

0607-1

Internationalizing the Campus: A National Agenda

Roch C. Smith

IT HAS now been over three decades since international education was incontrovertibly on the national agenda. The launching of the world's first earth-orbiting satellite by the Soviet Union in 1957 was seen as dramatic evidence that the educational system in our nation had smugly allowed itself to fall behind that of the world's second emerging superpower. With the success of the Marshall Plan still fresh in mind, we were poised for an educational plan of action that would respond just as dramatically to this new cold-war challenge. Not surprisingly, the initial proposals focused on improving instruction and research in science and mathematics. But when we discovered that Russian students spent long years studying foreign languages, there were soon calls for advances in this sphere as well. While some quarters expressed misgivings about neglecting other basic areas of study in favor of the "glamor subjects," the nation had little difficulty in arriving at a consensus. With the National Defense Education Act of 1958, passed the year after Sputnik was launched, the recommended changes were translated into law.

The NDEA had swift and far-reaching effects on foreign language education. Building on the research of scholars like Nelson Brooks at Harvard, on the successes of the Army Specialized Training Program, and on the experiments with the new language-teaching materials in Glastonbury, Connecticut, which were soon published as the *Audio-Lingual Materials*, NDEA-sponsored foreign language institutes were held around the country to enhance the quality of language teaching in the schools. NDEA fellowships supported the graduate training of a whole generation of PhDs in foreign language and literature, and NDEA student loans helped undergraduates in these fields finance their educations.

The way foreign languages are taught has surely been permanently transformed by this federal program, and many of the students supported by the NDEA are still teaching in our colleges and schools. Thus, in a very real sense, the nation is still benefiting from this dramatic intervention. Yet the national agenda changed

with the social revolution of the 1960s and the reaction of the 1970s. Not until the past decade has the nation begun, once again, to realize that there are serious shortcomings in what our students learn about the world beyond our borders.

The new national awareness began with the release, in 1979, of the report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. As Mary Allison points out, a number of states and universities, "in direct response to the recommendations made by the Commission," reexamined the curriculum and established some regional centers for international studies and research, and "the privately-supported National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies has been functioning since 1980," but the \$180 million in new federal funding called for by the report "never materialized" (533). Virtually at the rate of one a year, several other studies and reports followed throughout the 1980s, ranging from Michael I. Sovern's 1982-83 presidential report from Columbia University, subtitled *American Ignorance in a Dangerous World*, to Richard D. Lambert's *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, published by the American Council on Education (ACE) in December 1989.¹

Not only have numerous reports focused on international education, several organizations have singled it out for special emphasis as well. In *Memorandum to the Forty-First President of the United States*, issued before the 1988 presidential election, the ACE's Commission on National Challenges in Higher Education states that the first of five challenges to "preoccupy the American people during the [next] Administration and into the next century [is expected to be]

The author is Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of North Carolina, Greensboro. A version of this paper was presented at a meeting of the SAMLA Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (SAADFL), 9-11 November 1989, in Atlanta, at a session organized by Raymond Gay-Crosier.

preserving peace and security in an increasingly interdependent world" (vii). The document points to a now familiar list of deficiencies, noting, for example, that "many Americans are uninformed about other peoples and countries, and poorly prepared for an increasingly interdependent world," and that "foreign languages and cultures are a mystery to many of our young people" (1). In proposing an agenda that would respond to these challenges, the commission specifically recommends that the new administration lend its support to (1) strengthening international studies and research, (2) encouraging student and faculty exchanges, (3) expanding the teaching and study of foreign languages, and (4) assisting American colleges and universities in developing joint educational and research programs with foreign institutions (6).

Similarly, Phi Kappa Phi devoted the Fall 1988 issue of its journal, *National Forum*, to the topic Internationalizing the Curriculum. The lead essay, by John A. DiBiaggio, president of Michigan State University, reviews the dangers posed by the nation's "international illiteracy" in the context of today's global economic, political, environmental, and health problems (2). He urges that we move beyond specialization in international fields and heed the advice of Steven Muller, then president of Johns Hopkins University, to incorporate "international study . . . in the curriculum of the newly emerging American university" (4).

More recently, the May-June 1989 issue of *Liberal Education*, published by the Association of American Colleges (AAC), was devoted to the topic Internationalizing Higher Education through Business School/Liberal Arts Cooperation, a clear indication that colleges are attaching greater importance to economic issues now than they did in the past. The papers had been presented a year earlier at a conference that emphasized, as the conference coordinator puts it, "the mutually beneficial aspects of cooperation as opposed to the 'one partner in service to the other' model of curricular change" (Spalding 3-4).

