which has traditionally not embraced the effort. The Administration was committed to:

- "encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States;
- promoting study abroad by U.S. students;
- supporting the exchange of teachers, scholars, and citizens at all levels of society;
- enhancing programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise;
- expanding high-quality foreign language learning and in-depth knowledge of other cultures by Americans;
- preparing and supporting teachers in their efforts to interpret other countries and cultures for their students; and
- advancing new technologies that aid the spread of knowledge throughout the world" (Clinton, 2000).

President Clinton (2000) clearly stated that these goals could not be accomplished relying solely on the Federal Government: educational institutions, along with State and local officials, need to collaborate. Within this collaboration the private sector must be involved if this policy is to enable students to become an integral part of the global society that has evolved (Clinton, 2000). Already, the business community has been a driving force for change in higher education since it directly deals with the fast pace of global markets. As a direct result there has been a move to augment knowledge of international understanding and cultural awareness across the curriculum at the undergraduate level. The memorandum from President Clinton gives the charge to the following entities for the accomplishment of the initiative.

1. "The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of schools and colleges to improve access to high-quality international educational experiences by increasing the number and diversity of students who study and intern abroad, encouraging students and institutions to choose
non-traditional study-abroad locations, and helping under-represented U.S. institutions offer and promote study-abroad opportunities for their students.

2. The Secretaries of State and Education, in partnership with other governmental and nongovernmental organizations, shall identify steps to attract qualified post-secondary students from overseas to the United States, including improving the availability of accurate information overseas about U.S. educational opportunities.

3. The heads of agencies, including the Secretaries of State and Education, and others as appropriate, shall review the effect of U.S. Government actions on the international flow of students and scholars as well as on citizen and professional exchanges, and take steps to address unnecessary obstacles, including those involving visa and tax regulations, procedures, and policies.

4. The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of State and local governments and educational institutions to promote international awareness and skills in the classroom and on campuses. Such efforts include strengthening foreign language learning at all levels, including efforts to achieve bi-literacy, helping teachers acquire the skills needed to understand and interpret other countries and cultures for their students, increasing opportunities for the exchange of faculty, administrators, and students, and assisting educational institutions in other countries to strengthen their teaching of English.

5. The Secretaries of State and Education and the heads of other agencies shall take steps to ensure that international educational exchange programs, including the Fulbright program, are coordinated through the Interagency Working Group on United States Government-Sponsored International Exchange and Training, to maximize existing resources in a nonduplicative way, and to ensure that the exchange programs receive the support they need to fulfill their mission of increased mutual understanding.

6. The Secretary of Education, in cooperation with other agencies, shall continue to support efforts to improve U.S. education by developing comparative information, including benchmarks, on educational performance and practices. The Secretary of Education shall also share U.S. educational expertise with other countries.

7. The Secretaries of State and Education shall strengthen and expand models of international exchange that build lasting cross-national partnerships among educational institutions with common interests and complementary objectives.
8. The Secretary of Education and the heads of other agencies, in partnership with State governments, academic institutions, and the business community, shall strengthen programs that build international expertise in U.S. institutions, with the goal of making international education an integral component of U.S. undergraduate education and, through graduate and professional training and research, enhancing the Nation's capacity to produce the international and foreign-language expertise necessary for U.S. global leadership and security.

9. The Secretaries of State and Education, in cooperation with other agencies, the academic community, and the private sector, shall promote wise use of technology internationally, examining the implications of borderless education. The heads of agencies shall take steps to ensure that the opportunities for using technology to expand international education do not result in a widening of the digital divide.

10. The Secretaries of State and Education, in conjunction with other agencies, shall ensure that actions taken in response to this memorandum are fully integrated into the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) framework by means of specific goals, milestones, and measurable results, which shall be included in all GPRA reporting activities, including strategic plans, performance plans, and program performance reports *(Clinton, 2000).*

What was being promoted through this initiative was an effort to bring about a discussion on the strategic approach to internationalize higher education and also bringing to the forefront the changes that will occur as a direct result of the European Union's Bologna Agreement's Educational Reform. At the moment that President Clinton issued the policy, the knowledge of the workings of Bologna and Erasmus was not taken fully into consideration.

President George W. Bush continued in the same vein as President Clinton concerning international education. What changed was September 11th 2001. The context of historical events reshaped the view of internationalization and the urgency of securing national security. This new mindset of preparing students to confront the
challenges such as language acquisition and cultural awareness became imperative.

Awareness consists of the societal order, mores, religious beliefs, and linguistic aspects.

In 2006, President Bush launched the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI), “a plan to further strengthen national security and prosperity in the 21st century through education, especially in developing foreign language skills” (Bush, 2006). The President requested $114 million in FY07 to fund this effort which was going to integrate the educational spectrum of K-12 and higher education. In addition what was going to be added would be the private sector professional development. One of the concerns was the need for language training, not only in languages taught traditionally, but in languages of critical need such as Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Hindi, and Farsi.

President Bush (2006) discussed the rational, as thus:

“It is an essential component of U.S. national security in the post-9/11 world is the ability to engage foreign governments and peoples, especially in critical regions, to encourage reform, promote understanding, convey respect for other cultures and provide an opportunity to learn more about our country and its citizens. To do this, we must be able to communicate in other languages, a challenge for which we are unprepared.

Deficits in foreign language learning and teaching negatively affect our national security, diplomacy, law enforcement, intelligence communities and cultural understanding. It prevents us from effectively communicating in foreign media environments, hurts counter-terrorism efforts, and hampstrings our capacity to work with people and governments in post-conflict zones and to promote mutual understanding. Our business competitiveness is hampered in making effective contacts and adding new markets overseas.” (2006)

The program would include:

- “Providing $24 million to create incentives to teach and study critical need languages in K-12 by re-focusing the Department of Education’s Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) grants.
Building continuous programs of study of critical need languages from kindergarten to university through a new $27 million program, which will start in 27 schools in the next year through DOD’s NSEP program and the Department of Education, and will likely expand to additional schools in future years.

- Providing State Department scholarships for summer, academic year/semester study abroad, and short-term opportunities for high school students studying critical need languages to up to 3,000 high school students by summer 2009.

- Expanding the State Department Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant Program, to allow 300 native speakers of critical need languages to come to the U.S. to teach in U.S. universities and schools in 2006-07.

- Establishing a new component in State’s Teacher Exchange Programs to annually assist 100 U.S. teachers of critical need languages to study abroad.

- Establishing DNI language study "feeder" programs, grants and initiatives with K-16 educational institutions to provide summer student and teacher immersion experiences, academic courses and curricula, and other resources for foreign language education in less commonly taught languages targeting 400 students and 400 teachers in 5 states in 2007 and up to 3,000 students and 3,000 teachers by 2011 in additional states.

- Adding overseas language study to 150 U.S. Fulbright student scholarships annually.

- Increasing support for immersion language study centers abroad” (Bush, 2006)

As can be observed the legislative forum as reported by NAFSA has three main goals:

1) “Comprehensive legislation to restore U.S. competitiveness for international students and scholars.

2) The Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program.

3) Comprehensive immigration reform” (Oaks, 2006).

This process here in the United States will be an ongoing venture as the Bologna Agreement deadline for full compliance looms. As the European Union continues the process the results provide evidence that the fast growing need for internationalization within geographic locations will be the norm and not the
exception. In order for the United States to maintain its marketability with other parts of the world, it will require stepping up to the challenge to integrate those expectations expressed by both President Clinton and Bush pertaining to international education. In the opinion of Madeleine Green (2003) "true internationalization requires a commitment that is institution-wide (regarding higher education). There has been a disconnect of activities that attempted to be part of the core of the academic mission but failed to produce the outcomes desired".

Lincoln Fellowship Commission

The Lincoln Fellowship for Study Abroad has been instrumental in getting students to experience cultures and languages in the various host nations. Senator Paul Simon articulated a broad vision for study abroad. That vision was that all American college students experience the global community that surrounds them and also learn how to face the challenges that they will meet as future leaders. This fellowship, according to Senator Simon "would be the natural next step in the evolution of U.S. higher education in the tradition of the establishment of land grant colleges and the enactment of the GI bill" (Lincoln Report, 2004).

According to the report issued by the Lincoln Commission it pointed out:

"Study abroad for U.S. students provides an accepted and recognized mechanism for addressing the nation’s critical needs in global education. In order to address the challenges confronting the United States in the contemporary world environment, the nation needs to ensure that it has business men and women, scientists, medical professionals, and teachers—to say nothing of political leaders— whose knowledge and understanding collectively embrace the globe. Expanding access to and participation in study abroad is essential because it provides direct experience in living, learning, and working in other societies. As with other areas of national need, the federal government has a key role in fostering study abroad innovation, quality, and access—Partnering with states, higher education, and the private sector. Higher education has a key role to play in
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reducing barriers to participation and integrating study abroad into students’ programs and curricula” (Lincoln Report, 2004).

The outcomes would include:

- “Capacity to understand languages and cultures of other nations.
- Understanding of the United States culture with respect with the global community.
- Knowledge and skills that are critical in the global market.
- Flexibility in approaching problem solving.
- Self directed learning.
- Ability to operate successfully in an environment of cultural and ethnic diversity” (Lincoln, 2004).

**Discussion of the Literature**

The main purpose of the literature review is to critically analyze the empirical and theoretical literature to suggest what will be the impact of the European Union’s Bologna Agreement on higher education in the United States. It explores the relationship between the implementation of the process of internationalization and the impact it will have in the future. It demonstrates the impact this movement will have on future generation and identifies areas of future scholarly inquiry.

As a result of the currents and concerns regarding the status of international education here in the United States there has been debate on the concepts and context that will be integrated into the liberal arts dimension of the curriculum. For years higher education has been following an outdated model of traditional learning. When the winds of change and challenge begin to take hold, there will still be those in academia that were resistant to the shift. As a direct result of September 11th the shift
in paradigm has increased for national security reasons. Theoretical literature on the
topic has engaged in a nationwide debate on the readiness of the United States to
compete in the global market. On the other hand the EU has a strong hold on the
cultural diversity and competitive edge as a result of the educational goals that were
set forth prior to the Bologna Agreement and now even greater with the Erasmus
program and college credit transfer system.

Furthermore, when looking at the literature review, various questions have
been left unanswered. Each side of the Atlantic has elements that must be analyzed in
order to prepare the next generation to meet the demands of the global market.
Internationalization or globalization are terms that are not interchangeable.
Unfortunately in higher education the awareness of what each term infers are blurred.
Although the terminology, internationalization and globalization, has been around for
quite some time it is presently seen as a complex concept. Recently institutions are
finding the complexity of integrating those components into the curriculum a
challenge. Previously it was thought of as superfluous concept that was only addressed
in the context of a foreign language program. Now internationalization/globalization
covers multicultural curriculum, research partnerships – governmental, private sector,
and academic - , public diplomacy within the community groups, seeking profit
through fund raising and recruiting students overseas. Furthermore there is a
movement towards educating students about and involving them in other cultures,
political environments, and economies beyond the borders of their country. Europe
has shifted from ego centric (nationalities and regionalism) to a state of being part of
the whole of Europe. Although the unified system of higher education as stated in the
Bologna Declaration is mainly focused on European students, it has projected an increased competition in the international student market; increasing the demand for those individuals that have the ability to align themselves as global citizens with skills that aid in the new and evolving markets. Formation of the European Union has forced the United States to notice that there are gaps to be addressed in order to compete. Deardorff offers the following solution of bridging the gap by utilizing the “program logic model for internationalization in the United States” (2005). What has been presented is a four tier model: Inputs/Resources; Activities/Components of Internationalization; Outputs of Internationalization; and Outcomes of internationalization (2005). Each one is based upon the other, depending and focusing on moving forward toward an internationalization effort. What must be asked is: are administrators willing to invest the financial and professional development that will permit the institution to venture into the process?

Summary and Interpretations

As a direct result of the Bologna Declaration the European Higher Education Commission has been charged with creating a new dimension and expectation of the goals that graduates from their institutions will have experienced. Traditional education both in Europe and the United States has been challenged to look at the skills required of the future leaders. Globalization is a term that has both a positive and negative connotation, as expressed by McCaig “international cooperation is vital to the health of the planet and its people, the leadership of persons whose vision and experience extends beyond boarders is critically needed” (2002). What has been a disconnect is the lack of exchange of the opportunities that are available to American students to experience other
cultures and societies that will enable them to engage in dialogues that formerly would not otherwise be possible. For students it is increasingly necessary to have the skills, such as computer knowledge, coupled with language acquisition and cultural understanding/awareness. These elements are the challenges on both sides of the Atlantic. Deardorff (2006) offers an assessment guide for intercultural competence but falls short in light of the Erasmus Mundus and the Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowships. It has been evident that the connection between the two programs has not been discussed. Each is described and discussed but the linkage between them has not appeared in the literature.

**Recommendations**

Literature is limited to each individual region. There is a need to explore the use of the Erasmus Mundus and Lincoln Fellowship as a unit. Institutional strategies for internationalization must nurture alliances within the institution – administration, faculty, staff, and student body – in conjunction with the community and across borders. First is the relationship between the administration of the international office and faculty here in the United States. On the other side, European institutions must let go of the traditional formats and this includes regionalisms which are prevalent.

What is evident is the existence of the mission to retrain the faculty to visualize the concepts that are forged by the Bologna Declaration, internationalization of curriculum, and to expand the learning experience towards a global market.
CHAPTER II

Research Methodology

This case study will indicate the strides made in the EU - three institutions in Spain - and how the U.S. has embraced the concept of internationalization in higher education with the new reforms in the EU and the Department of Education international initiative in conjunction with the Lincoln Commission Fellowship. The methodology utilized will give insight on the process on both sides of the Atlantic; provide suggestions for implementing the internationalization in our national higher educational institutions; finally impart possible solutions to close the gaps in the literature.

Research Design

This study will be based upon the case study methodology. Case study investigation brings forth an understanding of a complex issue; extends the experience of the subject matter; strengthens what is already known concerning the matter adding further insight that previously was unavailable. In accordance to this methodology, by means of examining real-life situations it enables the researcher to provide the basis for application of ideas, suggestions, and extension of the method to other similar situations. Robert K. Yin defines the case study method “as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (Yin, 1984).

The selection of this method is based upon the fact that the EU educational reform and the internationalization of U.S. higher educational institutions is an on going process. In the case of the EU, there has been a goal date of 2010 for the complete implementation
of the Bologna Agreement. Each step of the process has had universities struggling with how to conform to the mandate, an undertaking that has various elements. On the other hand, in the U.S. there are institutions that are engaged in the process of internationalization of their curriculum and utilization of study abroad as a vehicle to achieve the goals of the Department of Education and President Clinton’s International Initiative. For this format, looking at the documents which are the cornerstone for both the European Union Commission, U.S. governmental documents, Lincoln Commission Fellowship, and the Department of Education initiatives.

During the course of the investigation on the topic, it was evident that there was little research on the Bologna Agreement and the relationship it has on U.S. higher learning institutions. It is an exploratory study which will contribute to bridging the gap in the literature. When looking at the gap it is evident that during the reform process that relationship has not been looked at.

When approaching the case study it was necessary that there be a detailed description of the actual situation, historical background, discussion of the challenges, and the opportunities that the reforms will surely affect students on both sides of the Atlantic. A holistic and in-depth analysis will be done on the following documents: Bologna Agreement, ERASMUS MUNDUS, Socrates, President Clinton’s International Education mandate, President G.W. Bush’s International Education initiative, Department of Education’s International Mandates, and the Lincoln Commission Fellowship. Each document will be analyzed and synthesized so as to facilitate the salient points of the objectives set forth in all of them. Upon going through the documentation and research there was a lack of linkage in the literature where upon the ERASMUS
MUNDUS and the Lincoln Commission Fellowship are not bridging the opportunities that could be availed to both students and faculty. Furthermore, the ERASMUS MUNDUS is not being taken advantage of by U.S. students. According to the documentation there is a provision for U.S. students that partake in the scholarship offered to European students.

The role of the researcher will be to provide the information and suggestions on how the gaps can be filled to the advantage of both the EU and U.S. That will be by identifying and stating the official mission of the organizations/documentation; along with the historical aspects that will enlighten the situation of the reforms. Recommendations will be presented for the best resolution for the U.S. higher educational institutions alignment with the European Union’s Bologna Agreement and partnership of the ERASMUS MUNDUS and the Lincoln Commission Fellowships. The procedure will be primarily based upon Stake’s (1995) approach:

1. Determine if the case study is appropriate to the search problem. This has already been established by the researcher since the Agreement is still in the process of being implemented in the EU. The target date for total implementation is 2010 with a clause of extension if need be.

2. Purposeful sampling. The subject of the design will be two European institutions that are at different stages of the implementation of the Bologna Agreement. Reasoning behind the institutions that have been selected were those that are available and have been working on various aspects to achieve the goals of the Agreement; in addition they have had ERASMUS MUNDUS students and also U.S. students. Another consideration was accessibility via networking and
personal inquiries done at conferences. In both cases the people that will be receiving a questionnaire and possible follow up telephone interview will be administrators, department chairs or administrators, international liaisons/directors, and those experts in the field of international education. The selected subjects will be contacted via email and a follow up hard copy of the consent letter and questionnaire. They will be aware that there is a possibility of a phone interview for further information, if need be.

3. Data Collection: A questionnaire has been devised in accordance to the documentation that is being utilized for the study. It is the goal to have on the European side four to eight questionnaires; on the U.S. the number will be four sources, there will be the chair of the NAFSA taskforce on the Bologna Agreement in relationship to the U.S; director or vice director of the Lincoln Commission Fellowship; and within the Department of Education someone from the international education aspect.

4. Type of analysis will be a combination of the holistic analysis – entire documentation, questionnaires, and interviews – and also an embedded analysis. The embedded analysis stems from the questionnaires and interviews that will be utilized in the study. A detailed description of the Bologna Declaration Agreement, ERASMUS MUNDUS, SOCRATES, European Higher Educational Commission/Council; United States Department of Education section of International Education, Lincoln Commission Fellowship, and President William J. Clinton’s International Education Initiative will be key to the understanding of
this undertaking and the emerging themes. These will be put in lay men's terms so as to better grasp the central issues that each of these documents have put forth.

5. Finally is the interpretation of the reports and the meaning it has to the EU and US. in terms of internationalization and globalization. The researcher will do an analysis and present observations and recommendations for the Spanish University and the U.S. organizations. After the dissertation a Federal Grant to continue the study will be sought.

Population

The subject of the design will be three European institutions that are at different stages of the implementation of the Bologna Agreement. The reasoning behind the institutions that have been selected were those that are available and have been working on various aspects to achieve the goals of the Agreement; in addition they have had ERASMUS MUNDUS students and also U.S. students. Another consideration was accessibility via networking and personal inquiries done at conferences. In both cases the people that will be receiving a questionnaire and possible follow up telephone interview will be administrators, department chairs or administrators, international liaisons/directors, and those experts in the field of international education. The selected subjects will be contacted via email and a follow up hard copy of the consent letter and questionnaire. They will be aware that there is a possibility of a phone interview for further information, if need be.

A questionnaire has been devised in accordance to the documentation that is being utilized for the study. It is the goal to have on the European side four to eight questionnaires; on the U.S. the number will be four sources, there will be the chair of the
NAFSA taskforce on the Bologna Agreement in relationship to the U.S; director or vice director of the Lincoln Commission Fellowship; within the Department of Education someone or documentation from the international education aspect; and the documentation on international education from President William J. Clinton.

**Instrumentation**

The questionnaire will focus on the information that relates to the research questions; additionally, a Web seminar will be utilized for the U.S. portion of the study.

For this study the following are the research questions:

1) What are the guidelines set by the Bologna Declaration and the ERASMUS MUNDUS?

2) How have the guidelines of the Bologna Declaration been implemented?

3) What are the guidelines of the Lincoln Commission Fellowship?

4) How can the ERASMUS MUNDUS and Lincoln Fellowships be integrated into both European and U.S. higher educational institutions to benefit students?

**Questionnaire:**

1. Can you please describe the programs of study that were available to students?

2. When did the first ERASMUS MUNDUS students arrive?

3. From what countries were they from and what was the length of time that they were enrolled at your institution?

4. Have there been pedagogical changes needed in order to accommodate the ERASMUS MUNDUS students?

5. How many of your students have partaken in the program?

6. Is there a difference between the ERASMUS MUNDUS and U.S. students that are studying abroad at your institution? If so, please explain.

7. Has the Bologna Agreement created or eliminated majors at your institution? Which
ones? Have any been combined?

8. What has been the change of the role of faculty with the new proposals of the Agreement?

9. Have the Agreement changes been completed? If so, how has it been? If not, when is the goal date for the integration?

10. Describe to the best of your knowledge the effect that these changes have had on both students and faculty.

11. Has your institution received any U.S. students that were on a fellowship from the Lincoln Commission? If so, how did that compare with those of the ERASMUS MUNDUS?

Methods of Data Analysis

A case analysis technique is used upon each of the documents and institutions that are under the study. The investigator studies all of the written materials/documentations, examining similarities and differences. Upon completion of the inquiry there is a prepared detailed case study write-up for each institution and document. This will include the questionnaires, telephone follow-up if needed, and the responses that were supplied by each of the individuals of the specific institution of higher learning in Europe and in the United States. In regards to the data analysis for the case study the researcher will be utilizing Creswell's (2007) method.

Creswell stated the in a case study the data analysis although at times is serendipitous the process conforms to a general contour called a 'spiral'. This type of analysis of qualitative data engages the movement of a circular movement as is seen in nature; each element is interconnected to formulate an organizational unit/subject.

This spiral manner commences with the date collection. In this study the foundational materials are the actual governmental documents where upon the reforms are being based on. Those documents are: Bologna Declaration Agreement, ERASMUS
MUNDUS, SOCRATES, European Higher Educational Commission/Council; United States Department of Education section of International Education, Lincoln Commission Fellowship, and President William J. Clinton’s International Education Initiative. As a result, this is a voluminous task; additional information will be acquired via the questionnaires given to the Spanish institutions; and a web seminar with the chair of the NAFSA taskforce on the Bologna Agreement in relationship to the U.S. The data analysis spiral provided by Creswell is what will be utilized for this section of the investigation as a visual.

The inception of the study was the documentation from the European Union and the U.S. government. Each document has been read; with notations to items that must be
simplified so as to clarify the salient points that are the essence of the objectives / goals. From this point the loop goes into the description of the terminology and concepts that relate to the study. At this point the following terms will be defined and categorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Union</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bologna Declaration Agreement</td>
<td>International Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS MUNDUS/SOCRATES</td>
<td>Lincoln Commission Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Commission</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the description of each of the above, the vision and interpretation is based upon the literature and the investigator. Interpreting the details of each term will enable the researcher to show the themes which are expected, not expected and concepts which are either of interest or unusual.

In the study the coding will have the classification of European Union and U.S. documentation; EU higher learning institutions in Spain; additionally the responses of the questionnaires both from the Spanish institution and the interviews with U.S. organizations. It is very likely; the code names will be ‘in vivo codes’ drawn from the subject matter. The Bologna Declaration Agreement, likewise, international education are the elements from which the dimensions of the topic will be deconstructed.

Later in the conclusions and recommendations there will be a comparison between the EU and US. Similarities and differences between the two systems will be looked at in terms of their perspective documentations and participants.
Recommendations for converging both the ERASMUS MUNDUS and the Lincoln Commission Fellowship for a joint effect will be based upon the observations of all the data collected by the researcher. Stake (1995) calls this type of analysis 'direct interpretation' with the establishment of 'patterns'. In the deconstruction, then reconstruction in a more meaningful format will lead to the indication of the relationship that can be fostered between the two entities. The EU educational reform and the U.S.'s need for further internationalization and alignment with the Bologna Declaration Agreement will have specific steps which will enable the establishment of the linkage between the ERASMUS MUNDUS and the Lincoln Commission Fellowship.

**Evaluation of Research Methods**

Key features that will be included in the report: participant’s answers from the questionnaires; follow-up interviews if deemed necessary; and observations based on the questionnaires and the correlation with the documents that are the focal point of the reforms in progress. The report will include confirmation and conflicts in the literature reviews. It will conclude making assertions and suggestions for further research in the future when nearing the end of the goal date of 2010 and still after the total implementation – giving a five year – re-evaluation.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

During the course of this study, it was clear that the core elements of analysis would be the governmental documents – Bologna Declaration Agreement, ERASMUS MUNDUS, SOCRATES, Lincoln Commission Fellowship, and President William J. Clinton’s International Education Initiative. Each of them first needs to be simplified so as to highlight the significant points which are indispensable for comprehending the objectives of each. Deconstruction, then later reconstruction of a generalization of core rudiments pertaining to the documentation is imperative to the research. With this in place the study could be duplicated at a later date to see the perceptions and implementations of the Bologna Declaration, ERASMUS MUNDUS, and the Lincoln Commission Fellowship both in Europe and in the United States. In the arena of international education this deconstruction will aid in the execution of internationalization / globalization of U.S. higher educational institutions faced with the new educational reforms of the EU with reference to the degree programs, therefore assisting with transatlantic exchanges that undeniably will be affected in terms of validation of degrees.

Document Analysis: European Union

Analysis of Bologna Declaration Agreement

In accordance with the Confederation of European Union Rectos’ Conferences, the Association of European Universities (CRE), and the European Commission of Higher Education, the Bologna Declaration Agreement marks the turning point of the
vision of European Higher Education. The Bologna Declaration was originally signed by twenty nine EU member countries that agreed to engage in this process of higher educational reform. The main objective is and has always been, to create an overall union to resolve common European problems in higher education systems. All of the institutions “are facing common internal and external challenges related to the growth and diversification of higher education, the employability of graduates, the shortage of skills in key areas, the expansion of private and transnational education, etc.”


As a direct result of the formation of the European Union (EU), the Ministries of Education and Culture of the respective members wanted to deepen relationships amongst the nations. One of the formulas was to build and strengthen the ties through intellectual, social, cultural, scientific, and technological linkages which would enrich the citizenry of the EU. Education is a means of developing those ties of comprehension and acquisition of knowledge for the benefit of the global community in terms of social, political and economic aspects.

European higher educational institutions accepted the challenges that this undertaking would give rise to a great compatibility of systems whilst maintaining autonomy. The salient points of the Declaration are the following:

- Definition of goals that enable mobility of the citizenry in order to increase global competitiveness in the area of higher learning.
- Adoption of comparable degrees with the assessment tool ‘Diploma Supplement’.
- Establishment of degree lengths to be comparable to the labor market.
  - First cycle [degree] are required to be a minimum of three years.
Second cycle consists of the Masters and Doctoral degrees.

- Establishment of a credit system inclusive of 'lifelong learning activities' as prescribed by the ECTS.
- Definition of quality criteria and methodology.
- Removal of obstacles which would impede or make difficult the mobility of both students and educators.
- Promotion of reforms in the "curriculum development inter-institutional co-operation, mobility, and integrate programs"


While these points were established in 1999, there have been subsequent annual meetings to continue the process of the initial Declaration. Guidelines and evaluations were gradually incorporated into the reform. At the Bergen Conference in 2005, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) adopted a framework covering the three cycles that comprise higher education. The first cycle is the 'licenciatura' (BA/BS); the second cycle was broken down into two areas – Masters and Doctoral degrees; the length of time for the Masters would be two years, the Doctoral between one to two years. For each of the cycles there are now specific outcomes that must be met. Those outcomes are competencies prescribed for each of the degree levels that will additionally carry credit ranges as deemed appropriate by each individual university department for the field of study pertaining to only first and second cycles. Doctoral credit range is under discussion amongst the European Higher Educational Council. What has been established are the competencies that are expected at this cyclical level of education. This framework of the cyclical competencies was started in 2007 and is expected to be completed in 2010.
During the transition from the old system there will be equivalencies to accommodate those students in the system who still need to complete their degrees.

EHEA framework for each of the cycles comprises of the following criteria for each of the cycles.

First Cycle:
- 180 – 240 ECTS credits.
- Competencies:
  - demonstration of knowledge and understanding based on texts and field experience.
  - application of knowledge and understanding as expected in the profession.
  - demonstration of critical thinking and problem solving as related to the field of study.
  - demonstration of ability to investigate and interpret data within the field; make judgments and reflect on social, scientific or ethical issues presented.
  - communication of information, problems, and solutions both to the experts and lay audience.
  - demonstration of mastering of skills that enable the further study in an autonomy manner.

Second Cycle:
- 90 – 120 ECTS credits minimum of 60 credits at the 2nd cycle level.
- Competencies:
• demonstration of knowledge and understanding beyond the level of the first cycle. Originality in development and application of ideas within the research context.

• application of knowledge, understanding, and problem solving in new and broader environments (multidisciplinary) related to field of study.

• demonstration of ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity. Formation of judgments which will include reflecting on the social and ethical responsibilities based on the knowledge acquired.

• demonstration of a clear presentation of findings with knowledge and rationale that can be followed by experts in the field and the general population.

• demonstration of self-direction.

Third Cycle:

• under consideration and is currently being discussed.

• Competencies:

  • ability to systematically demonstrate understanding of the field of study. Mastery of methods of research in that field.

  • ability to demonstrate the ability to conceive, design, and implement scholarly research.
ability to make a contribution via original research and develop a body of work that merits national or international refereed publication.

ability to demonstrate critical analysis and synthesize new and complex ideas.

ability to communicate with peers, scholarly community, and general population about the area of expertise.

ability to effectively promote, within the context of both the professional and academic communities the advancement of knowledge in the field.

**Analysis of SOCRATES**

The European Community’s action plan in the area of education across all levels from nursery school to higher education is called Socrates. Included in the program is adult and life learning education. “Socrates is relevant to all players involved in education: teachers, education staff, administrative and management staff, and students, along with civil servants and decision makers, all required to play an increasingly active part in European cooperation projects.”

(http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/socrates/socrates_en.html) The purpose of Socrates is to broaden education extending its parameters outside of the confines of the classroom. Goals and objectives to this initiative are the following:

- to strengthen the European dimension of education at all levels.
- to improve the knowledge of European languages.
- to promote cooperation and mobility throughout education.
- to encourage innovation in education.
- to promote equal opportunities in all sectors of education.

Socrates is broken down into five distinct areas of the educational process which is comprised of: Comenius: school education; Erasmus: higher education; Grundtvig: adult education; and other educational pathways; Lingua: learning European languages; and Minerva: information and communication technologies (ICT) in education. (http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/socrates/socrates_en.html).

Comenius focuses on the first phase of education, pre-school to secondary school (including technical and vocational education). Here the concentration is on learning in a multicultural framework, support for disadvantaged groups, countering underachievement at school, and preventing exclusion. (http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/socrates/socrates_en.html)

ERASMUS, also known as ERASMUS MUNDUS, was the first program initiative for higher education that was not solely for students but also for faculty. Since 1987, when it was introduced, more than 700,000 students have been able to take advantage of the mobility arrangements under ERASMUS. All European universities are involved. Erasmus document will be discussed more in depth in another section.

Grundtvig is the third stage of education which is the process that continues through the individual’s lifetime. It is not only via the educational system that knowledge is acquired, hence that must be taken into account. Adult education is the process of imparting the experience and knowledge ascertained but also the necessity of acquiring skills that complement prior skills. Those goals can be linked to acquisition of the education that possibly could not have been ascertainable earlier on, or simply
making use of leisure time for personal enjoyment. There are four areas that this is divided into:

- cooperation projects: validating skills acquired outside of the educational systems and developing new skills.
- educational partnerships: coordinating and organizing conferences, exhibitions or visits, for the purpose of exchanging experiences, practices and methods.
- mobility training: training in another country for 1-4 weeks.
- networks: providing either a thematic network (a forum for discussion of key issues) or projects – partnerships for institutions to work together on specific undertakings/ventures.

This acknowledgement of adult education in its many facets is one that will continue the promotion of both internationalization and globalization of the labor force.

Lingua learning European languages, is another dimension of Socrates that deals with the promotion of learning to communicate in different languages. The acquisition of other languages “brings a better understanding of other cultures in a Europe characterized by diversity” (http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/socrates/socrates_en.html).

This program encourages proficiency in languages in a classroom or outside of the school context. Lingua encourages the learning of the less widely used and taught European Union languages.

Lastly, Minerva is the technological portion of Socrates. Information and communication technologies (ICT) are the focal point of this program. Innovation, expansion of the Internet, and multimedia uses are encouraged in the learning
environment so as to have greater interaction between the educators and the students.

Open and distance learning is part of the ICT program, an initiative to provide
development and promotion of products that would enhance the learning outcomes. There
are four major activities for which the European Commission will provide support. They
are:

- To create a better understanding and support innovations in teaching and
  learning.
- To design innovative teaching methods and resources.
- To communicate findings and results of projects for future use.
- To use networking to encourage and promote the exchange of ideas,
  projects, experiences, and training.

Analysis of ERASMUS MUNDUS

ERASMUS MUNDUS, also referred to ERASMUS, is part of the Socrates
initiative to enhance the quality of higher education and promote cooperation amongst the
members of the European Union. This is a challenge evolved from the European
Councils in Lisbon (March 2000) and Bologna (June 1999) for the necessity of adapting a
European educational and vocational training system that would encourage exchange and
understanding of other societies by encouraging more students to experience an education
in other member nation universities. Its aim is to improve the attractiveness of European
higher education and promote scholarly research collaboration in a more international
environment. Mobility is key to this venture. Non-European Union members are
encouraged to engage in this program to promote a dialogue and understanding amongst
cultures.
Specifications of the aims sought are:

- To promote quality distinctively European higher educational values.
- To encourage highly qualified graduates and scholars from all over the world to obtain knowledge and skills via the EU experience.
- To cooperate between EU and non EU institutions so as to increase the mobility of both students and scholars.
- To market the European higher education globally.

An important fact is that the European Commission wants assurance that no group of citizens from non EU members be excluded or be at a disadvantage. The opportunity is open to all who qualify. Implementation of the ERASMUS MUNDUS is via five distinct actions as it is called: 1) ERASMUS MUNDUS master courses; 2) Scholarships; 3) Partnerships with third-country higher education institutions; 4) Promotional activities; 5) Technical support measures.

(http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/index_en.html) Each of the actions has specific criteria to ensure that the quality of the experience is high.

Master courses: advanced-level European diploma courses [second cycle] must meet the following criteria:

- To have as a minimum three institutions from three different EU member nations.
- To have as a result dual or multiple degrees.
- To ensure non EU member students be allotted a minimum number of seats in the program.
- To achieve transparent admission conditions.
- To maintain regulations in regard to procedures pertaining to selection of grant recipients – students and faculty.
- To make arrangements for hosting non EU students and faculty.
- To make a provision for two European languages spoken at the institutions participating in the masters courses. There is no obligation to use the two languages in the instruction.
- To commit to participate for a period of five years with an annual renewal process for monitoring.

Scholarships will have the following criteria applied to the participants:
- To provide financial support for non EU member graduate students and faculty in master courses.
- To have faculty be able to demonstrate “outstanding academic and professional experience” (http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/index_en.html)

Partnerships are another element that comprises the program. These agreements are with non EU higher educational institutions so as to seek outward mobility for the European participants in the program. Other factors that are relevant to the partnerships are:
- To have the maximum duration of three years in the involvement with the ERASMUS MUNDUS masters course work. Masters course work can be for the degree or specialization for research purposes.
- To provide faculty teaching assignments at the host institution which will be viewed as developing a research project.
- To participate in exchange of faculty, trainers, administrators and specialists.
To develop innovative new methods for higher education, such as e-learning and technology applications for the classroom.

To ensure cooperation in course offerings in the country in question.

Promotional activities are an aspect that the European institutions never before had to deal with for recruiting students. Prior to the educational reforms it was a given that the reputation of the institution was a testament of the knowledge that would be acquired upon attending such university. Now it is necessary to enhance the attractiveness of and the interest in receiving a European experience. This phenomenon is linked to these factors: ease of mobility, globalization, internet, and low birth rate resulting in fewer students. Other aspects of the promotional push are:

- establishing links with other institutions both public and private.
- raising higher education from the national to the international level.
- networking via seminars, conferences, production of material for publications.

Lastly is the technical support measure to ensure that technology is available for the assistance in teaching methodologies. This aspect will also assist scholars and professionals to conduct research that will add to either academic and / or professional benefit.

European Union members are responsible for the program at the national level, including the monitoring of the appropriate structures for all the stakeholders involved. Additionally, they must prescribe measures to ensure removal of any barriers be they administrative or legal (http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/index_en.html). The Commission is the body which must monitor the program, evaluating the impact and objectives, and furthermore, provide relevant policies,
assessment instrumentation, and actions which will enhance it (http:ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/index_en.html). The Commission will in turn report findings and suggestions to the following bodies: European Parliament, the Council, the European and Social Committee, and the Regional Committee.

**Document Analysis: United States**

*Analysis of President W.J. Clinton’s International Educational Policy*

President Clinton’s initiative for America’s competitiveness in the global economy identified some of the critical points that are lacking in the United States educational system. To ensure the maintenance of the nation as a world leader the Policy advocates a broader understanding of the world and the diversity of cultures and proficiency in other languages” (www.nafsa.org). As President Clinton, so eloquently stated, “Today, the defense of U.S. interests, the effective management of global issues, and even an understanding of our Nation’s diversity require ever-greater contact with, and understanding of, people and cultures beyond our boarders” (www.nafsa.org). What was proposed by President Clinton parallels elements present in the Bologna Declaration Agreement, the Socrates program, and specifically in the ERASMUS MUNDUS for higher education. In the United States there is, to a large extent, a lack of knowledge and understanding of different cultures compounded by lack of acquisition of other languages. The assumption is that everyone should speak English; hence no effort should be made for the acquisition of proficiency in another language. Language and culture are inseparable; one cannot truly know or understand a culture without the linguistic portion of the equation. In order to secure the interests of the United States, both at home and
internationally, “an understanding of our Nation’s diversity requires ever-greater contact
with, and understanding of, people and cultures beyond our borders” (www.nafsa.org).

The Federal Government has in place the policy of supporting international
education but it alone cannot accomplish the goals that will foster bridging the gaps. The
major objectives of the initiative are:

- To foster study abroad.
- To promote and encourage international students to study in the U.S.
- To build international partnerships and expertise for exchanges.
- To expand the acquisition and proficiency of other languages coupled with in-
depth knowledge of other cultures.
- To support and prepare educators in their effort to formulate understanding of the
diversities of cultures for students.
- To use innovative means to convey the knowledge via technology around the
  world (www.nafsa.org).

For these objectives to be achieved, “it is apparent that other agencies will be enlisted in
the process, such as the Departments of State and Education, State Departments of
Education, State and local governments, non-governmental organizations, and the
corporate world” (www.nafsa.org). There is a need to commit to the following actions to
accomplish the goals set.

Actions are:

1. To improve availability to quality international educational
   experiences through study or internships abroad. There is a push
to promote those areas that are nontraditional for an international experience.

2. To attract overseas qualified graduate students to U.S. institutions and educational opportunities.

3. To review the flow of exchanges of students and scholars and address any unnecessary obstacle such as visas, tax regulations, procedures, and policies.

4. To ensure that the Federal Government is and will continue to support State and local governments and educational institutions promoting international awareness, language acquisition and proficiency. Inclusive in this area is assistance to educators to acquire the skills for the achievement of the goals set forth. Opportunities for exchange of faculty, administrators, and students must be provided; likewise to assist foreign educational institutions with the instruction and methodologies of English as a Foreign Language.

5. To ensure international programs for exchange are supported and fulfill the mission of mutual understanding amongst nations.

6. To have the Secretary of Education with other agencies develop benchmarks for performance and practices in the arena of international education, and share U.S. educational expertise with other countries.
7. To strengthen and expand models of international exchange coupled with building partnerships.

8. To strengthen programs leading to exchange of international expertise with the goal of making international education an integral component of U.S. undergraduate, graduate and professional training and research. “Enhancing the Nation’s capacity to produce the international and foreign-language expertise is necessary for U.S. global leadership and security” (www.nafsa.org).

9. To use technology internationally creating borderless education. This will ensure greater opportunities for the accomplishment of the goals and internationalization of education.

10. “To have both Secretaries of State and Education, along with other agencies be responsible for integrating the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) framework indicating specific goals, milestones, and measurable results” (www.nafsa.org).

Analysis of Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program

The Lincoln Commission Fellowship was the vision of the late Senator Paul Simon who saw this as a timely initiative in the wake of world events in 2004. The program grew out of his understanding of the great benefits of international education expertise and exchange. The political ramifications that would result in creating such a program and the acceptance of cultural diversity would bring about a bridging of ties.
amongst the members of the global community. His bold vision for the U.S. revitalization of international education encompasses the following points which will be elaborated on individually afterwards.

- U.S. students should have an understanding of diverse cultures, especially of third world countries.
- U.S. students should have direct exposure to other languages, with benchmarks for acquisition and proficiency levels. Along side the communication skill is the cultural aspect which should be via an international experience that enriches the process.
- U.S. students should have international experiences which will avail them to a greater comprehension for the need of understanding and sensitivity to people from different ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds. Having this broad vision, participants in the future will be able to lead effective U.S. foreign policy, greater security concerning terrorism and raise the global market competitiveness.

Senator Simon’s vision for international education was to have it match the impact that the Morrill Act of 1862, the GI Bill, and Marshall Plan had on the citizens of the U.S. and abroad. As a direct result, underrepresented groups of students should be allotted the same opportunities as those who have the means to experience the international journey.

Comprehension of the various aspects of the Lincoln Commission Fellowship will be broken down to eleven sections, each dealing with specific goals. These areas are:

1. Expanding Study Abroad: Meeting a Critical National Need
(a) Critical need for global education in the U.S. as direct result of the following phenomena that are now part of the complex and fluid international community:

(i) To achieve communication, travel, migration, trade and cultural reshaping of local communities.

(ii) To emphasize the political, social, economic, and cultural influences impacting everyone.

(iii) To deal with global issues that impact all institutions and governments.

(iv) To give support to businesses which are increasingly competing in the global market. Amongst the areas that are in need of assistance are: second and or multilanguage proficiency, cross-cultural awareness, and increase interaction with counterparts abroad and their business practices.

(v) To conduct research and technology development two way collaboration.

(vi) To conduct business and interactions globally with diplomacy.

(b) Direct experience in living, learning and working abroad allows for participants to have first hand knowledge of that particular culture.

(c) U.S. record on ‘globally educated citizenry’ reflects significant shortfalls hence putting the nation at a huge disadvantage economically and at risk for national security.

(d) Expand the scope of cultural awareness and other languages less
frequently taught to strengthen ties with those regions.

(e) Higher education plays a key role in reducing barriers via the international experience and integrating it within the curricula.

(i) There is a critical need to acquire and be proficient in a second and third language.

(ii) There must be a connection between language acquisition and cultural understanding via the international experience within U.S. higher education.

(iii) There is a necessity to create less rigid curricula making it possible for students to incorporate the study abroad aspect to their core studies.

(iv) There must be academic rigor with assessment elements to ensure that the experience broadens the vision and ignites critical thinking and analysis of world issues.

(f) Costs for participation in study abroad is a major factor for a large portion of the student population, hence financial aid should be allotted for participation.

2. Defining Study Abroad

(a) An educational program in which undergraduate or graduate study, work, apprenticeship/internship, or research is done in a host country for academic credit.

(b) A quality control of the learning process in which the evolution of the knowledge base meets a high level of rigor and assessment value. The
program needs to specify length of time for the experience, location, types, subject matter and pedagogy are all intricately related to the growth in diversity. Location is not restricted to the classroom; it is inclusive of field research/ experience.

3. Providing outcomes and Impacts of Study Abroad

(a) Benefit for the individual and the U.S.

(b) Benefit to the universities, academic fields, and professions in regards to understanding cultures and acquisition/proficiency in second languages.

   (i) Acquire knowledge and skills essential to engage in the global communities are achieved through language competence.

   (ii) Flexibility in approaching problem solving emerges as per the ability to comprehend the cultural and ethnic values relayed through language.

   (iii) Increase awareness of self and others. Appreciation of diversity.

4. Trends in Study Abroad

(a) Despite the concerns about security issues abroad and the economic situation the numbers of study abroad students has not diminished.

(b) Programs are for a semester, eight weeks, or less.

