Chapter One: Institutional Internationalisation Strategies

Author: Dave Burnapp

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1 Rapid changes in the sector have made the internationalisation of higher education (HE) an extremely dynamic topic, indeed an extremely volatile topic. In addition to rapid changes in patterns of movements of students between countries, the types of collaborations involving universities have become more complex, new methods of delivering education have evolved, and motivations and expectations of all the stakeholders concerned have become more specific (Middlehurst and Woodfield 2007). HE practitioners who are interested in developing collaborations need to keep abreast of developments in order to follow market changes, to learn of amendments to regulations, and to be alerted to news items and research reports concerning internationalisation. Hence it is a good idea to subscribe to the newsletter of The UK Higher Education International Unit, 'Global Opportunities for UK Higher Education'[1].

1.1.2. The theme of this chapter, institutional strategy, can be seen as the foundation on which all of the other aspects of internationalisation which are examined elsewhere in this project must be based, both in terms of the themes of other chapters and also of the case studies which have been produced to illustrate them. All university activities are contextualised by such strategies, and at a higher level still the strategies of individual institutions are themselves contextualised by external constraints, including government policies such as those described by Fielden (2006) who compares the different national motives for the internationalisation of higher education in Australia, Canada, the USA, and the UK. In addition there are volatile changes in the world economy which could rapidly threaten the validity of any plans which are based on future projections for student recruitment, such as those made in the Vision 2020 report (Böhm et al 2004). Further prompts for changes in institutional strategies come from initiatives instigated by agencies such as the British Council. Middlehurst et al (2009) point out that when

---

[1] http://www.international.ac.uk/home/

compared with other countries (Germany, France, Sweden and Australia are given as examples) there is a lack of co-ordination amongst national level agencies in the UK. These higher order constraints, however, are beyond the scope of this project which focuses on issues related to developing specific examples of collaborations.

1.1.3. An essential first step for individual academics or groups who are considering engaging in any form of collaboration is to examine how their proposed activities would fit (or could be adapted in order to fit) within their institutional strategies. Before moving on to analyse different aspects of strategies it is therefore worth spending some time to consider how your own institution accords with the various approaches which have been identified in earlier analyses of the sector.

1.1.4. It is also worth, at this early stage, deliberating whether your institution's declared international strategy (assuming there is an international strategy) remains only an aspirational statement or whether aspirations are becoming realised and are having resources allocated to them. Fielden (2008) points out that posting an internationalisation strategy on the university website does not guarantee that all stakeholders will read or understand it. It could be useful to identify aspirations which are not currently being fulfilled, and then to adapt your intended collaboration as a way of doing this; this could be a way of getting institutional support for your plans. For example if the strategy talks about enhancing students' employability as global workers, then it is advantageous to be able to point out how your collaboration would do this.

1.1.5. Knight (2004) provided a typology of approaches to internationalisation, the headings of which have been adapted and amended here to provide a rough-and-ready audit tool for practitioners to consider as a first step to summarising the approaches favoured in their own institution, although a much more detailed analysis will of course be necessary at a later stage:

> **Activities:** what international activities does your institution currently engage in (or has declared it intends to start), in terms of links, partnerships, programs, projects?

> **Outcomes:** what does your institution intend to get out of these activities in terms of student and staff competences and achievements, forming partnerships, enhancing reputation?

> **Rationales:** what are the reasons proclaimed by your institution for engaging in these activities; for example to increase financial

income, or to create globally employable citizens, or to develop cross-cultural competences in staff?

Process: how is your institution going about incorporating these approaches into all of its functions, how is the process of internationalisation embedded within the management structure, what is the engagement of senior management with this process?

At home: what is your institution doing concerning internationalisation of all aspects of its activities and environment, including student support services, or encouraging learning and teaching initiatives for home students as well as for international students, or creation of community links, in order to become an internationalised institution?

Abroad: what is your institution doing in order to create a presence in other countries, for example via development of elearning, or establishing partnerships and articulations with foreign providers, or opening offices abroad?