What is clear from these various documents is that Americans and their institutions are responding much more gradually to the realities of today's global interdependence than they did to the challenge of Sputnik. This time, to be sure, there is no single dramatic event that might touch off an equally dramatic reaction. The problems are far more complex and more difficult to define than they were in 1958. There is no easy national consensus on the challenges facing us in international study, and that is surely why we as a nation have been debating the matter for a decade. Yet, in reviewing the discussion, one can readily see that the issues are no longer raised, as they were after Sputnik, exclusively in the context of national defense and that the curricular concerns, related as they are to a far wider range of problems, have expanded be-

yond foreign language study to include potentially any discipline.

More important, after ten years of analyzing this situation and living with its global ramifications—and in the face of ever more dazzling Japanese economic successes, the imminent inauguration of the 1992 European Economic Community and the recent liberalization of Eastern Europe—we do seem to be developing, at long last, something of a national agenda on the issue of international education.

The proposed solutions most often considered begin with the recognition that the challenges confronting us are multifaceted and cannot be reduced to a single cause. By rejecting "monocausality" (Hoegl 4), we are far more likely to take into account the interrelatedness of international concerns and to question the notion that any particular innovation might hold the promise of a general remedy. There seems to be widespread understanding that what is required in the present circumstances is a great deal of cooperation and coordination among various educational institutions and sectors of society.

There is also increasingly evident agreement on what form such a coordinated response might take. The most constant theme, thus far, seems to be that we must think about increasing our international competence. In the ACE's 1983 report, *What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us: The Shortfall in International Competence*, "international competence" is defined as "a substantial number of Americans in every walk of life who understand other peoples and societies well enough to be able to work effectively with them, using their own language on a broad range of economic, political, and security issues" (4). And *What We Can't Say Can Hurt Us: A Call for Foreign Language Competence by the Year 2000*, a 1989 statement by the ACE, clearly echoes the earlier report, calling for "usable levels of proficiency for all baccalaureate graduates" (3) and pointing out that "the goal of competency in a foreign language requires institution-wide activity and commitment; it is not the business of language departments alone" (1). Of particular interest in the 1983 publication is the emphasis on achieving general as well as specialized competence. The report recognizes that "there is a need for a well-trained cadre of Americans who can perform specific area-, language-, and international-related tasks," but it also perceives "a need for the American people as a whole to enhance their knowledge and understanding of the rest of the world . . . if our society is to arrive at sound public policies" (7).

Throughout the 1980s concerned individuals and groups return to the theme of building "American competence in world affairs," as Rose Hayden puts it (*Building 3*). Thus, in *Educating for Global Competence*, issued in August 1988, the Advisory Council on In-

ternational Educational Exchange states 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" (1). Similarly, in a paper read at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in October 1988, Miriam Kazanjian, an international consultant for the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS), argues that the increasing links between nations make it essential to add international competence to the list of basic educational skills (31).

Indeed CAFLIS is itself of recent vintage, having been formed in December 1987 "as a forum for debate and agreement on steps needed to build and maintain international competence in the U.S." Designed specifically to help shape "a national agenda on international education" (Kazanjian 31, 32), CAFLIS is one of several groups that are calling attention to the issue. For the ACE, this need "for wide sectors of American leadership—in both public and private life—to recognize both the existence and seriousness of the problem" is "the most important step" in developing international competence (*What We Don't Know* 6). The call to "raise national consciousness" about international issues has itself become part of the national agenda (Eith and Bussom ii)—and well it might, in view of the deep-seated American resistance to increased international skills. As Rose Hayden sardonically says about foreign language study, "It can almost be argued that Americans are under social pressure NOT to learn a foreign language" (*Building* 5). One might justifiably apply that observation to other forms of international competence. Yet we Americans have also marshaled our resources and our energies whenever we have become persuaded that the need is real. The old NDEA is an obvious case in point. With the intensified pace of change, particularly in the economic sphere, the 1990s present an evident opportunity for renewed national awareness.