   (i) Trend is female, white, junior year, major in humanities or social sciences

   (ii) There has been a shift in the trend whereupon a more ethnically
diverse population with broad array of majors is interested in the experience.

(c) U.S. students lag in venturing abroad because having to participate in another society/culture challenges their comfort level.

5. Program capacity for Increasing U.S. Student Participation in Study Abroad

(a) U.S. higher education institutions plan to increase the number of students studying abroad.

(b) The Lincoln Scholarship Program requires a national initiative to develop and open new programs / opportunities for a diverse set of students.

(c) There are four design models for sending students to an international experience.

(i) Bilateral exchange agreements “tuition swap”.

(ii) Reciprocity – two way (various campuses) for faculty and students.

(iii) Partnership direct enrollment.

(iv) Faculty led programs hosted by international institution.

(v) Study abroad providers with no exchange in the program.

6. Access and Barriers Shape Who Studies Abroad

(a) Barriers: financial (primarily), cultural, linguistics, and curricular.

(b) Disadvantage students which include issues of race (ethnicity), those with disabilities, and low income families.
(c) Students forgo the experience as a direct result of inadequacy of language preparation for the area they would like to attend.

(d) Adjust the curriculum incorporating the international experience part of the educational process.

7. Costs of Study Abroad

(a) Those costs would include travel, living (room and board), visas, extra insurance, books, and tuition plus incidentals making it difficult for many families to avail the opportunity to their students.

(b) Some financial assistance cannot be used for study abroad.

(c) Those who work part-time can ill afford to forego the income.

8. Safety, Health, and Security in Study Abroad

(a) Design a partnership among all involved in the experience and an infield director to ascertain the safety, health, and security of the program.

(b) Pre-departure student orientation regarding health and safety issues.

(c) Provide the do and don’t behavior and immediate consequences of not following the regulations set.

(d) Procedures and contingency plans in case of emergencies.

9. Study Abroad Quality Control

(a) Intellectual content and rigor of the learning experience.

(b) Quality control must include: safety issues, pedagogy, and logistics.

(c) Guidelines for accrediting students for the course work.

(d) Assessment of the experience in accordance to the institutional policy.

10. Existing Federal Role in Study Abroad
(a) Federal Government focuses on three areas: foreign policy, educational policy, and national security.

11. Sustainability: Achieving Expanded Participation in Study Abroad

(a) U.S. higher educational institutions should project long term study abroad programs that will meet the goals for international education.

(b) Institutions should be promoting the expectation that all college students will partake in the experience; prepared to deal with the barriers and find a resolution to them.

(c) Sample checklist consists of the following:

(i) Vision
(ii) Leadership and Advocacy
(iii) Diversification
(iv) Integration
(v) Preparation
(vi) Reintegration
(vii) Cost Control and Financial Support
(viii) Safety
(ix) Incentives
(x) Assessment   (Lincoln Report, 2004)

The Title VI of the Department of Education, in conjunction with Fulbright awards are federal grants that are aiding in the process of internationalizing the U.S. higher educational system.
Survey Analysis

This section analyses the questionnaires received from three public universities in Spain. Selection of the universities was based upon positive disposition to disclose their experiences thus far, the diversity of the level of implementation of the reforms, and lastly the fields of studies vary additionally, cooperation amongst themselves, likewise to other universities in Spain. The participants from the Universidad de León were keenly interested in the research since they are presently undergoing the changes. In the case of the Universidad de Salamanca they are in the middle of the process; Universidad de Extremadura are at the implementation in the academic year 2009/2010. There are departments at the Universidad de León currently working on the changes, be it great, slight, or if any, in the integration of the Bologna Declaration Agreement and ERASMUS MUNDUS exchanges. What was noted is that although all three universities are public the exposure to international students and agreements with U.S. higher educational institutions is an important factor in regards to how the progress of the reform is unfolding. The reasoning for conducting the research in Spain was based upon the factor that the higher educational system is in the group of nations which are behind in the process.

Participants were from the Office of International Relations, Department heads, Dean of Language and Literature, a high ranking administrator, and faculty from different disciplines, such as Hispanic and Classical Studies [classical studies refers to Latin and Greek], English Studies, Business, and Teacher Education. The questionnaire provided an opportunity to analyze how the reform process is affecting public higher education in Spain. Since all public universities are obligated to follow the mandates of the Ministry
of Education this study can be reproduced to indicate the steps that are being done from department to department and also at the administrative level. To be noted is that the ERASMUS MUNDUS has two distinct areas: undergraduate and the Masters course.

Upon collecting the data from participants at the Spanish universities there were responses which were to be expected, whilst others gave insight on the progress of the higher educational reform they are undergoing presently. The data collected on the effect of the European Union’s Bologna Declaration Agreement on U.S. Higher Education was a threefold process. It became evident that the EU reform had and has its challenges in an effort to accomplish the goals. The participants each had a different experience with the Bologna Declaration Agreement reform and the ERASMUS MUNDUS. Participants incorporated in this study hold different positions at the University such as: professors, administrators, coordinators, and the Office of International Relations. Although the questionnaires identified specific aspects of the study, it was a guide to focus on the progress made and indicate the areas in which gaps are yet to be resolved.

**Faculty, Department Chairs, and International Relations Office**

To facilitate the interpretation of the data provided, a summary of the responses for each point will be presented.

1. Can you please describe the programs of study that were available to students?

Program description was still identified in the traditional format—prior to the Bologna Declaration Agreement/Process—on the part of faculty, administration and coordinators. Goals and objectives were maintained, although there was an inclination towards incorporating international concepts. The International Relations Office (IRO) stated that the opportunity for international experiences were solely at the graduate level.
As a direct result of the ERASMUS program there has been, since 1988, a growing number of students from the university who are participating in the exchange in the following countries: Argentina; Australia; Austria; Belgium; Brazil; Bulgaria; Canada; Chile; Colombia; Costa Rica; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Denmark; Finland; Germany; Great Britain; Greece; Holland; Hungary; Ireland; Italy; Japan; Lithuania; Mexico; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Russia; Slovakia; Slovenia; Sweden; Switzerland; Turkey; and the United States at universities that are accredited by the respective accreditation agencies in the U.S. (those that are not EU members). Regarding the format it was noted from both the faculty and department heads that they are working on the changes presently. Administration and faculty reported that the changes would be coordinated with other departments, hence the delay.

2. When did the first ERASMUS MUNDUS students arrive?

Concerning the arrival of ERASMUS students there have been numerous participants in various programs offered at the university. Those that arrive go through the specific department therefore the IRO does not have data.

According to the departments’ participants during the last fourteen years approximately 500 students have participated from the Universidad de León. Students in all three universities are participating in the program are increasing depending on the field of study. It was stated by three departments at the Universidad de León that the international exchange students are growing every year and it is projected they will continue to do so. The Department of Hispanic and Classical Studies [classical studies refer to Latin and Greek] reported that there were only 2-3 Spaniards enrolled in their department that did an ERASMUS MUNDUS experience. Those students in the Hispanic
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and Classical Studies are not limited to only the study of the language but also research in cross cultural interpretation of literature, and interdisciplinary with other departments at the Universidad de León. On the contrary for the 2006/2007 academic year there were 200 ERASMUS MUNDUS students enrolled in the program. The business arena does have an increase of number of students participating in the ERASMUS MUNDUS (Spaniards going to other institutions and Europeans arriving to the University). This experience is fundamental to the cultural awareness that is fomented in this type of exchange. In the area of Education there is also an increase as a direct result of two fundamental factors: second and third language acquisition and the need to broad the skills so as to have a wider range of job opportunities in the global market. One must keep in mind the population growth in Europe is on the decline; hence there are more teachers than students. With this trend those wanting to enter education will have to acquire skills that will make them attractive in Spain for the few positions available, additionally, the global teaching positions that are available, such as in the U.S. or Far East.

3. From what countries were they from and what was the length of time that they were enrolled at your institution?

The response was unanimous that the countries of origin were mainly from the EU with other third countries participating. Data on the status of the program is not available. Length of time enrolled at the university is usually an academic year as is prescribed by the ERASMUS MUNDUS Master Course program. No data was given regarding the undergraduate ERASMUS MUNDUS.
4. Have there been pedagogical changes needed in order to accommodate the ERASMUS MUNDUS students?

This question on pedagogical change did stir up the issue of language in certain fields. Since the ERASMUS students are from various countries considerations must be taken into account for the following: 1) how the explanations are formatted; 2) how assessments must take into consideration the language proficiency level, pace of the course; 3) how to prepare students for the courses which requires more background information on the topics since one can not assume students have prior knowledge; 4) and lastly, how to formulate an evaluation process that takes on a holistic approach. In courses where English is the language of instruction it was noted that there has been no change in pedagogy. The proficiency level of English is sufficient; it is based upon the Common European Language Reference Framework (B2: high intermediate to C2: native). Proficiency in Spanish from EU and US students will vary on the length of time they have been studying the language. Upon entering upper division courses the proficiency level prescribed is a B2 to C2, just as it would be for English.

5. Is there a difference between the ERASMUS MUNDUS and U.S. students that are studying abroad at your institution? If so, please explain.

There are slight differences between the ERASMUS MUNDUS and U.S. students in the course work rigor. Although both have deficiency in the Spanish language, their interest and effort in getting the most out of the courses are the same. Students, both ERASMUS and U.S. have an initial orientation regarding not only the university life but expectations of the course work. Additionally, tutorials are given to aid the students in their courses. Also cultural activities are arranged that complement their academic
studies. The ERASMUS students adapt to the educational pedagogy and system easily. U.S. students have a harder time adjusting to the cultural mores and expectations.

6. Has the Bologna Agreement created or eliminated majors at your institution? Which ones? Have any been combined?

In the area of creating, eliminating majors, or combining courses of study there are differing responses. As a direct result of the on going evaluation on what will be done in the future the creating, eliminating and combining fields of study is presently unclear. What will be eliminated are certain specializations that are yet to be determined. At the time of this study, Spain is undergoing the accreditation of new majors and the cyclical number of years for the degrees. Presently, the university catalogue has not been actualized to reflect any of the changes that will occur in the majors and for the degrees. In some of the departments there has not been any elimination of specializations. What has transpired is an adaptation to bring it in line with the Bologna Process. Another aspect is the move to interdisciplinary dual degrees. This will allow students to obtain the dual degree in a shorter period of time; hence there is cooperation amongst the departments. Business students will be able to have a dual degree in business administration combined with English or Spanish degree. Likewise in the area of teacher education there is a shift in dual degrees and specializations to complement the students’ field of concentration.

7. What has been the change of the role of faculty with the new proposals of the Agreement?

The role of faculty activated by the reform has been as follows: redefining the degree requirements, reevaluating the objectives, changing of pedagogy, defining how
courses can be interdisciplinary, and changing classroom logistics – leading to more interaction and discussion versus the traditional lecture format. One participant stated it will be necessary for former academic habits to be replaced with more innovative mindsets. Giving up the realm of autonomy to that of team teaching is a concept that will take time. Presently courses are team taught in some disciplines as a direct result of the low enrollment in certain fields of study. This must be done to give professors some courses to teach besides their research. Professors are government employees hence being let go as a result of low enrollment is not an option. Changes in restructuring will hopefully result in increased numbers of students.

8. Describe to the best of your knowledge the effect that these changes have had on both students and faculty.

In regards to the changes and its affect on the both the faculty and students there was a resounding response for the need for additional time of adaptation. The process is still going on until 2010; the results of the changes will be fully seen upon the completion of the process. On the question of affect on the stakeholders, as can be predicted there are those that are traditionalists wanting to maintain the status quo. Most of the faculty and students are on board with the changes that the Process is producing. Students now are no longer passive in the course of study for their degree. They will have opportunities that will afford them a broader spectrum of knowledge that they will utilize in their professions. One of the departments stated that there will be a need for a different mindset when dealing with the new requirements, teaching courses across disciplines, and moving in a new direction in the fields which must broaden views to incorporate globalization/internationalization.
Administrators

The ‘Vice Rector de Planificación Académica’, of the Universidad de Extremadura and the Academia Dean of Language and Literatura Studies from the Universidad de Salamanca were very insightful on the progress and modifications that were recently approved for the restructuring of the higher education at their particular universities. Reflecting on the programs offered pre Bologna Declaration Agreement had to be re-evaluated in order to make it even better. This would net the result of attracting more students from all over Spain, also more importantly globally. Some would be attending the universities via accords/bilateral agreements, others via ERASMUS MUNDUS and scholarships from the home nation or institution. Modifications in the structuring of the fields of study would be, from the stand point of the administrators, an opportunity to expand the horizons of the Spaniards enrolled or about to enroll in the university. Each university in Spain has areas of expertise which are linked to another for joint ventures. This increases the student flow with agreements that credits could transfer.

Regarding the changes in pedagogy with ERASMUS MUNDUS students there was a resigning agreement that there is a critical need of training for the faculty to assist them in how to incorporate the non-native speakers of Spanish in those courses that are not conducted in English. Courses that tend to have prior knowledge of English are: Business, Education, Computer Science and the Sciences. As one of the administrators (the one from Extremadura) pointed out it is important to address the level of English proficiency. One concern was that there is a deficiency in the technological portion of the University which hinders those REASUMS students from highly technological home
institutions. That dilemma will need to be addressed in accordance to budgetary allowances and availability.

The number of home students participating in the ERASUMS MUNDUS program has been growing, although it does not come even close to those who want to come to Spain. In the case of the Universidad de Salamanca there has been a growing increase of ERASMUS MUNDUS students based upon the reputation of the university. Both administrators concurred that the lifestyle of Spain is very attractive to international and national students. Spaniards have had a history of not wanting to venture outside of the country for higher education, this generation is now reversing that trend, there are those who see it as an opportunity to experience other cultures. This comes on the heels of the ever growing need to be competitive in the global markets in all the fields of study.

As administrators they do not have consistent contact with students be it ERASMUS MUNDUS or U.S. What was commented is that U.S. students at times are in search of the same lifestyle they are accustomed to. The opportunity to party and live it up is very enticing. U.S. students do not in the beginning know how to balance the social aspects with the expectations of academic rigor.

According to the administrators the Bologna Declaration Agreement has not eliminated any fields of study at their universities; on the contrary it has created new avenues. Those avenues are in respect to the bachelors and Masters degrees was reflected in the Universidad de Salamanca. They will offer a MBA in Mass Media – specifically in television – being partnered with the company Santillana. At the undergraduate – titulación- level the following programs will be introduced: Oriental
Studies, Literary and Comparative Theory, and Biotechnology which will focus on areas that the Universidad de León does not offer.

In the case of the Universidad de Extremadura this has been, according to the ‘Vice Rector’ a period of open reflection in which the new phase of education will emerge. New adaptation of specializations/degrees will be seen in 2009/2010, the rest will be completed by the 2010/2011 academic year. The university will offer ‘Grado’, Masters, and Doctoral degrees. Those Master’s will be derived from the Official European Union Masters list. In the Doctoral program there will be two phases for confirmation of the degree which will be first completion of the Masters followed by a doctoral dissertation. Students will have an option to continue their studies via research.

Concerning the faculty’s new role, the administrators concurred that the transparency of the educational system that is emerging in conjunction with the expectations for the students will become highly competitive. The quality of the education will remain at a higher standard along with self analysis for continuous growth on the professional level as well as an institution.

Among the responses to the questions regarding the Bologna Declaration Agreement Process it was evident that there is more work to be done before all the goals and objectives are met. With this in mind, it was not surprising that little or no knowledge of the objectives of the Lincoln Commission Fellowship were known. The correlation between the EU documentation and the responses are in synergism. What has been asked of the European Higher Education is monumental and still in the developing stages hence until 2010 the resolution and changes will not be concrete. Even then there will be continual work on the achievement of the objectives.
Upon reviewing the questionnaire responses, it was evident that the task of educational reform of a system that has operated as separate entities is a major mind set undertaking. Removal of the barriers that once identified each nation has imposed an innovative vision of Europe, likewise on the educational system that has been around for centuries. What was learnt from the responses is that there is on the part of Spanish students, resistance to partake in venturing into other cultures. Recently, this is turning around as a direct result of the global market. In Spanish higher education, they are just starting to grasp the challenges that emerge with international students who are not proficient in the language and are enrolled in university courses that are transferable to the home institutions. Another aspect is the need for mutual exchanges are the lifeline in a nation that the population growth rate is low. Reformation of an educational system brings with it ventures into fields of study that would not otherwise be considered. What is also evident that the universities, not being tuition driven, might not have a handle on the total of participants of the ERASMUS MUNDUS, be it on the undergraduate or Masters Course. In the U.S. this would not occur, numbers are part of the statistics that higher educational institutions pride themselves on.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

At this juncture of the study it is imperative to summarize the results acquired, discuss the interpretations and implications, give the limitations, and offer some recommendations for the continuation of this process. Each element will have its own section, elaborating on the highlights that were presented and how integration of the reform can present a global/international higher educational system.

Introduction of the results acquired

From the start of this study on the impact of the European Union's Bologna Declaration Agreement on U.S. higher educational institutions, it was evident that there would be a plethora of questions left unanswered. The responses from the participants were partially expected; nevertheless, they raised other questions that would need to be dealt with at a later date. There was a confirmation of some of the assumptions that were proposed in the beginning of the research project, yet other issues arose that at the time of the writing of the dissertation could not be included since the conclusion of the process is still a few years away. The goal of the Bologna Declaration Agreement Process and the ERASMUS MUNDUS is to create a system in the European Union that enables exchange of knowledge, research, and expertise that previously was not as widely available.

Gaps in the how's and when's of the reforms concern all of the stakeholders involved. Elements that are of eminent concern are:

- The change in curricula for both national and ERASMUS students.
- The re-evaluation of the pedagogy.
• The requirements and devises that will be needed for interdisciplinary and dual degrees.

• The determination of the credits for the third cycle [doctoral level]

• The establishment of new assessment instruments to conform to the new credit system.

• The market specializations and programs at each particular institution.

• The integration of technology in the classrooms and expansion of the distance learning.

• The expansion of the integration of non EU students into the ERASMUS MUNDUS program.

• The impact that the SOCARTES program for the pre-university students will have on the university’s fields of study and pedagogy.

• The promotion of the ERASMUS MUNDUS participation on the part of faculty.

**Interpretations and Implications**

In the European Union there is a disparity of where each country’s educational system is located in the implementation of the Bologna Declaration Agreement. There are those who are in the last stages of the process, whilst others are struggling to achieve it because of the resistance to change of the traditional format. At the present moment [those nations in bold are EU members] Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway,
Russian Federation, **Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden**, and Swiss Confederation are in the last stages of the completion of the reforms. In the middle of the process are:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, **Cyprus, Czech Republic, France**, Georgia, **Greece, Hungary**, Iceland, Moldova, Norway, **Poland**, Romania, Turkey, and the Ukraine. The countries that are behind are: Holy See, **Ireland, Italy, Malta, Portugal, and Spain**.

While deconstructing the documents it is evident that the task is immense. There has never been a reform of this magnitude which requires the rethinking of how courses will be taught, the integration of **ERASMUS MUNDUS** students, and reformulation of degree confirmations at the three cycles [levels]. The results of the questionnaire showed that there was a degree of anxiousness, reservation, and miscommunication of certain data. For example, the International Relations Office has only partial data and each of the discipline departments another set. There is a need to bridge that gap of information and make everyone aware of the number of ERASMUS and U.S. students and program changes. Another aspect is the reservation and anxiousness that the disciplines have concerning the new curricula that must be reconfigured for the fields of study. It is with trepidation that both faculty and administration are undergoing the process that disrupts the traditional course of study; on the other hand it is a journey of reflection and innovation toward a new kind of student and demands in the global economy.

The literature discusses the process and the **ERASMUS MUNDUS** but falls short on two points: first on the need to address some of the issues mentioned previously concerning the faculty, departments, international relations office, and the students affected by the changes; secondly, on how to make a connection with the Lincoln
Commission Fellowship Program that would be mutually beneficial to participants. While all are in agreement that this reform in the European Union is positive, its implications are worldwide and influence other regions who engage in similar endeavors, such as the Pacific Rim Agreement and the Mercosur (Latin America).

On the other hand, the United States needs to evaluate and put in the forefront international education and language acquisition. Ignoring the reforms that are going on in Europe, or stating that it is not our concern will widen the lack of understanding of cultures, values, and loss of opportunities to compete in the global economy and threaten national security. Although this process is solely for the EU it will have an affect on higher educational institutions in the U.S. The future of the curriculum for all the fields of study must incorporate international education. Internationalization is the first step to globalization. The lack of skills imparted in an international experience it will negatively affect performance and advancement in the workforce which is continually striving for globalization.

Short-Term Recommendations (1-5 years):

1. Create a course such as World Cultures/Religions as an introduction to international education
2. Implement placement examinations for languages based upon the Common European Language Reference Framework.
3. Engage the College of Education and Department of Modern and Classical Languages to assist in the internationalization of the curriculum across the board.
4. Look at exchange agreements of other universities with European higher educational institutions for joint ventures in course offerings.
5. Encourage study abroad or international internships in the second and third year of the student’s career choice.

6. Increase language and culture course offerings and requirements.

7. Seek international grants for joint research projects.

8. Encourage students to seek out the ERASMUS MUNDUS scholarships offered in the European Universities.²

9. Promote and encourage both faculty and students to design projects with European Universities via the departments.

10. Have students who are planning to go abroad live in the student resident halls so as to experience part of the cultural aspect of the experience.

11. Have the target languages taught without English as an aid.

12. Incorporate meeting areas for students, staff, and faculty to engage in speaking only in the target language.

13. Organize cultural events and foreign films and forum for discussion between students, staff, and faculty.

14. Invest in promoting the home institution to the European counterparts with joint projects and exchanges hence slotting ERASMUS MUNDUS for the home institution.

15. Create rubrics for expectations for language and cultural acquisition proficiency levels; in addition, courses taught with discipline need to have benchmarks on the acceptable levels of cultural and linguistic knowledge.

²for further information: http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/mundus/index_en.html
As the costs of higher education increase the number of international students will likely diminish. For European students whose cost of higher education is less, ERASMUS MUNDUS can allow them to incorporate international education in their own backyard. Other aspects that will hinder are: visa procedures, TOEFL requirements, partial degree incompatibility, and transfer of credits to the home institution for validation.

What was apparent in the literature was that although the concept of international education has been around since the beginning of the twentieth century its implementation has been slow. The concept has had to change with the advent of technology and world events but still the percentage of U.S. students going abroad is not where it could be. Curriculum requirements should promote this experience coupled with the acquisition of a second or even a third language. As it has been stated both in the documents and the literature, if the United States wants to maintain its position of leadership, it will be up to the higher educational institutions to evaluate the core knowledge in the twenty-first century in the formation of 'global citizens'.

According to NAFSA’s committee on the Bologna Declaration Agreement, the acceptance of a three year degree for graduate admission has not been resolved. Each institution must make a determination on their criteria. Since the Diploma Supplement varies from country to country, U.S. institutions must set criteria on the evaluation and benchmarks expected. Additionally, there is the issue of transferring credits; presently one ECTS credit is equated to $\frac{1}{2}$ U.S. credits. This system of credit equivalency would hold back students on both sides of the Atlantic because the credit transfers. It is for this reason that guidelines must be set to balance the exchanges. Another issue that U.S.
higher educational institutions must resolve is how to promote language acquisition, cultural awareness, and rigorous criteria of study or internships abroad.

**Limitations**

*Weaknesses*

This study included data from three universities in Spain and a small pool of participants. Although the case study was limited to public universities it would have been interesting to observe how private ones are addressing the issues. Another element that was limiting was the focus was concentrated solely in Spain, whose university cycles are 4, 2, and 2. The Bologna Declaration Agreement is still being implemented and changes are bound to be incorporated. ERASMUS MUNDUS funding is up for re-evaluation at the end of 2008. At the time of the writing of the dissertation funding for the SOCRATES programs was yet to be determined. Lastly, one must consider that the U.S. Department of Education can not force higher educational institutions to comply with the international program initiatives.

*Strengths*

The study was done utilizing three universities in Spain which enabled the researcher to focus on the implementation procedure. Additionally, the Bologna Declaration Agreement is still being implemented hence further research can be conducted after 2010. Replication of the study can be done at other institutions for self evaluation. With the deconstruction of the documents and looking at the implications for educational reform will assist in providing direction in the future. Evident during the course of this study was the need for continued research for the purpose of arriving at
how U.S. institutions will address the issues of credits, accrediting degrees from Europe, and program equivalency.

**Recommendations/ Conclusions**

This research identified elements that are significant in the drive for higher education to embrace with enthusiasm internationalization and preparation of the future global citizens. Tangential to this issue are the evolving educational reforms that are occurring in the European Union, sparking other regions in the world to embrace the change and challenge them to become more global. The programs that have been launched in the EU have maintained a level of interest, observation, and motivation in reevaluating traditional educational systems which have been in place for a long time.

**Recommendations are as follows for the EU side:**

- There should be future research based upon how each nation as a whole in the EU is adjusting to the Bologna Declaration Agreement.
- There is a need to promote ERASMUS MUNDUS growth on the part of not only the students but also faculty.
- There should be an analysis of the affects on fields of study in each of the cycles [degrees].
- There must be a standardization of assessment of the Diploma Supplement.
- There needs to be change in pedagogy which will embrace technology and utilization of alternative means of presenting the same material.
Furthermore, at the completion of the implementation of the Bologna Agreement there should be an analysis of the whole EU higher educational system if the goals indeed came to fruition. It is at that point commentary on the success and the gaps that might exist can be discussed. Within that rubric the same would hold true for the ERASMUS MUNDUS program.

Since the process is still going on the linkage between the ERASMUS MUNDUS and Lincoln Commission Fellowship should be integrated in order for the exchange of both students and faculty can commence giving mutual benefit to all the stakeholders. The following are some recommendations that should be invested in order to enable this to fruition:

- The expansion and promotion of the SOCRATES program concerning the pre-k through high school here in the U.S.
- The language acquisition and cultural awareness element needs to include those that are less taught.
- The Lincoln Fellowship should provide economic and resource assistance to the elementary and high school levels to promote reforms in pedagogy so as to incorporate international education.
- The Lincoln Fellowship must provide guidelines that indicate the competencies that need to be met at each level of education. Even at the elementary school level there is a need for more emphasis on the knowledge base concerning international education and the acquisition of a second language.
• The ERASMUS MUNDUS and Lincoln Fellowship can encourage scholars to participate in research projects in all fields. With this comes also the monetary and health care issues that must be addressed.

• The SOCRATES, ERASMUS MUNDUS, and Lincoln Fellowship should attempt to pool not only the resources but also the costs that will enable exchanges of mutual benefit.

• The assessment of U.S. students degrees should have a rubric to specify the criteria used to award the credits entrance into the second and third cycle [Masters and Doctoral degrees].

The U.S. higher educational institutions must collaborate and make an investment for the future in the following areas:

• Setting guidelines that are accepted across the board by all institutions in the validation of EU degrees, credits, and acceptance of the Diploma Supplement.

• Establishing degree requirements coupled with competencies that indicate the acquisition of the skills that pertain to each of the fields of study and degrees [Bachelor’s, Masters and Doctoral degrees]

• Strengthening the role of language acquisition/proficiency.

Proficiency level achievements should be at an intermediate level.

The competencies have been established by the Common European
Language Reference Framework. They can be utilized for any language.

- Requiring U.S. students to study or participate in an internship abroad. For those that do not have the economic means scholarships and financial aid ideally should be made available.

- Completing a core of global/international courses that would include the themes of global ethics, communication, management, security, and cultural awareness.

- Promoting within the Masters and Doctoral degree programs international experiences/internships with rigor.

- Each institution can have its own requirements but a need for set guidelines is essential to gain European students.

- Organizing consortia of States where upon there is a consensus on the acceptance of credentials from abroad. This will be in addition to the national guidelines agreed upon. Guidelines would be generated by the Department of Education in conjunction with the Department of State.

- Formulating programs of study and internships abroad with rigor that would be transferable amongst the higher educational institutions that are part of a consortium of States.

- Setting standards required for licensure across all the States for the different fields it pertains to. Example: teaching licenses.
• Ascertaining for scholars assistance from the host institution in terms of: compensation, health care, and acquiring visas also applying for extensions.

• Re-evaluating the visa process for both students and scholars. This point includes ability to work and participate in paid internships which presently is limited or none existent.

• Promoting interdisciplinary fields of study along with second or third language acquisition.

• Promoting dual degrees at the Bachelor’s and Masters levels. Example would be: BA/BS or MA/MBA in Language/Literature/Cultural Awareness and Business Administration.

• Increasing federal funding for international education for K-post-doctoral studies.

• Creating rubrics that are cross disciplines for holistic and specific evaluation of acquisition of the skills required to demonstrate competency in the field of study.

• Promoting and implementing a portfolio similar to the Diploma Supplement of Europe. For this to be established the consortia of States must agree on what must be included and an evaluation rubric. Additionally, an agreement amongst the consortiums for accreditation of the portfolio for those students that want to further pursue their education.
As other regions of the world are joining in educational reform (Pacific Rim and Mercosur) it will stir an even greater need for cooperation amongst the global communities to strength ties with one another for a truly global society. The future of international education is linked to the reforms and specific regional agreements that will complement each other for the purpose of exchange of knowledge for the greater good of the global community.

Whilst this study is only the beginning of this new vision of global cooperative higher education the investment in the venture by both the European Union and the United States will enhance the quality of education. It is via these first steps that the momentum will expand to other areas of the globe. Furthermore, the dimension of international education will be changing in the near future to reflect the reforms and innovation of the twenty-first century.
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Appendix A

Instrument

Questionnaire:

1. Can you please describe the programs of study that were available to students?
2. When did the first ERASMUS MUNDUS students arrive?
3. From what countries were they from and what was the length of time that they were enrolled at your institution?
4. Have there been pedagogical changes needed in order to accommodate the ERASMUS MUNDUS students?
5. How many of your students have partaken in the program?
6. Is there a difference between the ERASMUS MUNDUS and U.S. students that are studying abroad at your institution? If so, please explain.
7. Has the Bologna Agreement created or eliminated majors at your institution? Which ones? Have any been combined?
8. What has been the change of the role of faculty with the new proposals of the Agreement?
9. Has the Agreement changes been completed? If so, how has it been? If not, when is the goal date for the integration?
10. Describe to the best of your knowledge the effect that these changes have had on both students and faculty.
11. Has your institution received any U.S. students that were on a fellowship from the Lincoln Commission? If so, how did that compare with those of the ERASMUS MUNDUS?
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Appendix C

The Bologna Declaration on the European space for higher education: an explanation

This document was prepared by the Confederation of EU Rectors’ Conferences and the Association of European Universities (CRE). It includes:

- a comment on the meaning and significance of the Bologna Declaration and information on the follow-up process in progress;
- the text of the Declaration;
- a list of internet addresses from which more detailed information can be obtained.

The authors are grateful to the European Commission for its support and its willingness to disseminate this document.

The Bologna Declaration: an explanation

The Bologna Declaration is a pledge by 29 countries to reform the structures of their higher education systems in a convergent way.

The Declaration is a key document which marks a turning point in the development of European higher education.

- It was signed by 29 countries which “undertake to attain the Declaration’s objectives” and to that end “engage in coordinating [their] policies”.

- It is a commitment freely taken by each signatory country to reform its own higher education system or systems in order to create overall convergence at European level.
  The Bologna Declaration is not a reform imposed upon national governments or higher education institutions. Any pressure individual countries and higher education institutions may feel from the Bologna process could only result from their ignoring increasingly common features or staying outside the mainstream of change.

- The Bologna process aims at creating convergence and, thus, is not a path towards the “standardization” or “uniformisation” of European higher education. The fundamental principles of autonomy and diversity are respected.

- The Declaration reflects a search for a common European answer to common European problems. The process originates from the recognition that in spite of
their valuable differences, European higher education systems are facing common internal and external challenges related to the growth and diversification of higher education, the employability of graduates, the shortage of skills in key areas, the expansion of private and transnational education, etc. The Declaration recognises the value of coordinated reforms, compatible systems and common action.

The Bologna Declaration is not just a political statement, but a binding commitment to an action programme

The action programme set out in the Declaration is based on a clearly defined common goal, a deadline and a set of specified objectives:

- a clearly defined common goal: to create a European space for higher education in order to enhance the employability and mobility of citizens and to increase the international competitiveness of European higher education;

- a deadline: the European space for higher education should be completed in 2010;

- a set of specified objectives:
  - the adoption of a common framework of readable and comparable degrees, “also through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement”;
  - the introduction of undergraduate and postgraduate levels in all countries, with first degrees no shorter than 3 years and relevant to the labour market;
  - ECTS-compatible credit systems also covering lifelong learning activities;
  - a European dimension in quality assurance, with comparable criteria and methods;
  - the elimination of remaining obstacles to the free mobility of students (as well as trainees and graduates) and teachers (as well as researchers and higher education administrators).

The Bologna Declaration and global competitiveness of European higher education

Next to the need to “achieve greater compatibility and comparability in the systems of higher education” (mainly an intra-European issue), the Declaration wants “in particular” to increase “the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education”. It says that the “vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal its culture has for other countries”. The signatory countries explicitly express their goal to “ensure that the European higher education system acquires a worldwide degree of attractiveness equal to [Europe’s] extraordinary cultural and scientific
On these “external” issues, the Bologna Declaration is genuinely opening up new avenues. In stressing so explicitly the need for European higher education as a (cohesive) system to become more attractive to students from other world regions, it provides one more reason for moving in the direction of a coherent European system and implicitly invites European institutions to compete more resolutely than in the past for students, influence, prestige and money in the worldwide competition of universities.

From Declaration to implementation: an organised follow-up structure and process

- The 29 signatory countries committed to attain the Declaration’s objectives will “pursue the ways of intergovernmental cooperation”, in collaboration with higher education institutions and associations.

- Ministers have agreed to meet again in Prague in May 2001, together with representatives from European higher education institutions and associations, in order to assess progress achieved and to agree on new steps to be taken.

- They have also established a specific follow-up structure with a mandate to prepare the Prague Conference and to facilitate and coordinate the action needed to advance the goals of the Bologna Declaration. The follow-up structure is based on:
  - a “consultative group” consisting of representatives of all signatory countries;
  - a smaller “follow-up group” comprising the countries successively holding the EU Presidency in the 2 years from Bologna to Prague (Finland, Portugal, France, Sweden), the Czech Republic, the European Commission, CRE and the Confederation;
  - in addition, since new political decisions may need to be taken in the process towards Prague, the follow-up to the Bologna Declaration will be on the agenda of meetings of EU education ministers.

- Follow-up work is in progress at the European, national and institutional level. The Declaration states that the process of establishing a European space for higher education requires constant support, supervision and adaptation to continuously changing needs.
  - A series of surveys and studies are in progress at the initiative of the group of national contact persons of the signatory countries, the EU Presidency, the European Commission and higher education associations and networks. They deal with transnational education, accreditation, credit systems, quality
assurance, etc., and serve as preparatory steps for the next stages in the process.

- Signatory countries are considering or planning legislative reforms and/or governmental action in relevant areas of their higher education systems; **convergent reforms** have already been introduced or are in progress in several European countries. They signal a move towards shorter studies, 2-tier degree structures, credit systems, external evaluation, more autonomy coupled with more accountability. Another trend is towards the blurring of boundaries between the different constituent sub-sectors of higher education.

- Individual universities as well as higher education consortia, networks and associations are studying and discussing the implications of the Bologna process in their particular country, subject area, or type of institution.

The Bologna Declaration invites the higher education community to contribute to the success of the process of reform and convergence

- The Declaration acknowledges the crucial role of the higher education community for the success of the Bologna process. It says that inter-governmental cooperation should be “together with non-governmental European organisations with competencies in higher education”. Governments also “expect universities to again respond positively and to contribute actively to the success of (their) endeavour”. It is therefore clear that higher education institutions have a unique opportunity to shape their own European future and to play a crucial role in the development and implementation of the Bologna process.

- The Declaration specifically recognises the fundamental values and the diversity of European higher education:

  - it clearly acknowledges the necessary independence and autonomy of universities;

  - it explicitly refers to the fundamental principles laid down in the Magna Charta Universitatum signed (also in Bologna) in 1988;

  - it stresses the need to achieve a common space for higher education within the framework of the diversity of cultures, languages and educational systems.

- In order to respond to the invitation contained in the Bologna Declaration, the higher education community needs to be able to tell Ministers in a convincing way what kind of European space for higher education it wants and is willing to promote. **Universities and other institutions of higher education can choose to**
be actors, rather than objects, of this essential process of change. They may in particular:

- profile their own curricula, in accordance with the emerging post-Bologna environment, in particular through the introduction of bachelor courses in systems where they have not traditionally existed, and through the creation of master courses meeting the needs of mobile postgraduate students from around the world;

- activate their networks in key areas such as joint curriculum development, joint ventures overseas or worldwide mobility schemes;

- contribute individually and collectively to the next steps in the process.

• The Confederation of EU Rectors’ Conferences and the Association of European Universities (CRE) plan to organise a convention of European universities and other institutions of higher education a few weeks before the Prague meeting.

This convention should provide an opportunity for the higher education community to discuss the main issues at stake and to produce a communication to Ministers on what higher education expects from the Prague meeting.

29 February 2000

**Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999**

The European process, thanks to the extraordinary achievements of the last few years, has become an increasingly concrete and relevant reality for the Union and its citizens. Enlargement prospects together with deepening relations with other European countries, provide even wider dimensions to that reality. Meanwhile, we are witnessing a growing awareness in large parts of the political and academic world and in public opinion of the need to establish a more complete and far-reaching Europe, in particular building upon and strengthening its intellectual, cultural, social and scientific and technological dimensions.

A Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognised as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competencies to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space.

The importance of education and educational co-operation in the development and strengthening of stable, peaceful and democratic societies is universally acknowledged as paramount, the more so in view of the situation in South East Europe.
The Sorbonne declaration of 25th of May 1998, which was underpinned by these considerations, stressed the universities' central role in developing European cultural dimensions. It emphasised the creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens' mobility and employability and the Continent's overall development.

Several European countries have accepted the invitation to commit themselves to achieving the objectives set out in the declaration, by signing it or expressing their agreement in principle. The direction taken by several higher education reforms launched in the meantime in Europe has proved many Governments' determination to act.

European higher education institutions, for their part, have accepted the challenge and taken up a main role in constructing the European area of higher education, also in the wake of the fundamental principles laid down in the Bologna Magna Charta Universitatum of 1988. This is of the highest importance, given that Universities' independence and autonomy ensure that higher education and research systems continuously adapt to changing needs, society's demands and advances in scientific knowledge.

The course has been set in the right direction and with meaningful purpose. The achievement of greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education nevertheless requires continual momentum in order to be fully accomplished. We need to support it through promoting concrete measures to achieve tangible forward steps. The 18th June meeting saw participation by authoritative experts and scholars from all our countries and provides us with very useful suggestions on the initiatives to be taken.

We must in particular look at the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions.

While affirming our support to the general principles laid down in the Sorbonne declaration, we engage in co-ordinating our policies to reach in the short term, and in any case within the first decade of the third millennium, the following objectives, which we consider to be of primary relevance in order to establish the European area of higher education and to promote the European system of higher education world-wide:

- Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, also through the implementation of the Diploma Supplement, in order to promote European citizens employability and the international competitiveness of the European higher education system;

- Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. Access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle
studies, lasting a minimum of three years. The degree awarded after the first cycle shall also be relevant to the European labour market as an appropriate level of qualification. The second cycle should lead to the master and/or doctorate degree as in many European countries;

- Establishment of a system of credits - such as in the ECTS system - as a proper means of promoting the most widespread student mobility. Credits could also be acquired in non-higher education contexts, including lifelong learning, provided they are recognised by the receiving universities concerned;

- Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement with particular attention to:

  - for students, access to study and training opportunities and to related services;
  
  - for teachers, researchers and administrative staff, recognition and valorisation of periods spent in a European context researching, teaching and training, without prejudicing their statutory rights;

- Promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies;

- Promotion of the necessary European dimensions in higher education, particularly with regards to curricular development, inter-institutional co-operation, mobility schemes and integrated programmes of study, training and research.

We hereby undertake to attain these objectives – within the framework of our institutional competencies and taking full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems and of University autonomy – to consolidate the European area of higher education. To that end, we will pursue the ways of intergovernmental co-operation, together with those of non governmental European organisations with competence on higher education.

We expect Universities again to respond promptly and positively and to contribute actively to the success of our endeavour.

Convinced that the establishment of the European area of higher education requires constant support, supervision and adaptation to the continuously evolving needs, we decide to meet again within two years in order to assess the progress achieved and the new steps to be taken.

Signed by:
Austria, Belgium (French community), Belgium (Flemish community), Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands,
Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Swiss Confederation, United Kingdom.

Internet addresses for more detailed information on the Bologna process and Declaration

rks.dk/trends1.htm (Danish Rectors’ Conference)

Background report for the Bologna Conference ("Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education") prepared by Guy Haug and Jette Kirstein on behalf of the Confederation of EU Rectors’ Conferences and CRE with support from the European Commission:

- executive summary
- report
- annex: analysis of the Sorbonne Declaration of May 1998
- survey of higher education systems of EU/EEA countries (tables and comments)

Text of the Bologna Declaration

unige.ch/cre (CRE, Association of European Universities)

Link to report on “Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education”

Programme of the Bologna Conference and text of the Bologna Declaration

Presentation by Kenneth Edwards, President of CRE, to the Ministers at the Bologna Conference

Presentation by Andris Barblan, Secretary General of CRE, on “The Sorbonne Declaration: follow up and implications”

Text of the Magna Charta Universitatum, signed in Bologna in 1988, which sets out the fundamental university rights.

crue.upm.es/eurec (Confederation of EU Rectors’ Conferences)

Link to the report on “Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education”

Presentation by Hans-Uwe Erichsen, President of the Confederation, at the Bologna Conference (“The challenges of a European higher education space”)

eaie.nl (European Association for International Education)

“Bologna and beyond: visions of a European future”, keynote address by Guy Haug to the EAIE Conference in Maastricht in December 1999
Link to report on “Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education”

Text of Bologna Declaration

murst.it/convegni/bologna99 (Italian Ministry of Education)

Text of the Bologna Declaration in Italian and English

Crui.it/altridoc (Italian Rectors’ Conference)

Texts of the Sorbonne and Bologna Declarations

Presentations by Luciano Guerzoni, Deputy Minister for Universities, and Luciano Modica, President of CRUI, at the Bologna Conference ("Higher education reforms in Italy, 1996-1999")

Text of the *Magna Charta Universitatum*, signed in Bologna in 1988, which sets out the fundamental university rights.

europedu.org (Sorbonne-Bologna process, French Ministry of Education)

Text of the Sorbonne Declaration of 1998 and the Bologna Declaration of 1999 in English, French, German and Italian, together with data on the higher education system of the signatory countries of the Sorbonne Declaration
Cooperation

The second phase of Socrates, the European education programme, which is to last seven years, started on 1 January 2000. It takes over from the programme's first phase, which lasted five years and achieved very appreciable results. The figures speak for themselves: almost 500,000 students undertook a period of study in another European university, 10,000 schools took part in European partnerships and thousands of projects were developed to promote the European languages.

The second phase of Socrates will carry on along the same path, while introducing some new features. There will therefore be emphasis on two keynote ideas: the promotion of lifelong learning and the building up of a Europe of knowledge. Opening up access to knowledge, irrespective of age or place, is important for a number of reasons. It makes it easier to get a job in a world in which it is necessary to adapt to increasingly relentless change. It is a way of obtaining recognized qualifications, acquiring a range of skills, including social skills, and it is a means of personal fulfilment. Lastly, it is a way of discovering other cultures, broadening one's horizons and preparing to exercise active citizenship.

Systems and practices in education vary enormously from one country to another. This is a feature of our Europe. In this context, European cooperation, whether through mobility, pilot projects, European networks or comparative studies, offers huge advantages. It provides a fertile ground for innovation, the quest for quality, and the implementation of new ideas. Surely we will be more creative if we all pull together!

