An Internationalized Stewardship of Urban Places

Gil Latz, Susan Buck Sutton, and Barbara Hill

Abstract

Metropolitan universities in the United States are driven by the intertwined missions of broadening educational access and serving their surrounding communities. International education historically has been placed somewhat apart from such missions. This separation has little justification in these globalized times, however – a realization that changes how such institutions might approach the civic engagement and stewardship at their core. Metropolitan areas must now be understood not only in terms of geographic proximity but also in terms of intersecting "spheres of engagement," from local to global. Cities, their universities, and the graduates they produce, must learn to operate across these spheres with skill, wisdom, and responsibility. The result is the internationalized academic stewardship of urban places discussed in this article.

Only a little over a decade ago, a study by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) concluded that most of the academic institutions they had surveyed saw little connection between their international and civic engagement activities (AASCU 2002, 19). These particular institutions were not alone in this regard. The tendency to see the local and the global as separate and distinct phenomena has a long history in U.S. academia. Since that study, however, local-global connections have become apparent for communities and academic institutions alike. In this century of clear and present globalization, colleges and universities are increasingly recognizing that local and global are part of the same system, that one cannot be understood without reference to the other, and that the local communities in which they are located must now be viewed as globally embedded.

This article considers how such understandings can be translated into new forms of civic engagement, especially for metropolitan universities with their clear mission of "being effective regional leaders and stewards for enhancing the quality of life and educational, economic, and cultural development" for their communities (Coalition for Urban and Metropolitan Universities). How can such stewardship reflect that the urban regions served by these universities function within multiple, intertwined networks of other places, from local to national to regional to global? It is time to close the gap between civic engagement and international initiatives noted — and argued against — in the 2002 AASCU report. In this light, metropolitan universities must consider and communicate the ways in which global forces shaped the cities in which they are located in the past and are reshaping them in the present. They must understand and connect with the international linkages that increasingly connect these localities with others. And they must prepare all graduates, no matter their discipline or profession, to operate in a globalized world with skill, wisdom, and responsibility.

Higher education in the United States is increasingly challenged to demonstrate its relevance in the face of stagnant economic growth, a world that is increasingly interdependent and, therefore, often increasingly competitive, and revolutionary advances in communication that bring the far away and unfamiliar closer in time but not necessarily in understanding. A repositioning of global learning in the U.S. higher education curriculum and a more intentional engagement with the international dimensions of the communities in which all our academic institutions reside can provide some answers to this challenge. Because of their distinctive student bodies and missions, metropolitan universities are in a position to lead the way in doing this.

Connecting International Education and Civic Engagement

In short, the pushes and pulls of a globalizing world ask metropolitan universities to reposition international education within their missions. For decades, international education was framed in ways that made its relevance to local and particularly urban stewardship hard to discern. Across the United States, the long-standing default understanding, holding sway until the current century, has been that international education was primarily for those interested in national security or certain specialist disciplines, such as those of two authors of this paper: anthropology and geography (Altbach 2013; de Wit 2002; Klasek 1992). In a similar vein, study abroad was largely seen as the domain of traditional-age, white, middle- or upper-class students in the liberal arts. Such students constituted roughly 75 percent of those who studied abroad from U.S. institutions until business students began to join the mix in the mid-1990s. Even now they are roughly half those who study abroad. International education was freighted with connotations of the exotic, expensive, and elitist.

Such images were never entirely true, but they were prevalent and resulted in perceiving international education as conflicting with a needed focus on local issues for metropolitan universities, and, therefore, side-lining it. For such urban-serving institutions, the emphasis on local community, the professional programs that featured prominently in their offerings, and the diverse, often older, often working students they served led to a particularly wide gap between civic engagement and international education.