In today's economic climate the question of resources is far more complex than it was in 1958. Most reports expect the federal government to play a role, and there is broad recognition that state and local governments will frequently be involved. But especially new is the call for assistance from the private sector, usually in the form of partnerships. Such ventures represent unusual opportunities to integrate some of the goals of higher education with those of the corporate world, to the benefit of both. A 1984 report on a survey for the Institute of International Education (IIE) summarizes the views of business managers by stating that "you cannot learn to operate abroad, to play with the kids on the street, from books alone" (Kobrin 53). Universities must certainly heed such comments,

for they represent the assessment of those for whom international competence is often a matter of economic survival. Yet the university must tread cautiously in this area, lest its international programs become nothing more than training schools. It is questionable whether society is well served when international competence is defined in excessively narrow terms. Here, as in all cooperative arrangements, the university must preserve its autonomy in order to carry out its mission to discover and impart knowledge even as it responds to social needs. One way of achieving this balance is to integrate experiential learning into a meaningful curriculum, as the University of South Carolina has done by requiring a six-month foreign internship for its master's degree in international business (MIB).

Colleges, universities, and professional organizations see a growing need for cooperative arrangements both within the institution and beyond. Some groups, like the AAC, encourage schools of business and the liberal arts to work together on the undergraduate level, where there are opportunities in "course development, team teaching, research and joint academic programs" (Spalding 4). Lambert's study also emphasizes undergraduate education and argues for the kind of intra-institutional cooperation that would expand opportunities for international competence to underrepresented groups, particularly through study abroad (*International Studies* 159-60). The Council for International Educational Exchange, which has promoted foreign-exchange programs for over four decades, has recently called for such programs to be expanded for undergraduates and for first-professional-degree students, including "under-represented academic and social groups," in response to "the general need for a much stronger international dimension in higher education." The CIEE encourages consortial and other kinds of interinstitutional cooperation as a means of making the best use of resources (Advisory Council 5, vii, 20).

Several programs involving cooperation within the institution as well as with government and corporate agencies already exist and can serve as models. Examples at large state universities include not only South Carolina's MIB program but Michigan State's long-standing and multifaceted international-studies programs, which emphasize instruction, research, and service to domestic and foreign agencies. Cooperative programs between universities and the private sector involving international business education include "Rutgers University's new Center for International Business and Education; . . . the University of Pennsylvania's Joseph H. Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies; the University of Michigan's Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies; and the University of California's Berkeley Roundtable

on International Economy (BRIE)" (Kazanjian 35). Courses of study that have established links specifically between liberal arts and business can be found at Babson College, which has instituted a Center for Language and Culture; at Ball State University, which has a new interdisciplinary international-business major; in the three-year liberal arts and management program at Indiana University, Bloomington; in the international-business program cosponsored by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Leavey School of Business and Administration at Santa Clara University; and in the international-business education and research program at the University of Southern California, which offers an intensive twelve-month MBA to American and Asian executives (see Stearman et al. 32-41).

Colleges and universities that find ways to make international awareness and learning an integral part of programs across the entire campus respond in especially effective ways to the call for international competence. As Richard Lambert indicates, "[T]he next stage in the development of international studies is clearly one that requires some cross-course, cross-departmental, cross-school, cross-function innovation and coordination" (*International Studies* 148). While Michigan State, which established the position of dean of international programs in 1956, was a pioneer in internationalizing the campus, a few universities in the SAML region have taken similar steps. The Southern Growth Policies Board report, by Kathleen E. Watters, notes several southern universities with outstanding comprehensive international programming. The University of North Carolina (UNC) at Charlotte, East Carolina University (ECU) in Greenville, North Carolina, and the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Florida, are, among others, leaders in this effort" (5). Such exemplary programs can serve as valuable resources for institutions wishing to address the international-competence issue more effectively on their own campuses.

I would like to complete this brief examination of the national agenda for internationalizing learning by reviewing specific initiatives taken by organizations beyond the campus.

In October 1986 the Association of American Universities (AAU) drafted a legislative proposal to create a national foundation for foreign language and international studies. Modeled after the National Science Foundation, the National Endowments for the Arts and for the Humanities, the Smithsonian Institution, and the privately supported National Endowment for Democracy, the proposed foundation would attempt to "remedy the current fragmented representation and ancillary status of foreign language and international studies programs throughout the government" (11). The purpose of the foundation, as stated in the bill

itself, would be "to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for foreign language, area, and international studies research and instruction at universities and colleges and other appropriate institutions and organizations" (6).