Socrates covers all types of learning – formal and informal - and all levels, from nursery school to university, not forgetting adult education, which is becoming increasingly important. Socrates is relevant to all players involved in education: teachers, education staff, administrative and management staff, pupils and students, along with civil servants and decision makers, all required to play an increasingly active part in European cooperation projects. With Socrates, the school is no longer confined within four walls; it is opening up to the various components of civil society which are eager to take up the challenges of education: local and regional authorities, the social partners, associations, the business sector, etc.

Socrates comprises eight actions. The first three correspond to the three stages which constitute milestones of education throughout life, viz. school, university and adult education. The other five are horizontal. All of these actions together have common priorities. The emphasis is on countering social exclusion and under-achievement at school by providing specific support for disadvantaged groups, and promoting equal opportunities for women and men. Special attention is paid to language learning, particularly the less widely used and taught languages. There is also emphasis on
the importance of studying in a multi-cultural environment as one of the cornerstones of European citizenship. The new information and communication technologies (ICT) permeate the whole programme, as they have much to offer active teaching methods and contribute to innovation.

Lastly, Socrates encourages broad dissemination of information, ideas and good practice, e.g. through the setting up of networks.

European cooperation opens many doors to education. How wonderful it would be if everyone could take full advantage of this!
Socrates, in a nutshell

Aims
- to strengthen the European dimension of education at all levels
- to improve the knowledge of European languages
- to promote cooperation and mobility throughout education
- to encourage innovation in education
- to promote equal opportunities in all sectors of education

The eight actions
1. Comenius: school education
2. Erasmus: higher education
3. Grundtvig: adult education and other educational pathways
4. Lingua: learning European languages
5. Minerva: information and communication technologies (ICT) in education
6. Observation and innovation of education systems and policies
7. Joint actions with other European programmes
8. Supplementary measures

Participating countries
There are a total of 31 countries taking part:
- The 15 European Union countries: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.
- Three EFTA countries: Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway.
- The 10 associated countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.
- Cyprus, Malta and, in due course, Turkey.

Duration
1 January 2000 – 31 December 2006

Budget
EUR 1,850 million over seven years

The National Agencies
The Socrates programme is largely managed by the National Agencies in each of the participating countries. This brings it closer to citizens. The details of these different agencies are given on the last page of this brochure.

Further information is available from:
- the Socrates National Agency in your country
- the European Commission’s Socrates website:
  http://europa.eu.int/commission/education/socrates.html
- the Socrates Guidelines for Applicants, which provides full details of the various actions and how to take part. This guide is available in 11 languages and can be downloaded from the Internet (from the site mentioned above) or can be
obtained from the National Agencies

Socrates: Greek philosopher, the embodiment of a humanist vision of the world and the rejection of dogmatism. His maxim “know thyself” is a fundamental basis for knowledge and respect of self and of others however different they may be.
Comenius: from nursery school to secondary school

Comenius, a 17th century Moravian philosopher, felt that school should be outward-looking. The whole point is to broaden horizons. European cooperation brings a breath of fresh air to schools, along with new ideas. It thus prompts them to build up new partnerships, to work better and differently.

Of Europe’s 340,000 schools, 10,000 took part in the first phase of Comenius from 1995 to 1999.

The aim from 2000 on is to considerably increase this figure.

The Comenius action focuses on the first phase of education, viz. from pre-school and primary to secondary school (including technical and vocational education). This concerns all members of the education community – teachers, education staff and pupils – while also endeavouring to actively involve organisations outside the school, e.g. parents’ associations, NGOs, local authorities, the business sector, the social partners, etc.

The aim of Comenius is to enhance the quality of teaching, strengthen its European dimension and promote language learning. There is also emphasis on certain important issues: learning in a multicultural framework, which is the cornerstone of European citizenship, support for disadvantaged groups, countering under-achievement at school and preventing exclusion. Comenius comprises three major strands.

School partnerships

There are three types.

- **School projects** enable schools (at least three schools from three participating countries) to work on a theme of common interest. They endeavour to involve as many classes as possible and thus work towards closer cooperation, particularly between different classes and subject areas. Encouraging the active participation of pupils is a priority and henceforth a limited number of pupils may be given the opportunity of going to another country to prepare and plan the European project in conjunction with their teachers.

- **Language projects** involve two schools from two European countries and must focus on the learning of foreign languages. Priority will be given to the less widely used and taught languages. The projects will generally entail an exchange involving a stay in the partner establishment and a return visit (minimum age of pupils: 14).

- **School development projects** involve schools (at least three schools from three participating countries) as institutions, the idea being to share their experiences and to compare notes on teaching methods, organisation, management or themes of common interest, e.g. preventing violence at school or the challenge of integrating pupils from different social and cultural environments. Each school is thus involved in a holistic way.
Initial and in-service teacher training

The European Commission can subsidise two types of activity:

- **Multilateral cooperation** projects between different types of institutions, particularly establishments providing initial or in-service teacher training. The aim of these projects is to prepare programmes, courses, strategies or teaching material for the training of staff involved in education. In addition to the contribution of these projects to enhancing the quality of training in Europe, the creation of links between colleagues working in this area in different European countries is invaluable.

- **Individual grants** for future teachers (including assistantships for future language teachers), teachers in service and other categories involved in formal or informal education (head teachers, inspectors, advisors, mediators, etc.). These mobility grants can be used to undertake practical courses in schools or companies in another country, or to take part in European courses with colleagues from other countries.

The establishment of Comenius networks

Upon completion of a Comenius project, the partners are often eager to pursue and expand the work they did together. The Comenius networks give them a chance to do so. Grouping together several ongoing projects, these networks must be structured around a specific topic, e.g. citizenship, education in environmental matters or intercultural education. Many ideas and proposals can thus be more widely shared, including by schools which have not yet been able to become involved in a European partnership.

The aim of this action is to consolidate, establish synergy between and spread positive achievements and innovatory practices, to disseminate ideas and results, and give the projects a lasting impact.
Erasmus: breaking down the barriers in higher education

Erasmus was the embodiment of the cosmopolitan intellectual, so this action is aptly named. It was the first major European programme in the area of higher education. Since it was launched in 1987 it has gone from strength to strength and more than 700,000 students have been able to take advantage of the mobility arrangements under Erasmus. Today, nearly all European universities are involved. What seems not to have been generally understood, however, is that the action is also intended for higher education institutions which are not universities, as well as for post-university education.

Each university presents its full range of Erasmus activities in a contract ("institutional contract") signed with the Commission.

Two categories of people can benefit from Erasmus activities: students and the teaching staff.

Students
Erasmus gives students the opportunity to study for a period of 3-12 months at a university or higher education institution in another participating country. By way of principle, the time spent in the other country is fully recognised in the home institution thanks in particular to the ECTS system which facilitates academic recognition of periods of study in partner institutions. This means that there must be prior agreement between the universities concerned before a person can benefit from the Erasmus scheme.

Students can, for the purposes of this mobility, be eligible for a grant on top of their grants from the universities, regions or states concerned. This European grant is intended to help to cover the cost of travelling and the difference in cost of living.

It should also be noted that the European Commission may fund part of students’ language tuition prior to their departure to, or on the arrival at a foreign institution.

Reports and surveys agree that a period of study in another country is very rewarding in personal, academic and social terms. Contact with another country enables the student to become more adaptable, provides inter-cultural communication skills, and knowledge of things European. It is also a considerable plus point on the employment market.

Information on Erasmus grants is obtainable from the universities’ international relations office.

Teachers

Several Erasmus strands concern university teachers directly.

- Teacher exchanges. The European Commission provides support for teachers giving
courses, generally short courses, as part of the official curriculum of a partner university in another European country. This type of experience has a positive impact on both teachers and students.

- **Joint preparation of courses.** At least three institutions (from different countries) pool their resources to develop a programme of study, a module, a curriculum or a master’s programme. This can be done in all academic subject areas, not only for 'European' subjects.

- **Intensive programmes.** Community funding may be allocated to universities organizing intensive courses (e.g. as part of summer university programmes), provided they have a European dimension. These short programmes will provide an additional option for teachers and students, and offer them an opportunity to gain a European perspective.

- **Thematic networks.** University departments or faculties, research centres or professional associations can form a European network around a subject area or a specific topic as a platform for analysis and discussion. The European Commission provides support for these thematic networks on condition that all the participating countries are represented.
Grundtvig: the third education link

Education does not only mean school. It is a process which continues throughout life irrespective of age or place. Grundtvig takes its name from a Danish educationalist who sought to link education with life in general and open it up to everyone. This action targets adult education and other education pathways. It supplements Comenius (school education) and Erasmus (higher education) by forming the third link of a single education chain.

Adult education differs from country to country and situations vary enormously. There are various reasons why adults opt to start learning again. They either want to return to school or university in order to gain new qualifications and find a job more easily. They may want to make good use of their leisure time by investing in their own personal and social development. Or else they may wish to take a step which has to do with being an active citizen and part of the democratic process.

The players involved in adult education are formal (schools, universities) or non-formal institutions (associations, libraries, museums, parents' organisations, etc.).

Grundtvig targets all adults, while at the same time taking care to encourage those who experience special difficulties in meeting their educational needs, either because they live in disadvantaged or isolated areas, because they hampered by difficult social circumstances or have an inadequate knowledge base. There is a compelling case for giving a second chance to adults (irrespective of age) who have been excluded from the school system by helping them to acquire a basic level of knowledge, by restoring their confidence, and by acknowledging certain skills or competencies obtained outside the school context.

Through Grundtvig, the European Commission supports four types of activities.

- **Cooperation projects** relate to adult education institutions and organisations which wish to undertake a tangible project or a joint production through European cooperation. An example is the development of systems for accrediting or validating skills acquired via the informal system of education. Another example is developing new training modules and new teaching methods. **Cooperation projects** may involve mobility, but only to a marginal extent in relation to the primary aim of cooperation, viz. producing a European education product.

- **Education partnerships** are intended for smaller organisations and provide for smaller scale cooperation. The emphasis is generally on the preliminary contact between partners in different countries which can subsequently lead to more ambitious things. Education partnerships seek, for instance, to organise conferences, exhibitions or visits, in order to exchange experiences, practices and methods. This means that mobility has a greater role to play in this context.

- **Mobility for training** activities involves assistance for trainers who decide to undertake a course in another country for a period of 1-4 weeks. This mobility concerns all categories of staff involved in adult education, be they teachers, managers or administrative personnel, advisers, mediators or mentors/tutors.
Lastly, Grundtvig networks provide the players involved in adult education with a lasting basis for discussion and permit very broad dissemination of innovatory practices and ideas in this context. There are two types of such networks: thematic networks which are forums for debating key issues, and project networks which provide an opportunity for the institutions taking part in a partnership to pursue their work together while passing on the results of their work to a wider range of bodies.
Lingua: getting people to talk... another language

Around half of all Europeans are incapable of carrying on a conversation in a language other than their mother tongue, and even when they are, it is usually in one of the 'big three', i.e. English, French or German.

Knowing other languages brings a better understanding of other cultures in a Europe characterized by diversity. It is a factor of personal development and fulfilment. It makes it easier to get a job. The teaching and learning of languages – the 11 Community languages plus Irish and Luxembourgish – is a feature of all the Socrates actions, be it Comenius, Erasmus or Grundtvig. Lingua itself operates horizontally by focusing on certain key issues in order to encourage proficiency in languages, whether these are taught at school or outside the school context. Support is available from the European Commission for two categories of projects.

The promotion of language learning

Encouraging people to learn another language entails getting them interested in doing so, familiarising them with the different opportunities that exist, and providing access to the places and channels of learning. The Commission accordingly supports a wide range of transnational projects which are all important steps in the learning of foreign languages.

Firstly, there is awareness raising: partnerships, for instance, can be organised to conduct campaigns through the mass media. Second, there is motivation. Third, we have information: where and how to find a method of learning which is suited to one's requirements? what is new and what is the best practice in this field? Lastly, there is the matter of access to language resources: how can they be networked so as to make them more readily available?

The development of tools

The aim of this second part of Lingua is to ensure the presence on the market of an appropriate range of language learning tools. The transnational projects supported by the European Commission must clearly be positioned in areas which are ill-catered for by this market. They must also support innovation. This could for instance embrace a new method for learning Finnish, the development of an Internet-based test of proficiency in Spanish, or the design of a video for students wishing to study in Germany.

Projects submitted under one of these Lingua strands must meet a number of conditions. They must be based on a partnership of establishments/ bodies from at least three participating countries. They must demonstrate an added European value and, importantly, they must not have any profit motive. Lingua also emphasises encouraging the learning of the less widely used and taught European Union languages.
Minerva: new technologies at the service of education

Things have changed so incredibly quickly in the space of a few years. Not so very long ago teachers had to be convinced of the point of information and communication technologies (ICT). Later, schools needed to be equipped and there was a shortage of educational multimedia products. Today, most schools in Europe are on-line. And with relentless technological innovation and the exponential expansion of Internet, ICT are becoming increasingly common in all forums of learning: school, home and everywhere else.

This is a historical turning point. The aim must now be to capitalise on this by structuring the learning environments and using ICT to introduce education engineering. There are two priority objectives. First and foremost, ICT must bring new learning opportunities based on teaching innovation: encouraging new interaction between teachers and learners, customising learning, and encouraging multi-disciplinary approaches. This must be backed up by a provision of services which fully caters for the requirements of teachers and learners alike, something which presupposes the development and promotion of quality products, at the same time avoiding a flood on to the market of mediocre products with little teaching value.

The Minerva action is a response to this challenge. It focuses on open and distance learning (ODL), multimedia and the use of the ICT in education. It is named after the Latin goddess of wisdom and knowledge, the idea being to stress that the whole point of using the ICT is precisely to improve knowledge, skills and competencies.

Through Minerva the European Commission will provide support for four major types of activities which are horizontal in Socrates.

- Projects to better understand and support innovation. These are research actions, targeted studies and comparative analyses in order to improve understanding of the impact of ICT and ODL models on the organisation of teaching and on the learning process.
- Projects to design new teaching methods and resources for the development of innovatory environments in learning.
- Activities intended to communicate and to provide access to the results of projects in order to increase their dissemination and generalise best practice.
- Projects intended to network and encourage the exchange of ideas and experience connected with ODL and the use of ICT in education. Cooperation is encouraged between designers, users and those in positions of responsibility in education and training.

ICT are present in the various actions of the programme, except that with Minerva they are the very essence of the projects. The Minerva-supported activities are intended to reach a critical mass and are on a larger scale than in the other actions. They must relate to themes of European interest, demonstrate a genuine multiplier effect and substantiate high spin-off potential.
In addition, the Minerva action attaches particular importance to transnational projects based on partnerships which include a wide range of players: schools and universities, the multimedia business sector and the ICT sector, publishers, ministries, associations and experts from outside the school context. Experience shows that integrated projects like these generate the most innovatory and lasting results.
Observation and innovation: we can learn from each other

Europe has a vast and varied wealth of traditions, practices and education systems. The challenge facing countries which are naturally inclined to focus on their own specific situations is to take an interest in what happens elsewhere. The point of observing other education contexts is not to copy them mechanically, but to look at the different approaches as a basis for perhaps doing things differently. The diversity of Europe in this way becomes a seedbed for innovation and for improving the quality of education.

This is what the action 'Observation and innovation' is all about. Its aim is to introduce tangible instruments to turn this diversity to good account. The European Commission will accordingly support a range of initiatives and operations:

- comparative, quantitative and qualitative analysis of the various countries;
- comparison of education systems and policies (particularly through the Eurydice network);
- field visits to allow decision-makers in education to deal with problems more effectively (Arion);
- use of the Naric network of national centres for the academic recognition of qualifications;
- pilot projects, e.g. on the evaluation of quality in education, or on the citizenship dimension;
- the organisation of initiatives dealing with certain particularly innovative topics, e.g. education and employment, teaching quality indicators, or more forward-looking debates concerning tomorrow’s education.

Knowing is one thing, spreading the message is another. New ideas, studies and debates must not remain within the confined forum of experts. The 'Observation and innovation' action under Socrates will therefore endeavour to instigate a fruitful dialogue around key issues with the whole of the education community and with the different members of civil society concerned (decisionmakers, the social partners, associations, etc.).

It is also vital to disseminate information on education and innovation widely. An Internet site will be built under Socrates to provide everyone - citizen, researcher, teacher, decision-maker - with a 'one-stop shop' for all the information he/she needs on education in Europe.

Support may also be provided, in order to give the programme flexibility, to transnational projects and studies catering for any new requirements which emerge as the programme progresses.
Joint actions: an integrated approach

Education is the typical example of an area which can fully attain its objectives only by creative interaction with other neighbouring areas. These include vocational training policy, youth policy and research policy. The Socrates programme must therefore work more closely with other Community programmes and actions. This is the whole point of the joint actions, which are an explicit feature of the three programmes Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci and Youth, designed to thus encourage an integrated approach for training, education and youth policy.

Synergy will be pursued in two ways:

- through calls for proposals for joint projects common to the different programmes. These projects must cover at least two of the three areas in order to be eligible;
- through projects which meet the criteria of one programme but relate to themes defined in common across the different programmes. An example is action to counter social exclusion. In this case there is no joint call in the strict sense, but once selected, projects in this second category will develop links with others in the other programmes.

Whatever the pillar chosen, synergy will be sought as a matter of priority between the three programmes of education, vocational training and youth affairs. Subsequently, however, this cooperation should be expanded to cover culture and sport as well as other European programmes, e.g. those concerning employment and social affairs, in order to address problems such as drug abuse or racism. Synergy will also be sought with research and with programmes relating to the information society.
Supplementary measures: bringing more flexibility

For obvious reasons of consistency and transparency, any programme as ambitious as Socrates needs to be structured around clearly-defined actions and pre-established criteria. These measures will provide Community support for activities which are not formally part of any of the Socrates actions but which are nevertheless relevant to the attainment of the programme’s objectives.

The support measures cover a wide range of activities:
- awareness-raising activities to promote cooperation in education (conferences and seminars);
- support for the dissemination of project results;
- improving programme implementation by providing training in project management or in tackling obstacles;
- favouring synergy between the different actions of the programme;
- targeting horizontal priorities such as the promotion of equal opportunities and inter-cultural education.

To be selected, projects must of course be conducted transnationally by a wide range of partners, cover a theme of European interest and demonstrate an impact.

(Last page: addresses of the National Agencies)
Commission reference
Compulsory references

Appendix E

European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students

(ERASMUS MUNDUS)

1) OBJECTIVE

To enhance the quality of higher education in Europe by promoting cooperation with third countries with a view to making higher education in Europe more attractive.

2) ACT


3) SUMMARY

Background

The Erasmus Mundus programme responds to the challenges laid down at the European Councils in Lisbon (23-24 March 2000) and Bologna (19 June 1999) referring respectively to the needs to adapt European education and vocational training systems to the demands of the knowledge society and to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a worldwide degree of attractiveness appropriate to Europe's cultural and scientific achievements.

The Erasmus Mundus programme, which will run from 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2008, proposes a manifestly "European" offer in the field of higher education, first and foremost with the aim of improving the quality and attractiveness of higher education in Europe and promoting international mobility for students and scholars. Erasmus Mundus follows up the Communications on reinforcing cooperation with third countries and on the role of universities in the Europe of knowledge.

Aims

Erasmus Mundus aims to enhance the quality of European higher education by fostering cooperation with third countries in order to improve the development of human resources and promote dialogue and understanding between peoples and cultures. More specifically, the programme seeks to:

- promote a quality offer in higher education, with a distinctly European added value;
encourage and enable highly qualified graduates and scholars from all over the world to obtain qualifications and/or acquire experience in the European Union;

develop better-structured cooperation between European Union and third-country institutions and increase outgoing mobility from the European Union;

make European higher education more accessible and enhance its visibility throughout the world.

In pursuing the programme's objectives, the Commission will adhere to the Community's general policy on equal opportunities for men and women. It will also ensure that no group of citizens or third-country nationals is excluded or disadvantaged.

Actions

The Erasmus Mundus programme is being implemented by means of the following five actions:

- **Erasmus Mundus masters courses.** These are advanced-level European diploma courses which are selected by the Commission on the basis of the quality of the proposed training and which:
  - involve a minimum of three higher education institutions in three different Member States;
  - consist of a study programme including a period of study in at least two of the three institutions;
  - have built-in mechanisms for the recognition of periods of study at partner institutions;
  - result in the awarding of joint, double or multiple degrees by the participating institutions which are recognised or approved by the Member States;
  - reserve a minimum number of places for third-country students;
  - establish transparent admission conditions which pay due regard, among other things, to gender issues and equity issues;
  - respect the rules applicable to the procedure for selecting grant recipients (students and scholars);
  - put in place adequate arrangements to facilitate access for, and hosting of, third-country students (information facilities, accommodation, etc.);
  - provide for the use of at least two European languages spoken in the Member States where the higher education institutions involved in the Erasmus Mundus masters course are situated. However, there is no obligation to use two languages of instruction.

Erasmus Mundus masters courses are selected for a five-year period, subject to an annual renewal procedure.

- **Scholarships.** Scholarships consist of financial support for third-country graduate students and scholars attending Erasmus Mundus masters courses. A "third-country graduate student" means a national of a third country who has already obtained a first higher education degree, is not a resident of a Member State or participating country, has not carried out his or her main activity for more than a total of 12 months of the last five years in a Member State or participating
country, and has been accepted to register or is registered for an Erasmus Mundus masters course. A "third-country scholar" means a national of a third country who is not a resident of a Member State or participating country, has not carried out his or her main activity for more than a total of 12 months of the last five years in a Member State or participating country, and can offer outstanding academic and/or professional experience.

- **Partnerships with third-country higher education institutions.** Partnerships (maximum duration of three years) involve an Erasmus Mundus masters course and at least one higher education institution in a third country, so as to create a framework for outgoing mobility towards third countries. Recognition of study periods at the host (non-European) institution must be guaranteed. Students and scholars from a Member State and third-country nationals who have been legally resident in the European Union for at least three years before the start of the mobility programme (for purposes other than study) are eligible for mobility grants. Partnership projects may also include:  
  - teaching assignments at a partner institution with a view to developing the project curriculum,  
  - exchanges of teachers, trainers, administrators, and other relevant specialists,  
  - development and dissemination of new methods for use in higher education, including information and communication technologies, e-learning, and open and distance learning,  
  - development of cooperation schemes with third-country higher education institutions with a view to offering a course in the country in question.

- **Promotional activities.** Erasmus Mundus supports measures enhancing the attractiveness of Europe as a venue for study. Such measures aim to enhance the profile and visibility of, and accessibility to, European education. They seek to establish links between higher education and research, through networks involving at least three public or private organisations in three different Member States which are active in higher education at national or international level. Networks may also involve third-country organisations. These activities (seminars, conferences, workshops, development of ICT tools, production of material for publication, etc.) may take place in Member States or third countries.

- **Technical support measures.** In implementing the programme, the Commission may make use of experts, an executive agency, existing competent agencies in Member States and, if necessary, other forms of technical assistance.

**Beneficiaries**

Erasmus Mundus is aimed in particular at:

- higher education institutions;
- students having obtained a first degree from a higher education institution;
- scholars or professionals who teach or conduct research;
- staff directly involved in higher education;
- other public or private bodies active in the field of higher education.
Participating countries

The programme is open to the 25 Member States of the Community, the EEA-EFTA countries, and candidate countries for accession to the European Union.

Implementation of the programme

The Commission is responsible for the practical implementation of the programme. A selection board, composed of high standing personalities from the academic world who are representative of the diversity of higher education in the European Union, selects the Erasmus Mundus masters courses and partnerships of higher education institutions. Erasmus Mundus masters courses are allocated a specific number of grants. Third-country students are selected by the institutions participating in Erasmus Mundus masters courses. Promotional activities, on the other hand, are selected by the Commission.

Selection procedures provide for a clearing mechanism at European level, in order to prevent serious imbalances across fields of study, students' and scholars' regions of provenance and Member States of destination; The Commission, in cooperation with the Member States, ensures overall consistency and complementarity with other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions, in particular with the sixth framework research programme and with external cooperation programmes in the field of higher education.

The Member States must take the necessary steps to ensure the efficient running of the programme at national level (including the designation of appropriate structures to cooperate closely with the Commission), involving all the parties concerned in education. They must endeavour to adopt any measures deemed appropriate to remove legal and administrative barriers.

Budget

The financial framework for the period from 1 January 2004 to 31 December 2008 is set at EUR 230 million. The annual appropriations are authorised by the budgetary authority within the limits of the financial perspective.

Monitoring and evaluation

The Commission must regularly monitor the programme in cooperation with the Member States. The programme will be evaluated regularly by the Commission, having regard to the objectives, the programme's impact as a whole, and complementarity between the programme and other relevant Community policies, instruments and actions.

The Commission must submit to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions:
• on the accession of a new Member State: a report on the financial repercussions of such an accession on the programme, and proposals to deal with these repercussions;
• by 30 June 2007: an interim evaluation report on the results achieved and on the qualitative aspects of programme implementation;
• by 31 December 2007: a communication on the continuation of the programme;
• by 31 December 2009: an ex-post evaluation report.

4) IMPLEMENTING MEASURES
5) FOLLOW-UP WORK
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Appendix F

Lisbon Convention Document

Convention on the recognition of qualifications concerning higher education in the European region

(The European Treaty Series, n°165, Council of Europe - UNESCO joint Convention)

Lisbon, 11 April 1997

The Parties to this Convention,

Conscious of the fact that the right to education is a human right, and that higher education, which is instrumental in the pursuit and advancement of knowledge, constitutes an exceptionally rich cultural and scientific asset for both individuals and society;

Considering that higher education should play a vital role in promoting peace, mutual understanding and tolerance, and in creating mutual confidence among peoples and nations;

Considering that the great diversity of education systems in the European region reflects its cultural, social, political, philosophical, religious and economic diversity, an exceptional asset which should be fully respected;

Desiring to enable all people of the region to benefit fully from this rich asset of diversity by facilitating access by the inhabitants of each State and by the students of each Party’s educational institutions to the educational resources of the other Parties, more specifically by facilitating their efforts to continue their education or to complete a period of studies in higher education institutions in those other Parties;

Considering that the recognition of studies, certificates, diplomas and degrees obtained in another country of the European region represents an important measure for promoting academic mobility between the Parties;

Attaching great importance to the principle of institutional autonomy, and conscious of the need to uphold and protect this principle;

Convinced that a fair recognition of qualifications is a key element of the right to education and a responsibility of society;

Having regard to the Council of Europe and UNESCO Conventions covering academic recognition in Europe:
European Convention on the Equivalence of Diplomas leading to Admission to Universities (1953, ETS No. 15), and its Protocol (1964, ETS No. 49);

European Convention on the Equivalence of Periods of University Study (1956, ETS No. 21);

European Convention on the Academic Recognition of University Qualifications (1959, ETS No. 32);

Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region (1979);

European Convention on the General Equivalence of Periods of University Study (1990, ETS No. 138);

Having regard also to the International Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees in Higher Education in the Arab and European States bordering on the Mediterranean (1976), adopted within the framework of UNESCO and partially covering academic recognition in Europe;

Mindful that this Convention should also be considered in the context of the UNESCO conventions and the International Recommendation covering other Regions of the world, and of the need for an improved exchange of information between these Regions;

Conscious of the wide ranging changes in higher education in the European region since these Conventions were adopted, resulting in considerably increased diversification within and between national higher education systems, and of the need to adapt the legal instruments and practice to reflect these developments;

Conscious of the need to find common solutions to practical recognition problems in the European region;

Conscious of the need to improve current recognition practice and to make it more transparent and better adapted to the current situation of higher education in the European region;

Confident of the positive significance of a Convention elaborated and adopted under the joint auspices of the Council of Europe and UNESCO providing a framework for the further development of recognition practices in the European region;

Conscious of the importance of providing permanent implementation mechanisms in order to put the principles and provisions of the current Convention into practice,

Have agreed as follows:

Section I. Definitions
Article I

For the purposes of this Convention, the following terms shall have the following meaning:

Access (to higher education)

The right of qualified candidates to apply and to be considered for admission to higher education.

Admission (to higher education institutions and programmes)

The act of, or system for, allowing qualified applicants to pursue studies in higher education at a given institution and/or a given programme.

Assessment (of institutions or programmes)

The process for establishing the educational quality of a higher education institution or programme.

Assessment (of individual qualifications)

The written appraisal or evaluation of an individual's foreign qualifications by a competent body.

Competent recognition authority

A body officially charged with making binding decisions on the recognition of foreign qualifications.

Higher education

All types of courses of study, or sets of courses of study, training or training for research at the post secondary level which are recognized by the relevant authorities of a Party as belonging to its higher education system.

Higher education institution

An establishment providing higher education and recognized by the competent authority of a Party as belonging to its system of higher education.
Higher education programme

A course of study recognized by the competent authority of a Party as belonging to its system of higher education, and the completion of which provides the student with a higher education qualification.

Period of study

Any component of a higher education programme which has been evaluated and documented and, while not a complete programme of study in itself, represents a significant acquisition of knowledge or skill.

Qualification

A. Higher education qualification

Any degree, diploma or other certificate issued by a competent authority attesting the successful completion of a higher education programme.

B. Qualification giving access to higher education

Any diploma or other certificate issued by a competent authority attesting the successful completion of an education programme and giving the holder of the qualification the right to be considered for admission to higher education (cf. the definition of access).

Recognition

A formal acknowledgement by a competent authority of the value of a foreign educational qualification with a view to access to educational and/or employment activities.

Requirement

A. General requirements

Conditions that must in all cases be fulfilled for access to higher education, or to a given level thereof, or for the award of a higher education qualification at a given level.

B. Specific requirements

Conditions that must be fulfilled, in addition to the general requirements, in order to gain admission to a particular higher education programme, or for the award of a specific higher education qualification in a particular field of study.
Section II. The competence of authorities

Article II.1

1. Where central authorities of a Party are competent to make decisions in recognition cases, that Party shall be immediately bound by the provisions of this Convention and shall take the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of its provisions on its territory.

Where the competence to make decisions in recognition matters lies with components of the Party, the Party shall furnish one of the depositories with a brief statement of its constitutional situation or structure at the time of signature or when depositing its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or any time thereafter. In such cases, the competent authorities of the components of the Parties so designated shall take the necessary measures to ensure implementation of the provisions of this Convention on their territory.

2. Where the competence to make decisions in recognition matters lies with individual higher education institutions or other entities, each Party according to its constitutional situation or structure shall transmit the text of this convention to these institutions or entities and shall take all possible steps to encourage the favourable consideration and application of its provisions.

3. The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall apply, mutatis mutandis, to the obligations of the Parties under subsequent articles of this Convention.

Article II.2

At the time of signature or when depositing its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or at any time thereafter, each State, the Holy See or the European Community shall inform either depository of the present Convention of the authorities which are competent to make different categories of decisions in recognition cases.

Article II.3

Nothing in this Convention shall be deemed to derogate from any more favourable provisions concerning the recognition of qualifications issued in one of the Parties contained in or stemming from an existing or a future treaty to which a Party to this Convention may be or may become a party.

Section III. Basic principles related to the assessment of qualifications

Article III.1

1. Holders of qualifications issued in one of the Parties shall have adequate access, upon request to the appropriate body, to an assessment of these qualifications.
2. No discrimination shall be made in this respect on any ground such as the applicant's gender, race, colour, disability, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status, or on the grounds of any other circumstance not related to the merits of the qualification for which recognition is sought. In order to assure this right, each Party undertakes to make appropriate arrangements for the assessment of an application for recognition of qualifications solely on the basis of the knowledge and skills achieved.

Article III.2

Each Party shall ensure that the procedures and criteria used in the assessment and recognition of qualifications are transparent, coherent and reliable.

Article III.3

1. Decisions on recognition shall be made on the basis of appropriate information on the qualifications for which recognition is sought.

2. In the first instance, the responsibility for providing adequate information rests with the applicant, who shall provide such information in good faith.

3. Notwithstanding the responsibility of the applicant, the institutions having issued the qualifications in question shall have a duty to provide, upon request of the applicant and within reasonable limits, relevant information to the holder of the qualification, to the institution, or to the competent authorities of the country in which recognition is sought.

4. The Parties shall instruct or encourage, as appropriate, all education institutions belonging to their education systems to comply with any reasonable request for information for the purpose of assessing qualifications earned at the said institutions.

5. The responsibility to demonstrate that an application does not fulfil the relevant requirements lies with the body undertaking the assessment.

Article III.4

Each Party shall ensure, in order to facilitate the recognition of qualifications, that adequate and clear information on its education system is provided.

Article III.5

Decisions on recognition shall be made within a reasonable time limit specified beforehand by the competent recognition authority and calculated from the time all necessary information in the case has been provided. If recognition is withheld, the reasons for the refusal to grant recognition shall be stated, and information shall be given concerning possible measures the applicant may take in order to obtain recognition.
at a later stage. If recognition is withheld, or if no decision is taken, the applicant shall be able to make an appeal within a reasonable time limit.

Section IV. Recognition of qualifications giving access to higher education

Article IV.1

Each Party shall recognize the qualifications issued by other Parties meeting the general requirements for access to higher education in those Parties for the purpose of access to programmes belonging to its higher education system, unless a substantial difference can be shown between the general requirements for access in the Party in which the qualification was obtained and in the Party in which recognition of the qualification is sought.

Article IV.2

Alternatively, it shall be sufficient for a Party to enable the holder of a qualification issued in one of the other Parties to obtain an assessment of that qualification, upon request by the holder, and the provisions of Article IV.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis to such a case.

Article IV.3

Where a qualification gives access only to specific types of institutions or programmes of higher education in the Party in which the qualification was obtained, each other Party shall grant holders of such qualifications access to similar specific programmes in institutions belonging to its higher education system, unless a substantial difference can be demonstrated between the requirements for access in the Party in which the qualification was obtained and the Party in which recognition of the qualification is sought.

Article IV.4

Where admission to particular higher education programmes is dependent on the fulfilment of specific requirements in addition to the general requirements for access, the competent authorities of the Party concerned may impose the additional requirements equally on holders of qualifications obtained in the other Parties or assess whether applicants with qualifications obtained in other Parties fulfil equivalent requirements.

Article IV.5

Where, in the Party in which they have been obtained, school leaving certificates give access to higher education only in combination with additional qualifying examinations as a prerequisite for access, the other Parties may make access conditional on these requirements or offer an alternative for satisfying such additional requirements within
their own educational systems. Any State, the Holy See or the European Community may, at the time of signature or when depositing its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or at any time thereafter, notify one of the depositaries that it avails itself of the provisions of this Article, specifying the Parties in regard to which it intends to apply this Article as well as the reasons therefore.

Article IV.6

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles IV.1, IV.2, IV.3, IV.4 and IV.5, admission to a given higher education institution, or to a given programme within such an institution, may be restricted or selective. In cases in which admission to a higher education institution and/or programme is selective, admission procedures should be designed with a view to ensuring that the assessment of foreign qualifications is carried out according to the principles of fairness and non-discrimination described in Section III.

Article IV.7

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles IV.1, IV.2, IV.3, IV.4 and IV.5, admission to a given higher education institution may be made conditional on demonstration by the applicant of sufficient competence in the language or languages of instruction of the institution concerned, or in other specified languages.

Article IV.8

In the Parties in which access to higher education may be obtained on the basis of non-traditional qualifications, similar qualifications obtained in other Parties shall be assessed in a similar manner as non-traditional qualifications earned in the Party in which recognition is sought.

Article IV.9

For the purpose of admission to programmes of higher education, each Party may make the recognition of qualifications issued by foreign educational institutions operating in its territory contingent upon specific requirements of national legislation or specific agreements concluded with the Party of origin of such institutions.

Section V. Recognition of periods of study

Article V.1

Each Party shall recognize periods of study completed within the framework of a higher education programme in another Party. This recognition shall comprise such periods of study towards the completion of a higher education programme in the Party in which recognition is sought, unless substantial differences can be shown between the periods of study completed in another Party and the part of the higher education programme which they would replace in the Party in which recognition is sought.
Article V.2

Alternatively, it shall be sufficient for a Party to enable a person who has completed a period of study within the framework of a higher education programme in another Party to obtain an assessment of that period of study, upon request by the person concerned, and the provisions of Article V.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis to such a case.

Article V.3

In particular, each Party shall facilitate recognition of periods of study when:
a there has been a previous agreement between, on the one hand, the higher education institution or the competent authority responsible for the relevant period of study and, on the other hand, the higher education institution or the competent recognition authority responsible for the recognition that is sought; and b the higher education institution in which the period of study has been completed has issued a certificate or transcript of academic records attesting that the student has successfully completed the stipulated requirements for the said period of study.

Section VI. Recognition of higher education qualifications

Article VI.1

To the extent that a recognition decision is based on the knowledge and skills certified by the higher education qualification, each Party shall recognize the higher education qualifications conferred in another Party, unless a substantial difference can be shown between the qualification for which recognition is sought and the corresponding qualification in the Party in which recognition is sought.

Article VI.2

Alternatively, it shall be sufficient for a Party to enable the holder of a higher education qualification issued in one of the other Parties to obtain an assessment of that qualification, upon request by the holder, and the provisions of Article VI.1 shall apply mutatis mutandis to such a case.

Article VI.3

Recognition in a Party of a higher education qualification issued in another Party shall have one or both of the following consequences:

a) access to further higher education studies, including relevant examinations, and/or to preparations for the doctorate, on the same conditions as those applicable to holders of qualifications of the Party in which recognition is sought;
b) the use of an academic title, subject to the laws and regulations of the Party or a jurisdiction thereof, in which recognition is sought.
In addition, recognition may facilitate access to the labour market subject to laws and regulations of the Party, or a jurisdiction thereof, in which recognition is sought.

**Article VI.4**

An assessment in a Party of a higher education qualification issued in another Party may take the form of:

a) advice for general employment purposes;
b) advice to an educational institution for the purpose of admission into its programmes;
c) advice to any other competent recognition authority.

**Article VI.5**

Each Party may make the recognition of higher education qualifications issued by foreign educational institutions operating in its territory contingent upon specific requirements of national legislation or specific agreements concluded with the Party of origin of such institutions.

**Section VII. Recognition of qualifications held by refugees, displaced persons and persons in a refugee-like situation**

**Article VII**

Each Party shall take all feasible and reasonable steps within the framework of its education system and in conformity with its constitutional, legal, and regulatory provisions to develop procedures designed to assess fairly and expeditiously whether refugees, displaced persons and persons in a refugee-like situation fulfil the relevant requirements for access to higher education, to further higher education programmes or to employment activities, even in cases in which the qualifications obtained in one of the Parties cannot be proven through documentary evidence.

**Section VIII. Information on the assessment of higher education institutions and programmes**

**Article VIII.1**

Each Party shall provide adequate information on any institution belonging to its higher education system, and on any programme operated by these institutions, with a view to enabling the competent authorities of other Parties to ascertain whether the qualifications issued by these institutions justifies recognition in the Party in which recognition is sought. Such information shall take the following form:

a) in the case of Parties having established a system of formal assessment of higher education institutions and programmes: information on the methods and results of this assessment, and of the standards of quality specific to each type of higher education institution granting, and to programmes leading to, higher education qualifications;
b) in the case of Parties which have not established a system of formal assessment of higher education institutions and programmes: information on the recognition of the various qualifications obtained at any higher education institution, or within any higher education programme, belonging to their higher education systems.

**Article VIII.2**

Each Party shall make adequate provisions for the development, maintenance and provision of:

a) an overview of the different types of higher education institutions belonging to its higher education system, with the typical characteristics of each type of institution;

b) a list of recognized institutions (public and private) belonging to its higher education system, indicating their powers to award different types of qualifications and the requirements for gaining access to each type of institution and programme;

c) a description of higher education programmes;

d) a list of educational institutions located outside its territory which the Party considers as belonging to its education system.

**Section IX. Information on recognition matters**

**Article IX.1**

In order to facilitate the recognition of qualifications concerning higher education, the Parties undertake to establish transparent systems for the complete description of the qualifications obtained.

**Article IX.2**

1. Acknowledging the need for relevant, accurate and up-to-date information, each Party shall establish or maintain a national information centre and shall notify one of the depositories of its establishment, or of any changes affecting it.

2. In each Party, the national information centre shall:

a) facilitate access to authoritative and accurate information on the higher education system and qualifications of the country in which it is located;

b) facilitate access to information on the higher education systems and qualifications of the other Parties;

c) give advice or information on recognition matters and assessment of qualifications, in accordance with national laws and regulations.
3. Every national information centre shall have at its disposal the necessary means to enable it to fulfil its functions.

**Article IX.3**

The Parties shall promote, through the national information centres or otherwise, the use of the UNESCO/Council of Europe Diploma Supplement or any other comparable document by the higher education institutions of the Parties.

**Section X. Implementation mechanisms**

**Article X.1**

The following bodies shall oversee, promote and facilitate the implementation of the Convention:

a) the Committee of the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region;

b) the European Network of National Information Centres on academic mobility and recognition (the ENIC Network), established by decision of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 9 June 1994 and the UNESCO Regional Committee for Europe on 18 June 1994.

**Article X.2**

1. The Committee of the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (hereafter referred to as "the Committee") is hereby established. It shall be composed of one representative of each Party.

2. For the purposes of Article X.2, the term "Party" shall not apply to the European Community.

3. The States mentioned in Article XI.1.1 and the Holy See, if they are not Parties to this Convention, the European Community and the President of the ENIC Network may participate in the meetings of the Committee as observers. Representatives of governmental and nongovernmental organizations active in the field of recognition in the Region may also be invited to attend meetings of the Committee as observers.

4. The President of the UNESCO Regional Committee for the Application of the Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region shall also be invited to participate in the meetings of the Committee as an observer.
5. The Committee shall promote the application of this Convention and shall oversee its implementation. To this end it may adopt, by a majority of the Parties, recommendations, declarations, protocols and models of good practice to guide the competent authorities of the Parties in their implementation of the Convention and in their consideration of applications for the recognition of higher education qualifications. While they shall not be bound by such texts, the Parties shall use their best endeavours to apply them, to bring the texts to the attention of the competent authorities and to encourage their application. The Committee shall seek the opinion of the ENIC Network before making its decisions.

6. The Committee shall report to the relevant bodies of the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

7. The Committee shall maintain links to the UNESCO Regional Committees for the Application of Conventions on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees in Higher Education adopted under the auspices of UNESCO.

8. A majority of the Parties shall constitute a quorum.

9. The Committee shall adopt its Rules of Procedure. It shall meet in ordinary session at least every three years. The Committee shall meet for the first time within a year of the entry into force of this Convention.

10. The Secretariat of the Committee shall be entrusted jointly to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and to the Director-General of UNESCO.

Article X.3

1. Each Party shall appoint as a member of the European network of national information centres on academic mobility and recognition (the ENIC Network) the national information centre established or maintained under Article IX. In cases in which more than one national information centre is established or maintained in a Party under Article IX, all these shall be members of the Network, but the national information centres concerned shall dispose of only one vote.

2. The ENIC Network shall, in its composition restricted to national information centres of the Parties to this Convention, uphold and assist the practical implementation of the Convention by the competent national authorities. The Network shall meet at least once a year in plenary session. It shall elect its President and Bureau in accordance with its terms of reference.

3. The Secretariat of the ENIC Network shall be entrusted jointly to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and to the Director-General of UNESCO.

4. The Parties shall cooperate, through the ENIC Network, with the national information centres of other Parties, especially by enabling them to collect all information of use to
the national information centres in their activities relating to academic recognition and mobility.

Section XI. Final clauses

Article XI.1

1. This Convention shall be open for signature by:

   a) the member States of the Council of Europe;

   b) the member States of the UNESCO Europe Region;

   c) any other signatory, contracting State or party to the European Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe and/or to the UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region, which have been invited to the Diplomatic Conference entrusted with the adoption of this Convention.

2. These States and the Holy See may express their consent to be bound by:

   a) signature without reservation as to ratification, acceptance or approval; or

   b) signature, subject to ratification, acceptance or approval, followed by ratification, acceptance or approval; or

   c) accession.

3. Signatures shall be made with one of the depositaries. Instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession shall be deposited with one of the depositaries.

Article XI.2

This Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the month following the expiration of the period of one month after five States, including at least three member States of the Council of Europe and/or the UNESCO Europe Region, have expressed their consent to be bound by the Convention. It shall enter into force for each other State on the first day of the month following the expiration of the period of one month after the date of expression of its consent to be bound by the Convention.