As Hoffa and DePaul (2010) put it, spreading study abroad (and by extension, international education in general) to broader audiences has required a process of "legitimation" that has really only gotten underway in the twenty-first century. For metropolitan universities, this has meant articulating the importance of international education for students beyond the liberal arts and the privileged, recognizing how urban regions are shaped by global forces, and moving toward democratization of the advantages conveyed by international education and understanding. The process started slowly but is gaining momentum. AASCU's recent follow-up study of local stewardship by U.S. institutions, for example, found that 23.8 percent of the colleges

and universities achieving the Elective Community Engagement Classification from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching now have a strategic priority of making international engagement a complement to their local engagement activities (Saltmarsh et al. 2014, 18). This shift resonates with ones that have been gaining momentum in international education more generally.

The first steps in this direction occurred when a few individuals and institutions argued that the various and often disparate activities falling under international education should be knit into a coherent, mutually reinforcing whole in the early 1990s. A new term, "internationalization," was coined to signal this change and captured in Knight's classic definition as the process of "integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions" of a college or university (Knight 1994).

This broadened view of international education matched an emerging awareness of the globalization that was – by then – visibly reshaping lives, communities, and professions everywhere. The shift called for international efforts to spread across all aspects of an institution and to be integrated with each other. There should be greater international content in classes, more cross-national research, and – what is most important for this article – under the heading of service, more attention to the international dimensions of civic engagement, such as working with local immigrant groups. Identifying what should be done and doing it are two separate activities, however, and it was another decade before many U.S. institutions began actively pursuing such agendas.

As this happened, understandings of what was at stake in internationalization broadened further still. Many colleges and universities now understand internationalization as more than an inward process of acquiring new perspectives and resources, but also—and equally – as an outward process of becoming more externally engaged (Ellingboe 1998; Sutton 2010). Internationalization now asks institutions to become actors in an emerging global system of higher education, in which cutting-edge research is done through collaboration of scholars across national boundaries, students swirl from one country to another, joint degrees and branch campuses emerge, and IT has made it possible for faculty to be in one country and students in another. Academia has become as globalized as any other profession, and institutions are being transformed in ways only partly knowable at this moment.

U.S. institutions are responding to this situation in different ways. For metropolitan universities, the increasingly outward connectivity of colleges and universities resonates with the increasingly outward connectivity of the communities they serve. In this fact lies the key to an internationalized understanding of stewardship of urban places. Academic institutions and urban communities are on parallel trajectories of global engagement, and there is much to gain from joining them together in this journey.

Metropolitan communities and universities have much to share in understanding the global forces that are reshaping them, welcoming the new citizens – and hence the new students – in their midst, intertwining the international linkages that each is developing, ensuring widespread global knowledge and competence across the region and workforce, and assisting each other in navigating an increasingly globalized world.

Such internationalized forms of civic engagement also can position metropolitan universities as leaders in academic internationalization more generally. Internationalization calls for application as well as theory, exploration of the international dimensions of all disciplines and professions, preparation of all students for globalized lives, and outward engagement that acknowledges the importance of dialogue and collaboration in an increasingly interconnected world. Such activities come naturally to metropolitan universities, with their long-standing concern for stewardship, civic engagement, and educating broadly across populations and disciplines.

Five Strategies for an Internationalized Stewardship of Urban Places

Metropolitan universities represent a critically important, community-directed modality of U.S. tertiary education. In this light, they are poised to explore the powerful role they might play in the internationalization of higher education and the sustainable development of urban life around the world. As Thomas Friedman, among others, notes, the leading communities of the future will be those that harness higher learning and global connectivity (Friedman and Mandelbaum 2012). They must look outwardly, and we see at least five major ways in which metropolitan colleges and universities can be part of this process. Each is a matter of integrating international perspectives into the kind of work that already distinguishes such institutions.

- Strategy #1: Institute global learning for all, regardless of major, and connect such learning experiences to professional practice and community development.

International learning must spread beyond the specialist disciplines that gave it birth and prepare graduates in all fields to navigate and lead in a globalizing world. Over the past ten years, the expectations of both public and private sectors for U.S. graduates to raise their levels of global competence have been well documented. *College Learning for the New Global Century* (AAC&U 2007) provides but one example by reporting survey findings for the learning outcomes on which U.S. business leaders want colleges and universities to place greater emphasis.

