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Overview

• Drivers of Graduate Internationalization
• John: Short-term GSA
• Mike: Joint- and dual-degrees, Partnerships
• Erich: Field work and Grant-funded work abroad
• Discussion: Institutional Structures, Key Stakeholders, Funding, Leadership Models
What drives graduate-level internationalization?

- Faculty, Research, Students, Employers, Competition
- Value proposition of graduate study, especially Master’s

Council of Graduate Schools survey data, 2014:

- 9% require int’l experience in over ½ of programs
- 59% have no requirements for international experiences
- But beyond what is required, much is offered:
  - 61% Short term study abroad
  - 61% International research opportunities
  - 58% Field Research
  - 48% Joint- or dual-degree programs
  - 40% Mid- or long-term study abroad
  - 29% language study outside the US
Respondents’ perceived hindrances to graduate international experiences

- 70% Garnering financial support while abroad
- 61% Family-work-life challenges for extended stay abroad
- 44% Concern about finishing degree in a timely way
- 25% Apprehension about extended time abroad
- 19% Worry about impact on local research projects
- 16% Fear of the unknown
- 14% Perceived disapproval of faculty mentors
- 13% Other
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Focus of My Comments

• Overview of short-term, faculty-led graduate study abroad (GSA)

• How to think about the overall aims of GSA

• Need for a guiding concept: The T-shaped professional

• Examples from the field

• Implications for design, facilitation, and assessment of GSA programs
Overview of GSA

- An emerging form of internationalization in graduate education
- Similarities and differences with undergraduate study abroad
- Increasing in numbers – students & programs
- Professions-based, discipline-specific
The Problem of Goals or Focus in GSA

- Lack of a coherent conceptual framework, such as liberal learning goals
- Vagueness of existing formulations of goals
Key Qualities of Effective GSA Programs

- Clear sense of overarching goals
- Grounded in a systems perspective of competencies
- Stresses interdisciplinary focus
- Relies on highly experiential learning methods
- Strives towards immersion within the culture
T-Shaped Professional as Guiding Concept for GSA
Examples Within Existing GSA Programs

• Providing professional development for university faculty and staff

• Interdisciplinary groups within education conducting analyses of capacity building needs

• Providing primary care for poor patients in developing countries
Implications for Design, Facilitation and Assessment of GSA

- Forming or building on existing international partnership
- Creating opportunities for immersion within a given site
- Discipline-based facilitation
- Assessment depends on particular focus
Issues in GSA

• Moving beyond academic tourism

• Integrating immersion within short time frames

• Building on prior experiences rather than reinventing the wheel for each program

• Branching out from professions to academic disciplines

• Funding
Dual Degrees and Networks: Scaffolding for International Research
Why Dual Degrees Specifically?

➢ “Joint” are much more complex
  • Additional accreditation issues
  • “Dual” is simply a reciprocal transfer agreement
  • Credentials from each institution
But how do they advance research?

- Take advantage of grant programs (e.g., PIRE, Erasmus)
- Develop broader collaboration
- Shared or complementary access to equipment, courses, faculty
- Integrated international experience
Why so few historically?

• Organic collaboration is generally based on individual faculty interest.
• Dual degree requires a whole department, and often several university-wide committees.
• Curriculum is the domain of individual units.
• Joint degrees may involve significant governance or accreditation issues.
• Evolving US position on thesis/dissertation
BUT there ARE Challenges:

• Supervision of thesis or dissertation

• Student burden: tuition, fees, cost-of-living

• Possible accreditation issues

• Integrating progress and structure timelines

• Converting class time, courses, credits

• Financial sustainability – *hence research*
Issues to Consider:

• Who needs to be at the table?
• Are all the processes in place and clear?
• Who is the best person/entity to move the program?
• Should grants drive programs or should programs drive grants?
• Visas and visa requirements
• Tuition, fees, expenses, time
3 Months…

Convene “Drivers”
Skype? Live?

1 month → 1 year

Exchange Curricula

1 month → 1 year

Appropriate Faculty
Review

Or 3 Years?
Example 1:
Dual PhD with the University of Rennes, France
Motivation: Broader Experience

- Better balance of Gender and Nationality
- Exposure to new culture and environment
- Exposure to different approaches and methods
- Acquire greater breadth of skills and techniques
Motivation: Academic Excellence

28 Co-Authored Peer Reviewed Publications


Motivation: International Research Grants

- **NSF-Materials World Network**: $360,000; 08/01/15-07/31/08; Synthesis, characterization and physical properties of IR glass-ceramics with new functionalities

- **NSF-Materials World Network**: $378,000; 07/01/08-06/30/11; Infrared Glass and Glass-ceramics with New Optical and Mechanical Functionalities

- **Partner University Fund**: $232,800; 07/01/11-06/30/14; Advanced Materials for Energy and Optics
Example 2:

UA College of Law
The Emerging Role of Networks:

- Consortia of peer universities
- Hub and spoke collaborations
- Mobility networks (Erasmus)
- Agency partnerships
Core Principles

• Seek broad and flexible solutions; ASK!!
• Be honest on BOTH sides and beware of hidden costs
• Maintain quality control
• Desire a clear outcome and manage timelines!
• Communicate regarding curriculum and processes … BUT...
• … don’t be a slave to process; be willing to do things differently
Field-Work and Grant-Funded Work Abroad

- Individual Field-work and internships
- Problem- and solution- based experiential learning
- The “global” resume
- Student and faculty collaboration on research and training grants
Field Work and Internships

• Workplaces, iNGOs, clinical placements, consulting,
• Professional objectives
• Quality assurance of placements, safety and security, student preparation
• Labor laws, visas, contracts
• Cultural issues in the workplace

Research and Training Grants

• Opportunities for deep student-faculty collaboration
• Issues of sustainability, scale
• Visas, legal and labor issues, IRB
For Discussion

• Leadership: What is the role of the SIO and central administration in Grad-level VS. UG internationalization?
• Who “owns” or “runs” grad-level internationalization? Deans of colleges/schools, faculty?
• Who funds graduate-level programs?
• What is central administration’s responsibility for integrity of the internationalization process, safety, security, risk mitigation, emergency response, institutional reputation...
• What is the value proposition of graduate international study?
• What makes international experiences “graduate-level” in terms of quality and content?
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