Article XI.3

1. After the entry into force of this Convention, any State other than those falling into one of the categories listed under Article XI.1 may request accession to this Convention.
Any request to this effect shall be addressed to one of the depositories, who shall transmit it to the Parties at least three months before the meeting of the Committee of the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region. The depository shall also inform the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and the Executive Board of UNESCO.

2. The decision to invite a State which so requests to accede to this Convention shall be taken by a two-thirds majority of the Parties.

3. After the entry into force of this Convention the European Community may accede to it following a request by its member States, which shall be addressed to one of the depositories. In this case, Article XI.3.2 shall not apply.

4. In respect of any acceding States or the European Community, the Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the month following the expiration of the period of one month after the deposit of the instrument of accession with one of the depositories.

Article XI.4

1. Parties to this Convention which are at the same time parties to one or more of the following Conventions:

   European Convention on the Equivalence of Diplomas leading to Admission to Universities (1953, ETS No. 15), and its Protocol (1964, ETS No. 49);

   European Convention on the Equivalence of Periods of University Study (1956, ETS No. 21);

   European Convention on the Academic Recognition of University Qualifications (1959, ETS No. 32);

   International Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees in Higher Education in the Arab and European States bordering on the Mediterranean (1976);

   Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region (1979);

  European Convention on the General Equivalence of Periods of University Study (1990, ETS 138), a shall apply the provisions of the present Convention in their mutual relations;

   b) shall continue to apply the above mentioned Conventions to which they are a party in their relations with other States party to those Conventions but not to the present Convention.
2. The Parties to this Convention undertake to abstain from becoming a party to any of the Conventions mentioned in paragraph 1, to which they are not already a party, with the exception of the International Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees in Higher Education in the Arab and European States bordering on the Mediterranean.

**Article XI.5**

1. Any State may, at the time of signature or when depositing its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, specify the territory or territories to which this Convention shall apply.

2. Any State may, at any later date, by a declaration addressed to one of the depositaries, extend the application of this Convention to any other territory specified in the declaration. In respect of such territory the Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the month following the expiration of a period of one month after the date of receipt of such declaration by the depository.

3. Any declaration made under the two preceding paragraphs may, in respect of any territory specified in such declaration, be withdrawn by a notification addressed to one of the depositaries. The withdrawal shall become effective on the first day of the month following the expiration of a period of one month after the date of receipt of such notification by the depository.

**Article XI.6**

1. Any Party may, at any time, denounce this Convention by means of a notification addressed to one of the depositaries.

2. Such denunciation shall become effective on the first day of the month following the expiration of a period of twelve months after the date of receipt of the notification by the depository. However, such denunciation shall not affect recognition decisions taken previously under the provisions of this Convention.

3. Termination or suspension of the operation of this Convention as a consequence of a violation by a Party of a provision essential to the accomplishment of the object or purpose of this Convention shall be addressed in accordance with international law.

**Article XI.7**

1. Any State, the Holy See or the European Community may, at the time of signature or when depositing its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval or accession, declare that it reserves the right not to apply, in whole or in part, one or more of the following Articles of this Convention:
   Article IV.8
   Article V.3
Article VI.3
Article VIII.2
Article IX.3

No other reservation may be made.

2. Any Party which has made a reservation under the preceding paragraph may wholly or partly withdraw it by means of a notification addressed to one of the depositories. The withdrawal shall take effect on the date of receipt of such notification by the depository.

3. A Party which has made a reservation in respect of a provision of this Convention may not claim the application of that provision by any other Party; it may, however, if its reservation is partial or conditional, claim the application of that provision in so far as it has itself accepted it.

Article XI.8

1. Draft amendments to this Convention may be adopted by the Committee of the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region by a two-thirds majority of the Parties. Any draft amendment so adopted shall be incorporated into a Protocol to this Convention. The Protocol shall specify the modalities for its entry into force which, in any event, shall require the expression of consent by the Parties to be bound by it.

2. No amendment may be made to Section III of this Convention under the procedure of paragraph 1 above.

3. Any proposal for amendments shall be communicated to one of the depositaries, who shall transmit it to the Parties at least three months before the meeting of the Committee. The depository shall also inform the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and the Executive Board of UNESCO.

Article XI.9

1. The Secretary General of the Council of Europe and the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shall be the depositaries of this Convention.

2. The depository with whom an act, notification or communication has been deposited shall notify the Parties to this Convention, as well as the other member States of the Council of Europe and/or of the UNESCO Europe Region of:

a) any signature;

b) the deposit of any instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval, or accession;
c) any date of entry into force of this Convention in accordance with the provisions of Articles XI.2 and XI.3.4;

d) any reservation made in pursuance of the provisions of Article XI.7 and the withdrawal of any reservations made in pursuance of the provisions of Article XI.7;

e) any denunciation of this Convention in pursuance of Article XI.6;

f) any declarations made in accordance with the provisions of Article II.1, or of Article II.2;

g) any declarations made in accordance with the provisions of Article IV.5;

h) any request for accession made in accordance with the provisions of Article XI.3;

i) any proposal made in accordance with the provisions of Article XI.8;

j) any other act, notification or communication relating to this Convention.

3. The depository receiving a communication or making a notification in pursuance of the provisions of this Convention shall immediately inform the other depository thereof.

In witness thereof the undersigned representatives, being duly authorized, have signed this Convention.

Done at Lisbon on 11 April 1997, in the English, French, Russian and Spanish languages, the four texts being equally authoritative, in two copies, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Council of Europe and the other in the archives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. A certified copy shall be sent to all the States referred to in Article XI.1, to the Holy See and to the European Community and to the Secretariat of the United Nations.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

SUBJECT: International Education Policy

To continue to compete successfully in the global economy and to maintain our role as a world leader, the United States needs to ensure that its citizens develop a broad understanding of the world, proficiency in other languages, and knowledge of other cultures. America's leadership also depends on building ties with those who will guide the political, cultural, and economic development of their countries in the future. A coherent and coordinated international education strategy will help us meet the twin challenges of preparing our citizens for a global environment while continuing to attract and educate future leaders from abroad.

Since World War II, the Federal Government, in partnership with institutions of higher education and other educational organizations, has sponsored programs to help Americans gain the international experience and skills they will need to meet the challenges of an increasingly interdependent world. During this same period, our colleges and universities have developed an educational system whose reputation attracts students from all over the world. But our work is not done. Today, the defense of U.S. interests, the effective management of global issues, and even an understanding of our Nation's diversity require ever-greater contact with, and understanding of, people and cultures beyond our borders.

We are fortunate to count among our staunchest friends abroad those who have experienced our country and our values through in-depth exposure as students and scholars. The nearly 500,000 international students now studying in the United States at the postsecondary level not only contribute some $9 billion annually to our economy, but also enrich our communities with their cultures, while developing a lifelong appreciation for ours. The goodwill these students bear for our country will in the future constitute one of our greatest foreign policy assets.
It is the policy of the Federal Government to support international education. We are committed to:

- encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States;
- promoting study abroad by U.S. students;
- supporting the exchange of teachers, scholars, and citizens at all levels of society;
- enhancing programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise;
- expanding high-quality foreign language learning and in-depth knowledge of other cultures by Americans;
- preparing and supporting teachers in their efforts to interpret other countries and cultures for their students; and
- advancing new technologies that aid the spread of knowledge throughout the world.

The Federal Government cannot accomplish these goals alone. Educational institutions, State and local governments, non-governmental organizations, and the business community all must contribute to this effort. Together, we must increase and broaden our commitment. Therefore, I direct the heads of executive departments and agencies, working in partnership with the private sector, to take the following actions:

11. The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of schools and colleges to improve access to high-quality international educational experiences by increasing the number and diversity of students who study and intern abroad, encouraging students and institutions to choose nontraditional study-abroad locations, and helping under-represented U.S. institutions offer and promote study-abroad opportunities for their students.

12. The Secretaries of State and Education, in partnership with other governmental and nongovernmental organizations, shall identify steps to attract qualified post-secondary students from overseas to the United States, including improving the availability of accurate information overseas about U.S. educational opportunities.

13. The heads of agencies, including the Secretaries of State and Education, and others as appropriate, shall review the effect of U.S. Government actions on the international flow of students and scholars as well as on citizen and professional exchanges, and take steps to address unnecessary obstacles, including those involving visa and tax regulations, procedures, and policies.

14. The Secretaries of State and Education shall support the efforts of State and local governments and educational institutions to promote international awareness and skills in the classroom and on campuses. Such efforts include
strengthening foreign language learning at all levels, including efforts to achieve bi-literacy, helping teachers acquire the skills needed to understand and interpret other countries and cultures for their students, increasing opportunities for the exchange of faculty, administrators, and students, and assisting educational institutions in other countries to strengthen their teaching of English.

15. The Secretaries of State and Education and the heads of other agencies shall take steps to ensure that international educational exchange programs, including the Fulbright program, are coordinated through the Interagency Working Group on United States Government-Sponsored International Exchange and Training, to maximize existing resources in a nonduplicative way, and to ensure that the exchange programs receive the support they need to fulfill their mission of increased mutual understanding.

16. The Secretary of Education, in cooperation with other agencies, shall continue to support efforts to improve U.S. education by developing comparative information, including benchmarks, on educational performance and practices. The Secretary of Education shall also share U.S. educational expertise with other countries.

17. The Secretaries of State and Education shall strengthen and expand models of international exchange that build lasting cross-national partnerships among educational institutions with common interests and complementary objectives.

18. The Secretary of Education and the heads of other agencies, in partnership with State governments, academic institutions, and the business community, shall strengthen programs that build international expertise in U.S. institutions, with the goal of making international education an integral component of U.S. undergraduate education and, through graduate and professional training and research, enhancing the Nation's capacity to produce the international and foreign-language expertise necessary for U.S. global leadership and security.

19. The Secretaries of State and Education, in cooperation with other agencies, the academic community, and the private sector, shall promote wise use of technology internationally, examining the implications of borderless education. The heads of agencies shall take steps to ensure that the opportunities for using technology to expand international education do not result in a widening of the digital divide.

20. The Secretaries of State and Education, in conjunction with other agencies, shall ensure that actions taken in response to this memorandum are fully integrated into the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) framework by means of specific goals, milestones, and measurable results, which shall be included in all GPRA reporting activities, including strategic plans, performance plans, and program performance reports.

Items 1-10 of this memorandum shall be conducted subject to the availability of
appropriations, consistent with the agencies priorities and my budget, and to the extent permitted by law.

The Vice President shall coordinate the U.S. Government’s international education strategy. Further, I direct that the heads of agencies report to the Vice President and to me on their progress in carrying out the terms of this memorandum.

This memorandum is a statement of general policy and does not confer a private right of action on any individual or group.
WILLIAM J. CLINTON
President Bush today launched the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI), a plan to further strengthen national security and prosperity in the 21st century through education, especially in developing foreign language skills. The NSLI will dramatically increase the number of Americans learning critical need foreign languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Hindi, Farsi, and others through new and expanded programs from kindergarten through university and into the workforce. The President will request $114 million in FY07 to fund this effort.

An essential component of U.S. national security in the post-9/11 world is the ability to engage foreign governments and peoples, especially in critical regions, to encourage reform, promote understanding, convey respect for other cultures and provide an opportunity to learn more about our country and its citizens. To do this, we must be able to communicate in other languages, a challenge for which we are unprepared.

Deficits in foreign language learning and teaching negatively affect our national security, diplomacy, law enforcement, intelligence communities and cultural understanding. It prevents us from effectively communicating in foreign media environments, hurts counter-terrorism efforts, and hamstrings our capacity to work with people and governments in post-conflict zones and to promote mutual understanding. Our business competitiveness is hampered in making effective contacts and adding new markets overseas.

To address these needs, under the direction of the President, the Secretaries of State, Education and Defense and the Director of National Intelligence have developed a comprehensive national plan to expand U.S. foreign language education beginning in early childhood and continuing throughout formal schooling and into the workforce, with new programs and resources.
The agencies will also seek to partner with institutions of learning, foundations and the private sector to assist in all phases of this initiative, including partnering in the K-16 language studies, and providing job opportunities and incentives for graduates of these programs.

The National Security Language Initiative has three broad goals:

Expand the number of Americans mastering critical need languages and start at a younger age by:

- Providing $24 million to create incentives to teach and study critical need languages in K-12 by re-focusing the Department of Education’s Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) grants.

- Building continuous programs of study of critical need languages from kindergarten to university through a new $27 million program, which will start in 27 schools in the next year through DOD’s NSEP program and the Department of Education, and will likely expand to additional schools in future years.

- Providing State Department scholarships for summer, academic year/semester study abroad, and short-term opportunities for high school students studying critical need languages to up to 3,000 high school students by summer 2009.

- Expanding the State Department Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant Program, to allow 300 native speakers of critical need languages to come to the U.S. to teach in U.S. universities and schools in 2006-07.

- Establishing a new component in State’s Teacher Exchange Programs to annually assist 100 U.S. teachers of critical need languages to study abroad.

- Establishing DNI language study "feeder" programs, grants and initiatives with K-16 educational institutions to provide summer student and teacher immersion experiences, academic courses and curricula, and other resources for foreign language education in less commonly taught languages targeting 400 students and 400 teachers in 5 states in 2007 and up to 3,000 students and 3,000 teachers by 2011 in additional states.

Increase the number of advanced-level speakers of foreign languages, with an emphasis on critical needs languages by:

- Expanding the National Flagship Language Initiative to a $13.2 million program aiming to produce 2,000 advanced speakers of Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Persian, Hindi, and Central Asian languages by 2009.

- Increasing to up to 200 by 2008 the annual Gilman scholarships for financially-needy undergraduates to study critical need languages abroad.
Creating new State Department summer immersion study programs for up to 275 university level students per year in critical need languages.

Adding overseas language study to 150 U.S. Fulbright student scholarships annually.

Increasing support for immersion language study centers abroad.

**Increase the number of foreign language teachers and the resources for them by:**

- Establishing a National Language Service Corps for Americans with proficiencies in critical languages to serve the nation by:
  1. Working for the federal government; and/or
  2. Serving in a Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps (CLRC); and/or
  3. Joining a newly created Language Teacher Corps to teach languages in our nation’s elementary, middle, and high schools.

This program will direct $14 million in FY07 with the goal of having 1,000 volunteers in the CLRC and 1,000 teachers in our schools before the end of the decade.

- Establishing a new $1 million nation-wide distance-education E-Learning Clearinghouse through the Department of Education to deliver foreign language education resources to teachers and students across the country.

- Expand teacher-to-teacher seminars and training through a $3 million Department of Education effort to reach thousands of foreign language teachers in 2007.

**2006/12**

Released on January 5, 2006
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Foreword

This briefing book, assembled for the members of the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Fellowships for Study Abroad, is an intentional part of Senator Paul Simon’s vision for this ambitious and timely initiative. Many who greatly respected this unique man of values and vision also knew that he was as pragmatic as he was prophetic and prolific in his legislative role. He understood that the members of the Commission would greatly benefit from the study abroad expertise of our country’s international education and exchange communities. He also understood the political importance of developing broad support from these communities for the Commission, and a sense of participation in its work.
This briefing book is unique in that addresses both of these intentions of the late Senator. A description of his strategy will provide the opportunity to acknowledge the talented individuals who provided extraordinary pro bono service in linking the study abroad community to the Commission and the Congressional leaders and Administration that appointed it.

In June of 2003, Senator Simon approached me, in my capacity as vice chair of the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, and asked if he could address the Alliance’s Executive Committee at its next scheduled meeting. That meeting took place in July 2003 at the Institute of International Education (IIE) in New York. The Senator accompanied by his wife, presented his vision for the Lincoln study abroad program using handwritten displays on a small flipchart. He repeated this informal flipchart presentation in numerous offices of his former Democratic and Republican colleagues in the Senate.

The presentation outlined a bold vision for American renewal, driven by international education. Its key elements follow:

- An understanding of the diverse cultures of the world, especially those of developing countries, should be an essential component of the 21st century education of our nation’s students.
- Direct exposure to the foreign languages and other aspects of these cultures can best be achieved through a meaningful study abroad experience.
- The understanding achieved through study abroad will give to our citizens greater understanding of, and sensitivity to, the peoples of other nations resulting in broader global understanding among America’s future leaders. This understanding would in turn lead to more effective U.S. foreign policy, greater security from terrorism, and an economic payoff in the increasingly competitive world trade.
- A massive intervention through study abroad is needed to achieve these goals. In the Senator’s vision, this would be a conscious act of national renewal, on a par with the Morrill Act of 1862, the GI Bill, and the Marshall Plan.
- Noting the connection with the Morrill Act and the approaching 200th anniversary of Lincoln’s birth in 2009, the Senator proposed that the initiative be called the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program.
- Senator Simon anticipated a very ambitious program: 500,000 American undergraduates participating annually for a period of 10 years at a cost of up to $7,000 per student or $3.5 billion a year. He noted that while this price tag is steep, it pales in comparison to our more traditional defense expenditures but is no less critical to our national security.
- The study abroad program must emphasize not just the most popular destinations, such as Europe and Australia, but place particular stress on sending students to the developing world.

The Lincoln program must ensure that underrepresented groups of students participate fully in study abroad.
Senator Simon proposed that the best way to launch his initiative and to build support for the Lincoln concept would be a Commission, jointly appointed by the President and the Congressional leadership, to design the program.

From July 2003 until his untimely death in December 2003, the Senator worked tirelessly with the Senate leadership to translate these elements of his vision into the Omnibus Appropriations Bill (HR 2673, Section 104). The bill called for the creation of the commission, and passed on January 22, 2004. How well the bill reflects the above referenced elements of his vision can be seen in its language:

Section 104 (a) "....to establish and fund a bipartisan Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Program”.

Section 104 (b) (1) “The Commission shall recommend a program to greatly expand the opportunity for students at institutions of higher education in the United States to study abroad, with special emphasis on studying in developing nations.”

Section 104 (b) (2) “...shall develop a program.... that assists a diverse group of students and meets the growing need of the United States to become more sensitive to the cultures of other countries.”

Section 104 (c) (2) “The Commission may consist of members who are leaders in university exchange programs, leaders in foreign policy, and business leaders with experience in international trade.”

Shortly after the initial presentation of his vision to the Alliance, Senator Simon asked for help in constituting an advisory group to ensure the assistance of the Alliance member organizations in preparing this briefing book, in building broad support within the exchange and international education communities, and in supporting the nomination process for the Commission. A Coordinating Group to achieve this task was assembled. In addition, at the Senator’s recommendation, we established an Advisory Council, which includes the leaders of the major associations concerned with study abroad as well as Senator Simon’s son, and a representative from the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois University. This Advisory Council helped to guide the work of the coordinating group, and remains available to the Commission as a resource.

The Coordinating Group established four working groups: Research and Strategic Analysis, Federal Relations/Lobbying, Association/Community Liaison, and Campus Outreach/Communication. The members of these groups provided the expertise and community involvement that Senator Simon desired. The Presidents and CEOs of the Advisory Council provided the pro bono release time for members of the Coordination and four Working Groups. Their names and affiliations of the Advisory Council and the various working groups are listed elsewhere in this briefing book.

Senator Simon approved this structure for accomplishing his task and expressed the hope that the members of the Commission would continue to draw on the expertise of the Advisory Council and Working Groups as they prepare the report for the President. All members of the Council and Groups have offered their continuing assistance.
A final word about the remarkable man behind this vision for the 21st century educational reform. To say that Senator Simon was prolific in his legislative efforts would be a major understatement. He personally introduced 822 bills and cosponsored another 5,405 while serving first as a representative and then senator of the 94th through 98th and 99th through 104th Congress, respectively. But he is best known as the member of Congress who championed education, foreign languages and cultures, and had a particular interest in supporting nascent democracies. Well known to many educators was his authorship of the National Literacy Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and his leadership in the direct college loan program. Through his entire career as a legislator there is a continuous thread of advocacy for incorporation of increased study of foreign languages and cultures into the nation’s education and foreign service systems. It is within this thread that he was perhaps most prophetic.

On September 12, 1985, almost 16 years to the day before 9/11, he introduced S.1631 “to further the national security and improve the economy of the United States by providing grants for the improvement of proficiency in critical languages, for the improvement of elementary and secondary language instruction, and for per capita grants to reimburse institutions of higher education to promote the growth and improve the quality of postsecondary language instruction”. He understood how knowledge of foreign languages and cultures supports U.S. national security and global competitiveness, and he never stopped advocating for its support. He saw this Commission and its unanimous support by the study abroad education community at this particular point in world history as an ideal legacy to leave the nation he served so well.

John Yopp
Project Coordinator
December 2004
Preface

It was Senator Paul Simon's wish that leaders in educational exchange provide active support to the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. Under Senator Simon's direction, an advisory council to the commission at the CEO level, a steering group at the staff level, and a series of working groups were in the process of being formed at the time of his death. Out of commitment to his vision, this effort has continued. The support structure envisioned by Senator Simon, whose members are listed on the cover, is in full operation and is available to the commission for such use as the commission may choose to make of it.

This briefing book was prepared in response to Senator Simon's wish that experts in the field provide the commission with an overview of the state of the field and an assessment of the issues that the commission would face in order to enhance the commission's deliberations. The briefing book was prepared by the Research and Analysis Working Group under the guidance of the steering group and was edited by Carl A. Herrin. Editorial assistance was provided by Dr. Debra L. Peterson of Michigan State University and NAFSA: Association of International Educators. Everyone involved in this effort extends special recognition to Dean John Hudzik, co-chair of the working group, whose leadership made this book possible.

The writers come from diverse and experienced study abroad backgrounds—both campus-based and from associations and organizations that have decades of individual and collective experience in educational exchange and study abroad. Although experienced in past and present approaches to study and learning abroad, these individuals were also keenly interested to identify roles, changes in practice, and enhancements in study abroad that would be required in order to realize Senator Simon's vision for greatly increased access to study abroad for U.S. students engaged in higher education. Attention is given to the federal role, higher education's role and practices, and roles and practices of study abroad providers. These in turn are grounded in an understanding of national needs and the needs of the private sector for a globally educated citizenry and workforce.

The working group sought to link Senator Simon's vision for vastly expanded study abroad participation and opportunities with identification of the essential needs and actions for doing so. The data collection, analysis, and subsequent writing and organization of the briefing book provide a baseline for understanding the current practices in and state of study abroad and educational exchange. Equally or more so, analysis and writing reflect working group views about the prerequisites for expanding access to study abroad and for enhancing its value and quality for meeting national needs.
A—Executive Overview

This briefing book, prepared for the members of the bipartisan Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, provides essential background information about the state of study abroad within U.S. higher education, including an overview of the public policy rationale for expanded study abroad and trends in student enrollment. This document also includes a summary of key aspects of study abroad, including definitions, barriers to study abroad, costs, and an outline of existing federal programs affecting study abroad.

The Commission’s charge, according to the enabling statute, is to “recommend a program to greatly expand the opportunity for students at institutions of higher education in the United States to study abroad, with special emphasis on studying in developing nations.” To prepare the Commissioners for this task, this briefing book has been organized and presented by an ad hoc group of U.S. higher education and study abroad professionals actively engaged with this enterprise.

That such a document might be assembled was contemplated by Senator Paul Simon, who in the year prior to his death began articulating a broad vision for increased study abroad programming for American college students. Calling the future program the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, Simon convinced the U.S. Congress to create a commission to flesh out his vision. In Simon’s view, such an initiative of the federal government would be the natural next step in the evolution of U.S. higher education in the tradition of the establishment of land grant colleges and the enactment of the GI bill. Such an initiative would be on behalf of educating American students about the world that they live in and the challenges they will face as future leaders.

The briefing book is divided into 12 sections, intended to present an overview of the key issues and practices of study abroad in the United States. These sections are briefly summarized below. Together with a set of appendices, the briefing book will serve as a point of departure for the work of the Commission and can be used to frame the issues the Commission is expected to consider.

Expanding Study Abroad: Meeting a Critical National Need

Study abroad for U.S. students provides an accepted and recognized mechanism for addressing the nation’s critical needs in global education. In order to address the challenges confronting the United States in the contemporary world environment, the nation needs to ensure that it has business men and women, scientists, medical professionals, and teachers—to say nothing of political leaders—whose knowledge and understanding collectively embrace the globe. Expanding access to and participation in study abroad is essential because it provides direct experience in living, learning, and
working in other societies. As with other areas of national need, the federal government has a key role in fostering study abroad innovation, quality, and access—partnering with states, higher education, and the private sector. Higher education has a key role to play in reducing barriers to participation and integrating study abroad into students’ programs and curricula.

Defining Study Abroad

Study abroad is an educational program of study, work, research, or internship that is conducted outside the United States and that awards academic credit. The process of approving and awarding academic credit for study abroad is a critical quality control mechanism; and that process activates institutional standards for learning, rigor, and assessment of value. The actual form and content of credit-bearing study abroad experiences varies widely and includes a spectrum of program locations, types, lengths, subject matter, and pedagogy that has undergone significant growth in diversity in the past decade or more.

Outcomes and Impacts of Study Abroad

There are demonstrable benefits of study abroad and they accrue both to individuals and to the nation. These benefits also are important to universities, and academic fields and professions, in building capacity to understand languages and cultures of other nations that these participants bring home to the United States. Gains in language competence, understanding of cultures not one’s own, and knowledge and skills critical to globally-networked professions have been documented in research on the outcomes of study abroad. Recent studies have also examined other outcomes that are of great advantage to the U.S. national interest, such as flexibility in approach to problem solving, self-directed learning, and the ability to operate successfully in an environment of cultural and ethnic diversity.

Trends in Study Abroad

Based on a summary of data reported in Open Doors (a publication of the Institute of International Education, the authoritative source of data on student mobility), U.S. student participation in study abroad programs has more than tripled since the mid-1980s to 160,920 in the 2002-2003 school year. This growth trend continues despite public concerns about security and safety abroad and economic pressures domestically. U.S. students are most likely to study in Western Europe, although in the past 15 years, enrollment growth in study abroad has taken place in other world regions. Much of the enrollment growth has been in programs of one-semester’s duration or less—programs of eight weeks duration or less are now the most popular programs. The typical study abroad participant is female, white, in her junior year, and studying either humanities or social sciences. These characteristics are, however, showing signs of change—study abroad participants are today more ethnically diverse, more likely to be studying other subjects, and more often include freshmen and sophomores than a decade ago.
Program Capacity for Increasing U.S. Student Participation

The Working Group surveyed 45 U.S. colleges and universities and 75 universities abroad in May and June 2004 to assess interest and demand for study abroad and capacity to accommodate greater numbers of students. The surveys revealed that higher education institutions and study abroad program providers plan to increase capacity for U.S. students studying abroad. However, expanding participant numbers to the level contemplated by the Lincoln Scholarship Program would require a national initiative to develop and open new high quality programming opportunities, especially for a more diverse set of students and in non-Western European destinations. Government, education, private, and business sectors need to work in partnership in order to develop bold and creative approaches to ensuring much greater access and diversity in study abroad.

Access and Barriers Shape Who Studies Abroad

Despite significant growth in participation, only a minuscule number of U.S. college students ever study abroad. These low participation rates occur despite evidence that a majority of college-bound students want and expect to study abroad. Access to study abroad is limited by a series of barriers, which include financial, cultural, linguistic, and curricular obstacles, that frustrate a wide variety of students from ultimately studying abroad. Among the students most disadvantaged by these barriers are students of color, those with disabilities, and those whose economic means are modest.

Identifying and Addressing Campus-Based Barriers to Study Abroad

In attention to study abroad as a key component to internationalizing curricula and learning has profoundly limited higher education’s ability to produce gains in student language acquisition and in international knowledge and understanding. This is so because study abroad is rarely integrated as a fundamental component of the undergraduate curriculum. Consequently, the essential relationship between the internationalization of the on-campus curriculum and study abroad needs to be strengthened. Internationalizing the on-campus curriculum provides the intellectual foundation for study abroad and study abroad provides the experiential and reflective component of international education. Also critical to reducing on-campus barriers and widening access is reinforcing an institutional vision of the importance of study abroad and institutional commitments to making study abroad affordable, expanding study abroad choices, integrating study abroad into the curricula and majors, improving program quality, and evaluating impact.

Costs of Study Abroad

The cost of a typical study abroad program can range from $2,000 to $3,000 for a sojourn of a few weeks to more than $16,000 for a semester-length experience. This substantial variation in cost depends on a variety of factors, including a program’s underlying fiscal
assumptions (including how costs are recovered), the comparative costs of running a program in a particular location, the financial model used by the study abroad provider, and the actual design characteristics of the particular program.

**Safety, Health, and Security in Study Abroad**

Successful study abroad programs must be health and safety conscious. Inattention to matters of health and safety not only puts participants at unacceptable personal risk, but threatens the quality of the study abroad program. Recognition of this connection has led over time to innovations and program models that reinforce good health practices, responsible behavior, and administrative attention to safety practices. Attention to health and safety when designing and delivering a study abroad program is a necessary condition for meeting minimal levels of program quality and minimizing risks to participants.

**Study Abroad Quality Control**

Quality in study abroad is rooted in a program’s intellectual content and rigor and the value of its learning outcomes. Other factors effecting program quality include attention to safety, program pedagogy, and logistics. Within the U.S. higher educational system three processes exist for assessing and promoting educational quality for study abroad: faculty review for awarding academic credit; institutional accreditation; and professional association guidelines.

**Existing Federal Role in Study Abroad**

The historical role of the federal government in study abroad has been focused in three areas: foreign policy, educational policy, and national security. In each case, study abroad has been utilized as a mechanism for addressing policy goals. The role of study abroad has evolved into its niche in federal programming over time, beginning with a foreign policy focus, followed by educational interests, and lastly (and comparatively recently) including national security concerns. There is also a cross-cutting objective that focuses on financial need for study abroad participants.

**Sustainability: Achieving Expanded Participation in Study Abroad**

A combination of actions taken within U.S. higher education is needed to help build and sustain study abroad for the long-term. The indicators and pre-conditions for reaching such a point include strong institutional vision, leadership and advocacy for study abroad, program diversification, academic integration, student preparation, sound financial planning and cost control, program incentives, and comprehensive assessment.

**B—Expanding Study Abroad: Meeting a Critical National Need**
Study Abroad and the National Interest

Sen. Paul Simon saw a direct correlation between study abroad and our nation’s ability to educate and prepare our young adults for the global challenges we face. For him, it was imperative that a sizable portion of future American undergraduates study abroad as a part of their formal education because study abroad is the most direct and effective way for students to come to a deeper understanding of the world around them, their place in it, and how to live and work effectively in it. He also saw it as the best way for young adults to see the effect that American decision-making has on global matters—economic, political, environmental, and social—and, in turn, how others can affect our choices.

Yet, today, a study abroad experience involves less than 170,000 American undergraduates per year (1 percent of students in postsecondary education). It was the late Senator Simon’s vision to greatly expand opportunity and participation in study abroad through creation of the Abraham Lincoln study abroad scholarship program for U.S. students.

There are many reasons why fostering direct in-the-world experience for American students is in the national interest. Our most vivid example, cited by Simon and many others, relates to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, because those attacks not only underscored our national vulnerabilities, but also our ignorance of others and their cultures and capabilities. In that regard, September 11 has been compared with the launching of the Sputnik satellite marking the beginning of the Cold War’s space race. That comparison may be too modest: the import of our American ignorance of the world and our monolingualism is potentially more far-reaching.

The world is no longer divided into two competing camps; it is instead a very complex and fluid international environment in which isolation in any form is not only impractical, but dangerous. Globalization of every facet of life makes ignorance of the world around us challenging in a far more complex way than during the Cold War. Our borders are increasingly porous in many ways. For example:

- Worldwide communication, travel, migration, trade, and the mass dispersion of cultures reshape local contexts and challenge governments, organizations, and commerce at all levels.
- World power and influence—military, political, cultural, economic—are now fundamentally fragmented, so that regional players and nonstate movements can and do play large roles divorced from each other, but potentially impacting everyone.
- Global issues increasingly are addressed in global governing institutions that are situated at the international level, complicating our traditional nation-state conceptions of leadership and responsibility.
- American businesses, large and small, engage increasingly in global commerce with concomitant needs for employees with language skills, cross-cultural awareness, and knowledge of global business opportunities. American workers must increasingly interact with their counterparts abroad.
Research and technology development capacity is globalized and dispersed so that the very best research may be done outside the United States, increasing our dependence on collaboration with partners abroad.

Diplomacy—still formally a governmental function—is increasingly undertaken by nongovernmental institutions and private individuals, and the world's awareness of issues and disputes is increasingly defined by citizen diplomats active on the international stage.

The interconnected world requires that public servants, educators, business leaders, and citizens better understand international phenomena in order to make informed and responsible decisions for themselves and the country.

A prerequisite for living and working effectively within these new global realities is having a citizenry and workforce that understands other cultures and is capable of interacting effectively with them. Effective interaction begins with a knowledge and understanding of others. Direct experience in living and working in other cultures is by far the most effective means for acquiring both practical knowledge and effective skills. Having a citizenry and workforce with such experience is not just in the national interest, but is a national imperative.

Student-citizens will be the next leaders in engineering, science, agriculture, law, business, politics, and other professions. They need to understand the international dimensions of their professions and future careers in order to be more productive employees and enlightened citizens. If they are informed about the different ideas and perspectives of their professions in other countries and cultures, they will have a greater opportunity to succeed.

Study abroad affords our nation's students the opportunities and experiences that can help them become successful in the workforce and contribute to an informed citizenry.

An Unacceptable National Reality

Our current record for addressing this demand for a globally educated citizenry is not impressive and reflects significant shortfalls in terms of knowledge and expertise. In many reports and public opinion polls, U.S. citizens reveal a woeful lack of basic knowledge about world affairs and other societies, as well as critical shortcomings in cross-cultural understanding and foreign language skills. These deficiencies have serious consequences for U.S. national security, economic well-being, and capacity for global leadership.

The Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange (1988) stated several years ago that if we fail to internationalize sufficiently our educational institutions, including expansion of student opportunities for study and work abroad, we will irreversibly diminish the world status of the United States.

The United States falls short on virtually all indicators of international awareness. In a 2002 National Geographic-Roper poll of geographic knowledge among young adults in
nine countries, Americans finished next to last. American 18-to-24-year-olds averaged 3.1 correct responses when asked to locate 11 countries on a numbered outline map of Asia. Less than 25 percent of the Americans surveyed could name the four Asian countries that acknowledge having nuclear weapons.

In dozens of other reports and studies, Americans reveal not only a lack of basic knowledge and understanding about other places, but they grossly underappreciate the disadvantages of such ignorance. As the NAFSA 2003 Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad (see Appendix I) accurately points out:

Inexplicably, many Americans justify our monolingualism with the fact that the rest of the world is learning English. But it is to our disadvantage that we are able to conduct foreign relations and international commerce in only one tongue, while the rest of the international community continually builds upon its proficiency in multiple languages. (p. 4)

Traditionally, a preponderance of our educational opportunities for learning about other societies and cultures, both classroom and study abroad, have focused on Europe. While the importance of Europe in the educational and learning map should not be discounted, understanding the rest of the world is an imperative. A Eurocentric approach to International education and study abroad is dangerously narrow. Our national needs and interests in commerce, defense, and world influence demand we expand access to learning about Africa, Asia, Latin America, and other world regions.

The Role of Study Abroad in Meeting the Challenge

Globalization challenges the nation’s educational system to make international education a component of every student’s program, expanding it beyond the purview of the few students who happen to choose majors in it or who have been fortunate enough to add a study abroad experience.

The challenge for our country—through its higher education system— is to democratize access to international education beyond the few majors that easily accommodate it and beyond the students who come from families where international travel is common. Study abroad provides the most effective and directly relevant mechanism through which to achieve broad and equal access to an international education. Democratizing access to study and learning abroad was at the core of Senator Simon’s vision.

Study abroad—when integrated into the regular curriculum—provides the best means for incorporating the experiential component into international education, for infusing international education with a reflective dimension, and for providing firsthand experience in how others think and make decisions. By providing hands-on learning and practical experience, study abroad complements on-campus classroom learning and serves both national security and economic competitiveness goals by preparing a citizenry better able to live and work effectively in a global environment.
Findings from hundreds of studies document the practical outcomes from study and learning abroad. The most commonly cited benefits (e.g., Akande & Slawson, 2000; Chao, 2000; Steglitz, 1993) are broadened perspective and knowledge, improved foreign language proficiency, improved crosscultural understanding and communication skills, greater ability to live and work effectively in other cultures, openness to diversity, and enhanced career choices. Studies also show that study abroad is the most effective method for teaching students how to learn, live, and work in another culture, including multicultural U.S. environments.

Study abroad is also a catalyst for a much broader vision of internationalizing education: it expands direct contacts with institutions abroad; prompts regular reexamination of foreign language instruction; helps create more innovative forms of collaboration across the curricula; and encourages updating of degree requirements. Students returning to campus from study abroad help to further internationalize the on-campus living and learning environments—with significant educational implications for those students who do not study abroad.

A Report Card on Internationalizing Education and Experience

America is doing a poor job of not only internationalizing the teaching of our students but also providing the experiential base for living and working in a global environment.

An American Council on Education (ACE) report (Engberg & Green, 2002) showcasing internationalization at eight very different institutions of higher learning suggests the data on campus internationalization are not encouraging. Among the findings was a 50 percent decline in higher education foreign language enrollments since the 1960s, with far less than a tenth of total language enrollments today in Asian languages, Arabic, or Hebrew. The report also found that less than a fifth of university students take more than four credits of internationally focused coursework during their entire degree program.

Present U.S. rates of participation in study abroad and language study are very low:
- Although the number of U.S. students studying abroad has doubled over the last decade, only 3 percent of U.S. college students in four-year programs participate annually (1 percent of all those in postsecondary education). By contrast, the European Union’s Erasmus program is rapidly expanding study abroad among students from member nations.
- While about 170,000 U.S. students study abroad annually (most in semester-length or shorter programs), well over 500,000 foreign students study in the United States annually (a large proportion in degree programs).
- While students in most developed countries (college-bound students in almost all countries) speak a second and even a third language, a bilingual American student is a rarity—even more so when not counting immigrant Americans.

- In a generation, the average number of U.S. students studying a foreign language has fallen from 16 percent to 8.7 percent.
The dismal performance in language learning is not surprising. As the 2003 NAFSA Task Force Report points out:

Most colleges—like our educational system generally—have taken relatively few steps to remedy this [the language learning] shortcoming. It is the rare campus where anyone other than a language major is required to achieve proficiency in a second language—and the ranks of language majors are dwindling... Is it any wonder that the U.S. State Department and our intelligence and security agencies are chronically short of analysts and diplomats with critical language skills? (p. 1)

Public Opinion Is Ahead of the Reality

By contrast, public sentiment about international education, foreign language training, and study abroad suggests recognition of the need for a more activist educational engagement with the rest of the world. In public opinion polls, the aspirations of students and the general public are much higher:

- One-half to two-thirds of prospective freshmen say that they want or intend to study abroad.
- More than 75 percent of the general public think foreign language study should be required in the K–12 years and 60 percent think it should be required in college.
- Nearly 70 percent of the general public believe that study abroad should be encouraged or required of undergraduates.
- In September 2002, the Institute of International Education (IIE) reported substantial growth (over the previous September) in student interest in study abroad. Applications for federally funded educational exchange programs increased by 10 percent for the Fulbright program, by 40 percent for the Gilman scholarship program, and by 50 percent for NSEP fellowship programs.
- Ninety-eight percent of the respondents to IIE’s 2002 survey said that international educational exchange, including study abroad, was regarded as “more” or “equally” important on their campuses in the aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001.

Why the Disconnect in Study Abroad?

The disconnect between our national needs and our public expectations on the one hand and the actual number of study abroad participants on the other is a picture of barriers and disincentives that arise both with our students (and their families) and with our higher education institutions.

For students and their families, the barriers are primarily related to costs (and the perception of those costs). These cost factors include the actual cost of going abroad—which is often, but not always, higher than the costs of remaining in the United States. These direct expenses are compounded—particularly for students who are older, of limited means, first-generation college students or immigrants, and/or supporting families—by what might be described as opportunity costs. Typically, a study abroad
student can’t be employed and is removed from whatever family obligations he or she may shoulder while simultaneously enrolled in college. For these students, who are the majority in today’s undergraduate population, the opportunity costs of study abroad are often too large even with some level of financial aid.

Compounding these barriers are social and academic disincentives. It is common to find that students don’t perceive, or are not encouraged to find, the connection between their academic goals and a study abroad experience. While much of this can be addressed by proactive academic advising that promotes study abroad, there remain cultural signals that call into question the value of study abroad.

There is, for example, an absence of suitable role models for students pursuing certain professional careers or from particular ethnic and racial groups.

As troubling as these barriers and disincentives are, the academic setting fosters its own inattention to study abroad. A commonality to these problems is that study abroad is rarely seen as being a core component of the undergraduate experience; indeed, it has been seen as a frill. The reality, though, is usually something quite different. Study abroad can easily make up 10 to 25 percent of an undergraduate degree. As numerous studies demonstrate, study abroad is typically intellectually challenging and broadening and helps the traditional curriculum come alive.

Other stereotypes of study and learning abroad also contribute to its marginalization—one being that study abroad is a finishing program for privileged young females who want to travel Western Europe and toss three coins in a Roman fountain.¹ There is also an implied impediment bubbling up through the smugness of the American higher education system. In a recent Michigan State University sponsored national conference on study and learning abroad, ACE’s Madeleine Green (2002) called attention to the problem when she noted that we have done such a great job of convincing ourselves that the American higher education system is the best in the world, that, as a result, we cannot imagine how our students could possibly learn anything valuable abroad. Leadership in U.S. higher education can address this matter, as perhaps Harvard University (Kirby, 2004) did in its recent articulation of the value of study abroad to its educational mission:

With influence comes responsibility...Harvard College has a responsibility to educate its students—who will live and work in all corners of the globe—as citizens not only of their home country, but also of the world, with the capacity not only to understand others, but also to see themselves, and this country, as others see them... We propose to provide, and we will expect, an international experience—defined as study, research, or work abroad—of all Harvard College students.

Although many higher education institutions in the United States have already been deeply committed for years to expanding higher education opportunity, Harvard’s recent announcement raised awareness to a new level.
There are other serious constraints in higher education that together conspire to limit expansion of opportunities to study abroad and actual participation levels as well:

- Widespread failures in higher education to integrate study abroad into the undergraduate curriculum marginalize its value to students and limit the contribution study abroad can make toward efforts to internationalize learning and curricula.
- Rigid curricula make it impossible for many students to incorporate a study abroad experience into their programs; many curricula do not count study abroad credits toward graduation requirements; parochial attitudes among some faculties depreciate the value of anything learned abroad; and competing agendas on campuses push innovation in study abroad to the back burner. Fear of other cultures, absence of institutional commitment to expanding study abroad opportunity, and an absence of program innovation also contribute to the gap between aspirations and participation.
- Potential participation is limited when information about study abroad is not provided to students early enough in the academic process—this being especially a problem for students who are in minority or disability populations.
- The lack of diverse study abroad options for students in majors outside the liberal arts (e.g., especially professional programs) limits access for some of the most heavily enrolled majors on our campuses.