Figure 1: Employers Say Graduates Need Expanded Skills to Succeed in a Global Economy

Essential Skills	Percent of Business Leaders Responding Affirmatively
Intercultural Knowledge and Global Issues	**72**
Role of United States in the World	**60**
Cultural Values and Traditions (U.S. and global)	**53**
Intercultural Competence (including ability to work on diverse teams)	**76**

Such outcomes cannot be achieved simply by opening up new sections of introductory geography or more slots in traditional study abroad programs, as important as these are. These outcomes require focused attention on new student constituencies, the relevance of international learning to their lives and professions, and the constraints that shape their ability to travel. These outcomes also require new courses and pedagogies that facilitate experiential, applicative, and dialogical learning; in other words, learning that weds knowledge to practice, builds skills of cross-cultural interaction, engenders self-reflection, and makes explicit how international learning prepares students for their lives and careers (Brewer and Leask 2012; Hovland 2006; Olsen, Green, and Hill 2006).

Along these lines, new, short-term study abroad options can open doors for students who have not historically thought of themselves as the kind who study abroad (Brewer and Cunningham 2010; Lewen 2009). Internationally focused internships and service learning can build skills of application and interaction, both at home and abroad (Bringle, Hatcher, and Jones 2010; Teekens 2006). Workshops and small grants can enable faculty, across all fields, to explore the international dimensions of their disciplines, as can curricular collaboration with colleagues in other parts of the world, both face-to-face and virtually (Edwards and Teekens 2012; Green and Schoenberg 2006). Of equal importance are efforts to bring disciplines that have historically been engaged with international learning into conversation with those that have not, as well as making explicit the connection between international and intercultural learning.

In short, the concepts and tools needed for a broadened understanding of international learning are increasingly known, and metropolitan universities are in a particularly good position to employ them, focused as they long have been on professional education as well as the liberal arts, on experiential learning as well as classroom. Kennesaw State University (KSU) is an exemplar in this regard.

In 2007 KSU formed a Global Learning Coordination Council, with representatives from each of KSU's academic colleges and student affairs units, to develop an institution-wide initiative titled "Global Learning for Engaged Citizenship." The result

has been a cross-fertilization of international ideas across departments and degrees. Eighty-six percent of KSU's degrees have now defined (and also now assess) global learning objectives, from nursing to education to business to liberal arts. Student enrollment in internationally-themed courses doubled in just five years. This growth was accompanied by development of a Global Engagement Certificate, which can be earned by students across all majors through a combination of classroom and experiential learning that prepares them for international work. In pursuing the certificate, students assemble a portfolio of work that demonstrates participation in courses, study abroad programs, language learning, international events on campus, and engagement with immigrant groups and international organizations and businesses in the surrounding area. The portfolio also includes student reflections on their personal growth in cross-cultural knowledge, awareness, teamwork, and citizenship.

- Strategy #2: Create public awareness and understanding of the ways in which global forces have shaped urban areas in the past and are reshaping them once again today.

Global engagement asks communities and universities to conceptualize themselves in terms of their broader relationships, an endeavor requiring focused research and reflection on international trends and networks, past and present. Cities have played particularly important roles in such networks, serving as points of energy and contact between the regions that surround them and the broader world. Knowledge of the particular international relationships at work in a particular urban area is vital to living, working, and planning the future of that area. Metropolitan universities are well-suited to research and assemble such knowledge and also to convene the public conversations that will make sense of the results. By focusing on the trends and networks of greatest relevance to their specific surrounding communities, universities can bring the local and the global together in ways that directly and explicitly help these communities (and the individuals who live within them) frame their futures.

