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Partnership Portfolio:
a comprehensive set of an institution’s international affiliations
(MOUs, research agreements, contracts, subawards, etc.)
Session goal:
to start a conversation on partnership portfolio analysis

• what we gain from thinking about partnerships collectively as well as individually
• what such analysis reveals about an HEI’s ecosystem of international collaboration, as well as the constituent parts of this ecosystem
• what data to collect, why, and how
• how to interpret this information and turn it into action
• How to connect it to institutional strategy and practice
• what comparative portfolio analysis reveals about the global networks now being woven by higher education
Portfolio Analysis

Jane Gatewood, PhD
Vice Provost for Global Engagement
Context For International Collaboration

Information Needs

INSTITUTIONAL DATA ELEMENTS

- Feeder institutions
  Students & faculty
- Alumni
  Residing abroad
- Mobility & Programs
  Students, Faculty & Staff
- Corporate Engagement
  Licensing, Internships, Funding, etc.
- Collaborative Agreements
  Mobility, research, degrees, etc.
- Academic Collaborations
  Conferences & Publications, etc.
- Research
  Funded or conducted abroad
- International Faculty
  Citizenship & Nationality
- International Students
  Citizenship & Nationality
- Degrees Awarded
  Disciplinary & Student demographics

University of Rochester – Internal Alignment
THE INSTITUTIONAL SELF-KNOWLEDGE HIERARCHY OF NEEDS

COLLECT

Internal data, external data, user-generated content, etc.

MOVE/STORE

Flow, infrastructure, storage

ALIGN/TRANSFORM

Cleaning, norming, prep

AGGREGATE/OPTIMIZE

Analytics, metrics, aggregates

LEARN

Institutional Self-knowledge

Adapted from “The Data Science Hierarchy of Needs” by Monica Rogati
Understanding your data landscape

- **Internal Data Organization:** who maintains and stewards it for various purposes?

- **External Reporting:** who/what office reports to various federal and rankings organizations?

- **Data storage:** where can you access various types of data?

- **Data Sharing:** how do you go about accessing various types of data?
What’s your institutional data landscape:

Centralized?
Decentralized?
Hybrid?
Data Landscapes

- **Centralized** - clear visibility into authoritative sources and transparency of access points.
- **Hybrid** – blend of two models; some authoritative sources, some fragmentation.
- **Decentralized** – fragmented, siloed sources; some of which are in competition; opacity.
University of Rochester – Internal Alignment

INSTITUTIONAL DATA ELEMENTS

**Feeder institutions**
- Students & faculty

**Alumni**
- Residing abroad

**Mobility & Programs**
- Students, Faculty & Staff

**Corporate Engagement**
- Licensing, Internships, Funding, etc.

**Collaborative Agreements**
- Mobility, research, degrees, etc.

**Academic Collaborations**
- Conferences & Publications, etc.

**Research**
- Funded or conducted abroad

**International Faculty**
- Citizenship & Nationality

**International Students**
- Citizenship & Nationality

**Degrees Awarded**
- Disciplinary & Student demographics

---

**Data Sources**
Admissions applications, Mobility & travel reports, faculty activity reports, faculty activity reports, contracts & grants, publications & conferences

**Data Stewards**
Admissions office(s), education abroad, departments & schools, libraries, sponsored research offices, institutional research offices
Thank you!

Jane Gatewood, PhD
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International Partnership Portfolio Review

THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
University of Kentucky (in brief)

- Public, comprehensive, flagship, research-intensive
- One of the original land-grant universities, est. 1865
- 30,545 students (22,276 ugrad; 8,006 grad/prof., 1,687 int’l)
- 2,586 faculty (1,734 instructional, 852 research/clinical)
- $4.2 billion annual operating budget
- $471 million in externally funded research
- Largest regional healthcare provider
a bit of institutional context . . .

**University of Kentucky** *(where we stand)*

- **#60** among US public universities, **#132** overall *(USN&WR, 2020)*
- **25** programs in the top 20 in the US *(USN&WR, 2020)*: public finance & budgeting, pharmacy, library & info studies, public affairs, physical therapy, public health, etc.

- **Top 350** worldwide *(USN&WR Global Universities, 2020)*
- **Top 400** worldwide *(ARWU Shanghai, 2019)*
- **Top 500** worldwide *(Times Higher Ed, 2020)*
- **Top 650** worldwide *(QS, 2020)*

and, yes . . .