Expanding Access and Quality: Federal and Higher Education Roles

A federal, higher education and study abroad provider partnership that uses three interconnected strategies is essential to expanded participation in high-quality study abroad. This view originated in a policy paper (Hudzik, 2004) from Michigan State University (see Appendix II) that was later supported by the Association for International Education Administrators and the Coalition for International Education. Essential components envisioned in such a partnership included:

1. Federal study abroad scholarships matched by private, state, or higher education institutional sources
2. Federally supported program development and quality assurance grants to expand the number and kind of high quality, safe, and cost-effective study abroad programs, especially in strategic areas of the world and for underrepresented majors and groups
3. Preconditions for higher education institutions and study abroad providers to qualify for participation in such a federal program (e.g., integration of study abroad into undergraduate curricula, institutional commitment to expand study abroad participation by its students, institutional efforts to reduce barriers to study abroad through cost control, and institutional attention to program quality and safety, and reduction of curricular barriers to participation) (p. 3)

The Federal Role. The federal government plays a pivotal role in collaborating with higher education and the private sector in advancing many areas of learning, especially when the national interest requires widening access, encouraging innovation, and improving quality. There is a critical national need for a well-informed citizenry with
first-hand information about other countries and an ability to operate effectively in an increasingly interdependent, competitive, and dangerous world environment. The essential role required of the federal government and its leadership in serving as a catalyst and directional force for needed change was succinctly put in the NAFSA 2003 Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad:

Leadership at the level of the President and Congress is particularly crucial. Without such leadership, the notion of a national strategy for international education is oxymoronic. It is at that level that national priorities are articulated, and that incentives and standards are set to promote those priorities. The United States needs to embrace study abroad in a way it never has done before. Our students need to hear the message loudly from the President and other leaders that study abroad is in the national interest. Absent this leadership, this sea change in colleges' priorities will not happen. (p. 11)

The federal government has the capacity and resources to leverage a nationwide partnership of education systems, state and local governments, the private sector, and nongovernmental organizations to achieve these objectives. The objectives of federal leadership and support should be to widen access to participation and advance innovation, to encourage integration and the reduction of campus-based barriers, and to enhance quality and accountability. The MSU policy paper (Hudzik, 2004) suggests that federal assistance through scholarships and program development grants can be the catalyst for change and for leveraging wider support and participation from higher education, the private sector, and the states.

The Role of Higher Education and Study Abroad Providers. Reducing barriers to study and learning abroad through federal scholarships and program development support is only one of the essential strategies needed. The other is for higher education and study abroad program providers to reduce other serious barriers. According to the MSU policy paper (Hudzik, 2004) a demonstration of institutional commitment to reducing higher education barriers should include a number of core elements:

- Integration of study abroad into the undergraduate curricula (e.g., into major or general education requirements and language learning) and counting credits earned abroad toward degree requirements
- Adopting specific institutional goals for expanding participation in study abroad
- Reducing economic barriers through controlling program costs
- Diversifying study abroad options especially in non-Western European locations and for underrepresented majors, e.g., sciences, engineering, and health professions
- Expanding the diversity of participants, including those of limited economic means, underrepresented groups, and first-generation college students
- Establishing an institutional study abroad safety and security assessment process and an ongoing commitment to student safety and security abroad
- Adopting ongoing practices for assessing program quality and measuring study abroad outcomes (p. 7)
Summary

Study abroad for U.S. students provides an accepted and recognized mechanism for addressing the nation's critical needs in global education. As the nation seeks to address the challenges confronting it in the fragmented world environment of this new millennium, we need to ensure that we have business men and women, scientists, medical professionals, and teachers—to say nothing of political leaders—whose knowledge and understanding collectively cover the globe from Angola to Belarus to Costa Rica to Djibouti to East Timor and beyond.

This internationalized learning is a critical national need. Expanding access to and participation in study abroad is essential because it provides direct experience in living, learning, and working in other societies. As with other areas of national need, the federal government has a key role in fostering study abroad innovation, quality, and access—partnering with states, higher education, and the private sector.
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Study abroad is an educational program for undergraduate or graduate study, work, research, or an internship that is conducted outside the United States and that awards academic credit to postsecondary students.

This definition limits study abroad to credit-bearing courses or experiences that can be counted toward degree requirements. The process of approving and awarding academic credit for study abroad is a critical quality control mechanism; the review and approval process activates institutional standards for learning, rigor, and assessment of value. An additional benefit of credit-bearing status for study abroad is that it permits students with financial aid to apply those funds toward their study abroad endeavors.

Scope
The actual form and content of credit-bearing study abroad experiences now varies widely. A wide spectrum of program locations, types, lengths, subject matter, and pedagogy compose study abroad today. Indeed, the doubling of study abroad participation numbers over the last decade is significantly related to the growth in diversity of program subject matter, models, lengths, and locations.

Open Doors 2003 data indicate that over a 15-year period: (1) participants in semester programs have held relatively constant; (2) participation in summer programs have slightly increased; (3) academic year program participation has declined; and, (4) short-term programs of eight weeks or less are steadily and significantly increasing.

Study and learning abroad now occur in classrooms, in field research settings, in places of work or community service programs, and in a wide range of other settings. The study abroad program may be led by a home-institution faculty member, by an approved third-party provider, or the student may enroll directly in a higher education institution abroad. Examples of the scope of program types include:

- A January-term cultural or language immersion program

Through Linfield University’s January term, students have the opportunity to spend an intensive four weeks studying in a foreign country. Among the available course titles are Environmental Science (New Zealand), Japanese Management Techniques, Eastern Europe in Transition, Religions of India, Cultures and Ideas of the Ancient World (Greece and Italy), and understanding the European Community (Belgium, France, and Luxembourg).

The American University in Cairo (AUC) offers three separate undergraduate programs for international students in January. Students may participate in courses such as Environmental Biology of the Red Sea, which includes classroom lectures at AUC in Cairo and laboratory and field trip work at Saffaga on the Red Sea, or Elementary Arabic, which for three undergraduate credits introduces non-Arabic speakers to the basics of modern standard Arabic.
D—Outcomes and Impacts of Study Abroad

The demonstrable benefits of study abroad accrue both to individuals and to the nation. While personal growth and development is a central value of the experience for individual students, there are benefits to universities, academic fields and professions, and ultimately the nation in building capacity to understand and use the deepened understanding of the languages and cultures of other nations that these participants bring home to the United States. Gains in language competence, understanding of cultures not one’s own, expanded knowledge and skills commensurate with globally-networked professions—all have been documented in research on the outcomes of study abroad. Recent studies have even examined less tangible outcomes that are nonetheless of great advantage to the U.S. national interest, such as flexibility in approach to problem solving, self directed learning, and the ability to operate successfully in an environment of cultural and ethnic diversity.

A recent study (Akande & Slawson, 2000) by the Institute for the International Education of Students (IES), for example, reported these long-term benefits of the education abroad experience. Responses from nearly 3,000 study abroad alumni showed that:

- Nearly half had worked or volunteered abroad since graduating from college
- 59 percent reported having returned to visit or work in the country where they had studied
- 69 percent of students who held internships during education-abroad programs said their internships had influenced their career choices
- More than 30 percent said the language skills gained on education-abroad programs continue to serve them today

These program-specific findings are similar to anecdotal reports of students and programs and match intuitively with expectations of educators about the correlation between overseas study and future professional and recreational activities.

Measurable outcomes for study abroad fall into five broad areas: foreign language competence, intellectual growth, cultural competence, breadth of professional knowledge, and interpersonal skill building.

Language Competence Gained Through Study Abroad

Researchers and teachers of foreign language share the assessment by Freed (1995) that students who participate in study abroad programs are “those who make the most progress in the language of choice and are most likely to become fluent.”

Over the past 15 years, research on study abroad and language gain have documented both consistent outcomes of and reliable predictors for successful language gain. The National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) conducted one of the first empirical studies of language gain in study abroad, documenting the relationships among certain student demographic characteristics and educational qualifications and language proficiency gains. NFLC researchers (Brecht, Davidson & Ginsberg, 1993) found that several student
opportunities for instruction, guidance, and student reflection, and assessment or testing of whether learning objectives have been met.

Study abroad programs vary in their learning objectives, including different combinations of objectives related to: gaining cross-cultural understanding and experience; improving interpersonal skills and personal growth; acquiring proficiency in a foreign language; gaining experience working and living in another culture and society; broadening comparative perspective and knowledge; or gaining new technical or professional knowledge, skills, and abilities.

The Future

As study abroad expands to accommodate majors in the professions as well as in the liberal arts, the diversity of program types, lengths, subject matter, and locations will have to expand to incorporate discipline-based learning, as well as instruction in languages and culture, and integrate the needs of students in highly constrained majors as well as those with more electives.
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• An internship experience

General Electric (GE) offers internships in the Netherlands or Mexico in the area of business finance and accounting. Interns work with site managers and mentors to complete project assignments during the eight-week internship. While GE pays interns’ cost of transportation, housing, and insurance and a monthly stipend, the internship experience can also be applied toward the interns’ university required business internship experience. Because the internship is required for the undergraduate business major, students can receive academic credit upon successful completion of the internship requirement. However, if academic credit is awarded for the internship, students may be required to pay tuition for the experience and subsequent assessments of learning.

Through the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (mainly in Big Ten institutions) Australian internship office housed at Michigan State University, students have internship options in Australian parliaments, government agencies, NGOs, and the private sector, either on a full-time basis, or part-time while taking additional coursework at an Australian university. Students are required to develop internship learning contracts, are supervised by both Australian faculty and agency supervisors, and are required to produce research and policy papers related to their internship. Academic credit is awarded following assessments by faculty and agency supervisors.

• A semester or summer spent working on a research project

Undergraduate and graduate students at many universities have options to work with faculty abroad on research projects as varied as archeology, food nutrition and safety, public opinion polling, and environmental monitoring, to name a few. Contact with host-country cultures and socioeconomic-political systems are integrated into the experience. Practical research and project management experience in varied cultural settings are gained, and academic credit awarded either in the form of coursework, directed study, or degree field or laboratory requirements.

• A short or long period involved in community volunteer programs

Some study abroad programs are designed around or incorporate a community service component to the experience. Students under faculty supervision may become involved in environmental cleanup projects, collection and analysis of data to identify causes of local diseases, participation in community education projects, or volunteer work in local clinics or community service offices, to give a few examples.

What unites these experiences, no matter their design, length, location, or subject matter, is that in order to award academic credit they should have learning objectives,
A short-term three-week summer study program

With coordination by the University of Liverpool’s Office of Widening Participation (Centre for Lifelong Learning) and the Center for Diversity Policy (ECHO), based in Utrecht, Netherlands, 24 TRIO students attended a three-week study program in London, Liverpool, Dublin, Amsterdam, and Paris. This summer program in Europe focuses on multiculturalism and social exclusion and was accredited by the University of Liverpool. In addition to research and journaling, students are required to present at a conference organized by ECHO to incorporate Dutch and U.S. students around the subject of inclusion and widening participation.

Note: TRIO Programs (initially just three programs) were established by Congress to help low-income Americans enter college, graduate, and move on to participate more fully in America’s economic and social life. They are part of our nation’s commitment to provide educational opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, ethnic background, or economic circumstance and are funded under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. While student financial aid programs help students overcome financial barriers to higher education, TRIO programs help students overcome class, social, and cultural barriers to higher education.

A one-semester language and cultural immersion program

Academic work is central to study at Université Cheikh Anta Diop in Senegal and provides an exceptional opportunity for in-depth examination of African arts, society, culture, economics, and politics under the guidance of well-qualified African scholars. Students are required to register for the equivalent of 12—15 semester credit hours, three of which must be in a language course. For the remaining four 3-credit courses, students select from a wide option in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. This program is also designed to give American college students who would not normally do so the opportunity to: (1) study in Africa by participating in a semester-length study abroad program, (2) significantly expand their knowledge and understanding of the history, culture, society, and contemporary issues in Senegal or South Africa, (3) expand disciplinary-based knowledge within their own majors, (4) increase their understanding of global issues that impact both the United States and countries in Africa, and (5) develop a commitment to international and global understanding.

An academic year program

American students studying science in Britain can enroll in a full year of courses, as well as meet and work with up to 50 science majors in their subject field. Enhanced academic development is coupled with the changed academic venue and cultural learning. By way of new contacts, lifelong friendships are also established to enhance future collaborative work and to promote international understanding.
• An internship experience

General Electric (GE) offers internships in the Netherlands or Mexico in the area of business finance and accounting. Interns work with site managers and mentors to complete project assignments during the eight-week internship. While GE pays interns' cost of transportation, housing, and insurance and a monthly stipend, the internship experience can also be applied toward the interns' university required business internship experience. Because the internship is required for the undergraduate business major, students can receive academic credit upon successful completion of the internship requirement. However, if academic credit is awarded for the internship, students may be required to pay tuition for the experience and subsequent assessments of learning.

Through the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (mainly in Big Ten institutions) Australian internship office housed at Michigan State University, students have internship options in Australian parliaments, government agencies, NGOs, and the private sector, either on a full-time basis, or part-time while taking additional coursework at an Australian university. Students are required to develop internship learning contracts, are supervised by both Australian faculty and agency supervisors, and are required to produce research and policy papers related to their internship. Academic credit is awarded following assessments by faculty and agency supervisors.

• A semester or summer spent working on a research project

Undergraduate and graduate students at many universities have options to work with faculty abroad on research projects as varied as archeology, food nutrition and safety, public opinion polling, and environmental monitoring, to name a few. Contact with host-country cultures and socioeconomic-political systems are integrated into the experience. Practical research and project management experience in varied cultural settings are gained, and academic credit awarded either in the form of coursework, directed study, or degree field or laboratory requirements.

• A short or long period involved in community volunteer programs

Some study abroad programs are designed around or incorporate a community service component to the experience. Students under faculty supervision may become involved in environmental clean up projects, collection and analysis of data to identify causes of local diseases, participation in community education projects, or volunteer work in local clinics or community service offices, to give a few examples.

What unites these experiences, no matter their design, length, location, or subject matter, is that in order to award academic credit they should have learning objectives,
opportunities for instruction, guidance, and student reflection, and assessment or testing of whether learning objectives have been met.

Study abroad programs vary in their learning objectives, including different combinations of objectives related to: gaining cross-cultural understanding and experience; improving interpersonal skills and personal growth; acquiring proficiency in a foreign language; gaining experience working and living in another culture and society; broadening comparative perspective and knowledge; or gaining new technical or professional knowledge, skills, and abilities.

The Future

As study abroad expands to accommodate majors in the professions as well as in the liberal arts, the diversity of program types, lengths, subject matter, and locations will have to expand to incorporate discipline-based learning, as well as instruction in languages and culture, and integrate the needs of students in highly constrained majors as well as those with more electives.
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D—Outcomes and Impacts of Study Abroad

The demonstrable benefits of study abroad accrue both to individuals and to the nation. While personal growth and development is a central value of the experience for individual students, there are benefits to universities, academic fields and professions, and ultimately the nation in building capacity to understand and use the deepened understanding of the languages and cultures of other nations that these participants bring home to the United States. Gains in language competence, understanding of cultures not one’s own, expanded knowledge and skills commensurate with globally-networked professions—all have been documented in research on the outcomes of study abroad. Recent studies have even examined less tangible outcomes that are nonetheless of great advantage to the U.S. national interest, such as flexibility in approach to problem solving, self directed learning, and the ability to operate successfully in an environment of cultural and ethnic diversity.

A recent study (Akande & Slawson, 2000) by the Institute for the International Education of Students (IES), for example, reported these long-term benefits of the education abroad experience. Responses from nearly 3,000 study abroad alumni showed that:

- Nearly half had worked or volunteered abroad since graduating from college
- 59 percent reported having returned to visit or work in the country where they had studied
- 69 percent of students who held internships during education-abroad programs said their internships had influenced their career choices
- More than 30 percent said the language skills gained on education-abroad programs continue to serve them today

These program-specific findings are similar to anecdotal reports of students and programs and match intuitively with expectations of educators about the correlation between overseas study and future professional and recreational activities.

Measurable outcomes for study abroad fall into five broad areas: foreign language competence, intellectual growth, cultural competence, breadth of professional knowledge, and interpersonal skill building.

Language Competence Gained Through Study Abroad

Researchers and teachers of foreign language share the assessment by Freed (1995) that students who participate in study abroad programs are “those who make the most progress in the language of choice and are most likely to become fluent.”

Over the past 15 years, research on study abroad and language gain have documented both consistent outcomes of and reliable predictors for successful language gain. The National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) conducted one of the first empirical studies of language gain in study abroad, documenting the relationships among certain student demographic characteristics and educational qualifications and language proficiency gains. NFLC researchers (Brecht, Davidson & Ginsberg, 1993) found that several student
characteristics are significant predictors of successful language learning during study abroad, including, not surprisingly, knowledge of another foreign language, strong preprogram reading, and grammar knowledge.3

Further research in the past decade has examined the components of program design that maximize language learning gains. Particularly in studies related to the acquisition of Russian, the American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR) has drawn clear connections between duration of study, prior language training and proficiency levels, and living arrangements that foster cultural integration.

Note also that in more than 10 years of programming in the U.S. Department of Defense’s National Security Education Program (NSEP), both undergraduate scholarship and graduate fellowship recipients have made documented, significant language gains in the critical target languages of national security interest to the United States—notably in languages like Chinese, Arabic, Korean, and Russian. The federal government recognizes that one of the best ways to make a significant language gain in less commonly taught languages is through study abroad.

Intellectual Growth and Learning Through Study Abroad

New studies, currently underway, are examining academic learning as an important outcome of the study abroad experience and initial findings are validating the assumption that study abroad students not only make language gains but also achieve learning outcomes in other areas. Notably, an MSU study (Ingraham & Peterson, 2004) cites initial data that validates learning outcomes that include:

- contributing to students’ professional development by facilitating awareness of how their intended profession may be viewed/practiced differently in different cultural contexts and by encouraging the development of skills today’s employers seek (such as self reliance, cultural awareness, and cross-cultural communication skills)
- developing students’ skills for relating to culturally different others in various situations, such as academic settings, social venues, and professional environments
- enhancing students’ self awareness and understanding of their own culture

The study also identified positive correlations between study abroad experiences, regardless of length, and learning outcomes. It also found a significant positive correlation between the length of the sojourn and the degree of the learning outcomes. These data also suggest that there is a correlation between study abroad participation and both student academic performance (study abroad participants appear to have higher grade point averages at the completion of their undergraduate careers) and time to graduation (students typically reach graduation earlier than their non-study abroad classmates). While not all of these correlations are necessarily attributable solely to the study abroad experience (e.g., study abroad students might have had higher grades even if
they had not gone overseas), they are suggestive of strong, positive connections between study abroad participation and the learning goals of students.

**Cultural Competence Gained through Study Abroad**

The first studies on the relationship of study abroad to increased intercultural competence (Drews & Meyer, 1996) found that those who study abroad are more likely than those who do not to conceive of other national groups in terms associated with characters of individuals, as opposed to food, historical events, geographical characteristics and other non-personal factors. The authors conclude that a significant impact of study abroad is a more “personalized” view of other cultures.

A four-campus study, led by Georgetown University, is exploring aspects of cultural competence and cross-cultural learning to determine the comparative difference in cross-cultural sophistication gained through study abroad. Early data in this study suggest that study abroad participants across disciplines make measurable cross-cultural competency gains that exceed those of students who remain on a U.S. campus.

The MSU study, referenced above, also found evidence of students’ increased intercultural awareness in such areas as enhanced understanding of international issues, other cultures, their host country’s culture, and their own culture, as well as increasing their curiosity about other cultures and their appreciation of human difference.

**Study Abroad Aids U.S. Students to be Competitive As Professions Globalize**

Study abroad has a profound effect on shaping the future academic and professional career decisions and successes of study abroad participants. For example, a 1999 study by Wallace examined the long term impact of study abroad on alumni careers, volunteer activities, and world and personal perspectives among alumni of study abroad programs 10 years after that experience. This report found that most participants viewed their study abroad experience positively, reported that it had influenced their career selection, and enhanced their awareness and appreciation of other cultures and international issues. These findings have been echoed in other reports about student perceptions of their career development as a result of study abroad experiences.

**Individual Growth Through Study Abroad**

Impacts such as “increased awareness of self and others,” increased appreciation of foreign culture, and increased maturity have been reported anecdotally for decades and noted in the research on the outcomes of study abroad over the past 15 years. In a study of 174 American university student participants in a one-semester study abroad program in England, Thomlinson (1991) found that the greatest changes reported included confidence in travelling abroad, personal independence, understanding of life in the host culture, desire to travel overseas, appreciation of other cultures, and the ability to cope with new and different surroundings. Similarly, a report from St. Mary’s College in
Indiana, which surveyed American participants in study abroad programs, found the greatest amount of growth to be in an appreciation of different cultures, followed by independence and maturity, and a greater self-awareness (Cash, 1993).

More recently, the American Councils for International Education: ACTR/ACCELS has conducted research on American alumni of its study abroad programs over a 25-year span.

Table 1
The primary purpose of the survey was to gain a perspective on the long-term impact of the study abroad experience on both personal and career development. The following charts illustrate participants’ views of the impact of the study abroad experience.

In Table 1, data are presented that outline rank alumni responses to their self-evaluation of the significance of study abroad to their overall educational experience, including data about second and third-time study abroad sojourns. The vast majority of alumni ranked their study abroad experiences among the top three most significant learning experiences, and virtually no alumni rated the experience as negative or disappointing.

In Table 2, alumni reported their top three outcomes from their study abroad experience beyond language learning. (Participants on these particular study abroad programs were concentrating on learning Russian during their overseas sojourns.) The three most commonly mentioned outcomes were having a broader world view, gaining cultural knowledge, and developing increased adaptability.

Table 2

Table 3

Table 3 presents data on the amount of personal changes experienced by alumni. Again, the vast majority of program alumni reported increased change in their ability to adapt to new situations, greater self-confidence, and increased interest in events in their host country (in this case, Russia).

As these summary tables suggest, ACTR study abroad alumni reported significant impact on their lives, including their professional and career choices, as a result of their overseas study.

For an example of the breadth of current research assessing the impacts of study abroad, see the introduction to the Fall 2004 special issue of the journal, Frontiers (in the enclosed CD).

In Summary

These studies demonstrate the value of the study abroad experience by documenting academically significant learning outcomes, including significant potential for real
language gain in structured study abroad settings. An undergraduate student with study abroad experience is more likely to be competitive in the employment market, is more likely to have stronger second language skills, is more likely to be culturally sophisticated and sensitive, and is more likely to have valuable cross cultural and interpersonal skills that will serve not only their own individual professional and life objectives but serve the national interest by being part of a better educated and more globally competent workforce.
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E—Trends in Study Abroad

Summary of Open Doors Data on U.S. Study Abroad

U.S. student participation in study abroad programs has more than tripled since the mid-1980s and continues to show growth despite some public concerns about security and safety abroad and economic pressures domestically. Despite this growth the U.S. still lags behind the rest of the world in the numbers of students studying abroad. Historically and currently, U.S. students are most likely to study in Western Europe, although in the past 10–15 years enrollment growth in study abroad in other world regions has taken place.

Much of the growth in student participation has been in programs of one-semester’s duration or less—programs of eight weeks duration or less are now the most popular programs based on changes in enrollment rates. Participation in academic-year programs has steadily declined. The typical study abroad participant is female, white, in her junior year, and studying either humanities or social sciences. These characteristics, are, however, showing signs of slow change—study abroad participants are today more ethnically diverse, more likely to be studying other subjects, and more often include freshmen and sophomores than a decade ago. The growth in the number of U.S. students studying abroad demonstrate that U.S. college and university students and their parents increasingly value a study abroad experience as a crucial part of their education. As they enter the 21st century workforce, students and their parents realize that hands-on knowledge of other nations, cultures, and languages will be essential tools not only for professionals operating in a global marketplace, but for an educated citizenry. The continuing challenge facing U.S. higher education is to facilitate study abroad for a wider cohort of American students, especially those with limited financial resources.

Summarized below are answers to the most frequently asked questions about U.S. students who study abroad.
How Many U.S. Students Study Abroad Each Year?

According to the latest Open Doors, 6160,920 U.S. students received credit in 2002/2003 for study abroad in the prior academic year.

How Has This Number Changed Over the Past Two Decades?

Since the mid-1980s, the number of U.S. students receiving credit has increased steadily, with the greatest growth since the mid-1990s. Data from the first year of the Open Doors survey on study abroad showed that 48,483 U.S. students studied abroad for credit in 1985/1986. In less than two decades, the number has more than tripled to 160,920 students (see Chart 1). Despite these increases, the absolute numbers of Americans studying abroad continue to lag well behind the numbers of international students studying at U.S. campuses, which totalled 586,323 as per Open Doors 2003. Even the horrific events of 9/11 and subsequent concerns about safety abroad have not abated the upward growth. Anecdotal data for the 2003/2004 year suggest substantial continuing growth.

Chart 1

Where Are American Students Studying Abroad?

Nearly half of all U.S. students studying abroad chose destinations in Western Europe (see Chart 2). The leading four destinations, the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, and France, hosted nearly 48 percent of U.S. students abroad.

Chart 2

However, current trends indicate that American students are increasingly choosing to study in a variety of destinations, with growing interest in nontraditional destinations outside of Western Europe, in places such as Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Oceania. Of the leading 20 destinations for U.S. study abroad, 11 are outside of Western Europe. Moreover, of the destinations that had double-digit increases in the number of U.S. students from the previous year, 8 of those 11 were non-Western European destinations. These include: Australia, China, Japan, Czech Republic, Chile, South Africa, New Zealand, and Cuba (in rank order of the leading 20 destinations above).

Chart 3

What is the Profile of the Typical U.S. Student Who Studies Abroad?

Academic Level. The majority of U.S. undergraduate students continue to study abroad during their junior year, as they have done since the earliest days of Open Doors study abroad data collection (see Chart 3). The most recent Open Doors data show that 40.7 percent of U.S. undergraduate students studying abroad were juniors. (Although we can’t
know for certain, there is a possibility that “juniors” may include those studying abroad the summer between the sophomore and junior year or between the junior and senior year, and thus could unduly weight the numbers for study abroad participation by “juniors.” Seniors were the second largest group in 2001–2002, at 20.4 percent.

**Gender.** Traditionally, females have made up approximately two-thirds of U.S. students who study abroad and that trend has remained unchanged throughout IIE’s data collection (see Chart 4). The gender gap has grown slightly larger since 1993/1994. For international students coming to the U.S., the male/female ratio is reversed, with more male than female students studying in the U.S., although that gender gap is shrinking.

**Chart 4**

**Race/Ethnicity.** As is the case in the male/female distribution of U.S. students abroad, the racial and ethnic background of U.S. study abroad students is heavily skewed toward Caucasian students, who are the overwhelming majority, 82 percent (National Center for Education Statistics data for 2000 indicate that Caucasian students make up 68.3 percent of the U.S. student population in degree granting institutions.). While there has been modest growth in the number of African-Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans studying abroad, the percentages are still extremely low and under representative of the numbers of these students in the general student population. Of the nearly 161,000 students reported in the 2001/2002 Open Doors data for study abroad, 5,632 (3.5 percent) were African-Americans; 9,333 (5.8 percent), Asian-Americans; 8,690 (5.4 percent), Hispanic Americans; 644 (0.4 percent), Native American; and 3,218 (2.0 percent), multiracial. Percentages of these students in the overall general student population, respectively, were 11.3, 6.4, 9.5, and 1.0 percent. (NCES did not report multiracial.) The number of Native Americans studying abroad has not increased at all, while the number of students identifying themselves as multiracial has declined. Response to the race/ethnicity variable was 50.3 percent for 2000/2001 and 47.7 percent for 2001/2002, but the overall response rate indicating race/ethnicity went up from 84.3 percent in 2000/2001 to 87.1 percent in 2001/2002.

**Disability.** While students with disabilities make up 9 percent of higher education enrollments (triple the percentage from two decades ago), 7 two surveys conducted in the late 1990s suggest they make up less than 1 percent of those who study abroad. Anecdotally, numbers seem to be increasing and information disseminated through national projects provides feasible solutions to expand their participation. However, some barriers still remain that may keep percentages low and current data are not available to help benchmark progress.

**Fields of Study.** The majority of U.S. students who study abroad tend to major in the “traditional” fields of study, such as the social sciences, humanities, and foreign languages. But the data show a steady increase in study abroad participation by students majoring in scientific and technical fields, and especially in business/management (see Chart 5).
The latest Open Doors data show that business/management was the second leading field of study among U.S. study abroad students, representing 17.6 percent of the study abroad total cohort, following closely behind social sciences, the leading field of study among U.S. students abroad, representing 21.9 percent. Looked at a different way, among the total enrolled U.S. undergraduate population, approximately 10.7 percent of the 265,700 U.S. students majoring in business have studied abroad; 8.0 percent of the 58,100 U.S. students majoring in engineering have studied abroad; and 5.9 percent of the 105,600 U.S. students majoring in education have studied abroad.

This increase in participation is a reflection of the greater availability, diversity, and flexibility of programs, especially for those students in nontraditional majors whose degree or curricula requirements could not previously have been met by the more traditional study abroad approaches.

What Kinds of U.S. Schools Send the Most Students Abroad?

An examination of higher education institutions shows that research institutions send the largest number of U.S. students abroad (44.2 percent), followed by master's institutions (20.4 percent), baccalaureate institutions (18.2 percent), doctoral institutions (12.8 percent), associate's institutions (2.5 percent), and other institutions (1.9 percent). This is not surprising, since research institutions also typically have higher overall enrollments than other four-year institutions. Conversely, students studying at two-year institutions are often older, with family and/or work obligations that make it difficult to pursue study abroad.

While a comparison of the total number of study abroad students by institution tends to highlight the larger institutions (since they send large numbers of students abroad), a comparison of the participation rate of study abroad by institution highlights certain smaller, liberal arts institutions, since the most active of these send a larger proportion of their students abroad. In part this may reflect that liberal arts institutions' somewhat more homogenous curricula—emphasizing the humanities, social sciences, and other liberal arts disciplines—match well with the more traditional and well-established forms of study abroad programming.

How Long Is the Average Study Abroad Stay?

Historically, study abroad meant "Junior Year Abroad" for an academic year. Even so, this has not been the reality in a numerical sense for a long time. While the popularity of academic year programs has been steadily declining during the past decade, the popularity of short-term study abroad programs has been growing (see Chart 6). These include programs of fewer than eight weeks' duration, faculty-led programs, curricular-embedded programs, and programs that take place during January term. In the most recent Open Doors, the overwhelming majority of students (90.7 percent), studied abroad.
for one semester or less; within this total, 39 percent studied abroad for one semester and 3.9 percent for one quarter.

Short term programs (summer programs or programs of eight weeks or shorter) accounted for 47.7 percent of all U.S. study abroad. Students across all institutional types are enrolling in short term programs abroad, with the largest proportion at associate degree institutions and the smallest proportion at doctoral institutions.

Chart 6

These short-term programs have a different focus from the traditional semester and academic year programs, with the latter more focused on language acquisition and deeper cultural immersion. Many shorter-term programs are designed to provide a relevant study abroad experience for tightly constrained majors (e.g., sciences), a learning situation that links the professional degree program to a different cultural milieu, and an opportunity for students otherwise not able to live and learn abroad due to cost, time, or other constraints to do so.

The shorter-term approach to study abroad has had the effect of accommodating greater numbers and categories of students (especially nontraditional students) and serving as an introduction to study abroad for students who may otherwise never have even considered doing so.

What Is the Participation Rate of U.S. Students Studying Abroad?

The overall proportion of U.S. higher education students who study abroad can be (and has been) presented in various ways and yields a complex picture of how U.S. campuses are involved in this activity. Data presented here take a conservative approach, including only U.S. students (citizens and permanent residents) who have studied abroad and received credit toward their degree at a U.S. institution of higher education. It does not count those students for whom no campus-based records might exist, such as those who travel or work abroad without receiving academic credit or those who directly enroll overseas for a degree program, as there is no effective way of capturing information on this group of students.

The study abroad census can be used in different ways to calculate the overall percentage of U.S. study abroad activity. A cohort analysis of study abroad participation over the course of a four-year degree program suggests that somewhere between 9 percent and 12 percent of U.S. students at four year undergraduate institutions study abroad at some point before they graduate. This analysis, however, excludes community college enrollments, which account for a third of U.S. higher education enrollment but have quite low study abroad participation in general. A significantly different picture of study abroad participation rates appears when study abroad numbers are compared with overall U.S. higher education enrollments prepared by the College Board. In that comparison, annual study abroad participation rates are between 1 percent and 3 percent.
Whichever method is used to calculate participation rates, it remains clear that U.S. students lag far behind other students for whom a study period outside their own country is an essential component in preparation for careers in the 21st century. Year 2000 data from IIE’s Atlas of Student Mobility indicated that of the countries designated by the World Bank as “high income” and for which data were available, the United States had the lowest rates of study abroad. To be sure, rationales for study abroad in other countries are complex and inextricably linked with internal capacities, but the point is that study abroad is a critical element of education in diverse sectors of the globe. Moreover, the European Union considers study abroad so important for its future professionals that it has provided millions of euros annually to support undergraduate and graduate study abroad among European Union member states and is now expanding the program globally.

What Impact Did September 11 Have on Study Abroad?

The events of September 11, 2001, had a clear impact on study abroad in unexpected ways. Interest in study abroad across the board actually grew (albeit slightly) after September 2001 and applications to federally funded study abroad programs, such as Fulbright,10 Gilman,11 and NSEP12 continue to grow, notably those to certain places in the Middle East and the Islamic world.

Based on survey data from U.S. campus-based study abroad administrators, IIE documented the following responses in each of the past three academic years:

- In a survey of U.S. campuses conducted one month after September 11, 2001, 91 percent of respondents reported that either none or less than 10 percent of their students had changed their minds about or cancelled their plans to study abroad. When asked whether they had seen a decline in the number of study abroad applications or requests for information on study abroad for the coming term (Spring 2002), 67 percent of the respondents reported that they were seeing continued or increased interest in study abroad; 19 percent reported a slight decline or some decline, while only 2 percent reported a substantial decline in interest in study abroad. All but 2 percent reported that in light of September 11 and its aftermath international educational exchange was regarded either as more important on campus or there was no change in attitude.
- The following year (October 2002), the survey data showed that interest in study abroad continued to grow. Almost half of the respondents reported an increase in study abroad participation for the Fall 2002 term, compared to the fall term at the same time the previous year. An additional 34 percent reported no noticeable change.
- The October 2003 survey on the state of international educational exchange showed that of the responding educators, 68 percent reported that the number of U.S. students studying abroad had either continued to increase for Fall 2003 or remained the same. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents reported an increase in the number of U.S. students studying abroad in nontraditional destinations. In a separate question about the effects of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
(SARS) on study abroad programs, 67 percent of the respondents who had study abroad programs that were previously cancelled due to SARS reported that their programs had resumed. Lastly, in response to a question about obstacles to study abroad, respondents reported that the perceived obstacles to study abroad are primarily financial, followed by academic issues, and then by health and safety issues.

Michigan State University researchers (Riedinger, Silver & Brook, 2002; Riedinger, Silver & Wallmo, 1999) conducted statewide random surveys in Michigan both before and after September 11. Both sets of data revealed that close to 70 percent of the general public thought students should study abroad.

Similarly, surveys of the general public conducted by the American Council on Education (Siaya, Porcelli & Green, 2002) in the spring of 2000 and 2002 demonstrated strong support for study abroad and agreement that students should participate in study abroad at some point during their college experience.

The Future of Study Abroad

The data available on U.S. study abroad show that there is growing interest from U.S. students for an overseas educational experience. But the picture is mixed both about the present and future prospects for expanded study abroad participation. On the one hand, with more programs available for students with diverse interests—both in terms of the number and variety—the opportunities to study abroad now are far greater than ever. Accordingly, it has become comparatively easier for students of all majors to fit a relevant study abroad experience into their program of study. It has become easier for students to transfer credits from study abroad toward their degree, as well as to use federal financial aid for study abroad.

On the other hand, curricular reforms supporting study abroad remain the exception rather than the rule. Many majors remain de facto hostile to incorporating a study abroad experience. The study abroad experience remains out of reach for many students, particularly those who lack sufficient financial resources and/or who need to work while in school. Thus, while many of the academic obstacles have been and continue to be addressed—by way of shorter programs and non-traditional approaches—the financial obstacles to study abroad remain formidable and compelling.

While greater diversity in program options, especially those linked to non–liberal arts majors and of differing lengths and pedagogies, have helped to expand participation, the relative numbers of American students who have a real opportunity to learn firsthand about the world outside our borders remain very small.
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F—Program Capacity for Increasing

U.S. Student Participation

Higher education institutions and study abroad program providers plan to substantially increase the numbers of U.S. students studying abroad. Expansion of participant numbers to the level contemplated by the Lincoln Scholarship Program, however, would require a national initiative to develop and open new high quality programming opportunities especially for a more diverse set of students and in non-Western European destinations. Such an initiative would require a shared investment by higher education, private foundations, and federal and state governments, which would likely provide a reasonable expectation of building the necessary capacity envisioned by Senator Simon’s proposal.

Government, education, private, and business sectors need to work in partnership in order to develop bold and creative approaches to ensuring much greater access and diversity in study abroad. An essential aspect of such an effort would be to articulate the value of study abroad as a key component for strengthening U.S. capacity to know and understand the rest of the world. Embracing this concept can open the door to developing and enhancing resources necessary to expand study abroad opportunities for more U.S. students.

Leading, individual higher education institutions with established track records in study abroad can work independently to expand the participation of their own student populations. Concerted joint efforts are required also to make a difference for the American student population as a whole. If the goal is to expand access to quality study abroad opportunities and to increase diversity in destinations and disciplines, U.S. institutions must work collaboratively in order to achieve the goals of the Lincoln initiative. Broad based access to study in the developing world will require collaborative partnerships among U.S. institutions, study abroad providers, and host institutions abroad in order to significantly change our knowledge and understanding of other countries and cultures. It is in the national interest that government, business, and the private sector collaborate with higher education and support the development of increased capacity for study abroad.

Survey of Capacity Among U.S. and International Institutions

The Working Group conducted surveys in May and June 2004 involving 45 U.S. colleges and universities and 75 universities abroad to assess interest and demand for study abroad and capacity to accommodate greater numbers of students. Survey respondents included a sample of the full range of U.S. institutional members of the Forum and ISEP, notably large and medium-size public universities, large private institutions, and small private colleges. The ETS minority-serving institutions included community colleges as well as four-year institutions. This report summarizes responses to the surveys. Copies of the respective survey instruments may be found in Appendices III, IV, and V.
Study Abroad Capacity and Program Design

The survey identified four program design models utilized for sending students abroad.

Those are:

- **Bilateral exchange agreements**: reciprocal exchange of students via tuition-swap mechanism between the host and home campus.
- **Other exchange programs**: programs that may be two-way or reciprocal and may serve more than one campus or serve faculty and students, not necessarily limited to "tuition swap" mechanisms.
- **Direct enrollment options for students in partner institutions abroad**.
- **Faculty-led institutional programs**: home campus faculty taking a group of their students abroad.
- **U.S. study abroad providers and nonreciprocal programs**: programs managed by a single institution or program provider but open to U.S. students from many campuses, sending them abroad with no incoming students being received by the home campuses involved.

Survey responses indicated a difference in the relative importance of the different mechanisms for managing education abroad across U.S. institutions. Smaller independent colleges depend most on exchanges and direct placements, where the home campus retains the tuition dollars; large independent universities make the most use of external providers; and state universities rely more heavily on their own faculty-led programs. These differences reflect both philosophical and practical differences across institutional types, and they probably also reflect the different cost structures of the institutions and the prices their students are prepared and able to pay. Small colleges maintain relatively large numbers of exchange partnerships, most likely for financial reasons—tuition dollars remain at home when students study abroad on a reciprocal exchange. For many in-state students at public universities cost control is a major factor, thus they tend to utilize faculty-led programs and exchanges offered by their own institution or a consortium.

Since the different mechanisms have different pricing structures, levels of service, institutional costs, and faculty management practices, the survey results indicate that a "one-size-fits-all" approach to enrollment development will not be as effective as tailored and multiple types of program options.

Near-Term Capacity for Increasing Numbers

The capacity of institutions to add students to their programs is difficult to estimate. In many cases, even the institutions themselves do not have a good grasp on their capacity to expand because they depend on external providers, use overseas partners, or have programs that are not demand-driven. Nonetheless, the survey responses suggest limits to significantly increased capacity in their existing programs, but some expansion through existing program options is feasible.
There appears to be more flexibility in faculty-led programs, but these tend to be more specialized since they depend upon specific faculty interest and availability. In some cases, institutions report strong interest and participation in faculty-led programs, particularly for established programs, while others indicate that at least some programs are canceled each year because of insufficient student interest.

Member institutions of the Forum, which tend to offer larger than average programs, report that they could add between 100 and 200 students each. ISEP members report similar expansion possibilities with an average of 165 in all types of programs. The 45 institutions in the survey reported growth capacity of about 7,000 students. If the averages were applied to all members in the two organizations—that is, approximately 300 of the most active U.S. institutions in study abroad—the total numbers would approach 50,000. The ETS group of 24 minority-serving institutions reported wide divergence in the capacity to increase numbers from very little to numbers similar to the other two reporting groups.

Institutional Plans for Growth in Education Abroad

Smaller institutions tend to be less planning-oriented than larger universities in the expansion of study abroad opportunities for their students. Still, one in ten of the Forum’s smaller institutions expects to have more than 50 percent growth in study abroad over the next five years. Large independent universities plan for the lowest growth rates, perhaps reflecting the adverse financial impacts of education abroad on the operating budgets of these institutions.

The Forum and ISEP memberships and the ETS-affiliated institutions anticipate growth rates of 30-50 percent for most public institutions. The flagship state campuses appear to be the institutions showing the most aggressive planning for expansion of education abroad.

The working group survey did not identify a preferred method for how U.S. institutions expect to advance this planned growth. Reciprocal exchanges are seen by some as the preferred model. This is especially true for institutions in developing nations, which are reluctant to host U.S. students unless there is reciprocal benefit for their own students. It is also true for many traditional partners such as the Europeans, who are concentrating more on internal exchanges within Europe and for whom scholarships to the United States are in critically short supply.

One-way student flows, however, serve U.S. students well and can provide a more convenient program model for many U.S. institutions, as well as institutions abroad seeking more American students for purposes of internationalizing their own campus environment. It is estimated that approximately 20 percent of current study abroad flows are administered through study abroad providers, and it appears reasonable that a substantial part of any growth in overall numbers would increase that ratio, as well as the number of students participating under one-way models and faculty-led programs to
sohe extent, especially for institutions looking to maximize their program offerings while keeping their internal program costs low.

**Plans for Growth in Geographic Regions**

All institutions surveyed reported plans for growth in their study abroad numbers. They were also very consistent in terms of targeted destinations with Europe ranking highest. Regions with the most growth potential in order of preference are as follows:

- Europe
- Latin America
- Australia/New Zealand
- Canada/Mexico

The Forum reported that program limitations appeared to be strongest in Eurasia, Eastern Europe, South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. However, ISEP members reported notable growth potential in East/Central Europe, East Asia, and Central America. This difference may have to do with ISEP's structure as a consortium that offers diversity in study opportunities abroad by pooling resources to develop and sustain a wider variety of program destinations. ISEP members, by virtue of their membership, sought out these opportunities; whereas Forum members responded as individual institutions that had less capacity on their own to develop and sustain programs outside more traditionally sought regions. The ETS group did not report any differences in target destinations from the other two groups.

Overall, the data show that institutions see strong growth possibilities in the traditional regions that have long dominated the education abroad field—most notably Western Europe and our neighbors in the Americas. Much more work would be needed to increase study abroad capacity in other key geographic regions that correspond to current national needs for expanded international understanding and respond more directly to the goals of the Lincoln Fellowship initiative.

**Capacity of Universities Abroad to Serve U.S. Students**

Survey responses were received from 75 universities outside the United States in 31 countries. The origin of the responses, as follows, is consistent with the earlier data on the countries that host the largest number of U.S. students abroad: Western Europe, 51 (including 30 in the United Kingdom); Latin America, 17; Sub-Saharan Africa, 5 (including 3 in South Africa); Canada, 3; East/Central Europe, 2; South Asia, 2; and East Asia, Middle East, South Asia, and Russia, 1 each.

Most of these institutions indicated a modest capacity to expand program access to U.S. students in all categories. Less than 1 percent reported substantial capacity to host U.S. students sent by short-term, independent study abroad providers. This is most likely an indicator of their lack of capacity for recruiting U.S. students and need for external support. Most expressed interest in hosting additional U.S. students. Also, most noted considerable interest in bilateral exchanges and other increased opportunities for their
own students to study in the United States. Financial constraints were cited as the main barrier for their students to overcome in being able to study in the United States, however.

**Conclusion**

The responses from U.S. institutions are indicative of the kind of growth that is possible under current circumstances, but also point to limitations in achieving some of the aims of the Lincoln Fellowship initiative without federal support.