As an institution recognized for its high levels of civic engagement, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) has, for example, made such public discussions a hallmark of its internationalization program, convening forums, festivals, workshops, and performances that bring faculty, students, and residents of central Indiana into conversation on key global issues. Over the last few years, IUPUI has held forums for teachers, police, and the public in general on the new immigration (especially from Mexico) that is reshaping the local population; hosted a community town hall to grasp the reasons behind the post-election violence in Kenya, a nation to which literally hundreds of Indianapolis organizations have become connected through twenty years of collaboration sparked by IUPUI's work with Moi University on healthcare; expanded the work of its Confucius Institute in illuminating Chinese history, culture, economy, and current growth for audiences from pre-school children to the Indianapolis business community, including co-production of programs on trade and medicine through local public broadcasts; become a major sponsor of the annual Indianapolis International Festival; and facilitated a public interactive video conference series with speakers from regions of conflict around the world.

It must be underscored that IUPUI's efforts to illuminate relevant global issues for the Indianapolis metropolitan area have not been unidirectional. Dialogue and collaboration have been critical to developing an understanding of the city's international linkages and connections, with benefits for IUPUI's students and faculty as well as the local community. Many of the events listed previously were conceived and implemented during meetings of groups whose members represented both university and community. In so doing, these internationally focused activities have been able to build on such long-standing centers of civic engagement at IUPUI as the Polis Center, which partners with more than one hundred Indianapolis organizations in providing data and research to inform community-building and decision-making, and the Center for Service and Learning, which operates through a clearly articulated philosophy of community partnership as a source of mutual learning.

- Strategy #3: Shape the university's international programs at least partially to reflect the specific international connections of local businesses, agencies, groups, and organizations.

Another strategy for bridging international education and local engagement is for universities to focus at least some curricula, research projects, public programming, study abroad opportunities, and international partnerships toward specific areas of the world in which the local community has the greatest interest and the most connections. This enables universities to accumulate the area expertise needed to advise local organizations and businesses, doubles the linkages that tie individuals and organizations to each other, and builds academic-community synergies around specific projects and initiatives.

Portland State University in Oregon (PSU) is an exemplar on this point. One of PSU's most successful international endeavors is the Intel Vietnam Scholars (IVS) program, a 3+2 B.S. Engineering degree project for cohorts of Vietnamese students that responds to the changing international work force needs of Intel, Oregon's largest private employer, and other technology-driven companies in Oregon's "Silicon Forest." Over seventy-five students have graduated from this program (http://www.pdx.edu/cecs/intel-vietnam-scholars).

PSU has made partnerships with Vietnamese institutions a priority since 2003. Initially, PSU explored linkages with the Vietnam Fulbright Office, resulting in a Visiting Fulbright Scholar for the 2004–2005 academic year (Latz, Ingle, and Fischer 2009). A series of strategic partnerships and projects resulted, including collaboration with national and local academic, government, and business partners in each country, organized around such themes as Enhancing Sustainable Urbanism and Eco-City Innovation; Reforming Academic Programs in Engineering, Computer Science, Political Leadership, and Business; Expanding Learning Opportunities for Vietnamese and U.S. Students; Curricular Development Opportunities for PSU Faculty; and Strategic Partnering in Applied Research, Professional Development and Trade (Halimi et al. 2014; Halimi and Ingle 2007) (http://www.pdx.edu/cps/vietnam-partnerships-leadership-trainings). In support of collaboration, for example, PSU's

Institute of Sustainable Solutions provided an investment of $45,000 for PSU's sustainability-related programs in Vietnam. Priorities for the funding include climate change and adaptation research, capacity building in eco-city development with Hoi An and Danang City, and support for the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI). Through this investment, PSU now places four graduate student interns in Vietnam and hosts four government officials from Vietnam as interns at PSU for periods of ten weeks. Of particular significance, PSU's decade-plus activity in Vietnam has been recognized with a $500,000 grant from the U.S. State Department to assist the U.S. Mission in Vietnam in the planning and execution of a number of country-wide and provincial celebrations in 2015 in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of normalization of diplomatic relations between the United States and Vietnam.

Each of these initiatives allows PSU to collaborate with a nation undergoing profound economic, social, and political change, but also to connect its efforts in mutually beneficial ways with global educational, workforce, and development needs of businesses in the Oregon and the Pacific Northwest (Domagal-Goldman et al. 2014).

- Strategy #4: Reach out to the growing immigrant communities in many of our regions through collaborations that benefit both students and the communities.