Yet, as desirable as the AAU proposal may seem to those of us in higher education, it has not attracted the support of the larger foreign language and international-education community that includes the public schools. Thus, Mary Allison, editor of ACTFL's *Public Awareness Newsletter*, writes, "The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages supports the concept of a national body devoted to foreign language and international education and strongly believes that *such a body should be concerned with all educational levels*" (536; my emphasis). Not surprisingly, perhaps, the bill has not been introduced to date, although the idea of some form of national agency has been advanced by several groups and individuals, including the Department of Education's National Advisory Board on International Education, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Language and International Studies, and the American Council on Education, as well as Michael I. Sovern, Richard D. Lambert (one of the chief authors of the AAU bill), and Senator Paul Simon (Allison 533-35; "ACE" 4).

In May 1989 Representative Leon Panetta from California introduced the Foreign Language Competence for the Future Act. The bill, which has been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, would authorize \$110 million to fund five programs: (1) summer foreign language institutes for elementary and secondary foreign language teachers, (2) foreign language loans to encourage majors in elementary and secondary foreign language education, (3) matching grants to states and major metropolitan areas to establish foreign language institutes that would provide language training, translation services, and cultural information to small and medium-sized businesses that want to enter the export market, (4) demonstration grants for long-distance learning that would use technology to bring foreign language and international studies to rural school districts, small colleges, and adult business education classes, and (5) demonstration grants for critical language and area studies to support the study of such languages and area studies through consortia and study abroad ("NCLIS" 24).

In October 1989 the American Association of Teachers of French published its *Syllabus of Competence*, developed under the leadership of Philip Stewart of Duke University, past president of AATF, and Stirling Haig of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, the association's current president.

Syllabus establishes, for the first time, national standards of competence for teachers of French in the areas of language proficiency, culture, literature, applied linguistics, and methodology (see Commission on Professional Standards). While these standards are designed for elementary and secondary teachers, they have obvious implications for colleges and universities that train teachers and that rely on the preparation received by precollege students.

In retrospect, it can be seen that the numerous reports and initiatives of the past decade have led to a slowly emerging consensus. The implications of that consensus for colleges and universities are evident in some specific suggestions for internationalizing the campus that have grown out of the national discussion of this issue.

First, the highest levels of the administration must be committed to internationalization. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) defines such a commitment as "a deliberate and considered mandate and plan to incorporate an international dimension in the institution's program and activities" (1-2). In the best of circumstances the mandate is incorporated into the institution's mission statement and approved by the board. One should not overlook, in addition to the resource implications, the increased campus awareness and cooperation that typically follow such a commitment from the president and the board.

Second, to carry out a campus-wide mandate effectively, the college should establish a central office of international programs to "serve as the focal point for all international activities on campus" (Watters 6). International activities are rarely concentrated within one administrative unit. Nor need they be. What is required is a means of coordinating and facilitating several efforts.

Third, international education should be incorporated as a fundamental part of the general undergraduate curriculum. As AASCU points out, "[a]ll academic disciplines and professional studies draw their substance from a global knowledge base and provide students with concepts, skills, and values by which they can understand the significance and impact of global events" (3). An institution should formally assess the international content of its curriculum and establish review procedures that examine the international dimension of its general education offerings.

Fourth, colleges and universities should require the study of a foreign language. Governors in the South have already made such a recommendation (Watters 7), and the benefits—not only of communicating in a specific foreign language and gaining insight into a foreign culture but of developing the potential to learn still other languages with greater ease—are widely recognized.

Fifth, the institution should support faculty development in the international area by providing leaves and grants for foreign travel, by promoting faculty exchanges with foreign universities, and by encouraging and supporting international research activities.

Sixth, the institution should involve student services (resident halls, the international students office, career planning and placement, etc.) in its efforts to internationalize the campus and should make funds available for American students to study abroad and to assist foreign students who wish to study in the United States.

Seventh, the university should promote alliances with government agencies, with businesses that are active internationally, and with former students. Such links not only offer potential programmatic benefits but can also prove useful in raising funds.

And, thus, the eighth and final recommendation: the institution must provide the necessary resources to internationalize the campus. All the previous suggestions assume adequate funding, of course. The point of departure here, as AASCU suggests, includes "an initial inventory and assessment of existing resources and the identification of steps to acquire and integrate additional resources" (10).

The current national agenda on international education may well be less dramatic than the Sputnik-induced response of thirty years ago. It has taken about ten times longer to emerge, but the pace has allowed for careful reflection. It is not unreasonable to speculate that this decade of deliberation and debate on international learning will lead to a more profound and long-lasting transformation of the campus.