Without incentives, prospects for growth in numbers and types of programs remain largely in traditional destinations in Western Europe and point to substantial obstacles for expanding access to a more diverse student profile and to increasing opportunities in the developing world.

While many institutions recognize the need for expanding the reach of study abroad to non traditional destinations, particularly in the developing world, limits to creating capacity stem largely from insufficient institutional resources to build and sustain programs that will offer greater access and diversity. Creative and broad-based approaches that reach large and diverse audiences need to be developed and supported to build the critical mass necessary to enhance and sustain program capacity well into the future if the stated goals of the Lincoln Fellowship initiative are to be attained.

Lead author: Mary Anne Grant, International Student Exchange Program  
E-mail: [redacted]  
Additional author: Geoffrey Bannister, The Forum on Education Abroad  
E-mail: [redacted]
G—Access and Barriers Shape Who Studies Abroad: A Brief Overview

As noted earlier, the number of U.S. students studying abroad has doubled in less than a decade and tripled over the past 15 years. A record 160,920 students took classes overseas in 2001-2002 for academic credit. Yet, despite these gains, only a minuscule number of U.S. college students ever winds up studying abroad. These low participation rates occur despite evidence that a majority of college-bound students—supported by their parents—want and expect to study abroad.

This section provides an overview of the barriers that effect access to study abroad, with a specific focus on those barriers that shape study abroad participation from the perspective of the student. The following section focuses on obstacles to study abroad that are curriculum-based, essentially controlled by an institution and its faculty.

Financial Constraints

Financial constraints are usually cited as the principal barrier to study abroad, particularly for students of limited financial means. The leading examples of this barrier are: the high costs associated with some programs (or student perceptions that these costs are high); and the "opportunity costs" of study abroad. Average program costs are separately discussed in Section I. Opportunity costs are most significant for students who work full or part-time during the academic year or during the summer and who stand to lose that income because study abroad participants are typically barred from overseas employment. Other significant money-related concerns include financial aid that may not transfer to study abroad programs, particularly aid from the institutions themselves and certain state based assistance; and a lack of student unawareness of the potential long-term benefits of study abroad, causing the costs associated with study abroad to be viewed as unnecessary.

The federal government has come a long way in facilitating study abroad for students of limited financial means by making changes to its laws regarding the use of financial aid for study abroad. The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1992 mandated that a student can receive financial aid for study abroad if the student is enrolled in a program for academic credit that is approved by the home institution regardless of whether the study abroad program is required as part of the student’s degree. Until 1998, students participating in short-term study abroad programs faced difficulties in using their student loans as the loans were disbursed over a period of time rather than in one lump-sum. Since 2000, a limited number of Gilman Scholarship Grants, a need-based scholarship, have been available for study abroad participation, but not in sufficient numbers to meet the demand for such support. Non-federal assistance, especially institutional aid, is often less flexible when it comes to funding study abroad. Many institutions will not allow their aid to be used for study outside of their campuses.

A recent report prepared by the Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) underscores the importance of study abroad financial assistance for students of limited financial means. COE analyzed the low study abroad participation rate of students assisted by the
federal TRIO programs; TRIO students are generally of lower socioeconomic status and often first-generation college attendees. The survey found the following barriers to study abroad: cost, lack of information, family constraints, and individual limitations, with cost being perceived as the largest barrier. This report is summarized in Appendix VI.

Minority, Disabled, and Low-Income Participants

Currently, American study abroad participants reflect only a very small segment of our society. Hispanic, African-American, and other students of color, as well as students with disabilities make up much smaller percentages of students going abroad than their respective percentages in postsecondary enrollment. The participation of minority, low-income, and disabled students is limited by economic perceptions and realities. Other barriers include the lack of information about opportunities, lack of family or disability support, and a lack of knowledge and encouragement on the part of the individual professionals that work with first-generation, minority, disabled, and lower income students. Part of the challenge in providing equal opportunity for U.S. students of all backgrounds is overcoming the impediments to participation in study abroad.

Diverse Destinations

In addition, despite recent trends, Western Europe remains by far the most popular destination for U.S. students studying abroad. There are many reasons students choose Western Europe over other destinations, but perhaps the most common reason is the American mindset—including its misperceptions about other countries of the world, their importance to the United States, their cultures, and their quality of life. Students, and their parents, often have a skewed view of what study would be like in countries in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and even South America, particularly with regard to safety.

Program Types

According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics, 75 percent of undergraduate students in the United States today are “nontraditional,” meaning they have one or more of the following characteristics: did not graduate from high school; did not enroll in an institution of higher education directly after high school; attend part-time; work fulltime; or are financially independent, married, and/or have dependents. To include this vast student population, programs must be designed to accommodate their unique needs. Students who are first-generation college students or who are from low-income families need a way to have a first experience abroad. They may need a way to be able to go abroad for a program of shorter duration in order to have a positive experience to build upon. Asking these students to go for an extended period as their first experience (and for their families to support them doing so) is sometimes too large a leap. Unlike their middle-or-upper income peers, who have often already had extensive personal or family travel experience, many nontraditional students have never left their own neighborhoods. “Foreign” travel is just that.
Insufficient Language Preparation

Many students forgo the opportunity to study abroad because they feel they have been inadequately prepared in the languages of their destinations of choice. And it comes as no surprise that they are unprepared, as the percentage of American students studying foreign languages beyond the most elementary of levels has dropped dramatically over the past several decades. Constraining factors can combine: for example, a survey of freshman college students with disabilities showed that these students were less likely than their peers without disabilities to have met or exceeded the recommended years of high school study in foreign languages (Henderson, 1999).

More can be done to structure programs that are not so dependent on foreign language skills and the needs of foreign language and literature programs. Faculty and host institutions abroad are often able to assist in creating sound programs for students who do not speak the local languages (even while the study abroad student simultaneously enrolls in courses to learn the local language). Study abroad can provide excellent learning situations for English-speaking American undergraduate students even if their introduction to the local language is modest. In fact, properly structured study abroad programs can serve to introduce students to language study. Institutions need to emphasize this last point to students with no experience in the language or with limited proficiency. Language learning is a part of the process, and should not been seen as a barrier.

While study abroad programs created for students with limited proficiency in the destination’s language allow such students to experience the world outside our borders and enhance the limited skills they possess, the long-term answer is to better prepare future generations of college students in foreign languages. In order for this to occur, changes need to be made in the U.S. educational system at the K–12 level.

A sampling of the Study Abroad experiences of TRIO and Mobility International USA (MIUSA) are provided in the enclosed CD.

Lead author: Courtney Klein-Faust, NAFSA: Association of International Educators
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II—Identifying and Addressing Campus-Based Obstacles to Study Abroad

The inattention given to study and learning abroad as a key component to internationalizing curricula and learning profoundly limits higher education’s ability to produce the gains that it intends in student language acquisition and in international knowledge and understanding. This inattention acts as a separate and distinct set of obstacles to increasing study abroad from those described in the previous section.

The reasons for inattention to study abroad are many and varied, but they all point to a common problem: study abroad is rarely integrated as a fundamental component of the undergraduate curriculum. The relationship between internationalizing the on-campus curriculum and study abroad needs strengthening. Richard Brecht (2003), for example, has put it succinctly: “the key to study abroad is foreign language and the key to foreign language is study abroad.” By extension, the point is that internationalizing the curriculum requires the experiential component of study abroad, and study abroad requires the support of an internationalized curriculum on campus. Either one without the other is a significant impediment to the development of language and area expertise as well as to the development of a broadly informed and experienced citizenry. Among the most effective methods for teaching students new cultures and languages is to have them learn, live, and work in another country and culture. Such international experiences not only provide students with an effective international and cross-cultural education, they are life-changing experiences for many. Students returning to campus help further internationalize the on-campus learning environment.

In sum, internationalization of the on-campus curriculum provides the intellectual foundation for study abroad. Study abroad provides the experiential and reflective component of international education. We can no longer pretend to be graduating educated persons if their curricula have not exposed them to both.

Barriers and Their Removal

Higher education makes expanded participation to study abroad difficult for students through inattention to issues critical to access. Viewing study abroad as a luxury and only for the privileged few makes access difficult. It is further made hard through high costs; inattention to program quality and safety; and institutional, academic, and administrative leadership failures to communicate that study abroad is part of a core institutional vision for internationalizing undergraduate education.

Limiting study abroad options in terms of program length, subject matter, world region, and format limits opportunity for students in many majors because majors differ in how study abroad experiences can be designed to add value, and they also differ in their capacity to accommodate varying kinds of study abroad models. Among the most significant impediments is the failure to integrate study abroad into the curriculum. Our challenge and goal should be to “democratize access” to the opportunity for study abroad and global learning by reducing these barriers.
Critical to reducing barriers is reinforcing an institutional vision of the importance of study abroad. It is essential to contain cost and enhance affordability; integrate study abroad into the curriculum and adjust the curriculum to accommodate study abroad; prepare students to go and reintegrate their learning and experiences upon return to campus; expand and diversify program options, models, subject matter, and locations; attend to safety and security concerns; and implement quality and impact assessment. An integrated institutional approach to removing barriers and widening access would include:

1. **Make study abroad affordable.** Commit to an integrated set of cost management and financial assistance actions to make it possible for any student who can afford to attend his/her home institution to have a study abroad experience at the same or less cost. Give priority to the development of programs abroad whose tuition and fees, room, board, field trips, and, in some instances, airfare, do not exceed the cost of studying on campus; build on domestic and international partnerships and consortia to facilitate this. Restructure institutional processes and procedures to eliminate unnecessary practices and reduce administrative overhead. Remove restrictions when applying financial aid for study abroad. Make the establishment of endowments and scholarships for study abroad an institutional goal for private fund-raising. Institute a series of incentives and cost control measures to encourage academic departments to reinvest in study abroad and in their own further internationalization.

2. **Expand study abroad choices.** Expand course and program offerings beyond the humanities and social sciences and into fields such as science, engineering, education, and business. Widen the range of choices in program length, time of year offered, country and regional location, and program types (e.g., internships, faculty-led programs, direct enrollment, symmetric and asymmetric exchanges). Expanding options means diversifying options.

3. **Integrate study abroad into curricula and majors.** Prepare students for study abroad through systematic orientation programs. Provide academic advising that helps students plan well in advance and integrate study abroad into their majors and their career goals. Design curricula that prepare students in languages and cross-cultural knowledge and provide for reintegration on return by using study abroad learning and experiences in the classroom. Closely involve academic departments in the planning and design of the study abroad experiences. Diversify forms of faculty and departmental involvement in planning, delivering, and evaluating the quality of programs. Be prepared to take advantage of what students have to offer when they return.

4. **Enhance study abroad safety.** Have credible, independent, and documented safety assessment processes. Commit to ongoing assessment of program sites for health, security, and safety. Establish authorities to alter or cancel programs. Establish and document emergency procedures.
5. Improve program quality and evaluate impact. All programs should strive to maximize the quality of the learning experience within the stated goals and objectives of the particular program and program model. Impact on student knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes should be a fundamental part of program evaluation.

The Challenge of Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum

Even in institutions with a large number of program options and students studying abroad, there can be serious curricular barriers to study abroad: (a) numerous majors that have few or no options in which study abroad can be used to meet major and other degree requirements; (b) an academic adviser system that does not routinely educate students in a timely manner about how to fit study abroad into their curriculum; (c) individual students that are unaware of or do not plan far enough in advance to take advantage of options that do exist; and (d) an absence of study abroad options sufficiently linked to meeting degree requirements such that student progress toward graduation is not delayed. Study abroad curriculum integration means (1) preparing students to study abroad, (2) formally incorporating a learning experience abroad into the learning objectives and design of every major, and (3) making use of what students have learned abroad on their return to campus. Integration of study abroad into the curriculum is part of a wider goal to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum. It is also the best method for assuring quality control and connecting a study abroad experience to overall educational objectives.

Why Is Curriculum Integration Important?

Failure to integrate study abroad into the regular curriculum is a serious impediment to growth in participation and is a drag on building and sustaining high quality programs. The old adage, “What gets counted counts,” is germane in many ways. First, if study abroad doesn’t count toward graduation requirements, many students will look on it as an unacceptable cost associated with the goal of graduating. If study abroad is not incorporated into meeting curricular requirements, then faculty and others are less involved in designing programs and monitoring quality. If study abroad is not seen as a central component of the undergraduate learning experience, then the on-campus curriculum does little to prepare students for the experience abroad and fails to take advantage of what students have learned once they return to campus.

Who Are the Key Players in Removing Curricular Barriers to Study Abroad?

On American campuses, the curriculum is in the control of the faculty, who are typically organized into departments and colleges. Academic advising may be done by regular faculty, by specialists hired for that purpose, or by a combination of the two. If curriculum integration is to have practical meaning, then faculty must design and approve curricula that accommodate it and academic advising must provide students with timely information about options, preparation, and how to fit the experience into the
undergraduate curriculum. In all, the essential unit of analysis in effecting curriculum integration is the academic unit that houses the major.

So, although curriculum integration can be given logistical and other support by an office of study abroad, and although central university administration can provide the impetus to forge curriculum integration, the actual work of integration must be done by faculty and academic advisers.

Issues vary from major to major and from campus to campus. For majors where study abroad is a natural component (e.g., international relations), there may still be an insufficient number or variety of programs offering courses for that major. In other majors (e.g., some professional programs), study abroad may most appropriately be a venue for fulfilling general education requirements, but there may not be enough study abroad programs offering the desired kind of general education credit. In majors where degree requirements are numerous and sequential (e.g., engineering), more thought may need to be given to how the sequencing of on-campus courses can be better arranged to accommodate a study abroad experience or how some course requirements can actually be met abroad.

Successful curriculum integration projects individualize problem identification and problem solving by working with individual colleges and departments major by major. Faculty and advisers in each college and department become core contributors to identifying problems and solutions. This approach eventually provides faculty and advisers in each college and department with the opportunity to review required course work (major-specific, college-specific, and general education) in collaboration with all or part of an institutional-level project implementation team.

**Indicators of Institutional Commitment to Curricular Integration**

What are the key components and steps that signal an institutional commitment to removing curricular barriers to study abroad and integrating it into the undergraduate experience? There are many such indicators, but the most important include:

1. Examining requirements, major by major, to see how a study abroad experience can be accommodated, as well as incorporate an international component to the major’s learning objectives. In some cases this may mean revising course sequencing, changing some course requirements, or designing special study abroad options that fit the curriculum.

2. Devising multiple methods for informing students and advisers about the variety of options available through study abroad, including faculty-led programs and direct enrollment in institutions abroad, or programs provided by approved third parties.

3. Working jointly with faculty and advisers to create or identify new program options that fill gaps and enhance the major.

4. Educating faculty and advisers on options and helping them to become advocates of study abroad among their students.
5. Easing the process of placing credits earned on study abroad onto the student’s home institution transcript and the process by which these credits are accepted to meet degree requirements.

6. Developing major-specific, multifaceted marketing strategies for getting the word to students early and often as they plan their undergraduate programs.

Wrestling with the Problem of Constrained Majors

Degree programs in engineering, business, nursing, journalism, and pre-human medicine and pre veterinary medicine typically involve a larger number of required courses, locked into tight sequences, thus making it harder to find time and credits for a study abroad experience (more so than usually is the case in liberal arts majors).

It is one of the principal goals of curriculum integration to assist such colleges and departments in expanding study abroad opportunities for their students. Techniques include (1) designing study abroad experiences that can actually satisfy major requirements and address sequencing constraints and (2) reviewing curricular requirements to determine if reducing the number of requirements is feasible and sensible. In some of these majors there is also the challenge of the “junior admit” plan, where students are not formally admitted to the major until after meeting requirements in the first two years. Advising for the major doesn’t occur until then, and by then it may be too late for the student to incorporate study abroad into remaining requirements. In such cases, general university undergraduate advising mechanisms must advocate for study abroad experiences early on, and many of these students will only be able to accommodate an experience abroad sometime within their first two years.

Transcript Recognition of Courses and Credits Taken on Study Abroad

A rapidly growing number of institutions recognize that expanding study abroad opportunities requires both faculty-led programs and direct-enrollment programs in institutions abroad. It is essential that courses and credits earned on either type of program be recorded on transcripts.

In general, regular university courses are used for faculty-led programs and are later added in normal fashion to the academic transcript. However, the direct enrollment of students in institutions abroad or through quality programs of third-party providers may raise transcript complications. For either of these kinds of programs, curriculum integration aims to assure that credits and courses taken abroad will be recorded on home-institution transcripts and that equivalences are established to meet degree requirements.

If credits aren’t placed on home-institution transcripts and equivalences established, the value of the study abroad experiences is seriously diminished. Fully valuing study abroad work means that the home will “transcript” course numbers and titles, credits and grades from approved institutions and other approved providers abroad. An “approved” program
is one for which an interinstitutional quality review has taken place and agreement made to provide study abroad experiences for students. Approved programs can include direct enrollment or exchange programs with these institutions.

One example of how some universities work with assigned credit for courses taken at international institutions is the Global Engineering Education Exchange (Global E3) Course Equivalency Database, a Web site developed by the Institute of International Education (Global E3 can be viewed at http://www.iie.org/programs/global-e3/students/course_data_bank.htm). U.S. engineering programs participating in Global E3 can post information on the courses for which their students received credit during an overseas study period and the number of credits awarded. This database, available for public viewing, helps U.S. engineering faculty at other institutions assess whether these courses might be accepted for transfer credit from abroad, as they likely would from other U.S. institutions.

Three Examples, Three Approaches

Three specific case studies involving the University of Minnesota, Michigan State University, and Kalamazoo College related to curriculum integration are included in Appendix VII.

Lead author: John K. Hudzik, Michigan State University
E-mail: [Redacted]
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I—Costs of Study Abroad

How Much Does It Cost to Study Abroad?

The cost of a study abroad program can range from $2,000 to $3,000 for a sojourn of a few weeks to more than $16,000 for a semester-length experience. This substantial variation in cost depends on several factors outlined below. Regardless, even the least-expensive program options usually involve several thousand dollars in costs to students and their families.

If academic credit is earned as a part of the program, then some of the costs associated with study abroad are “replacement” costs to being on campus (e.g., housing, food, books, tuition, and fees). Other additional costs peculiar to studying abroad would not be incurred if remaining on campus (e.g., international travel and visa fees, extra insurance, higher housing and food costs in some locations abroad, additional program or field study fees).

Some campuses have adopted a cost goal for their study abroad programs of trying not to exceed equivalent on-campus costs for a majority of the study abroad options (that is, a semester abroad approximates the costs of being on campus). This is not realistic for all programs as some locations are very expensive regardless of cost control strategies. It is particularly problematic for public institutions, where in-state tuition charges are a third or half that of private institutions. Nonetheless, financial barriers to studying abroad increase significantly as the gap between equivalent on-campus semester costs is exceeded by the cost of studying abroad for a semester.

More than 85 percent of the nation’s students are on some form of financial assistance, and nearly 80 percent work while attending school. Half of students attending college do so on a part-time basis, with jobs presumably filling the remainder of the time for most. For the majority of these students, a study abroad experience means foregone work income while abroad (significant foregone income in some cases), and not all forms of financial aid can be used abroad. These are real additional costs in the form of lost “income” when studying abroad. For many kinds of financial aid, students must be enrolled full time, which typically is defined as 12 credits each semester or term during the academic year and 6 credits (at many institutions) during a summer term.

An analysis of study abroad cost data from the 2004 IIE Passport provides a fairly representative view of how costs vary for semester-length programs and for short-length programs. A sample of 21 countries, roughly distributed across Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America was taken from the Passport report. With few exceptions these are countries where most American students go. (Details are provided in Appendix VIII; one can also see there how costs tend to vary across regional and country locations.) In general, however:
For Short-Term Programs

- The average low cost for tuition, housing, and food, but not airfare, across all selected countries is $2,360, and the average high cost for the same is $4,945.
- The average low cost with airfare included is $3,775 and the average high cost with airfare included is $5,747.
- The average cost of short-term programs for all selected countries and programs for tuition, housing, food, and transportation is $4,626.

For Semester-Length Programs

- The average low cost for tuition, housing, and food, but not airfare, across all selected countries is $6,580, and the average high cost for the same is $15,751.
- The average low cost with airfare included is $11,522 and the average high cost with airfare included is $18,258.
- The average cost for semester programs for all selected countries and programs for tuition, housing, food, and transportation is $14,835.

It is clear from this summary and from data in the tables in Appendix VIII that there is substantial variation in program costs, even within a given country. So, what are the principal drivers of these differences in cost?

In general, short-term programs cost significantly less in total. But short-term programs also offer fewer academic credits. On a per-credit cost basis (total program costs divided by number of academic credits earned), short-term programs are usually more expensive than semester-length programs (in large measure because there are certain fixed costs, such as transportation, that are the same for short and long programs).

However, short-term programs fill an important need. Most are offered during the summer months and provide students greater flexibility in fitting in a study abroad experience. For many students, a summer experience is their only option. Also, even though the per-credit cost of short study abroad programs is usually higher, the generally lower total cost for short-term programs provides students of limited financial means options that fit their constraints.

Components and Determinants of Cost

Study abroad costs vary significantly depending on several factors:

1. Program location. Unit costs are generally high for certain world regions (e.g., Western Europe) and major urban settings; and usually, but not always, lower in less developed and developing areas.

2. Institutional policies and business model. Do institutions charge students for actual costs abroad or is billing on a “cost plus” basis? Does the institution subsidize certain on
campus costs (e.g., running an office of study abroad) or recover these costs through study abroad administrative fees? In cases of high on-campus tuition costs, are differences between these on-campus rates and actual instructional costs abroad treated as institutional surplus, returned to students, or used to offset other costs of study abroad?

3. Study abroad as a profit center. Does the institution see study abroad as a mechanism for generating profit or surplus for other institutional purposes?

4. Exchange rates. When the U.S. dollar weakens against foreign currencies, the cost of study abroad can escalate significantly, often unpredictably and quickly. This leads most providers to place “subject to change” clauses in information and contracts and/or develop reserves to cover exchange fluctuations. In either case, higher costs are passed on to students.

Costs also vary significantly depending on other specific factors. For example:

1. **International transportation.** A major factor is whether the program provider is able to arrange significant discounts through group contracts. Another is the degree of price-cutting competition existing for certain routes and distance. Round trip airfare for more distant locations, such as Australia and Africa, will easily average $1500 to $2000 or more, even with discounts. Western European locations can vary from $400 at the very low end to $800 or so at the high end. Time of year and restrictions, such as change penalties or group departure and return requirements, can also affect price.

2. **Type of housing.** The per-day cost of housing can vary substantially depending on whether university dorms abroad are available, if accommodations are shared or single, and prevailing area rental rates if housing must be obtained on the open market. Costs will be driven also by requirements that housing meet basic codes for health and safety. Even when homestays are used there are costs associated with securing and monitoring those arrangements, and compensation for host families.

3. **Food.** Is food part of a room and board package, or can students self-cater (via cooking facilities in the housing), or must they routinely “eat out.” In “developed” countries, food costs will rival or exceed those found in the United States for most of these options. Food costs can be significantly less in less-developed countries, but care must be exercised to ensure quality and safety while controlling costs.

4. **In-country transportation.** This cost will vary significantly depending on the number of and distance to field trip locations, mode of transportation, attention to safety standards, and the proximity of housing and instructional venues to one another. Programs with large in-country field trip components or with multiple country locations can easily add from several hundred dollars to a thousand dollars or more of additional transportation costs.

5. **Tuition.** A core issue is whether tuition charged for the academic and instructional part of the study abroad program is similar to or differs substantially from on-campus tuition costs on a per-credit or other equivalent basis. Factors that can drive tuition costs higher
include:

- Does the home institution charge its normal tuition and use this revenue to meet instructional costs and fees abroad or does the institution “double” charge—students pay the home institution tuition to transfer credits back, as well as paying tuition to the host institution abroad? costs abroad from its normal tuition income regardless if tuition costs are higher abroad?
- Does the home institution design programs and negotiate tuition costs or instructional fees abroad so as not to exceed or be less than its normal on-campus rates?

There is also an issue as to the institution's prevailing tuition rate. The rate at public institutions can easily be one half to a third of that at private institutions and in-state rates are often half those of out-of-state tuition rates.

Low institutional tuition rates put additional pressure on cutting costs abroad, as well as charging a supplemental tuition cost. Alternatively, private institutions can often realize a significant surplus when their normally high tuition rates produce significantly more than needed to cover instructional costs abroad. For private institutions, however, this assumed surplus shrinks or disappears through scholarship discounting for students both on and off campus.

6. Study abroad administrative fee. Some institutions charge a study abroad overhead or administrative fee in addition to fees charged to cover all direct costs—a practice that is becoming more common. These fees can vary greatly from a few hundred dollars to well over a thousand dollars per student. The fees are typically set to support administrative and advising services associated with a study abroad office on campus.

7. Health insurance and evacuation and repatriation insurance. A major cost factor is whether students can be covered on parents', employers' or Medicaid policies while abroad or whether their health insurance is part of a university plan that provides coverage abroad. It is not typical for a parent’s plan to have coverage designed to work well when a student is abroad. It is increasingly the case that an institution will require (as program providers typically do) the study abroad participant to purchase customized international insurance, often as a part of a group plan. If none of these options is available to the student, significant additional costs of up to several hundred dollars per month will be incurred. Study abroad participants are typically encouraged or required to have evacuation and repatriation coverage, and premiums will vary depending on the extent and nature of coverage. It is not unusual for reasonably complete coverage to cost between 75 cents and $1 per day abroad.

8. Program fee. This is a “grab bag” category and can be used to incorporate many of the categories above, plus some additional costs, such as cost recovery for on-site program directors or home-institution faculty accompanying and teaching on the program. Study abroad programs generally include both direct academic costs (e.g., tuition at a foreign institution, home campus faculty salaries, classroom rental, etc.) as well as nonacademic costs that would not be covered by tuition alone if on-campus in the United States. Such additional costs include excursions related to the academic program, student housing and
meals, travel and on-site expenses of accompanying home campus faculty, insurance, and campus-based expenses related to the program (such as production of a program brochure, telephone and postage charges, etc.).

A lump-sum study abroad program fee is often charged to cover expenses such as those above if they are not covered by tuition. Additionally, some institutions do not charge any “tuition” for their study abroad programs but opt to put all program expenses (academic and nonacademic) into one lump program fee. This is often the case when a campus “resells” a program provided by a third-party provider.

There is the further issue that program costs are of two types: fixed and variable. Program fees are usually set to cover both. If the number of participants on a program is high, then fixed costs can be more easily spread, driving down the fixed-cost part of the program fee. This is a reality whether the program is offered by a higher education institution, consortium, or third-party provider. Many study abroad consortia arrangements first start as a way to spread high fixed costs across several institutions’ students. If numbers are insufficient from a single institution, consortia arrangements add participants, thereby decreasing the fixed-cost charge.

Third-party providers of study abroad tend to price their programs from a somewhat commercial perspective, attempting to cover their costs (and in the case of for-profit entities, earn a profit). Among the factors that effect their pricing approach include volume, demand for the study abroad program location, and what value participants put on being on that program in that location. A third-party program provider might set a fee below cost as a way to create demand, or to have a loss-leader in order to be able to provide a broad selection of destinations to market to institutions and students. Higher education institutions use similar strategies as a means to broaden the range of options available to students. In such cases, more heavily enrolled programs will end up subsidizing the costs of the less heavily enrolled ones. This is consistent with budgetary practices in higher education generally; that is, on-campus disciplines are cross-subsidized as a means of preserving a full range of on-campus courses and programs for students.

9. Type of study abroad program (home institution programs compared to options from other institutions and providers). Students at larger institutions usually can choose from a wide range of study abroad programs offered by their own institution. However, students at smaller institutions may not have many, if any, programs offered by their own institution. These students must either choose to go on a program sponsored by another institution (if they will accept outside students) or choose to participate in a program offered by a third-party study abroad program provider. Going on another institution’s program can involve extra costs, such as out-of-state tuition or private school tuition.

Choosing a study abroad program offered by a third-party program provider may also entail added costs. Some providers are not affiliated with a university and therefore must
re-create the services typically provided at institutions (billing, student records, etc.), resulting in higher overhead costs. Since providers are financially self-supporting entities with no support or subsidies from states or universities, all overhead costs must be recovered through program fees that students pay.

10. Study abroad as a revenue source for the host institution abroad. Some of the most popular study abroad destinations (Australia and the U.K. are examples) view study abroad by American students as a revenue source for their institutions, resulting in high study abroad or non degree tuition rates as compared to prevailing tuition rates for host country, degree-seeking students.

In Summary

Study abroad costs vary substantially. Some can be controlled by prudent program planning and deliberate attention to cost amelioration. Regardless, several thousand dollars in costs are the minimum typical “buy in” price to participating on a study abroad program. And although many of these costs can be seen as “replacements” for on-campus costs, there are significant additional marginal expenses associated with study abroad when compared to typical on-campus costs. Student financial aid is not always portable, but if institutions attend to liberalizing their financial aid policies to accommodate study abroad, some of the difficulties that may arise with financial aid can be greatly moderated. Given the high percentage of students who work while attending college, and that half of college students attend part-time, a study abroad experience can lead to significant foregone income (income often essential for students to pay educational bills).

Cost is a barrier to students participating—particularly for students from middle and lower income backgrounds. If cost barriers to increased participation in study abroad are to be lowered, additional scholarship support expressly designed to meet marginal costs associated with study abroad will be essential, and it will be important that such scholarship support be in addition to, rather than supplanting, current sources of scholarships and other financial aid.
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J—Safety, Health, and Security in Study Abroad

The success of a study abroad program has many components and few so conspicuous in contemporary times as health and safety. Indeed, there is a critical link between study abroad program success and student health and safety. Inattention to matters of health and safety not only puts participants at unacceptable personal risk, but threatens the quality of the study abroad program. Recognition of this connection has led over time to innovations and program models that reinforce good health practices, responsible behavior, and administrative attention to safety practices. Appropriate attention to health and safety when designing and delivering a study abroad program is a necessary condition for meeting even minimal levels of program quality and minimizing risks to participants.

A Partnership. Achieving safety and security in study abroad involves a partnership among all involved: program providers, home institutions, host institutions abroad, and students themselves.

For all those involved in designing and providing programs, attention to health and safety in site selection, program design and logistics, and ongoing monitoring and adjustments as safety and health conditions warrant become prime obligations. Adequately educating and preparing students about health and safety risks abroad and providing them with the resources to become fully informed not only about the risks but “do and don’t” behaviors is also an obligation of providers and home and host institutions. Students have an obligation not to engage in risky behaviors or ignore sound advice and rules of the program. And, as all risk can never be eliminated, all involved in study abroad have roles to play for handling emergencies abroad—in particular, having procedures and contingency plans in place in case of emergency.

Getting the Balance Right. There is no way to eliminate all risk in any learning enterprise. This applies equally whether the educational setting is on the home campus or in a study abroad setting. Also, attempts to eliminate risk can seriously impact many of the learning objectives of a study abroad experience.

For example, eliminating field trips and confining the study abroad experience to the classroom will of course eliminate threats posed by indigenous transportation systems, but students in turn become isolated in the sterile classroom and exposure to the indigenous culture is minimized. Why study abroad merely to sit in another classroom? On the other hand, there is a clear need to avoid field trips to locations of known serious danger (e.g., insurgencies) or over dangerous roads using unreliable transport or eating unsafe food while in the field.

It is always important to balance adequate attention to safety and security needs with the legitimate learning objectives of programs. For some institutions, having an independent assessment process (independent of program designers and providers) is necessary to evaluate whether the appropriate balance between safety and learning has been achieved in a particular program design.
History and Current Practice

History. Concern for student health and safety has long been a critical component of responsible study abroad programs. Advising participants about safety issues is manifest in the materials for U.S. study abroad participants from at least as early as the 1920s. Formalized professional guidance for study abroad administrators contains information on legal considerations and emergencies from at least as early 1979, and by the late 1980s—partly in reaction to international terrorism and its potential impact on study abroad—professional guidance was extensively expanded. A primary focus on this period of development was preparing students for traditional health challenges faced while abroad, as well as early efforts at sharing accurate and timely information about security issues that related to postponing or canceling study abroad programs in response to terrorism.

Sophistication about health, safety, and security issues was markedly advanced during the 1990s, beginning notably with attention to the adequacy of appropriate health and accident insurance and more elaborate orientation efforts related to basic health issues. Much of this sophistication was developed in an environment that recognized both the growth of overall study abroad participation levels and the increasing diversity in program models and destinations. By the middle of the last decade, an interested and motivated U.S. undergraduate could reasonably expect to study virtually anywhere in the world—and with that potential came a greater variety of health and safety challenges for students and their parents, as well as for U.S. higher education institutions and other program providers.

Although there is understandable attention at this moment in history on security issues related to health and safety for U.S. students abroad, it is the everyday health issues students face, whether on a U.S. campus or abroad, that largely dominate the enterprise of study abroad. Basic health and insurance coverage are typical concerns. Public health issues like potable water, road safety, and other local environmental concerns such as crime are also first-tier concerns. Student behavior issues related to alcohol and drug abuse, as well as interpersonal matters that constitute risky behavior and increased exposure to health dangers, are also typically an important concern for study abroad programs and students and their parents.

Current Practice. Partly in response to greater public scrutiny, notably applied by the national media and parents of U.S. college students, the professional study abroad community endeavored to create a set of guidelines—now known as Responsible Study Abroad: Good Practices for Health and Safety—that would offer program providers (including U.S. colleges and universities), student participants, and their parents an outline of health, safety, and security practices that were reasonable to provide and expect. Released in 1998, the statement of good practices is widely acknowledged as the educational community’s expression of what constitutes a healthy and safe study abroad program.
Health, safety, and security issues have faced renewed attention following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States, as have health issues like the pandemics of HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, and the outbreak of SARS. U.S. student interest in studying at non-Western European sites—notably in the Arab Middle East, as well as in Central and South Asia—have also renewed public attention to this issue.

There is no formal governmental control or oversight (though critical information and advice is available from such government agencies as the Department of State and the Centers for Disease Control), little legal precedent on questions of liability, and a host of issues that are in flux for other reasons (e.g., student privacy laws, limitations on sharing health records, the public’s expectations about higher education’s role in supervising young adults). Much of what is provided and expected for safety and security in specific study abroad settings is individually crafted by each study abroad program in response to the style and philosophy of a given program (e.g., intensive language immersion versus an “island” program), the location of educational sojourn, and, increasingly, with guidance from the wider study abroad community.

The U.S. higher education community, and particularly those concerned with international education and study abroad, has collectively crafted a fair body of professional guidance intended to address this issue. One such example is referenced above. In addition to the “good practices document”, institutions have begun to develop their own “institutional protocols” that provide overall guidance on issues of health and safety for all programs and students falling under their purview. The appendices provide several examples: (1) a relatively complete institutional health, safety and emergency protocol from Michigan State University (Appendix IX); (2) a checklist for health and safety abroad developed at Montana State University (Appendix X); and (3) a reprint of the Responsible Study Abroad: Good Practices For Health and Safety document that was developed a few years ago by a coalition of members of the national study abroad community (Appendix XI).
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K-Study Abroad Quality Control

The core issue of quality in study abroad is the program’s intellectual content and rigor and the value of its learning outcomes. Other contributions to program quality include attention to safety, program pedagogy, and logistics. The federal government has an interest in promoting quality in higher education generally and particularly in programs that meet national needs. While encouraging processes that enhance quality, the federal government traditionally avoids imposing its own definitions and criteria of quality. Rather, criteria are left to higher education and to the professions and disciplines. This reduces federal intrusion into areas traditionally reserved for higher education and the states.

The Established Means for Quality Assurance

Under the American higher education system, three established and mutually reinforcing processes exist for assessing and promoting educational quality. Each of the methods is currently in use in study abroad quality assurance. Faculty review for awarding academic credit: The most important quality assurance process is faculty review of course and program content to determine whether academic credit should be awarded for work that meets standards. Faculty and academic administrators determine required content, and assess whether the program of study meets standards of quality, rigor, and value. The basis for assessment is the course’s contribution to intended learning outcomes.

Coursework done abroad for which credit is awarded by the home campus is assessed by home campus faculty in the department awarding credit to ensure that the learning outcomes meet the home campus standards. This is similar to the process for assessing course credit transferred from one U.S. institution to another.

Accreditation: Faculty and institutional review is supplemented with assessments by national and regional higher education accreditation bodies. These bodies set overarching standards of quality within their purview and have the power to withhold institutional and program accreditation. Denying accreditation negatively impacts institutional funding, student access to financial aid, and peer and employer assessments of the value of courses and degrees offered by the institution.

As part of existing overarching institutional accreditation, study abroad programs must demonstrate that they meet the overall goals and standards of the academic institution and provide comparable quality. Guidelines: In addition to institutional and accreditation reviews, some professional bodies and associations offer guidelines, which, although not binding, serve as powerful indicators of recommended content or procedures. As noted later, several study abroad professional associations have generated such guidelines for the study abroad community.

The quality-control process remains centered at the campus level, with decisions made there about whether to award academic credit for a course or program. This decentralized process has produced a richly diverse marketplace of courses and curricular options that
serve the nation well, and in the minds of many, has produced the world’s best higher education system. Expansion of study abroad opportunity, as well as actual participation, requires a similar diversity of program options, designs, content, and locations in order to meet the very different learning objectives of diverse majors and students.

An often vexing issue is how quality control and diversity can be pursued simultaneously. Standards of quality can sometimes lead to standardization and a squeezing out of innovation and needed market diversity. Approaches to quality control should not be so narrowly defined as to limit needed diversity and innovation.

**Quality Assessment and Diversity in Study Abroad Programming**

Different kinds of study abroad models and programs have different learning objectives and intended outcomes. How quality is measured will differ from program to program. The need is to have program designers and providers and faculty reviewers define how quality is defined and measured in their programs.

The federal interest is in encouraging attention to quality control, rather than rigidly specifying its meaning. Many national professional and academic standards bodies have recognized the need to approach quality control in a manner that permits diversity in program goals and design. Accrediting bodies use a well-established process that includes:

- Requiring institutions and program providers to answer questions about goals, quality, and outcome measures while allowing latitude in how the questions are answered.
- Having institutions and program providers identify learning goals and objectives, as well as the standards to which they subsequently will be held accountable.
- Charging assessors with determining whether core questions have been adequately addressed in the program or course plan and, subsequently, in course and program outcomes.

This process parallels the one used in peer reviews of competitive research and project grants. It balances the need to be responsive to priorities and accountability with the need for flexibility and innovation.

The federal interest in study abroad quality can be advanced through a process that parallels the steps above. For example, federal funds for program development seed grants or scholarships could require applicants to satisfactorily identify:

1. Program or course learning objectives and the content and pedagogy for achieving the learning objectives
2. A campus-based process for reviewing and approving course learning objectives, academic quality, and rigor
3. How academic credit will be awarded to students who successfully complete the study abroad experience
4. Procedures for ongoing or periodic assessment of program quality and outcomes
A Short History of Study Abroad Quality Assurance Processes

Over the years, and particularly in the past decade, study abroad professionals have developed and articulated a set of standards by which to assess and ensure the quality of the study abroad programs managed by campuses or by study abroad providers off campus. Because any such program offered by U.S. campuses is subject to review as part of that campus’s overall accreditation process by the appropriate regional accrediting agency, there is no separate accreditation process for study abroad.

The study abroad community has produced various statements of quality assurance. In the 1960s and 1970s, Lilly Von Klemperer helped train a generation of study abroad advisers and produced a seminal article, “How to Read Study Abroad Literature,” which has been reprinted annually in IIE’s study abroad directories, to help readers assess the quality of the programs they are considering. (See enclosed CD).

During the 1980s and 1990s, the Section on U.S. Students Abroad of NAFSA: Association of International Educators developed various statements of “best practices” for study abroad administrators. See the latest version, Principles for U.S. Study Abroad, on the NAFSA web site: www.nafsa.org/content/InsideNAFSA/EthicsandStandards/PrinciplesStudyAbroad.htm.

In 2002 the Forum on Education Abroad was created to promote high quality and effective programming in study abroad through advocating good practice and promoting excellence in curriculum development and academic design, among other goals. This fall, the Forum (currently representing about 150 members whose programs send abroad about half of the U.S. study abroad students reported in Open Doors) is publishing a set of voluntary “Standards of Good Practice for Education Abroad” that will be widely shared within the study abroad community. See the Forum’s web site, www.forumea.org/pdfs/ForumStandards.pdf, for more information on current recommended Forum practices.
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I—Existing Federal Role in Study Abroad

Since the end of World War II, the federal role in study abroad has been manifest in three general areas: foreign policy, educational policy, and national security. In each case, study abroad has been utilized as a mechanism for addressing policy goals. The role of study abroad has evolved into its niche in federal programming over time, beginning with a foreign policy focus, followed by educational interests, and lastly (and comparatively recently) including national security concerns.

There is also a cross-cutting motivation in two pieces of federal legislation that focus on financial need for study abroad participants.

Foreign Policy and Study Abroad

Though not specifically labeled as study abroad, the first major policy inclusion of this activity was with the 1946 establishment of the Fulbright program (subsequently rewritten and expanded as the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961—the Fulbright-Hays Act—see http://www.ed.gov/programs/iegpsddrap/legislation.html for current statutory language). Conceived of as a way to foster mutual understanding and peaceful relations in the postwar period as a matter of U.S. foreign policy, the Fulbright program (and its attendant other programmatic activities contemplated under the act) clearly included flows of American students and scholars overseas as part of the exchange of persons. In some sense, the Fulbright student program is the single best-known study abroad program—though in contemporary times, its focus on post-undergraduate activities means it has little direct bearing on traditional undergraduate study abroad.

The vast majority of Fulbright-related activities is undertaken through the U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) and funded by an annual appropriation through the Commerce, Justice, and State spending bill. One component—and the one most relevant to undergraduate study abroad—is administered by the U.S. Department of Education. Known as the “overseas” component of the international education programs within the Bureau of Postsecondary Education and often referred to by its statutory subparagraph (e.g., Fulbright-Hays 102(b)(6)), these Education Department programs are focused primarily on current and future teachers, and include a series of programs such as doctoral research and group projects. It is the group projects category that includes specific support for undergraduate overseas language study through study abroad. These programs are funded through an annual Labor, Health and Human Services (HHS), and Education spending bill.

The most recent significant addition to the corpus of exchange programs related to study abroad is the 2000 addition of the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program. Named for the congressman who proposed the program, it is designed as a
straightforward needs-based scholarship program for undergraduate study abroad activities. The program, funded through ECA, supported 365 awardees in the 2003–2004 academic year.

Education Policy and Study Abroad

A dozen years after the creation of the initial Fulbright program, Congress acted in the Cold War/Sputnik period to create a series of subsidized programs designed to enhance and improve U.S. higher education with enactment of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958.

Subsequent congressional action recast that same legislative framework as the contemporary Higher Education Act (HEA) in 1965. Title VI of the act (see http://www.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/hea98/sec601.html for text of current law) includes provisions for the study of foreign languages and area studies, as well as international business studies, and authorizes grants and support for study that can include overseas study, as well as research on these activities. Among the best known grants under the Title VI provisions are grants to individual students for Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships. Historically, undergraduates have participated in this program, but at present the statute restricts eligibility to only graduate and postdoctoral students for these awards.

There is, however, a specific section of HEA that focuses on undergraduate international and foreign language studies, Section 604. The statutory language includes references to permitted activities that include the development of “education abroad” programs, a term generally recognized as broader in scope than “study abroad.” There is also a provision under the business and international education programs of Title VI for study abroad programs for business students (here the term used is study abroad).

Finally, added in a 1992 reauthorization of HEA’s Title VI, Congress created a separate program called the Institute for International Public Policy aimed at students attending higher education institutions with significant minority populations (e.g., HBCUs) to support a “junior year abroad program.”

Congress authorized a separate International Education Act in 1966. However, funding for that set of authorized programs was never forthcoming, and so the programs contemplated never materialized.

Congress has also acted in another section of HEA to specifically authorize federal financial aid eligibility for study abroad undertaken for academic credit. With the passage of the HEA amendments and reauthorization in 1992, Congress made Title IV Student Assistance specifically available to U.S. students engaged in study abroad, so long as certain academic and procedural requirements were met. For students interested in overseas study who were constrained by financial need, this change made a large source of potential assistance available on parity with students who did not study abroad.
All of the funding for these education-oriented programs comes through the annual Labor, HHS, and Education funding legislation.