The United States is undergoing the highest level of immigration since the massive waves that entered the country at the turn of the nineteenth into the twentieth century. Some newcomers are highly educated and value sending their children to college. Others are struggling simply to pay the rent. All face issues of adaptation and discrimination. Urban-serving institutions have long played a critical role in broadening educational access to all groups within their communities. Reaching out to new immigrants continues this tradition, enabling them to achieve mobility and acknowledging them as a vital resource for the community as a whole.

The City University of New York (CUNY), across its various campuses, is a leader in engaging with immigrant communities and has been for some time. Its first campus was established in mid-nineteenth century, in the words of its founder Townsend Harris (former U.S. ambassador to Japan), to "let the children of the rich and the poor take their seats together and know of no distinction save that of industry, good conduct, and intellect" (CUNY website http://www.cuny.edu/about/history.html). When New York City was inundated with new immigrants in the early twentieth century, CUNY added campuses and innovations such as evening classes to serve them. It continues to meet such needs. Its latest campus, Gutmann Community College established in Manhattan in 2011, was designed specifically to improve "graduation rates for CUNY's diverse urban students with a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds" (CUNY website http://www.cuny.edu/about/history.html).

Today 60 percent of students across the CUNY system are either immigrants themselves or the children of immigrants. Their presence enhances the learning of all CUNY students, and CUNY actively supports these students and reaches out to the communities from which they come. All CUNY campuses provide dedicated language

training and special services to immigrant students, and most have clubs such as Brooklyn College's Haitian American Student Association. Courses on immigration history and issues abound, and research units such as the Center for the Study of Staten Island sponsor borough-specific immigration studies. CUNY partners with the mayor's office to conduct the We Are New York program, which has supported over 700 CUNY students in teaching and counseling 4,000 young immigrants across all five boroughs over the last few years. In a parallel initiative, CUNY law students provide free advice at an Immigration and Refugee Rights Clinic.

- Strategy #5: Take the lead in developing community conversations on matters of global citizenship and responsibility.

Metropolitan universities also can become voices for international collaboration rather than exploitation, for ethically-based mutuality that sustains global partnerships rather than undermines them, and for approaching global issues through global dialogue. The more our communities and institutions participate in global networks, the greater is our responsibility to work with others to shape these networks in mutually beneficial ways. Kanter's early (1994) identification of the "collaborative advantage" that accrues to businesses that enter the international arena through partnership rather than take-over is reflected in the increasing emphasis on ethics, social responsibility, and impact investing across U.S. business schools today. Such themes reverberate across all professions and disciplines, and urban-serving universities can model and promulgate such collaborative understandings of international engagement for their communities.

Florida International University (FIU) is pursuing just such goals in multiple ways. The first is preparing its graduates to take up such issues when they graduate. "Global learning for global citizenship" is the driving theme of its initiatives in international education, establishing the goal that all FIU students will not only gain knowledge about the broader world but will become engaged citizens of it, with a sense of responsibility and connection. To this end, all undergraduates must take two global learning courses to graduate, one in the general education portion of their curricula and one taking up matters of global citizenship in their majors. FIU also provides Global Civic Engagement grants to students to develop service projects that have both international and local significance. The FIU College of Business sponsors the *Journal for Global Business and Community* that solicits student submissions "to encourage an increased level of discourse among tomorrow's business and community leaders so they may be better able to fairly and efficiently advance productive economic relationships in the global arena" (Florida International University website http://jgbc.fiu.edu.).

Moving in another direction, FIU also takes these discussions of global citizenship beyond the university itself. Its concise mission statement articulates its commitment to "collaborative engagement with our local and global communities" (Florida International University website http://www.fiu.edu/about-us/vision-mission/index.html). In this light, the Jack D. Gordon Institute for Public Policy and Citizenship Studies regularly sponsors public lectures on matters of global citizenship

by local and international speakers. FIU's Latin American Grid project brings together universities and computer companies in the United States, Mexico, Argentina, and Spain to build research partnerships and explore how their combined strengths can lead to new discoveries in cyber infrastructure applications, integration, and enablement. FIU also serves as one of twenty-five US universities designated to run preparation programs for prospective Peace Corps volunteers. And its GLOWS (Global Waters for Sustainability) Project, funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development, pulls together a host of university and community organizations to address water issues in sub-Saharan Africa. In short, FIU does much to ensure that matters of global responsibility and collaboration find their place in South Florida's conversations about international engagement.