- **the winningest basketball program** in the history of US college basketball
Why should we assess our overall international partnership portfolio?

- Identify and gather data related to the *full range of international collaborations happening across campus* (student/staff mobility, recruitment, alumni relations, funded research, tech transfer, corporate relations, etc.)
- Identify *gaps in your knowledge* about your partnership portfolio (i.e. “know what you don’t know”)
- Inform *strategic decision-making* (where to invest, where to divest)
- Identify *clusters* of engagement
- Avoid redundancies and work towards *economies of scale*
- Identify and *celebrate long-term/historical* partnerships
- Identify your most active *campus stakeholders*
- Identify any *geographic gaps* in your global engagement
- Develop an accurate *taxonomy of agreement types* for your institution, and monitor the distribution of types across the portfolio
Assessing your institutions overall partnership portfolio

Some data points to consider:
• Taxonomy: Agreements by type/purpose
• Geography: Agreements by country/region
• “Ownership”: Agreements by requesting/sponsoring unit
• History: Agreements sustained over time

Some questions to consider:
• Institutional Context: Mission & Strategy
  How effectively does your portfolio contribute to broader institutional priorities and goals
• Institutional Context: Student Demands and Interests
  Does your portfolio reflect your sources of international students? Your students’ study abroad destinations?
• Institutional Context: Research Collaborations/Foci
  Does your portfolio reflect the research interests and collaborations of your faculty?
### Partnership Database Overview

#### Dashboard

- **Active**: 295
- **About to Expire**: 4
- **Expired**: 316
- **Permanent**: 34

#### Partnerships

All partnerships are listed below. Clicking on a partnership will allow you to edit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Effective date</th>
<th>Expiration date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Al-Beroni University</td>
<td>Agriculture, Food, and Environment</td>
<td>1/26/2012</td>
<td>1/26/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>American University of Tirana</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>8/30/2011</td>
<td>8/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Universidad de Morón</td>
<td>Agriculture, Food &amp; Environment</td>
<td>8/10/2018</td>
<td>8/9/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia &amp; Oceania</td>
<td>Student Exchange</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>9/1/2016</td>
<td>8/31/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia and Oceania</td>
<td>Student Exchange</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>1/1/1995</td>
<td>12/31/2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
298 currently in-force inter-institutional agreements, with partners based in 63 countries

By UK College/Unit:
- University-Wide (18%)
- Gatton B&E (17%)
- CAFE (10%)
- Engineering (12%)
- Arts & Sciences (16%)
- Medicine (11%)
- Pharmacy (3%)
- Communication & Information (1%)
- Education (1%)
- Fine Arts (1%)
- Health Sciences (2%)
- Martin School (1%)
- Nursing (2%)
- Public Health (1%)
- Dentistry (1%)
- Law (.5%)
- VPR/Institutes (1%)

By Type:
- General (37%)
- Student Mobility-Outbound (28%)
- Student Mobility-Inbound (28%)
- Research Focused (3%)
CASE STUDY: Partnership Portfolio Sample: University of Kentucky IPR Partnership Database

**Agreements by Type**
- Clinical Placement or Exchange, 23
- Cooperative Research, 8
- Dual Degree, 1
- Faculty Exchange, 1
- Grad Pathway, 25
- Internship, 1
- Joint Center (Confucius), 1
- Medical Resident Placement or Exchange, 15
- Partnering, 3
- Student Exchange, 44
- Study Abroad, 4
- Staff Exchange, 1
- Recruitment, 2
- General, 2

**Agreements by UK College/Unit**
- University-Wide, 53
- Arts & Sciences, 50
- Engineering, 36
- Gatton B&E, 50
- Fine Arts, 1
- CAFE, 31
- Communication & Information, 4
- Dentistry, 2
- Education, 2
- Martin School, 3
- Law, 1
- Health Sciences, 6
- Medicine, 33
- Pharmcy, 9
- Nursing, 5
- Social Work, 2
- Public Health, 2
CASE STUDY: Partnership Portfolio Sample: University of Kentucky IPR Partnership Database

Agreements by World Region

- Asia: 55%
- Europe: 21%
- Latin America & the Caribbean: 13%
- Africa: 8%
- Middle East: 5%
- North America: 3%
- Australia & Oceania: 1%
Other data sets to consider . . .