Notes

¹In addition to Sovern's and Lambert's reports, other pertinent documents published in the 1980s include *Critical Needs for International Studies: Recommendations for Action*, a 1983 report by the National Advisory Board on International Programs; *What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us: The Shortfall in International Competence*, issued by the ACE in 1983; *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*, a 1984 study prepared by Richard D. Lambert for the Association of American Universities; "International Dimensions of Education," a 1985 position paper by the Council of Chief State School Officers; *Federal Support for International Education: Assessing the Options*, published in 1985 by Rose L. Hayden, president of the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies; *Educating Americans for Tomorrow's World: State Initiatives in International Education*, issued in 1987 by the National Governors' Association; *The United States Prepares for Its Future*, a 1987 report of the Study Commission on Global Education; *America in Transition: The International Frontier*, the 1989 report of the National Governors' Association; and *What We Can't Say Can Hurt Us*, issued by the ACE in 1989.

Works Cited

- "ACE Calls for Foreign Language Competency Standards." *Higher Education and National Affairs* 24 July 1989: 1+.
- Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. *Educating for Global Competence*. New York: CIEE, 1988.
- Allison, Mary. "A Review of Proposals to Strengthen Foreign Language and International Education." *Foreign Language Annals* 19 (1986): 533-36.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *Guidelines: Incorporating an International Dimension in Colleges and Universities*. Washington: AASCU, 1984.
- American Council on Education. *What We Can't Say Can Hurt Us: A Call for Foreign Language Competence by the Year 2000*. Washington: ACE, 1989.
- . *What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us: The Shortfall in International Competence*. Washington: ACE, 1983. ERIC ED 242 202.
- . Commission on National Challenges in Higher Education. *Memorandum to the Forty-First President of the United States*. Washington: ACE, 1988.
- Association of American Universities. *To Strengthen the Nation's Investment in Foreign Languages and International Studies: A Legislative Proposal to Create a National Foundation for Foreign Languages and International Studies*. Unpublished draft, 1986.
- Commission on Professional Standards. *The Teaching of French: A Syllabus of Competence*. Spec. issue of *American Association of Teachers of French National Bulletin* 15 (1989): 1-35.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. "International Dimensions of Education." Unpublished report, 1985.
- DiBiaggio, John A. "A Case for Internationalizing the Curriculum." *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. Ed. Ralph Smuckler and Lawrence Summers. Spec. issue of *National Forum* 48.4 (1988): 2-4.
- Eith, Gary L., and Robert S. Bussom, eds. *Proceedings of the Third Business-Higher Education Conference: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, October, 1988*. Unpublished ms., 1988.
- Hayden, Rose L. *Building American Competence in World Affairs*. ERIC, 1986. ED 276 659.
- . *Federal Support for International Education: Assessing the Options*. New York: Natl. Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1985.
- Hoegl, Juergen K. *Education in the World System: The Demand for Language and International Proficiencies in Economic Development and National Security*. ERIC, 1986. ED 266 677.
- Kazanjan, Miriam A. "Building International Competence: Defining Issues and Responsibilities." Eith and Bussom 31-40.
- Kobrin, Stephen J. *International Expertise in American Business: How to Learn to Play with the Kids on the Street*. New York: IIE, 1984.
- Lambert, Richard D. *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*. Washington: AAU, 1984.
- . *International Studies and the Undergraduate*. Washington: ACE, 1989.
- National Advisory Board on International Programs. *Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action*. Washington: U. S. Dept. of Education, 1983.
- National Governors' Association. *America in Transition: The International Frontier*. Washington: Natl. Governors' Assn., 1989.
- . *Educating Americans for Tomorrow's World: State Initiatives in International Education*. Washington: Natl. Governors' Assn., 1987.
- "NCLIS Press Release—May 1989." *American Association of Teachers of French National Bulletin* Sept. 1989: 24.
- President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. *Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U. S. Capability*. Washington: GPO, 1979.
- Sovern, Michael I. *In Search of Reason: American Ignorance in a Dangerous World*. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.
- Spalding, Jane R. "Internationalizing Higher Education through Business School/Liberal Arts Cooperation." *Liberal Education* 75.3 (1989): 2-5.
- Stearman, David M., et al. "Promoting Cooperation between Business and Liberal Arts." *Liberal Education* 75.3 (1989): 32-41.
- Study Commission on Global Education. *The United States Prepares for Its Future: Global Perspectives in Education*. New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1987.
- Watters, Kathleen E. "Internationalizing Education in Southern Universities." *Southern International Perspectives* 15 (1989): 1-16.