Organizing Universities for an Internationalized Stewardship of Local Place

These five strategies ask metropolitan universities to bring their international activities and their civic engagement activities into conversation with each other. In most, if not all, of the examples given, this has been done by moving beyond organizational silos within the university. This cross-silo collaboration often starts with greater communication between the international and community engagement offices, recognizing that each has something to bring to the conversation. Neither can do this work alone. One side must become more familiar with the local, while the other must do the same with the global. Establishing a regular pattern of cross-office communication as well as joint projects can be very useful in establishing trust and identifying what each side can contribute.

The larger projects mentioned previously only came about when the larger campus community also became engaged in this work. International and civic engagement offices can stimulate, organize, and support such projects, but the success of these endeavors ultimately relies on the engagement and commitment of many others. For this to happen, as Kytle (2012) says for new developments within universities in general and Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) point out for new international initiatives in specific, it is best to establish an institution-wide dialogue that engages in collective sense-making and goal-setting. There are various modalities for doing this, with one of the most common being the formation of an institution-wide council or committee to bring together all relevant parties.

In other words, the kinds of dialogues recommended in strategy five above have to occur within the university as well. Who must be at the table for these discussions will vary from institution to institution, but certainly must span the top-down/bottom-up divide. These conversations must consider how an internationalized stewardship of local place fits with institutional mission and where there might be institution-wide priorities and synergies. They must also consider how such efforts advance faculty work and student learning. For metropolitan universities, these discussions must also consider workforce needs, pressing civic issues, and regional goals as well. There is no

need to identify a single way of carrying out such stewardship; in fact, all of the illustrative institutions mentioned previously have a host of relevant projects under way. What is important is creating the atmosphere that values and supports such work.

There is also the increasingly important question of accountability and agreed upon ways to measure progress toward new campus and community goals for internationalization. The foremost goal of any institutional change initiative, such as internationalization, is improvement, whether the target is student learning, campus climate, or research productivity. The evidence needed should be directed to answering three questions:

- How much change has occurred? What is different on campus?
- What strategies have produced the change?
- What has been the impact, intended and unintended, of the changes?

These questions suggest three types of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative. First is information documenting what has happened and what progress, if any, has been achieved (what activities occurred, who participated, what changes were instituted). Second is evidence that differentiates between successful and unsuccessful strategies (which ones worked best and why). Third are assessments of the overall impact of these efforts, both those that were intended and those that were not (evaluations by participants, surveys of various institutional units and community partners, changes in pre-existing patterns).

Figure 2: Providing Evidence of Internationalization

General Framework for Determining Evidence	Progress	Success of Strategies	Results
Activities	What activities are different?	What strategies helped change activities?	What is the impact of these activities?
Outcomes	What changes have occurred in select areas (e.g., number of international students, number of students studying abroad, activities with international partners)?	What strategies led to changes in key outcomes?	What impacts have the changes created?

Processes	What processes are different?	What strategies were effective in altering processes?	What are the impacts of these changed processes? Which were intentional? Which were unintentional? Which were unforeseen?
Structures	In what ways have defined roles and relationships, or institutional structures changed?	What strategies were used successfully to bring this about?	What are the impacts and implications of these changes for daily work and long-term institutional health?
Experiences	In what ways has the institutional climate changed?	Through what strategies was climate changed?	What are the impacts of the new climate on faculty, students, staff, and administrators? On external constituencies?
Language and symbols in both internal and external statements (including web/print materials)	In what ways has language about the initiative changed?	What strategies worked and did not work to change this language?	What are the implications of these changes?