National Security and Study Abroad

While the correlation of study abroad with national security—broadly defined in terms of foreign affairs, economic preparedness, and high-level educational expertise—underlies all of the federal initiatives outlined above, it was not until the Soviet Union and its immediate satellite countries began their move to a postcommunist era that Congress directly addressed study abroad as a national security activity. It did so with the 1991 enactment of the National Security Education Act, creating the National Security Education Program (NSEP), which awards scholarships and fellowships to undergraduate and graduate students to study foreign language and other subjects of importance to the nation's security in exchange for an obligation of national service to a U.S. government agency or body with national security responsibilities (see http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2003_cr/hr3676.html#txt for a copy of the current statute). The awards are named David L. Boren scholarships and fellowships for the senator who championed the establishment of the program. The program is administered by the U.S. Department of Defense and is currently funded through a trust fund. Funds in that trust will likely be depleted in 2005, although there is an effort underway to alter the funding mechanism by moving to an annual appropriation that would presumably be included in the Defense Department spending bill. NSEP's provision of grants to U.S. undergraduates stipulates that the study supported is to be overseas in world areas that are critical to national security and must be in places other than Western Europe, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The emphasis of these scholarships is to build knowledge of and competencies in other languages and cultures. Since the program's creation over a decade ago, Congress has imposed a service requirement on undergraduates that requires program alumni to seek employment with national security-related entities in the U.S. government. Congress has periodically amended this requirement and may do so again in 2004.

The graduate fellowships are similar to the undergraduate scholarships although they technically do not require overseas study (as a practical matter, virtually all graduate students use their NSEP fellowships to pursue their studies and research abroad). Fellowship recipients have always had a service requirement similar in content to the provisions currently affecting undergraduates, although Congress has amended that requirement in the past and may do so again in 2004.

The NSEP program also has an institutional grants provision that in the past has been used to develop innovative program models and strategies to increase U.S. study abroad participation in less common study abroad sites that would serve national security interests. In recent years, the Defense Department has recast—with congressional support—the institutional grants into a language flagship program designed to train U.S. students to achieve high language proficiency levels in targeted, strategically important critical foreign languages. The pilot stage of this program is underway for the
languages of Arabic, Chinese, Korean, and Russian; and in each case some study abroad component is required of the students involved in the program.
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**M—Sustainability: Achieving Expanded Participation in Study Abroad**

At what point does expanded participation in study abroad become permanent and self-perpetuating? And, what are the indicators and preconditions for reaching such a point?

**Institutional Factors in Sustainability**

Important ingredients to achieving sustainable levels of expanded study abroad participation are (1) reaching a point where students who come to college (and their parents) fully expect that study abroad will be a part of their undergraduate experience and (2) dealing effectively with institutional barriers to student participation.

As reported in other sections of this briefing book, a majority of college-bound students and the general public already believe that study abroad should be a part of the undergraduate experience. The unanswered question is, “What portion actually think that they will study abroad and actively plan to do so?” The answer to this question will vary from institution to institution, but a critical issue to sustained growth in participation is whether the numbers grow of those who actively plan to participate and are subsequently able to do so.

Student and parent expectations are important to reaching sustainability for study abroad. When a significant proportion of students and families expect to incorporate a study abroad experience and plan for that eventuality (perhaps even choosing an institution because of its study abroad commitment), then significant and unavoidable pressures build among the student clientele population for institutional support and accommodation of study abroad. In effect, when the “market” itself expresses significant demand, an important ingredient in reaching sustainability has been achieved.

Student and parent expectations and behaviours are influenced by messages emanating from institutional leadership. It is a powerful signal when presidents and provosts say to students that study abroad is an expected part of the undergraduate experience. But without follow-up, the message can be lost in myriad pressures that befall the undergraduate student. So, institutional leadership must remain on message. Still, this is not enough because the message needs reinforcement through faculty and academic advisers who have the face-to-face contact with students.

The related institutional factor is how well internal barriers to study abroad have been addressed. Although the factors involved in this will vary somewhat from institution to institution, one way to catalogue needed actions and assess progress is with a checklist (or perhaps a type of barometer of institutional commitment and success). One such checklist follows.
A Sample Checklist of Institutional Commitment to Dealing with Barriers in the Interest of Sustained Growth in Study Abroad

VISION. Has the institution forged and broadly publicized an institutional vision and goal for expanding participation in study and learning abroad as a core feature of its commitment to internationalizing education?

LEADERSHIP AND ADVOCACY. Have the president and the provost advocated for expanded study abroad participation and cultivated the support of academic leaders and faculty throughout the institution to expand study abroad opportunity?

DIVERSIFICATION. Is there evidence of expanding opportunity for all majors by diversifying types, locations, and subject matter of program options?

INTEGRATION. What is the evidence that study and learning abroad opportunities are being integrated into the institution’s curriculum and academic majors and facilitated by applying credit earned abroad to meeting degree requirements?

PREPARATION. Are there programs to prepare students intellectually, emotionally, and practically to effectively live and learn abroad in a different culture?

REINTEGRATION. Are there programs to reintegrate returning study abroad students back into campus life that both consolidate and expand on the learning abroad at the individual level and further internationalize the overall on-campus learning environment?

COST CONTROL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT. Is there evidence that the institution has successfully implemented an integrated set of strategies that increase the affordability of study and learning abroad for all students by reducing program costs and institutional overhead and by increasing access to student financial support?

SAFETY. Does the institution assess study abroad sites and programs for health, safety, and security, and adopt institutional policies and practices to minimize risk?

INCENTIVES. Has the institution created incentives for students to participate in study abroad and for academic units and faculty to actively support it?

ASSESSMENT. Does the institution evaluate study abroad programs to measure and improve quality and assess the impact of study abroad on students, faculty, and the institution as a whole?

It may not be that all items in the above checklist are of equal importance in sustaining widened participation in study abroad, but all have some degree of contribution to make. And the list, in total, represents an overarching and systematic way to assess institutional commitment to supporting and integrating study abroad into the undergraduate experience.
The challenges of the new millennium are unquestionably global in nature. This reality imposes a new and urgent demand on Americans, one this country has been all too quick to ignore: international knowledge and skills are imperative for the future security and competitiveness of the United States. The rhetoric of a decade attests to the widespread recognition of this fundamental truth, yet concrete steps to fulfill this need have been few. Strong leadership and a coherent policy are still lacking, and the cost of inaction grows ever greater.

To address this serious deficit in global competence, the report of NAFSA's Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad proposes a national effort to promote study abroad. We strongly believe that the events of September 11, 2001, constituted a wake-up call—a warning that America's ignorance of the world is now a national liability. Americans in vastly greater numbers must devote a substantive portion of their education to gaining an understanding of other countries, regions, languages, and cultures, through direct personal experience.

We use the term "national effort," rather than "federal program," advisedly. Although the federal role is crucial, the states, the private sector, higher education institutions, and state and regional accrediting bodies must all step up to the plate and do their part to promote study abroad. Here is what must be done:

The president and Congress must articulate this urgent national priority, provide a legislative framework and resources appropriate to the urgency of the problem, and remove regulatory barriers to study abroad.

Governors and state legislatures must make international education an integral part of their strategic planning for enhancing state economic development and competitiveness.

College and university presidents must implement strategies to encourage study abroad on a schoolwide basis. They must involve the faculty, ease curricular rigidities, counter financial disincentives, and create new study abroad models and diverse study abroad options that recognize the changed demographics of U.S. higher education today and make study abroad accessible to the broadest possible spectrum of students.

The private sector must do more to encourage and assist schools in producing the globally competent workforce it requires.

Professional licensing and accrediting agencies must build global competence into the curricular standards that they set for professional schools.
It is the hope of the task force that this report will stimulate a long-overdue dialogue among these parties and lead to a national effort to ensure that far greater numbers of American students pursue part of their higher education abroad.

Appendix II
Ensuring Future U.S. International Engagement Through College and University Study Abroad
John K. Hudzik, Michigan State University

Abstract
We propose a new federal program in partnership with U.S. higher education to increase student participation in undergraduate study abroad. The term "study abroad" means educational programs for which academic credit is awarded in a student’s undergraduate program for study, internships, research or service learning done outside the United States.

We identify three interconnected strategies that are essential to expanded participation and value:
Federal study abroad scholarships, matched by private, state, or higher education institutional sources.
Program development and quality assurance grants to expand the number and kind of high quality, safe, and cost-effective study abroad programs, especially in strategic areas of the world and for under-represented majors and groups.
Pre-conditions for higher education institutions to qualify for participation in such a federal program (e.g., integration of study abroad into undergraduate curricula, institutional commitment to expand study abroad participation by its students, institutional efforts to reduce barriers to study abroad through cost control, and institutional attention to program quality and safety, and reduction of curricular barriers to participation).

We outline these general strategies for purposes of discussion, and, perhaps, to serve later as a foundation for subsequent specific legislative proposals.

The Challenge to the Nation

In dozens of studies, reports and public opinion polls U.S. citizens reveal a woeful lack of basic knowledge about world affairs and other societies, as well as shortcomings in cross-cultural understanding and foreign language skills. These deficiencies have serious consequences for U.S. national security, economic well-being, and U.S. capacity for global leadership.

The Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange stated several years ago that if we fail to internationalize sufficiently our educational institutions, including expansion of student opportunities for study and work abroad, we would irreversibly diminish the world status of the United States.

By providing hands-on learning and practical experience, study abroad contributes significantly to the international education and global understanding of U.S. undergraduates and citizens, and thus serves both national security and economic
competitiveness goals. Study abroad develops a workforce and a citizenry who are directly informed about the dynamics of globalization.

Findings from well over 200 studies consistently document the practical outcomes from study and learning abroad. The most commonly cited benefits are broadened perspective and knowledge, improved foreign language proficiency, improved cross-cultural understanding and communication skills, greater ability to live and work effectively in other cultures, openness to diversity, and enhanced career choices.

Study abroad develops a workforce and a citizenry who are directly informed about the dynamics of globalization. Study abroad provides the real-life practice that supplements on-campus classroom learning in how to live and work effectively in a global environment.

Present U.S. rates of participation in study abroad and language study are very low: Only 3% of U.S. college students in four-year programs participate annually; and less than 1% of all students attending post-secondary education ever study abroad. By contrast, the European Union’s Erasmus program is rapidly expanding study abroad among students from member nations. For example, 30% of Austria’s college students study abroad. Over the last 30 years, the average number of U.S. students studying a foreign language has fallen from 16% to 8.7%.

While about 150,000 U.S. students study abroad annually (most in semester-length or shorter programs), well over 500,000 foreign students study in the United States each year (a large proportion in degree programs). U.S. students clearly are behind in gaining firsthand knowledge about the world. Although actual participation and learning rates are relatively low, the aspirations of students and the general public are much higher. In public opinion polls:

One-half to two-thirds of prospective freshmen say that they want or intend to study abroad;

More than 75% of the general public think foreign language study should be required in the “K-12” years and 60% think it should be required in college; and

Nearly 70% of the general public believe that study abroad should be encouraged or required of undergraduates.

The huge gap between aspiration and actual participation is the result of powerful barriers that limit access to undergraduate study and learning abroad.

The cost of study abroad over standard college expenses is one barrier.

The lack of diverse study abroad options—denying access for students in many majors (especially those outside the liberal arts)—is another.

Widespread failures in higher education to integrate study abroad into the undergraduate curriculum marginalize its value to students and limit the contribution study abroad can make toward efforts to internationalize learning and curricula. The additional expense of study abroad (e.g., airfare) is undoubtedly a hindrance to access, particularly for students from middle and lower income families. A majority of U.S. students work while attending school (70% or more on many campuses). The income helps to meet living and educational costs, which is especially important for the growing proportion of
nontraditional students. For these working students, foregone income while studying abroad raises the barrier even higher.

Substantial increases in federal study abroad scholarship funds are needed to "democratize" access and encourage broader participation. Rigid curricula make it impossible for many students to incorporate a study abroad experience into their programs; many curricula do not count study abroad credits toward graduation requirements; parochial attitudes among some faculties depreciate the value of anything learned abroad; and competing agendas on campuses push innovation in study abroad to the back burner. Fear of other cultures, absence of institutional commitment to expanding study abroad opportunity, and an absence of program innovation also contribute to the gap between aspirations and participation.

The Federal Role

The federal government plays a pivotal role in collaborating with higher education and the private sector in advancing many areas of learning, especially when widening access, encouraging innovation and improving quality are needed in the national interest. There is a critical national need for a well-informed citizenry with first-hand information about other countries and an ability to operate effectively in an increasingly interdependent, competitive, and dangerous world environment.

There is a national need for federal leadership to widen access to and transform U.S. study abroad through the following.

Scholarships
Substantial increases in federal study abroad scholarship funds are needed to "democratize" access and encourage broader participation by reducing financial barriers, especially for lower and middle-income students.

Program Development and Quality Improvement Grants
Program development grants made to qualifying higher education institutions and non-profit higher education organizations are needed in order to expand innovative, high quality study abroad options, especially for underrepresented majors and groups and for under-enrolled strategic regions of the world.

Higher Education Institutional Commitment
Pre-conditions to qualify for federal funds are needed to encourage higher education institutions to reduce on campus curricular and other barriers to study abroad and to enhance program quality, accountability, and safety.

None of the existing federal programs that directly or indirectly support study abroad meet the full range of these needs and purposes. It may be that one or more existing federal programs could be augmented or restructured for the goals and purposes outlined above (for example, the Gilman Scholarship Program or the Fulbright-Hays Program). Whether under a new program or through modifications to an existing one, the objectives should be to support widened access and innovation, to encourage integration and the reduction of campus-based barriers, and to enhance quality and accountability. Federal
assistance through scholarships and program development grants can be a catalyst for change.

Planning Concepts for Discussion: A Federal Program to Expand Access to and Innovation in High Quality Study Abroad

Program Goal and Objectives
The goal is to achieve a study abroad participation rate of 25% among undergraduates within eight years and 40% within twelve years of establishing the program.

Federal assistance through scholarships and program development grants can be a catalyst for change. The program, which would provide new money for study abroad scholarships and for program development and quality assurance seed grants, would support expanded access, participation, and accountability by:

1. Providing scholarships for undergraduate students focused on broadening access and participation, including addressing the special needs of economically disadvantaged students and first-generation college students, and other under-represented groups.
2. Expanding high quality and safe study and learning options in all world regions (especially outside Western Europe), for all majors (especially in professional disciplines), and by incorporating innovative formats (e.g., internships).
3. Reducing barriers to study abroad by establishing conditions for institutions to qualify for federal support: For example, by requiring institutions to attend to controlling program costs, encouraging integration of study abroad and language learning into undergraduate curricula, easing transfer of academic credit from abroad, supporting program options for the growing number of students who begin work at community colleges and transfer to four-year institutions, and adequately preparing students for study abroad and re-integration into the campus environment on return.

Categories of New Federal Support
We propose a program of substantial annual federal support and a requirement for matching funds from other sources (with at least 80% of Federal funds reserved for scholarships and up to 20% of federal funds available for program development and quality and safety assurance seed grants). Federal scholarship support should be increased as system capacity and demand increase.

Scholarship Awards
Awards would be made to individual students (with at least a 2.5 GPA) to participate on qualifying study abroad programs offered by their own institution or another institution or provider (see item 4 below). A “qualifying” program would meet the criteria stated (see item 5 below) and offer academic credit that would be accepted by the student’s home institution. Scholarship funds would be used to cover all or part of documented tuition and fees, room and board, international travel to and from the program location, insurance, books, and replacement of up to some reasonable amount of foregone income. The goal is to achieve a study abroad participation rate of 25% among undergraduates within eight years and 40% within twelve years of establishing the program.
Program Development and Quality Assurance Grants
These grants would be made to qualifying higher education institutions, consortia, and non-profit higher education organizations (see item 4 below) for one or more of the following purposes:

Program Seed Grants to develop new programs meeting national needs (see item 5 below), including those for under-represented majors and groups and for under-enrolled strategic areas of the world.

Quality Assurance and Outcome Measurement Grants made to (a) develop and implement approaches for assessing study abroad program quality and accountability and to measure learning and other outcomes, (b) assemble study abroad baseline data, (c) undertake research to define evolving national study abroad program needs, or (d) conduct research on program quality, safety, learning and other outcomes.

Pass-Through Scholarships for Programs made to institutions and other providers of new qualifying programs. Providers of new programs would award scholarship support for students participating on the new programs as a means to build initial student enrollment and interest in the program.

Additional Program Features and Requirements

1. Low Income or First Generation College Students. A portion of scholarship awards should focus on increasing the participation of students with limited economic means, first-generation college families, and other under-represented groups. Students receiving federal aid would be eligible for scholarships to supplement existing aid (to the extent needed) to meet additional marginal costs associated with studying abroad (e.g., travel costs, insurance, and replacement of up to some reasonable amount of foregone income). The intention here is that a student’s aid package is not reduced by a study abroad grant.

2. Consortia Programming. A portion of program development seed grants should be allocated to encourage developing consortia or collaborative programming that involve several higher education institutions or providers.

3. Matching Funds Scholarships: The scholarship program should encourage students and their institutions to find matching support toward total study abroad costs from private sector, institutional, state, or personal sources.

Program Development and Quality Assurance Grants: All awards (i.e., program development seed grants, quality assurance and outcome measurement grants, and pass-through scholarships) would require a match. Match may come from institutional, donor, private, state or foundation sources.

4. Institutional Qualifications. To apply in an open competition for seed grants or to have their programs qualify to admit students on federal scholarships under this program, higher education institutions (or other eligible study abroad providers must demonstrate commitment to meeting the following criteria: A portion of scholarship awards should focus on increasing the participation of students with limited economic means, first-generation college families, and other under-represented groups.
Integrate the study abroad experience into the undergraduate curricula (i.e., into major or general education requirements, language learning, etc.); Adopt specific institutional goals for undergraduate study abroad participation;

Improve access to study abroad by adoption of policies that internationalize curricula, reduce economic barriers through cost control, diversify study abroad options, assure quality and integration of study abroad into the curriculum, and attend to safety and security abroad;
Establish an institutional study abroad safety and security assessment process and an ongoing commitment to student safety and security abroad;
And adopt on-going practices for assessing program quality and measuring study abroad outcomes.

5. Program Development Priorities for National Needs. A majority of scholarship awards would give priority to students participating in programs having one or more of the following characteristics:
Non-Western European program locations;
Designed for under-represented majors, e.g., sciences, engineering, business;
Using high quality and innovative instructional and experiential models;
High quality programs with low cost barriers;
Interinstitutional collaboration or partnership programs.
Bringing students to higher levels of language proficiency, including in less commonly taught languages.
Expanding the diversity of participants, including those of limited economic means, underrepresented majors and groups, and first-generation college students.
Supported by the Association of International Education Administrators.
Reviewed and endorsed by the Coalition for International Education for purposes of review by the Lincoln Commission.

Appendix II Endnotes


4 The calculation of foregone income requires assumptions. One example: a full-time student who averages 15 hours of work per week during a semester and earns, say, $7.00 per hour; hence, foregone income during the semester from this kind of work would total approximately $1,600 gross (something less net). This is only an example. There are considerable policy questions involved in setting an upper limit as well as documenting employment and foregone income, if that is desirable. An alternative approach is to simply assume foregone income for the majority of students (upward of 70% of students do work while attending school) and have scholarship awards set at a level appropriate to this assumption.

5 Non-profit higher education organizations and study abroad consortia providing high quality study abroad experiences which qualify for academic credit can apply for capacity development grants if they have one or more higher education institutional partners that meet the stated institutional qualifications.

Appendix III

Survey for U.S. Institutions on Behalf of the Advisory Council for The
Lincoln Scholarship Commission Introduction

The late U.S. senator, Paul Simon (D-ILL) proposed the formation of a U.S. national commission to investigate and report to Congress and the administration upon the desirability and feasibility of a substantial increase in U.S. student participation in study abroad. The Senator's vision included:
The need for understanding other cultures as an essential component of the education of the 21st Century student;
Special emphasis on students studying in developing nations;
Special emphasis on study abroad opportunities for underrepresented groups;
The goal of sending 500,000 students a year to match the number of international students coming to the United States.

An Advisory Council to the Commission has appointed a Research and Strategic Analysis Working Group to collect data about current capacity and feasibility of such an initiative. Thus, your responses to the following questions will greatly assist the Working Group in reporting on capacity for increasing the participation of U.S. students in study abroad.

Note: If you have difficulty responding to the questions as written, please answer as best you can and add a note to explain.

1. How many students did your institution send abroad in 2002-03 through the following avenues:
   - Bilateral exchange agreements
   - Other exchange programs
   - Faculty-led institutional programs
   - U.S. study abroad providers (no reciprocal exchanges)
   - Direct enrollment in institutions abroad with which your institution has an affiliation
   - Other

2. What is the length of study undertaken by students from your institution? Please specify the total number of students enrolled in 2002-03 in each category:
   - Semester, trimester or quarter
   - Academic year
   - Short-term (summer, or less than 10 weeks)
   - Other

3. Please estimate the number, if any, of additional students you could send abroad in your institution’s programs? (For example, your institution’s semester program in France allows you to send 20 students, but with an average number of 10 per semester, you could send 10 more students.)
   - Semester, trimester or quarter
   - Academic year
   - Short-term (summer, or less than 10 weeks)
   - Faculty-led institutional programs
   - Other

4. What is your perception of the capacity to accommodate additional student enrollments in the regions listed below in your existing programs and programs available to you? Note: Little = 1-5%; Some = 6-10%; Significant = 11% or more.
   - No program
   - None
   - 1-5%
   - 6-10%
   - 11% or more
   - Europe
   - East/Central Europe
   - Russia
   - Former Soviet states
Southeast Asia
South Asia
East Asia
Central America
Latin America
Sub-Saharan Africa
North Africa
Canada/Mexico
Australia/New Zealand

5. Is there an institutional plan for growth in education abroad, and if so, what is the goal? Over what time frame would you seek to reach the stated goals?

Timeframe (number of years)

- None
- 5 – 10%
- 10 – 20%
- 20 – 30%
- 30 – 50%
- over 50%

6. Is there an institutional plan for increasing exchanges as part of the strategy for expanding participation in education abroad, and if so, what is the goal? Over what time frame would you seek to reach the stated goals?

Timeframe (number of years)

- None
- 1 – 4%
- 5 – 10%
- 10 – 20%
- 20 – 30%
- 30 – 50%
- over 50%

If less than 5%, why? (check all that apply)

- Insufficient access for exchange students to academic departments
- Insufficient support services
- Other. Please specify:

7. What do you consider are the main barriers to expanding numbers and diversity in study abroad? Rate each barrier on 1-5 scale with:

1 = low barrier; 5 = significant barrier

- Lack of information about education abroad;
- Access to financial aid;
- Cost of study abroad programs;
- Students do not perceive value in study abroad;
- Peer pressure;
- Institutional resistance to support or accommodate study abroad;
- Constrained curricula;
- Study abroad credit not counted toward degree requirements;
- Lack of foreign language competence;
- General public apathy in the United States about study abroad;
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Leadership Survey on Behalf of the Advisory Council for the Lincoln Scholarship Commission

Introduction
The late U.S. senator, Paul Simon (D-ILL) proposed the formation of a U.S. national commission to investigate and report to Congress and the administration upon the desirability and feasibility of a substantial increase in U.S. student participation in study abroad. The Senator’s vision included:
- The need for understanding other cultures as an essential component of the education of the 21st Century student;
- Special emphasis on students studying in developing nations;
- Special emphasis on study abroad opportunities for underrepresented groups;
- The U.S. needs to set a more ambitious goal of sending 500,000 students a year instead of the current 160,000.

The Senator’s proposal was approved before his untimely death in November of 2003, and was ratified by the U.S. Senate in January 2004. The Commission has been funded and its members are currently being appointed by a bi-partisan group of the leaders of the Congress and the Senate. The Commission is scheduled to begin meeting by the summer of this year and is scheduled to complete its recommendations by the end of 2004.

An Advisory Council to the Commission has appointed a Research and Strategic Analysis Working Group to collect data about current capacity and feasibility of such an initiative. Thus, your responses to the following questions will greatly assist the Working Group in reporting on capacity for increasing the participation of U.S. students in study abroad.

The Survey starts on the next page.
The Survey

Please respond to the following questions:

Note: The working group seeks quantifiable information in presenting a picture of study abroad and capacity to the Commission. Additional comments, thoughts and recommendations may be included at the end of the survey.

1. Does the numerical goal of 500,000 undergraduates each year seem feasible to you?
   Yes   No
   If so, over what timetable?
   ____ 3-5 years
   ____ 5-10 years
   ____ Other

2. Do you believe that capacity constraints, if any, would most likely come from:
   ____ Limitations on staff and resources in sending institutions,
   ____ Capacity limitations at receiving institutions?
   ____ Other?

3. What do you consider are the main barriers to expanding numbers and diversity in study abroad? Rate each barrier on 1-5 scale with:
   1 = low barrier; 5 = significant barrier.
   ____ Lack of information about education abroad;
   ____ Access to financial aid;
   ____ Cost of study abroad programs;
   ____ Students do not perceive value in study abroad;
   ____ Peer pressure;
   ____ Institutional resistance to support or accommodate study abroad;
   ____ Constrained curricula;
   ____ Study abroad credit not counted toward degree requirements;
   ____ Lack of foreign language competence;
   ____ General public apathy in the United States about study abroad;
   ____ Faculty resistance/apathy;
   ____ Family reluctance;
   ____ Health, safety and security issues;
   ____ Xenophobia;
   ____ Other? Please specify:

4. What is your perception of the capacity to accommodate additional student enrollments in the regions listed below in existing programs?

   Note: Little = 1-5%; Some = 6-10%; Significant = 11% or more.
   None 1—5% 6—10% 11% or more

   The Middle East
   Western Europe
   East/Central Europe
   Russia
   Former Soviet states
Southeast Asia
South Asia
East Asia
Central America
Latin America
Sub-Saharan Africa
North Africa
Canada/Mexico
Australia/New Zealand

5. What is your perception of student demand or interest for programs in:
   None Little Some Significant

   The Middle East
   Western Europe
   East/Central Europe
   Russia
   Former Soviet states
   Southeast Asia
   South Asia
   East Asia
   Central America
   Latin America
   Sub-Saharan Africa
   North Africa
   Canada/Mexico
   Australia/New Zealand

6. What do you consider to be the principal emerging threats, if any, to expansion in numbers while retaining program quality (please rank order 1-10):
   Lack of knowledge about program assessment and student learning outcomes;
   Lack of scholarships to attract the “right” mix of students;
   Availability of space at high quality overseas institutions;
   Weak U.S. dollar;
   Price of programs;
   Overseas perceptions of the U.S. as a desirable partner in study abroad;
   Other?

7. In order to increase participation in study abroad, what are the priorities (please rank order 1-5):
   General marketing and advocacy campaign
   Scholarships
   Increased program opportunities
   Institutional/Faculty support
   Family support
   Other? Please specify:
8. In order to increase diversity in study abroad destinations for study abroad, what are the priorities (please rank order 1-5):

____ General marketing and advocacy campaign;
____ Scholarships;
____ Increased program opportunities;
____ Marketing to targeted institutions and/or groups (HBCUs, Hispanic-serving institutions, minority groups, et al.);
____ Increased opportunities for faculty and other advisors to learn about nontraditional destinations.
____ Other? Please specify: ____________________________

9. What other remarks, observations, data or advice would you like to provide on this general topic?

Appendix V
Survey for Institutions Outside the United States to Increase U.S. Participation in Study Abroad

Introduction

The late U.S. senator, Paul Simon (D-ILL) proposed the formation of a U.S. national commission to investigate and report to Congress and the administration upon the desirability and feasibility of a substantial increase in U.S. student participation in study abroad. The Senator’s vision included:

- The need for understanding other cultures as an essential component of the education of the 21st century student;
- Special emphasis on students studying in developing nations;
- Special emphasis on study abroad opportunities for under-represented groups;
- The goal of sending 500,000 U.S. students abroad each year to match the numbers of international students coming to the United States.

Several working groups are gathering information to report to the Commission. The Research and Analysis Working Group is conducting a survey to ascertain the capacity by the higher education community in the United States and abroad to increase and sustain much higher levels of participation. Your responses to the following questions to assist the efforts of the Working Group are greatly appreciated.

1. How many U.S. students does your institution receive during the academic year ending in 2003 through the following avenues:

____ Bilateral exchange agreements
____ Other exchange programs
____ U.S. study abroad providers (no reciprocal exchanges)
____ Institutional recruiting efforts (i.e., through direct enrollment)
____ Other ____________________________
2. What is the length of the study period undertaken by incoming U.S. students at your institution? Please specify the total number of students hosted by your institutions in 2002-03 in each category:

- Semester or trimester
- Academic year
- Short-term (summer, or less than 10 weeks)
- Other, e.g., degree seeking

3. What is the maximum number of U.S. students you could accept under current circumstances while sustaining quality in support services and academic programs?

- Semester or trimester
- Academic year
- Short-term (summer, or less than 10 weeks)
- Other

4. If exchanges are an important part of your capacity to receive U.S. students, are you likely to have enough interest to match exchange numbers?

- Yes
- No

If not, why? (check all that apply)

- Insufficient interest to study in the United States
- Lack of funds for students
- Insufficient linkages to match student interest
- Other. Please specify:

5. Do you have other comments or suggestions on this initiative?

Appendix VI

Equal & Equitable Access in Study Abroad

Introduction

In the summer of 2002, the Council for Opportunities in Education undertook a study to understand what barriers prevent TRIO students’ participation in study abroad opportunities. A review of the literature was sought to best address previous findings with regard to barriers to study abroad that affect low-income, disabled, and minority students. Washington (1998) conducted a particularly insightful study on the perceptions and attitudes of Africa—Americans toward study abroad. Two higher education institutions were utilized for the study: one was an historically black college and university (HBCU) and the other was a majority white institution. From this study, Washington found that “awareness was the most significant factor contributing to their [African American students] non-participation in study abroad programs” and there is “a statistically significant school (institutional type) main effect” within the awareness
factor category (pp. 126—127). Studies on barriers to study abroad for students with disabilities at five universities also showed lack of awareness about study abroad options as the most significant barrier. Although the literature addressed limitations and barriers affecting minority students (Carroll, 1996; Washington, 1998) and disabled students (Matthews et al., 1998), there was no control for income or parental educational background. Hence, this study sought to focus more specifically on students participating in TRIO programs given that they represent students from low-income and first-generation family backgrounds.

The study design for this research project sought input from TRIO Student Support Services (SSS) and McNair Programs staff, those education professionals who serve low-income and first-generation college students, many of whom are minority students and 16,000 of whom are students with disabilities. Although a comprehensive study involving student input, similar to that of Washington’s (1998), could be appropriately applied to TRIO students, the limitations of time did not allow this type of study. The findings from Washington’s 1998 study however do support a study of this type.

The Council study sought to understand: (1) Do TRIO program directors perceive the study abroad opportunities for TRIO participants as important? (2) Are TRIO participants made aware of study abroad opportunities? (3) What are the perceived barriers to study abroad for TRIO participants?

To gather the data, a two-page web-based questionnaire was developed and distributed to all 944 SSS and 156 McNair Programs funded in the 2001—2002 academic year, utilizing an email distribution methodology.

Respondents were given a Web site to complete and submit the questionnaires, as well as a mailing address if preferred. There were 105 emails that bounced back, signalling that the program director changed. The resultant 995 e-mailed directors became the population sought for feedback to the questionnaire. Of the 995 directors, 245 responded, for a response rate of 25 percent. Table 1 lists characteristics of the programs that responded.

Table 1: Aggregated Institutional Characteristics of Responding SSS and McNair Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>% of Total Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program located in urban setting</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program located in suburban setting</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program located in rural setting</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure how to classify</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program affiliated with a 2-year institution</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program affiliated with a 4-year institution</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program affiliated with a public institution</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program affiliated with a private institution</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C.O.E. Barrier to Study Abroad Quick Information Survey, November 2002

This section will consider the following barriers to study abroad: cost, lack of information, family constraints, individual limitations, and language. As a first step in
examining the barriers to study abroad for TRIO college level students, the study sought information regarding barriers to participation perceived by directors.

Cost

According to the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), “financial barriers prevent 48 percent of college-qualified, low-income high school graduates from attending a four-year college and 22 percent from attending any college at all in the two years following high school graduation.” The financial barriers that affect college-going rates among low-income students suggest that the high costs of attendance affect a student’s persistence and ultimate degree completion. Using data from the Open Doors 2002 report, we find that institutions with the largest numbers of students studying abroad may not necessarily lead in enrolling low-income and minority students. Additionally, when examining the characteristics of these institutions with high numbers of students participating in study abroad programs, we find low minority enrollment rates. According to a study published by the American Association of University Professors,2 “of the 30 non-historically black colleges and universities that enrolled the largest numbers of black students, 23 were institutions that granted only associate degrees. Just three—Temple and Wayne State Universities and the University of Maryland at College Park—were research universities.” Similarly, for Hispanic students, “Of the 30 colleges and universities elsewhere that enrolled the largest numbers of Hispanic students, 17 granted only associate degrees, and only one, the University of New Mexico, was a research university.” Henderson (1999) found that students with disabilities are more likely to enroll in two-year colleges and universities than nondisabled students, although enrollment in four-year institutions has increased. It is important to note that low-income, disabled, and minority students do not usually attend the institutions cited in the Open Doors report that have high numbers of students studying abroad. The cost to attend these institutions may be a variable that precludes low-income, disabled and minority students’ enrollment, and, therefore, participation within study abroad programs.

Cost was perceived by TRIO directors as the major barrier to TRIO students’ interest and participation in study abroad. Two questions were asked of TRIO directors regarding their perceptions and experiences of barriers facing TRIO students in study abroad. In both questions, more than three-quarters (76 percent) of the responses indicated that high costs and limited financial aid and funding were barriers to TRIO college-level students. In an open-ended question, directors were able to elaborate on the complexity of limited financial aid and the high cost of study abroad as a perceived limit to TRIO students. One director stated, quite simply, “They can’t afford it. Period. We never get much beyond that.” Another commented that the students were not only deterred from applying for study abroad due to the high cost, but were also deterred due to the students’ “unwillingness to take out more student loans, especially if the credits earned from the study abroad experience do not apply directly to their graduation requirements.” Not only are many TRIO students “at or below the poverty level,” but their view of study abroad is limited. Another director stated, “The rest of the U.S. outside of our state is ‘foreign territory’ to many [students]... If foreign study opportunities could be arranged for
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shorter periods of time and at lower individual cost, more of our students would take advantage of such opportunities.”

According to TRIO directors, associated financial costs of participating in a study abroad program are the loss of wages to be earned during a summer study, the associated lack of family support due to the lost wages that the student would contribute, and the immediate need for funds. Additionally, states one director, “Study abroad is more expensive than staying at home; students cannot work while on study abroad.” Students thus not only incur an additional loan burden through financial aid by not typically working abroad but also experience a lack of family support. Given the increased need for financial support, as a result of unmet financial need, low income students are dramatically at risk of dropping out. As a result, another TRIO director notes,

Students at risk (and their parents) often do not believe that they can afford the cost of international travel because it increases their overall level of indebtedness. In a family of limited means, the $5,000 that an educational trip might cost could seem better spent on a used car, or some other item that admittedly would improve the family’s short-term living standard. While the abstract and more long-term benefits of increased global awareness and perhaps greater employability may well be recognized, the immediate need of a paycheck is often reason enough to decide against a travel experience.

Finances are without a doubt “the biggest obstacle” to TRIO students’ study abroad opportunities according to TRIO directors. Consequently, the cost of studying abroad and the associated loss of income is an equally important barrier to low-income student participation in such programs; students “can’t afford to lose the money they make at part-time and/or full-time jobs if they go abroad.” In addition, for students with disabilities it may mean losing Medicaid or state-provided assistance that would pay for their personal assistant services for daily activities, or the lack of understanding that vocational rehabilitation funding some students with disabilities receive to cover tuition, books, or services can be used for study abroad.

Lack of Information
Lack of information was a barrier frequently cited. According to one respondent, “The biggest barrier is lack of information and the fear of the unknown...especially post 9/11.” Fear and lack of information about how the opportunity will help students in the future were linked to the overarching barrier of information. As one director said, “Lack of information about both the opportunity and how to finance it coincide with being aware of the relevance to one’s major or ‘bigger picture’.”

On another level, cites a different respondent, “Timewise, students may see the study abroad experience as interrupting their undergraduate studies; that they are taking time out to ‘see the world’ and not to complete the requirements for their degree.” Information and workshops to help students understand the costs, benefits, arrangements, expectations, and how an experience abroad can contribute to their academic, personal, and/or professional goals are lacking. This lack of information coupled with financial barriers also impacts the family support. Comments concerning lack of information
frequently include the lack of family support. One director elaborated on the lack of information applicable to Spanish-speaking immigrants saying, “Much of this has to do with the sensationalistic nature, or manner in which the news is presented, especially in a Spanish broadcast. If you’re bilingual, and watch these, you pick up on ‘tones’ and ‘expressions’ that hint at the ‘horrible danger’ that awaits immigrants.” Though providing information appears to be a simple concept that is easily carried out, it involves a wide circle that includes not only the possible student participant, but also the student’s family members, the financial aid officer, academic counselor, and TRIO advisor.

Family Constraints
Although lack of financial support and limited information dominate the list of barriers for TRIO students as perceived by TRIO directors, they also cite family constraints as a barrier. Lack of information has already been mentioned with regard to its impact on perceptions of safety. In addition to concerns of safety, one TRIO director notes, “The younger student may or may not have the family support,” while “our mature students may have issues with childcare constraints and job considerations.”

While it may be true that “students do not get the encouragement from their family for study abroad,” notes one director, the lack of family support is due to “lack of information and the fear of the unknown,” as well as the student’s lost contribution to the family’s income. Hence, some family constraints, though they may appear simple on the surface, involve the complex limits of the family’s income, information, and childcare issues.

Individual Limitations In the process of explaining the lack of information and other factors that limit TRIO students, the survey uncovered limitations of individuals who work with these students. One respondent stated, “Low-income, first generation students (and TRIO staff) don’t have the luxury of thoughts such as study abroad.” This statement is evidence of a misconception that low-income students and staff do not need to consider study abroad. One director went so far as to say, “I don’t think that the Council should be spending time on this issue—it is simply not a priority concern!”

Another TRIO person elaborated at length on the value of a study abroad experience while also injecting the question, “Is this necessary?” Yes, I’d love for all TRIO college students to have this international experience. Yes, it would benefit them in so many intangible ways. But is it NECESSARY? No, an international experience isn’t necessary for them to reach their educational goals. Let’s get real....There are more important concerns.

As previously mentioned, low-income students do not usually attend schools where there are many students studying abroad. Similarly, staff that work with these students at such institutions may not have a similar appreciation or priority to promote study abroad to their students. Thus, upon close examination of the data, some individuals that work with these students may also be considered a barrier to students’ ability to study abroad when they limit the information provided to TRIO students and staff or discount the importance of study abroad for the students that they serve. The limited access of SSS and McNair students to study abroad opportunities is a critical disadvantage and prompts the question: “How can TRIO projects be more involved in international education opportunities?”
Language

Language is frequently mentioned as a potential barrier to students’ interest in study abroad (Carroll, 1996; Washington, 1998). However, the data from this survey reflect a different picture. When TRIO directors were asked if they perceived language to be a barrier to study abroad for TRIO students, the majority (45 percent) responded that language is not a barrier. Only 35 percent of the college-level TRIO program directors perceived language to be a barrier to study abroad for TRIO students. Language was cited as a barrier in two separate questions that were asked of TRIO directors. However, in both instances, financial constraints and costs associated with a student’s study abroad opportunity were perceived as the primary (75 percent) barrier for TRIO students.

Study Abroad Advising

TRIO professionals were asked to comment on the advising practices that their TRIO student participants may receive regarding study abroad opportunities. Although advising students about study abroad opportunities is not a direct responsibility of TRIO college-level programs, both SSS and McNair programs can advise students in the area of counseling, mentoring, research opportunities, and career options that may be enhanced by an international experience.

Table 2: Advising Provided to TRIO Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising Knowledge of Financial</th>
<th>Advised Students to Referred Students</th>
<th>Occurred Aid Used for Study</th>
<th>Study Abroad to a Study Abroad Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C.O.E. Barrier to Study Abroad Quick Information Survey, November 2002

However, the survey showed that the directors themselves may be considered as a barrier to students’ ability to study abroad since they communicate only limited information and are ambivalent at best about the importance of study abroad for TRIO students. Hence, project directors and staff must get support from the international/study abroad program offices on their campus to incorporate international education opportunities within the information they provide to students, and information on national projects that disseminate information on the possibilities for creative accessibility abroad for students with disabilities.

Conclusion

Information from the Barrier to Study Abroad Survey suggests that college-level TRIO students, projects, and staff all experience some level of disengagement in the value, interest and knowledge they have regarding study abroad opportunities. Projects identified how they could better serve students’ if provided with increased funding support, information on how financial aid and vocational rehabilitation and SSI funds
could be used, and general information about study abroad programs, which may also be communicated to students’ families.

Hence, the perceived obstacles to providing the education, training, and credentialing for low-income, disabled and minority students that is prerequisite for creating global citizens and their successful pursuit of careers in the international arena are: (1) limited financial support, (2) lack of information, (3) lack of family support, and (4) the individual limitations of professionals that work with students. The professional limitations may best be confronted by increasing institutional support for internationalization of the curriculum, as well as providing other campus supports and incentives.

Appendix VI Endnotes


3 See Mobility International USA/Social Security Administration brochure – www.miusa.org/publications

4 According to Horn & Berktold (1999), postsecondary students with disabilities are more likely than nondisabled students to be older, financially independent of parents, and have dependent children.

5 Postsecondary students with disabilities are more likely than nondisabled students to not work during school, however, they may also be receiving Social Security Disability Insurance or Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to support their accommodation needs. They also are more likely to be in the lowest income quartile and less likely to have parents who had attained a bachelor’s degree or higher. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999—2000 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:2000). Students and their families often are not aware of the less known statement that is an exception to the more widely known 30-day limit for receiving benefits when outside the United States. This exception stated in the Social Security handbook explains students eligible for SSI can continue to receive their benefits while temporarily outside the U.S. for the purpose of conducting studies not available in the U.S. Mobility International USA / Social Security Income brochure—www.miusa.org/publications.

Appendix VII
Three Examples, Three Approaches to Curriculum Integration
The University of Minnesota Curricular Integration Project

The University of Minnesota began a pilot project in the late 1990s to test new ways to integrate study abroad into the curricula. Global Campus • Study Abroad (now the Learning Abroad Center) and the Institute of Technology (IT) looked for proactive ways
to encourage IT students to study broad as part of their undergraduate degree programs. Outcomes of this pilot project included increased student participation (which doubled each year) and development of a model for interacting with other academic units. Work on the pilot project coincided with a university wide emphasis on integrating international perspectives into the undergraduate experience. University leadership enthusiastically supported study abroad as one way to integrate international perspectives into the curriculum and encouraged the pursuit of grants to fund the development of a curriculum integration model that could be shared with other institutions. Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and the Bush Foundation grants enabled the integration work to encompass nearly every college on all four university campuses. Among project goals were developing innovative practices to help faculty and academic advisors integrate and articulate study abroad into the academic program; enhancing undergraduate access to and enrollment in study abroad; increasing the enrollment of at risk students in study abroad; increasing faculty awareness of the critical role of study abroad in students’ academic and professional development; creating new pilot efforts to contextualize the study abroad experience through the internationalization of on-campus courses; evaluating and disseminating new insights, practices, and materials to colleagues nationwide; and establishing new scholarships in collaboration with academic units. (For more details see the university’s curriculum integration web site: http://www.umabroad.umn.edu/ci/index.html).