- Funded research (int’l sources of funding, sites of activity, foci, int’l subcontracts)
- “unfunded” research (co-authorship, IRB apps, dissertation travel grants)
- Faculty/staff travel (conference, consulting, teaching, research)
- International awards and recognitions (faculty, staff, students)
- Recruitment travel, agents, etc.
- Technology transfer (int’l patents, licensing, data sharing, material transfer agreements)
- Alumni relations (int’l clubs/chapters)
- Purchasing (int’l vendors, service providers)
- International Rankings
Faculty, staff, student travel snapshot (travel registry data)
# Co-authorship activity (SciVal data)

Scholarly Output at the University of Kentucky, by amount of international, national and institutional collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Scholarly Output</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Citations per Publication</th>
<th>Field-Weighted Citation Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International collaboration</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>7,317</td>
<td>105,321</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only national collaboration</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>9,107</td>
<td>69,891</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only institutional collaboration</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>4,755</td>
<td>33,910</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single authorship (no collaboration)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>6,414</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[UK International Center logo]
Co-authorship activity (SciVal data)

Top Collaborating non-U.S. Institutions:
1. Chinese Academy of Sciences (380)
2. Hong Kong Polytechnic (287)
3. University of Toronto (224)
4. University of British Columbia (176)
5. Centre national de la recerche scientifique—CNRS (159)
6. Tsinghua University (154)
7. University of Science and Technology of China (139)
8. University of Cambridge (120)
9. Goethe University Frankfurt (118)
10. University College London (118)
11. Ministry of Education China (116)
12. Shandong University (113)
13. University of Oxford (111)
14. Czech Academy of Sciences (109)
And once again . . .

Why should we assess our overall international partnership portfolio?

• To better understand our institution’s global presence
• To align that presence with institutional strengths, priorities, investment of resources for internationalization
• To align that presence with local, state, regional stakeholders
• To inform strategic planning and decision-making
• To more effectively respond to opportunities, crises, changing geopolitical and economic landscapes, and evolving regulatory/compliance environments
Comparing portfolios: a first foray

The sample: 8 research intensive public (state) universities in U.S.
• Land grant only, not land grant, or both
• Representing different U.S. regions
• Have posted lists of MOUs with basic descriptions online

Yielding:
• 1416 distinct partnerships (some with multiple MOUs)
• In 129 nations
• Ranging from 78 to 305 partnerships per sample university
Caveats

• Small sample, only marginally scientific
• U.S. only – and just one type within this
• Cannot tell the actual level of activity from the listing
• The HEIs that post such listings are also those that have devoted considerable energy and thought to partnerships

• A preliminary study – just starting to sketch this landscape
### INSTITUTIONAL COMPARISON: Percentage of Partnerships in Each Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>HEI 1</th>
<th>HEI 2</th>
<th>HEI 3</th>
<th>H3I 4</th>
<th>HEI 5</th>
<th>HEI 6</th>
<th>HEI 7</th>
<th>HEI 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agric/Vet</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts&amp;Sci</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Xchange</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highest for that field*  
*Lowest for that field*
Regional Distribution of Partnerships

- Europe: 29%
- Asia: 15%
- Middle East: 5%
- Oceania: 4%
- South Amer: 5%
- Africa: 41%
- Canada: 1%
### TOP TEN NATIONS (in # of partnerships)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATION</th>
<th># PARTNERSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO *</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH KOREA</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: MEXICO is marked with an asterisk.*

32% of U.S. study abroad students are hosted by the United Kingdom, Italy, and Spain.
## REGIONAL COMPARISON: Partnership Type Distribution within Each Region
(in percentages of total partnerships in that region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Agric/Vet</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Arts&amp;Sci</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
<th>Law/Pol</th>
<th>Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highest* for that region  
*Lowest* for that region
Some questions to ponder together:

• What more would be useful to know/investigate?
• Where does this lead us? What does it suggest? How do we act on it?
“The universities of the world are a sort of new diplomatic network that has never really been lit up yet. But it could and it should.”

Simon Anholt, Plenary Presentation, EAIE 2019
THANK YOU!