Ultimately, an internationalized stewardship of urban places will rest on institutional actions that spread global learning broadly across all disciplines, connect directly to the international interests of local organizations and businesses, and pursue such goals through partnerships, both local and global. This will be achieved when colleges and universities understand and construct their international efforts to have local impact and meaning, when academic-community collaborations carry mutual benefit for both sides (as well as for the international partners thus engaged), when there is a sustained structure for dialogue and planning of such activities, and when these activities spread widely across both campus and community.

References

Altbach, Philip, G. Reisberg, and L.E. Rumbley. 2009. *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking a Revolution. A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education.* Paris: UNESCO.

Altbach, Philip G., ed. 1996. *The International Academic Profession: Portraits of Fourteen Countries.* Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Altbach, Philip G. 2013. *The International Imperative in Higher Education.* Boston: Sense Pubs.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). 2002. *Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place: A Guide for Leading Public Engagement at State Colleges and Universities.* Washington D.C.: AASCU.

Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC& U). 2007. *College Learning for the New Global Century.* Washington D.C.: AAC&U.

Brewer, Betsy, and Betty Leask. 2012. "Internationalization of the Curriculum." In *The Sage Handbook of International Higher Education*, edited by Darla K. Deardorff, Hans deWit, John Heyl, and Tony Adams. Sage Publishers, pp. 245–266.

Brewer, Betsy, and Kiran Cunningham. 2010. *Integrating Study Abroad into the Curriculum: Theory and Practice across the Disciplines.* Sterling VA: Stylus.

Bringle, Robert G., Julie A. Hatcher, and Steven Jones, eds. 2010. *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research*, Sterling VA: Stylus.

Coalition for Urban and Metropolitan Universities website. Accessed http://www.cumuonline.org/?page=missionvision.

Deardorff, Darla K., Hans deWit, John D. Heyl, and Tony Adams, eds. 2012. *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education.* Los Angeles: SAGE Pubs.

DeWit, Hans. 2002. *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Domagal-Goldman, Jennifer, Richard Dunfee, Arlene Jackson, Peter N. Stearns, and Jolanda Westerhof. 2014. *Becoming a Steward of Place: Four Areas of Institutional Focus.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Edwards, Jane, and Hanneke Teekens. 2012. "Leveraging Technology and the International Classroom for Cross-Cultural Learning." In *The Sage Handbook of International Higher Education*, edited by Darla K. Deardorff, Hans deWit, John Heyl, and Tony Adams. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publishers, pp. 267–282.

Egron-Polak, Eva, and Ross Hudson. 2014. *Internationalization of Higher Education: Global Trends, Regional Perspectives.* Paris: International Association of Universities.

Friedman, Thomas L., and Michael Mandelbaum. 2012. *That Used to Be Us: How America Fell Behind in the World It Invented and How We Can Come Back.* New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux.

Green, Madeleine F., and Christa Olson. 2003. *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Green, Madeleine F., and Robert Shoenberg. 2006. Where Faculty Live: Internationalizing the Disciplines. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Halimi, Shpresa, and Marcus Ingle. 2007. "Community-Based Environmental Management in Vietnam: The Challenge of Sharing Power in a Politically Guided Society." *Public Administration and Development*, 27.

Halimi, Shpresa, Kevin Kecskes, Marcus Ingle, and Phung Thuy Phuong. 2014. "Strategic International Service-Learning Partnership: Mitigating the Impact of Rapid Urban Development in Vietnam." Chapter in *Crossing Boundaries: Tension and Transformation in International Service-Learning*. Stylus Publishing.

Hovland, Kevin. 2006. *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Hudzik, John. 2011. *Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action.* Washington DC: NAFSA.

Hudzik, John K., and JoAnn S. McCarthy. 2012. *Leading Internationalization: Strategy and Tactics for Action.* NAFSA. http://www.nafsa.org/epubs.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1994. "Collaborative Advantage: The Art of Alliances." *Harvard Business Review*, July–August, 72, 96–108.

Klasek, Charles B., ed. 1992. *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education.* Durham NC: Association of International Education Administrators.