Setting Goals for Curriculum Integration and Getting Started at Michigan State University
The Michigan State University (MSU) Study Abroad Curriculum Integration Project seeks to closely integrate study abroad options into the undergraduate experiences and curricula for all students in all majors. Specific program goals aim at:
1. Developing study abroad options for every major—typically multiple options that meet students’ individual needs and can be applied toward meeting general university or specific major graduation requirements.
2. Improving how university, college, and major requirements can prepare students for a study abroad experience.
3. Expanding ways in which credits earned on a study abroad experience can be used to meet graduation requirements.
4. Developing study abroad options that enhance the value of degrees.
5. Reintegrating study abroad students and their experiences abroad into the on-campus curricula and learning environments when they return to campus.

To better assess the diverse needs of various majors and departments at MSU, a university wide Curriculum Integration Team (CIT) has been established and, working through the Office of Study Abroad (OSA), sponsors a series of roundtable discussions for faculty and advisors. Some of these roundtables are college or department specific. Departments and faculty are asked to think through a series of fundamental issues that include uncovering the value-added that study abroad could have in their majors and identifying options that may exist or could be created to accommodate value-added and high quality study abroad experiences. Departments and faculty also are asked to consider whether foundation or other course requirements might be met through
coursework taken from approved institutions abroad. Course syllabi from institutions abroad are reviewed and approved for transfer. Advising sheets are created, major by major, to explain study abroad options that can be used in that major.

The Kalamazoo College Study Abroad Portfolio Project

The Kalamazoo Portfolio Project helps students “collect, connect, and reflect on the various threads of their Kalamazoo College education,” which for the vast majority of them includes a required study abroad experience. So, the study abroad experience is integrated with the rest in this portfolio process. At pivotal points throughout their undergraduate program students are asked to prepare a series of writings—prematriculation “foundations” essays, study abroad application essays, and reflective pieces about their Integrative Cultural Research Project and study abroad experiences—and provide examples of their best academic and other key performances. In consultation with faculty, students develop a “collection of best work” from which to write a reflective “senior connections” essay. This culminating paper weaves together the various parts of their undergraduate education, including study abroad experiences, thoughts about their K Plan, Senior Individualized Project, and their growth both in skills (information literacy, quantitative reasoning, writing, and oral communication) and in the five dimensions (lifelong learning, career readiness, leadership, intercultural understanding, and social responsibility) of their education at Kalamazoo.

Year Portfolio Entry What It Is

First Year Foundations Essay Connects high school experiences to the K Plan Portfolio creation and Creation of home page and writing writing self-assessment self-assessment, link to best Seminar paper, link to Foundations Essay Sophomore Best work, key Links best course work or other pivotal performances educational experiences Foundations for inter- Essay questions for study abroad application cultural understanding Junior Developing intercultural Photos from study abroad, internships, understanding and other pivotal experiences; reflections on important relationships and experiences; Integrative Cultural Research Project (ICRP); reflections upon return to campus in Junior spring Senior Senior Connections Connects various parts of a “K” education, Essay or a similar reflective reflects on K plan & SIP, discusses statement growth in skills* and dimensions** * Skills: information literacy, quantitative reasoning, writing and oral communication. **Dimensions: lifelong learning, career readiness, leadership, intercultural understanding, social responsibility. For more information and sample portfolios see www.kzoo.edu/pfolio or contact Dr. Zaide Pixley, Assistant Provost for the First Year Experience and Director of Advising or Dr. Joseph L. Brockington, Associate Provost for International Programs. 
Appendix VIII
Additional Cost Information: From the 2004 IIE Passport Data Summary

The tables below summarize study abroad cost data as published in the 2004 IIE Passport (the “Short-Term Study Abroad” and the “Academic Year Abroad” volumes). We selected a sample of countries in every major world region based on those countries having a relatively large number of study abroad participants from the United States. We then analyzed cost data for every study abroad program offered in these countries as reported in IIE Passport. Two sets of cost numbers are reported in the tables below for each country: (1) for tuition, housing, food, and transportation (THFT) and (2) for tuition, housing, food (THF).

Table 1: Study Abroad Cost Data—Semester Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program location</th>
<th>THFT</th>
<th>THFT</th>
<th>THFT</th>
<th>THF</th>
<th>THF</th>
<th>THF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa/Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>15,574</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>19,617</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>10,039</td>
<td>5,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>14,748</td>
<td>10,495</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>9,456</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>17,813</td>
<td>17,813</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>19,617</td>
<td>18,715</td>
<td>17,813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>13,571</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>13,670</td>
<td>9,231</td>
<td>6,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>15,242</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>7,952</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>16,780</td>
<td>15,312</td>
<td>14,285</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>10,351</td>
<td>6,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>19,650</td>
<td>13,149</td>
<td>7,096</td>
<td>33,251</td>
<td>13,233</td>
<td>5,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>10,212</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,632</td>
<td>9,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>14,248</td>
<td>9,508</td>
<td>6,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>19,617</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>17,250</td>
<td>9,145</td>
<td>4,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>17,813</td>
<td>8,432</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>11,180</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>12,766</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>17,870</td>
<td>11,354</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin/South America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>10,142</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>15,190</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>5,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>11,225</td>
<td>11,225</td>
<td>11,225</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>8,361</td>
<td>4,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>19,617</td>
<td>12,001</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>16,069</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,258</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,835</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,751</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,457</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,580</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2: Study Abroad Cost Data—Programs of Four to Six Weeks

Program location: THFT THFT THFT THF THF THF
High Mean Low High Mean Low

Africa/Middle East
- Israel 8,000 8,000 8,000 5,750 5,750 5,750
- Kenya 4,995 4,645 4,295 4,950 4,113 3,295
- South Africa 5,239 4,359 3,400 5,350 3,131 1,600
- Tanzania 6,500 6,500 6,500 4,600 3,028 1,490
- Turkey 3,900 2,967 2,000
- Zimbabwe 1,290 1,190 1,090

Asia
- Australia 5,900 4,450 3,200 7,200 4,077 2,990
- China 6,200 3,872 2,150 5,500 4,002 1,235
- India 6,000 4,900 3,800 4,000 3,400 2,800
- Japan 4,300 3,111 2,000 4,162 2,450
- New Zealand 4,800 4,800 4,800
- Thailand 4,545 4,545 4,545 4,950 4,317 3,350

Europe
- Czech Republic 5,200 4,720 4,239 5,190 3,744 2,200
- France 6,875 4,432 3,300 6,300 3,540 1,710
- Italy 7,800 5,177 2,885 7,000 4,562 1,700
- United Kingdom 7,500 4,716 2,885 6,350 3,974 1,250

Latin/South America
- Brazil 5,000 5,000 5,000 3,250 2,345 1,675
- Chile 3,450 3,450 3,450 2,950 2,188 1,825
- Costa Rica 6,400 3,822 2,525 5,000 2,812 1,500
- Dominican Republic 3,900 3,075 3,900
- Mexico 3,795 2,949 2,000 5,595 2,844 940

COLUMN $5474 $4626 $3775 $4945 $3525 $2360

AVERAGES

There are some cautions to convey when interpreting these data. First, these figures are what program sponsors report that they charge students. In some cases other costs (beyond tuition, housing, food, and transportation) are included in the charges. Tuition, housing, food, and transportation costs account for the vast majority of expenses on most study abroad programs, but there are other costs as detailed later in this document. We also cannot tell how much of the charge represents costs and how much is planned surplus (i.e., charging students on a cost plus basis). There is good reason to believe, however, that most pricing is on some kind of cost plus basis. One other caution is that for some countries the data reported in the table are based on a small sample (only one or two programs).

The best statistic to use for general cost information is the reported average costs. In each case, the “low” cost is the least expensive program listed in the IIE Passport volume and the “high” cost is the most expensive program. These “outliers” give an accurate portrayal of the range of costs; but the averages are more representative figures. It is also obvious from an inspection of numbers by country that costs vary substantially based in part on obvious cost of living differences and related factors in these countries.
Appendix IX
An Overarching Institutional Protocol for Study Abroad Safety and Security: An Example
John K. Hudzik

This summary provides an outline of major topics, approaches, and issues addressed by hundreds of pages of policies, procedures, and recommendations governing study abroad safety and security at Michigan State University. The objective of the university protocol is to reduce threats to student, faculty, and staff health and safety while participating in university-sponsored or co-sponsored study abroad programs.

General Scope and Approach
Safety and security assessments, institutional policies, and recommendations to students focus on reducing potential threats posed by civil unrest, terrorism, crime, health risks, natural disasters, and unsafe student behaviors. Institutional policies and procedures also address institutional reactions if events occur that appear to seriously impact or threaten the safety and security of one or more individuals participating in university study abroad programs.

General Categories of Policy and Practice
I. Site and Program Assessment
Pre program planning and assessment focuses on review and analysis of program locations abroad (e.g., instructional locations, field trip settings, student housing, transportation to and within the host country, options for evacuation under varying circumstances, access to medical treatment, student access to program staff or leaders). Examples of issues reviewed include, but are not limited to: prevalence of disease and other health threats; incidence and patterns of crime and criminal threat; social and political stability and threats of civil unrest, war, or terrorism; general safety and security of transportation infrastructure to be used; quality and location of program housing; concerns about safe and affordable food; access to quality health care; general issues of safety for students traveling alone or in groups; areas, locations, and behaviors to avoid; options and capacity for evacuation; access to emergency communication; emergency access to program leadership; and preventive measures (e.g., vaccinations and health assessments prior to departure).

Information gathering and analyze

I: Program planners in the office of study abroad and an independent university safety and security assessment committee routinely assess and monitor programs or program locations (new or existing programs as warranted) for unusual or heightened sources of risk to safety and security. Locations raising serious concern for whatever reason are subject to further evaluation as follows:

Program leaders or sponsors supply an analysis and response to areas/issues of concern that are raised.
The Office of Study Abroad gathers information to the extent needed and as appropriate for the particular issue(s) from numerous sources, for example, the U.S. Department of State, the Overseas Security Advisory Council, host institutions in the country of concern, the World Health Organization, the Centers for Disease Control, direct phone conversations with U.S. Embassy staff in the country of concern, assessments by MSU faculty and staff in or recently in the country of concern, direct contact with other experts in the country of concern, and the press.

The University Study Abroad Security and Risk Assessment Committee conducts an independent review of issues of concern in identified countries and program locations, using information sources noted above and additional sources as it may request. The committee has the authority to recommend directly to the provost/president of the university that a program be cancelled, its location be changed, or significant changes be made in program logistics and other features in order to reduce risk. The committee is chaired by a senior university official not associated with study abroad, and includes a majority of members not associated with study abroad (e.g., the director of risk management and insurance, the university physician, and representatives from the offices of the university general counsel and the provost).

The security and risk assessment committee routinely reviews new programs where the locations or design raise significant concerns about safety and security and monitors all study abroad locations for information suggesting new or emergent threats (reviewing those in a timely fashion about which concern is significantly elevated).

II. What to Know and Do Before Departure
A key feature of the institution’s approach to reducing threats to safety and security abroad is to view it as a partnership between the institution and study abroad participants. The university provides a wide array of information through multiple means so that travelers can be informed about risks and behaviors and situations to avoid. The university attempts to reduce risk through prior assessment of program locations and program design and logistical support networks, but recognizes that risk cannot be eliminated, especially that risk due to the behavior of participants.

Numerous topics are addressed through information conveyed to participants (students, faculty and staff leaders, hosts abroad) by a variety of overlapping and deliberately redundant means to ensure as thoroughly as is possible that all participants have had access to the pertinent information and can be appropriately informed.

Educating participants about sources of information and advice reinforces needed preparation and appropriate behaviors while in the host country. Such resources encompass student handbooks, faculty handbooks, mandatory orientation meetings for students prior to departure, a Know Before You Go summary information card, information from the University Travel Clinic, and additional advice provided both prior to departure and once in-country by faculty and staff.

Examples of issues dealt with through multiple sources include, but are not limited to: passports, visas, and other forms of identification; finances; “do and don’t” behaviors; vaccinations and other health preparations; information about the host country (available
through numerous Web-based sources) that participants are directed to and assigned to read; who and how to contact various authorities in case of an emergency or other need; considerations for bringing medications abroad or obtaining them onsite; and insurance requirements.

III. While Abroad

Once students are abroad, the university continues to monitor program sites for new threats to safety and security from a variety of sources. (See those listed above under Roman I.) In addition: Regular contacts with faculty leaders on-site or program sponsor organizations supplement the normal channels of information monitoring. And, in the case of concerns, on-site personnel are asked to assess situations afresh and make recommendations for changes (and to immediately take action in the face of imminent threat).

The Office of Study Abroad maintains up-to-date contact information for reaching faculty, students, staff, and program sponsors abroad at various locations on a timely basis through a variety of means (e.g., phone, fax, email) in case of emergencies or other important developments. This information is also provided to students for their own information and to share with their families and others.

The university has a detailed protocol for assessing the need for evacuation, moving students and programs, or altering program plans if warranted. (See further reference below.)

All MSU students, faculty, and staff have access to a free emergency number that rings directly to the MSU Department of Police and Public Safety and is monitored 24/7. Operators have a detailed protocol on what to do in case of an emergency call from abroad.

Faculty program leaders are given guidelines for the steps they should take to keep themselves and their students safe and secure. Examples include:

- Establish and review safety guidelines for students.
- Attend a safety orientation and reinforce general and specific safety precautions with students.
- Be aware of specific health needs of students.
- Carry as appropriate a first aid kit in case of emergencies.
- Have an appropriate credit/debit card (or alternative) for emergency cash.
- Be familiar with the procedure for making collect calls outside of the U.S. and make sure that students are aware of this as well.
- Know where the nearest U.S. Embassy, local police station, and local hospital are located and how to contact them.
- Make sure that the host-country American Embassy has been made aware of students being in country.
- Discuss preventable accidents with students.
- Maintain regular contact with the Office of Study Abroad.
- Provide the Office of Study Abroad with complete emergency contact information and notify the office of any changes to contact information.
- Review safety issues for students of color.
- Review safety issues for women students.
- Review safety issues for students with hidden and visible disabilities.
Review safety issues for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students. The university’s Study Abroad Security and Risk Assessment Committee can be called into session very quickly to assess and render advice if warranted.

IV. Protocol for Responding to Emergencies Abroad
The university has developed a detailed protocol, including provisions for establishing an emergency response team, should events abroad warrant an institutional response. Duties of the response team will include information collection, assessment, and making recommendations for institutional response. In addition, the university Incident Command procedure will be activated as appropriate to respond to emergency conditions abroad. When the incident commander for International Studies and Programs (ISP) receives a crisis call, he or she will: (1) determine the level of urgency and scope of response to the situation, including the appropriate offices and individuals to participate on the Incident Command Team (if activated), and (2) if warranted, call the MSU Department of Police and Public Safety, which will assemble and coordinate the initial Incident Command Team and its functions.

The usual members of an ISP Incident Command Team will, as appropriate, include representatives of the following university offices: the ISP Dean, University Security and Risk Assessment Committee, Risk Management and Insurance, Department of Police and Public Safety, the Provost, University Relations/Media Communications, Study Abroad, and, depending on the situation, the University General Counsel, area studies director(s), dean(s) of the affected college(s), department chair(s) or director(s) of the affected unit(s), and the University Physician. The Incident Command Team will assess the situation and develop recommendations for the president and provost of the university.

Appendix X
Outline/Checklist for Implementing a Study Abroad Health and Safety Program
Norman Peterson, Montana State University-Bozeman

The following is an outline/checklist for implementing the Responsible Study Abroad: Good Practices for Health and Safety document developed by the Interorganizational Task Force on Safety and Responsibility in Study Abroad. It extrapolates from the “Good Practices” a set of specific steps to be taken by a higher education institution to put them into effect. Since institutions may have unique needs to address in developing a study abroad health and safety program, this outline should only be used as a starting point. The sequence of steps outlined here is only a suggestion; many of the steps could be completed in a different order.

1. Initiate the process to formally support the guidelines as an institution. When appropriate review and approval for institutional support has been obtained, submit a completed Response Form (found at the Task Force’s web site) to the Task Force.
2. Consult with essential institutional officials, such as the senior student affairs officer of the institution, the institution’s risk manager, university counsel, and health service director as you begin to implement the study abroad health and safety program.
3. Research existing institutional student crisis intervention procedures and ensure that the study abroad health and safety program that is adopted is consistent with them.
4. Review and if necessary revise the information provided to prospective participants in study abroad programs to ensure that appropriate information is included regarding health and safety issues. This should include information about home campus services and conditions that cannot be replicated at overseas locations.

5. Provide a copy of the health and safety guidelines to all institutions abroad that host students under the institutions’ programs as well as other organizations involved in these programs, requesting that these institutions endorse and adopt them. Coordinate efforts with these institutions to assess health and safety conditions, emergency preparedness processes, crisis response plans, etc. (discussed below).

6. Conduct an assessment of health and safety conditions for each study abroad program sponsored by the institution, including potential health and safety risks within the program’s local environment (such as accommodations, program-sponsored excursions, and events, etc.). This process should involve host institution officials and other appropriate individuals at the study site. To the extent possible, it should involve site visits by home institution personnel. Procedures should be put in place to periodically reassess each program.

7. Identify available medical, psychological, and other health-and safety-related professional services in study abroad locations. Provide information about these services to participants and their parents/guardians/families. Ensure procedures are in place to help participants obtain needed services should that become necessary.

8. Develop and maintain emergency preparedness processes and a crisis response plan applicable to all study abroad programs sponsored by the institution. Coordinate with host institutions abroad and other involved organizations (e.g., consortia offices) in their development. These should be periodically reviewed and revised as needed.

9. Review and if necessary revise participant selection procedures to ensure that consideration is given to health and safety issues in evaluating individuals’ participation in study abroad programs. These should take into consideration factors such as disciplinary history that may impact on the safety of the individual or group. (Care must be taken to ensure that information is not improperly used to deny entrance to the program.)

10. Review and if necessary revise forms participants are to complete, including a waiver of liability, a medical information form, and a “self-disclosure” document which requests disclosure of any condition or circumstance which could have implications for the participant’s health and safety or that of others. Ensure that processes are in place for the medical information form to be on file at the host institution/study site.

11. Ensure that procedures are in place to provide professional counseling for prospective/selected participants who have conditions which pose special health and safety problems to assist them in determining if the program is appropriate for them.

12. Review and if necessary revise health and travel accident insurance (emergency evacuation and repatriation) coverage offered to participants, and/or information provided to participants about how to obtain appropriate coverage.

13. Implement a requirement for participants to provide evidence of appropriate health and travel accident (emergency evacuation and repatriation) insurance coverage if one does not already exist.

14. Review and if necessary revise information provided to participants and their
parents/guardians/families to ensure that health and safety issues are appropriately covered. This should include information regarding when and where the institution’s responsibilities end, and aspects of the study abroad experience beyond the institution’s control.

15. Review and if necessary revise pre departure and on-site orientation programs to include appropriate information on safety, health, legal, environmental, political, cultural, and religious conditions in the host country. Ensure that orientations deal with health and safety risks and appropriate emergency response measures.

16. Review and if necessary revise training programs for program directors and staff. This should include guidelines with respect to intervention and referral, and working within their own competencies. Encourage host institutions and other involved organizations to provide such training for their staff.

17. Ensure that channels are in place to receive current and reliable information concerning health and safety risks at study sites and to pass such information on as necessary to participants, institution officials, and other appropriate individuals.

18. Ensure that adequate channels are in place to maintain communication among program sponsors and others needed in case of serious health problems, injury, or other significant health and safety circumstances.

19. Review and if necessary revise participant codes of conduct. Ensure this policy addresses use and abuse of alcohol. Communicate these to participants along with information about the consequences of noncompliance. Ensure that steps are in place to take appropriate action if and when participants violate codes of conduct in ways that present health and safety risks to themselves or other participants.

20. Ensure that participants receive information about their responsibilities as outlined in the good practices document and that they understand to the extent possible the impact their decisions before and during the program may have on their health and safety.

21. Review and if necessary revise procedures to inform parents/guardians/families to ensure they can play the most effective role possible in helping make decisions and influencing participants’ behavior overseas.

Appendix XI
Responsible Study Abroad: Good Practices for Health and Safety

Statement of Purpose

Because the health and safety of study abroad participants are primary concerns, these statements of good practice have been developed to provide guidance to institutions, participants (including faculty and staff), and parents/guardians/families. These statements are intended to be aspirational in nature. They address issues that merit attention and thoughtful consideration by everyone involved with study abroad. They are intentionally general; they are not intended to account for all the many variations in study abroad programs and actual health, safety, and security cases that will inevitably occur. In dealing with any specific situation, those responsible must also rely upon their collective experience and judgment while considering their specific circumstances.

I. Responsibilities of Program Sponsors
The term sponsors refers to all the entities that together develop, offer, and administer study abroad programs.
Sponsors include sending institutions, host institutions, program administrators, and placement organizations.

To the extent reasonably possible, program sponsors should consider how these statements of good practice may apply. At the same time, it must be noted that the structure of study abroad programs varies widely. Study abroad usually a cooperative venture that can involve multiple sponsors. Because the role of an organization in a study abroad program may vary considerably from case to case, it is not possible to specify a division of efforts that will be applicable to all cases. Each entity should apply these statements in ways consistent with its respective role.

In general, practices that relate to obtaining health, safety, and security information apply to all parties consistent with their role and involvement in the study abroad program. Much of the basic information is readily available and can be conveyed to participants by distributing it and/or by referring them to, or utilizing materials from, recognized central sources. Statements of good practice that refer to the provision of information and the preparation of participants are intended for parties that advise, refer, nominate, admit, enroll, or place students. Statements of good practice that suggest operating procedures on site apply to entities that are directly involved in the operation of the overseas program. It is understood that program sponsors that rely heavily on the collaboration of overseas institutions may exercise less direct control over specific program components. In such cases, sponsors are urged to work with their overseas partners to develop plans and procedures for implementing good practices.

The use of letters is provided for ease of reference only and does not imply priority. Program sponsors should:

A. Conduct periodic assessments of health and safety conditions for their programs, and develop and maintain emergency preparedness processes and a crisis response plan.

B. Provide health and safety information for prospective participants so that they and their parents/guardians/families can make informed decisions concerning preparation, participation and behavior while on the program.

C. Provide information concerning aspects of home campus services and conditions that cannot be replicated at overseas locations.

D. Provide orientation to participants prior to the program and as needed on site, which includes information on safety, health, legal, environmental, political, cultural, and religious conditions in the host country. In addition to dealing with health and safety issues, the orientation should address potential health and safety risks, and appropriate emergency response measures.

E. Consider health and safety issues in evaluating the appropriateness of an individual’s participation in a study abroad program.

F. Determining criteria for an individual’s removal from an overseas program taking into account participant behavior, health, and safety factors.

G. Require that participants be insured. Either provide health and travel accident (emergency evacuation, repatriation) insurance to participants, or provide information about how to obtain such coverage.

H. Conduct inquiries regarding the potential health, safety, and security risks of the local
environment of the program, including program-sponsored accommodation, events, excursions and other activities, prior to the program. Monitor possible changes in country conditions. Provide information about changes and advise participants and their parents/guardians/families as needed.

I. Hire vendors and contractors (e.g., travel and tour agents) that have provided reputable services in the country in which the program takes place. Advise such vendors and contractors of the program sponsor’s expectations with respect to their role in the health and safety of participants.

J. Conduct appropriate inquiry regarding available medical and professional services. Provide information about these services for participants and their parents/guardians/families, and help participants obtain the services they may need.

K. Develop and provide health and safety training for program directors and staff, including guidelines with respect to intervention and referral that take into account the nature and location of the study abroad program.

L. Develop codes of conduct for their programs; communicate codes of conduct and the consequences of noncompliance to participants. Take appropriate action when aware that participants are in violation.

M. In cases of serious health problems, injury, or other significant health and safety circumstances, maintain good communication among all program sponsors and others who need to know.

N. In the participant screening process, consider factors such as disciplinary history that may impact on the safety of the individual or the group.

O. Provide information for participants and their parents/guardians/families regarding when and where the sponsor’s responsibility ends and the range of aspects of participants’ overseas experiences that are beyond the sponsor’s control.

In particular, program sponsors generally:

A. Cannot guarantee or assure the safety and/or security of participants or eliminate all risks from the study abroad environments
B. Cannot monitor or control all of the daily personal decisions, choices, and activities of participants
C. Cannot prevent participants from engaging in illegal, dangerous, or unwise activities
D. Cannot assure that U.S. standards of due process apply in overseas legal proceedings or provide or pay for legal representation for participants
E. Cannot assume responsibility for actions or for events that are not part of the program, nor for those that are beyond the control of the sponsor and its subcontractors, or for situations that may arise due to the failure of a participant to disclose pertinent information
F. Cannot assure that home-country cultural values and norms will apply in the host country

II. Responsibilities of Participants

In study abroad, as in other settings, participants can have a major impact on their own health and safety through the decisions they make before and during their program and by their day-to-day choices and behaviors.
Participants should:

A. Assume responsibility for all the elements necessary for their personal preparation for the program and participate fully in orientations.
B. Read and carefully consider all materials issued by the sponsor that relate to safety, health, legal, environmental, political, cultural, and religious conditions in the host country(ies).
C. Conduct their own research on the country(ies) they plan to visit with particular emphasis on health and safety concerns, as well as the social, cultural, and political situations.
D. Consider their physical and mental health, and other personal circumstances when applying for or accepting a place in a program, and make available to the sponsor accurate and complete physical and mental health information and any other personal data that is necessary in planning for a safe and healthy study abroad experience.
E. Obtain and maintain appropriate insurance coverage and abide by any conditions imposed by the carriers.
F. Inform parents/guardians/families and any others who may need to know about their participation in the study abroad program, provide them with emergency contact information, and keep them informed of their whereabouts and activities.
G. Understand and comply with the terms of participation, codes of conduct, and emergency procedures of the program.
H. Be aware of local conditions and customs that may present health or safety risks when making daily choices and decisions. Promptly express any health or safety concerns to the program staff or other appropriate individuals before and/or during the program.
I. Accept responsibility for their own decisions and actions.
J. Obey host-country laws.
K. Behave in a manner that is respectful of the rights and well being of others, and encourage others to behave in a similar manner.
L. Avoid illegal drugs and excessive or irresponsible consumption of alcohol.
M. Follow the program policies for keeping program staff informed of their whereabouts and well being.
N. Become familiar with the procedures for obtaining emergency health and legal system services in the host county.

III. Recommendations to Parents/Guardians/Families

In study abroad, as in other settings, parents, guardians, and families can play an important role in the health and safety of participants by helping them make decisions and by influencing their behavior overseas.

Parents/guardians/families should:

A. Be informed about and involved in the decision of the participant to enroll in a particular program.
B. Obtain and carefully evaluate participant program materials, as well as related health, safety and security information.
C. Discuss with the participant any of his/her travel plans and activities that may be independent of the study abroad program.
D. Engage the participant in a thorough discussion of safety and behavior issues, insurance needs, and emergency procedures related to living abroad.
E. Be responsive to requests from the program sponsor for information regarding the participant.
F. Keep in touch with the participant.
G. Be aware that the participant rather than the program may most appropriately provide some information.


Appendix XI Endnote

1 The good practices document, along with a variety of practitioner guidance on health and safety issues, is posted on-line at http://www.secussa.nafsa.org/safetyabroad/default.html. Though hosted on the NAFSA: Association of International Educator Web site as a part of its education abroad professional section materials, the document is a joint product of four organizations—NAFSA, Council on International Educational Exchange, Association of International Education Administrators, and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators—and was crafted by an interorganizational committee independent of any particular organization. That committee, now constituted as the Interorganizational Advisory Committee on Health and Safety in Study Abroad, remains active as the body responsible for updating and promoting the good practices statement.

2 Nearly two-thirds of undergraduate participants in study abroad are women. This figure has remained relatively steady since the Institute of International Education (IIE) began collecting this information in 1985—86. Similarly, since data collection in the area began in 1993—94, participation by Caucasian students has generally been just over four-fifths. See, Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange. (1996, 2002). T. M. Davis (Ed.). New York: Institute of International Education.


4 There was also, somewhat unexpectedly, a correlation between language gain and gender. In a large-scale study of language gain in the study abroad context, Davidson (2004) reports on the effects of duration of immersion and initial levels of proficiency on measurable gains in language proficiency. (It is the largest study of its kind in the foreign language field.) Students with relatively low levels of proficiency do not in most cases experience gains in the target language that exceed those attainable in stateside immersion (“greenhouse”) programs of comparable duration. In fact, up to half of the students who take part in short-term study abroad programs experience no measurable language gains at all. (Although they learn and experience much that is worthwhile.) The real “value added” of study abroad for second language gain is increasingly felt as learners ascend the proficiency scale. Most American university programs do not attempt to train beyond the “2” (advanced) level of proficiency in speaking or listening; well-structured study abroad learning can produce 2+, 3 (superior) and above.

5 Beginning in 1976, the American Councils for International Education: ACTR/ACCELS, then known as American Councils of Teachers of Russian (or ACTR), began sending U.S. college students to Russia on academic exchange. As of 2000, more
than 2,600 students from 274 colleges and universities have taken part in ACTR semester or academic year advanced level language and regional studies training programs in Russia or other NIS countries. (Davidson & Lehmann, 2004).

6 The data used for this trend analysis has been collected by the Institute for International Education (IIE) and published annually in the Open Doors Report on In e nationa l Educational Exchange, available online at http://www.opendoors.iienetwork.org. IIE has been collecting these data with support from the Department of State’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs for the past two decades to supplement its annual census of international students studying in the United States. The data are used by educators, press, policy-makers, researchers, students, and others interested in international educational mobility.

7 The most recent Open Doors data on study abroad was reported in Spring/Summer 2003, capturing credit received by students for study abroad during the period from Fall 2001 through Summer 2002. The survey went to 1,286 U.S. accredited higher education institutions that had previously reported any study abroad students. Of those surveyed, 1,120 (or 87.1 percent) of the institutions responded with data that were reported in Open Doors 2003. More recent data will be available in November 2004, capturing students who studied abroad from Fall 2002 through Summer 2003.


11 The Fulbright U.S. Student Program is sponsored by the U.S. Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and administered by the Institute of International Education.

12 The Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program is sponsored by the U.S. Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and administered by the Institute of International Education.

13 National Security Education Program (NSEP) David L. Boren Undergraduate Scholarship is guided by the National Security Education Board and administered by the Institute of International Education.

14 The survey responses were limited and the responding groups varied as noted below. Surveys went to four-year colleges and universities that are members of or affiliated with the three surveying organizations listed below. The writers note the absence of community colleges in this assessment and the need to include them in any further study, since study abroad is a particular challenge for students in community colleges.
• Forum on Education Abroad: A new national membership association (founded in 2000) dedicated to the needs of education abroad. Membership includes U.S. educational institutions and study abroad providers, many of which have long experience in study abroad. The 150 Forum members, which include a large number of independent universities as well as public institutions, send abroad over 80,000 students annually, about half of the total U.S. study abroad populations. Twenty-three Forum members responded to the survey.

• ISEP (International Student Exchange Program): Founded in 1979, ISEP is a membership organization of 245 higher education institutions in the United States and 35 other countries. Eighty percent of its U.S. members are public universities, both large and mid-size, and 20 percent are smaller private colleges in 41 states. ISEP conducts reciprocal exchanges and study abroad programs. Nearly 24,000 students—more than half of which are U.S. students—have participated in ISEP programs. ISEP data include responses from 22 U.S. institutions and 19 from outside the United States.

• Educational Testing Service (ETS): A nonprofit organization founded in 1947 and devoted to research and assessment to advance education. ETS serves individuals, educational institutions, governments, and business in more than 180 countries. Surveys were received from 56 ETS-affiliated higher education institutions outside the United States. U.S. respondents were senior level education abroad administrators. Their experience ranged from a low of two years in the profession to a high of 25 years. On average, respondents had served 10-12 years in the profession.

15 Hispanic students made up 10 percent of postsecondary enrollments. However, they represent only 5.4 percent of study abroad participants. For African-American students, who make up 11 percent of postsecondary enrollments, study abroad participation is even rarer—only 3.5 percent of participants are African-American. Students with disabilities make up 9 percent of those in higher education, which is triple the number from two decades ago. (The National Center for Educational Statistics, 2002; The HEATH Resource Center National Clearinghouse on Post Secondary Education for Individuals with Disabilities, 1999.) However, limited surveys in the late 1990s show students with disabilities make up less than 1 percent of those who study abroad: The online survey of 68 member institution responses conducted by Institute on International Education (IIE) in collaboration with National Clearinghouse on Disability and Exchange on the numbers of students with disabilities studying abroad in 1996—97 was published in IIE’s Winter 1999 membership newsletter, Reaching Partners in Education. A survey of Big Ten universities (Aune & Soneson, 1996) found the same outcome. Anecdotally, numbers seem to be increasing, and information disseminated through national projects provides feasible solutions to making participation possible. However, current statistics through Open Doors is unavailable and some barriers still remain that may keep percentages low.

16 Five universities interviewed 64 undergraduates with disabilities on barriers to study abroad (Matthews, Hameister & Hosley, 1998). Findings show the greatest barrier is lack of information, followed by a perceived lack of support devices, and thirdly, financial barriers. Students identified being involved in a program for nondisabled students as opposed to one solely for students with disabilities as being the most important accommodation, followed by advance notice to prepare.
17 These are techniques used by the University of Minnesota in its curricular integration project, as well as by Michigan State University in its campus wide curriculum integration process.

18 Global E3 can be viewed at http://www.iie.org/programs/global-e3/students/course_data_bank.htm

19 Students with disabilities may be receiving personal assistance and aids as well as medical coverage through Medicaid.

19 Prior to the 1999 Department of State reorganization, the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) was the home of these programs.
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Subpart A--General

Sec. 655.1 Which programs do these regulations govern?
The regulations in this part govern the administration of the following programs in international education:
(a) The National Resource Centers Program for Foreign Language and Area Studies or Foreign Language and International Studies (section 602 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended);
(b) The Language Resource Centers Program (section 603);
(c) The Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program (section 604);
(d) The International Research and Studies Program (section 605); and
(e) The Business and International Education Program (section 613).

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1121-1130b)


Subpart A--General

Sec. 655.3 What regulations apply to the International Education Programs?
The following regulations apply to the International Education Programs:
(a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) as follows:
   (1) 34 CFR part 74 (Administration of Grants to Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Nonprofit Organizations).
   (2) 34 CFR part 75 (Direct Grant Programs).
   (3) 34 CFR part 77 (Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations).
   (4) 34 CFR part 79 (Intergovernmental Review of Department of Education Programs and Activities), except that part 79 does not apply to 34 CFR parts 660, 669, and 671.
   (5) 34 CFR part 82 (New Restrictions on Lobbying).
   (6) 34 CFR part 85 (Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension
(Nonprocurement) and Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace
(Grants)).

(7) 34 CFR part 86 (Drug-Free Schools and Campuses).

(b) The regulations in this part 655; and

(c) As appropriate, the regulations in--

(1) 34 CFR part 656 (National Resource Centers Program for Foreign
Language and Area Studies or Foreign Language and International
Studies);

(2) 34 CFR part 657 (Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships
Program);

(3) 34 CFR part 658 (Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign
Language Program);

(4) 34 CFR part 660 (International Research and Studies Program);

(5) 34 CFR part 661 (Business and International Education Program);

and (6) 34 CFR part 669 (Language Resource Centers Program).

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1121-1127; 1221e-3)

[47 FR 14116, Apr. 1, 1982, as amended at 58 FR 32575, June 10, 1993; 64
FR 7739, Feb. 16, 1999]

Sec. 655.4 What definitions apply to the International Education Programs?

(a) Definitions in EDGAR. The following terms used in this part and
34 CFR parts 656, 657, 658, 660, 661, and 669 are defined in 34 CFR part
77:

Acquisition
Applicant
Application
Award
Budget
Contract
EDGAR
Equipment
Facilities
Fiscal year
Grant
Grantee
Grant period
Local educational agency
Nonprofit
Project
Project period
Private
Public
Secretary
State educational agency
Supplies

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1121-1127)

(b) Definitions that apply to these programs: The following definition applies to International Education Programs:

Combination of institutions of higher education means a group of institutions of higher education that have entered into a cooperative arrangement for the purpose of carrying out a common objective, or a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution designated or created by a group of institutions of higher education for the purpose of carrying out a common objective on their behalf.

Critical languages means each of the languages contained in the list of critical languages designated by the Secretary pursuant to section 212(d) of the Education for Economic Security Act, except that, in the implementation of this definition, the Secretary may set priorities according to the purposes of title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

Institution of higher education means, in addition to an institution that meets the definition of section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, an institution that meets the requirements of section 101(a) except that (1) it is not located in the United States, and (2) it applies for assistance under title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, in consortia with institutions that meet the definitions in section 101(a).

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1121-1127, and 1141)


Subpart B--What Kinds of Projects Does the Secretary Assist?

Sec. 655.10 What kinds of projects does the Secretary assist?

Subpart B of 34 CFR parts 656, 657, 658, 660, 661, and 669 describes the kinds of projects that the Secretary assists under the International Education Programs.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1021-1027)


Subpart C [Reserved]
Subpart D--How Does the Secretary Make a Grant?

Sec. 655.30 How does the Secretary evaluate an application?

The Secretary evaluates an applications for International Education Programs on the basis of--
(a) The general criteria in Sec. 655.31; and
(b) The specific criteria in, as applicable, subpart D of 34 CFR parts 658, 660, 661, and 669.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1121-1127)

[64 FR 7739, Feb. 16, 1999]

Sec. 655.31 What general selection criteria does the Secretary use?

(a) Plan of operation. (1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the quality of the plan of operation for the project.
(2) The Secretary looks for information that shows--
(i) High quality in the design of the project;
(ii) An effective plan of management that ensures proper and efficient administration of the project;
(iii) A clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the program;
(iv) The way the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve each objective; and
(v) A clear description of how the applicant will provide equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as--
(A) Members of racial or ethnic minority groups;
(B) Women; and
(C) Handicapped persons.

(b) Quality of key personnel. (1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the quality of the key personnel the applicant plans to use on the project.
(2) The Secretary looks for information that shows--
(i) The qualifications of the project director (if one is to be used);
(ii) The qualifications of each of the other key personnel to be used in the project. In the case of faculty, the qualifications of the faculty and the degree to which that faculty is directly involved in the actual teaching and supervision of students; and
(iii) The time that each person referred to in paragraphs (b)(2) (i) and (ii) of this section plans to commit to the project; and
(iv) The extent to which the applicant, as part of its nondiscriminatory employment practices, encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as members of racial or ethnic minority groups, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly.

(3) To determine the qualifications of a person, the Secretary considers evidence of past experience and training, in fields related to the objectives of the project, as well as other information that the applicant provides.

(c) Budget and cost effectiveness. (1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows that the project has an adequate budget and is cost effective.

(2) The Secretary looks for information that shows--

(i) The budget for the project is adequate to support the project activities; and

(ii) Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project.

(d) Evaluation plan. (1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the quality of the evaluation plan for the project.

(2) The Secretary looks for information that shows methods of evaluation that are appropriate for the project and, to the extent possible, are objective and produce data that are quantifiable.

(e) Adequacy of resources. (1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows that the applicant plans to devote adequate resources to the project.

(2) The Secretary looks for information that shows--

(i) Other than library, facilities that the applicant plans to use are adequate (language laboratory, museums, etc.); and

(ii) The equipment and supplies that the applicant plans to use are adequate.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1121-1127)

Sec. 655.32 What additional factors does the Secretary consider in making grant awards?

Except for 34 CFR parts 656, 657, and 661, to the extent practicable and consistent with the criterion of excellence, the Secretary seeks to achieve an equitable distribution of funds throughout the Nation.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1126(b)).

[58 FR 32575, June 10, 1993]

[Code of Federal Regulations]
[Title 34, Volume 3]
Subpart A--General

Sec. 661.1 What is the Business and International Education Program?

The Business and International Education Program is designed to promote linkages between institutions of higher education and American businesses engaged in international economic activities. The purpose of each project assisted under this part is both to enhance the international academic programs of institutions of higher education, and to provide appropriate services to the business community that will enable it to expand its capacity to sell its goods and services outside the United States.

Sec. 661.2 Who is eligible to apply for a grant under the Business and International Education Program?

Under this program the Secretary considers applications from institutions of higher education that have entered into agreements with business enterprises, trade organizations or associations engaged in international economic activity—or a combination or consortium of these enterprises, organizations or associations—for the purposes of pursuing the activities authorized under this program.

Sec. 661.3 What regulations apply?

The following regulations apply to this program:
(a) The regulations in 34 CFR part 655.
(b) The regulations in this part 661.

Sec. 661.4 What definitions apply to the Business and International Education Program?

(a) Definitions in EDGAR. The following terms used in this part are defined in 34 CFR part 77:
(b) Definitions in 34 CFR part 655. The following terms used in this part are defined in 34 CFR part 655.4(b):

Combinations of institutions
Institution of higher education

Subpart B--What Kinds of Activities Does the Secretary Assist Under This Program?

Sec. 661.10 What activities does the Secretary assist under this program?

The activities that the Secretary may assist institutions of higher education to conduct under this program, include but are not limited to--

(a) Innovation and improvement of international education curricula to serve the needs of the business community, including the development of new programs for nontraditional, mid-career, or part-time students;

(b) Development of programs to inform the public of increasing international economic interdependence and the role of American business within the international economic system;

(c) Internationalization of curricula at junior and community colleges, and at undergraduate and graduate schools of business;

(d) Development of area studies programs and interdisciplinary international programs;

(e) Establishment of export education programs through cooperative arrangements with regional and world trade centers and councils, and with bilateral and multilateral trade associations;
(f) Research for and development of teaching materials relating to international education, including language materials, and facilities appropriate to business-oriented students;

(g) Establishment of student and faculty fellowships and internships for training and education in international business activities;

(h) Development of opportunities for business and other professional school junior faculty to acquire or strengthen international skills and perspectives;

(i) Development of research programs on issues of common interest to institutions of higher education and private sector organizations and associations engaged in or promoting international economic activity;

(j) The establishment of internships overseas to enable foreign language students to develop their foreign language skills and their knowledge of foreign cultures and societies;

(k) Establishing linkages overseas with institutions of higher education and organizations that contribute to the educational objectives of this program; and

(l) Summer institutes in international business, foreign area, and other international studies designed to carry out the purposes of this program.

Sec. 661.20 What must an application include?

An institution that applies for a grant under this program shall include the following in its application:

(a)(1) A copy of the agreement between the applicant and the other party or parties described in Sec. 661.2 for the purpose of carrying out the activities for which the applicant seeks assistance.

(2) The agreement must be signed by all parties and it must describe the manner in which the business enterprise, trade association, or organization will assist in carrying out the activities proposed in the application.

(b) An assurance that the applicant will use the funds to supplement and not to supplant activities conducted by the applicant.

Sec. 661.30 How does the Secretary evaluate an application?

(a) The Secretary evaluates an application for a grant under this program on the basis of the criteria in Sec. 661.31.

(b) The Secretary awards up to 100 possible points for these criteria. The maximum possible points for each criterion are shown in parentheses.

Subpart D--How Does the Secretary Make a Grant?

Sec. 661.31 What selection criteria does the Secretary use?

The Secretary uses the following criteria to evaluate applications
for a grant under this program.

(a) Plan of operation. (Maximum 30 points) (See 34 CFR 655.31(a).)
(b) Qualifications of the key personnel. (Maximum 10 points) (See 34 CFR 655.31(b).)
(c) Budget and cost effectiveness. (Maximum 15 points) (See 34 CFR 655.31(c).)
(d) Evaluation plan. (Maximum 15 points) (See 34 CFR 655.31(d).)
(e) Adequacy of resources (Maximum 10 points) (See 34 CFR 655.31(e).)
(f) Need for the project. (Maximum 20 points)

The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the need for the project, and the extent to which the proposed project will promote linkages between institutions of higher education and the business community involved in international economic activities.

Sec. 661.32 What priorities may the Secretary establish?
(a) The Secretary may each year establish priorities for funding from the activities described in Sec. 661.10.
(b) The Secretary announces any priorities in the application notice published in the Federal Register.

Subpart E--What Conditions Must be Met by a Grantee?
Sec. 661.40 What are the matching requirements?
A grantee shall pay a minimum of 50 percent of the cost of the project for each fiscal year.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1130a)