Knight, Jane. 1994. *Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints.* Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Knight, Jane. 2008. *Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalization.* Rotterdam: Sense Pubs.

Kytle, Jackson. 2012. *Best Practices in Change Management: Critical Process Variables.* New York: Advance Group. http://jacksonkytle.com/site/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Best-Practices-in-Change-Managment_Paper-by-Jackson-Kytle.pdf?625ae2.

Latz, Gil, Marcus Ingle, and Marcia Fischer. 2009. "Cross-Border Capacity Building: Selected Examples of Portland State University's Involvement in Tertiary Level Educational Reform in Vietnam." *Technology Management in the Age of Fundamental Change*, edited by T. R. Anderson, T. U. Daim, and D. F. Kocaoglu. Portland, PICMET.

Lewin, Ross. 2009. *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and Quest for Global Citizenship.* Taylor and Francis.

Olson, Christa L., Madeleine F. Green, and Barbara Hill. 2006. *Handbook for Advancing Comprehensive Internationalization: What Institutions Can Do and What Students Should Learn.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Olson, Christa, Rhodri Evans, Robert E. Schoenberg. 2007. *At Home in the World: Bridging the Gap between Internationalization and Multicultural Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Saltmarsh, John, KerryAnn O'Meara, Lorilee Sandmann, Dwight Giles, Jr., Kelley Cowdery, Jia Liang, and Suzanne Buglione. 2014. *Becoming a Steward of Place: Lessons from AASCU Carnegie Community Engagement Applications.* Washington D.C. http://www.aascu.org/bookstore/lessonslearned.

Stearns, Peter N. 2009. *Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities: Challenges and Opportunities.* Routledge Publishing.

Sutton, Susan Buck. 2010. "Transforming Internationalization through Partnerships." *International Educator* 19 (1): 60–63.

Teekens, Hanneke, ed. 2006. *Internationalization at Home: A Global Perspective.* The Hague: NUFFIC.

Author Information

Dr. Gil Latz is associate vice chancellor for international affairs and professor of geography, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI); and associate vice president for international affairs, Office of the Vice President for International Affairs, and affiliated philanthropic studies faculty member, Indiana University. Before his appointment to IUPUI in 2012, Latz was affiliated for twenty-eight years with Portland State University, Portland, Oregon, where he held positions in geography and international studies and as vice provost for international affairs. His research on comparative regional development policy includes affiliation with Tokyo University (Japan) and University of Florence (Italy). Recent publications include topics on transnational organizations in Asia; assessing international learning (U.S.); educational reform (Vietnam); landscape history (Italy/U.S.); and controversial issues in politics and society (Japan).

Dr. Susan Buck Sutton is senior advisor for international initiatives, Bryn Mawr College, and emerita associate vice president of international affairs and chancellor's professor of anthropology, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). Sutton is past president of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) and active in the American Council of Education, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA), and the Institute of International Education (IIE).

She has given numerous presentations on the changing nature of internationalization, institutional partnerships, curriculum internationalization, and international service learning. Sutton has published five books and more than sixty articles.

Dr. Barbara Hill is senior associate in the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, working with institutional leaders to promote comprehensive internationalization. Hill has consulted with Higher Education for Development, developing infrastructure to serve international development through university partnerships and organizing workshops to disseminate expertise in international development. Hill formerly participated in the Visiting Advisors Program/Salzberg Seminar, consulting in Russia and Eastern Europe about governance, finance, academic structure, and program quality. Before joining ACE leadership, she was provost at Denison University and president of Sweet Briar College.

Gil Latz
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
902 W. New York Street, ES 2126
Indianapolis IN 46202 USA
E-mail: glatz@iupui.edu
Telephone: 317-278-1265

Susan Buck Sutton
Senior Advisor for International Initiatives
Office of the President
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr PA 19010
E-mail: ssutton@brynmawr.edu
Telephone: 610-526-5158

Barbara Hill
Senior Associate for Internationalization
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington, DC 20036
E-mail: BHill@ACENET.EDU
Telephone: 202-939-9300