1.2. Stages of strategy development

1.2.1. A useful conceptualisation of how institutional strategies may have changed is a categorization supplied by Middlehurst & Woodfield (2007). Their model implies a movement over time covering three stages, but different universities may have settled at different points along this movement, and indeed the general model may not be applicable to all institutions.

1.2.2. In this model the first of the three phases is described as *'International activity'*, which describes activities which could often be limited or short-term in nature, usually set up by individuals or small groups, and which are described by Middlehurst & Woodfield as consisting of 'disparate and unconnected activities'. This may be the beginning point of internationalisation for some universities, and could involve academics who are building on their own interests and contacts. Such activities may well largely only impact on one programme or faculty, and any required links or support from other parts of the institution (for example from the student accommodation office or from the careers service) are negotiated on an ad hoc basis rather than being a part of an integrated structure. From the beginning of any collaboration it is necessary to identify the stakeholders across the institution that need to be contacted. The staff members creating such links may be rather entrepreneurial and could be considered as early champions of internationalisation. Indeed Teichler (2008) when discussing the beginnings of ERASMUS describes early pioneers who were able to exploit a sceptical wait-and-see attitude about internationalisation in many institutions: '[they] often made use of this

anarchic state of internationalisation to seize more resources and to shape the character of the curricula and their departments' (p17).

1.2.3. During the second phase of Middlehurst & Woodfield's model, *'International strategy',* the emerging activities are in many cases accompanied by the establishment of an International Office, and attempts are made to rationalise and co-ordinate initiatives, or at least to compile an institutional register of international links and memorandums of understanding (MoUs). Hence this phase is described as involving 'co-ordination and beginning of alignment'.

1.2.4. The third phase is characterised as *'Internationalisation process'* and involves 'effort to integrate, achieve leverage and added value' (Middlehurst & Woodfield 2007, p32). At this stage the university probably has a clearly articulated strategy, clearly defined roles in a structure including senior management, and a detailed procedure for creating and monitoring collaborations.

1.2.5. Fielden (2008) also presents a distinction between three models of international strategies in a way which has similarities with the above model but is not identical to it: a 'traditional' strategy primarily aimed at recruitment; a second strategy where recruitment is combined with the creation of partnerships and collaborations; and a third type which aims at internationalising all aspects of the institution.

1.2.6. It should be repeated that although this three-step development can be thought of as a narrative of organisational development, different institutions do remain at different phases, and even those who have created a co-ordinated strategy may differ greatly in their *priorities*. For example does the strategy *primarily* focus on recruitment of international students or does it claim to focus *primarily* on developing international perspectives across the institution and engendering international perspectives amongst home students?

1.2.7. Hence Fielden (2008) talks of strategies which 'are still in a state of flux or transformation'. Some institutions have a distinct strategy statement concerning internationalisation, while for others this is subsumed in a more general strategy document. Koutsantoni (2006a) reports that of the 133 institutions researched for the Leadership Summit in 2006 only 69 had some kind of international strategy – however this is likely to have changed since then.

1.2.8. These differences can be reflected in allocation of leadership roles and provision of resources, hence Koutsantoni further reported that of the 133 institutions researched only 20 had a 'senior officer exclusively responsible for internationalisation' (p28). If, as this section has described, there is a tendency for initiatives to be centralised and moved up the hierarchy of the university, then there may be a danger of plans being stifled if ultimate responsibility for international activities is just one part of a wider portfolio held by a senior manager.

1.3. Bottom-up and top-down

1.3.1. The possibility of failing to engage the early champions whilst moving to a more central model is identified as a risk by Middlehurst (2008) who describes one possible pitfall in the internationalisation process as being a failure 'to achieve the right balance between centralised and devolved responsibilities' (p17). Unless handled carefully there is a possible conflict between these early champions, who can be thought of as bottom-up innovators, and the central top-down administrators who come to manage collaborations in institutions which have established a central strategy (stages two and three in the above model).

1.3.2. Differences may just result from a communication problem, as Fielden (2008) suggests, or these can perhaps be thought of as two distinct groups with different understandings of how things should be done; innovative and entrepreneurial spirits may be difficult to accommodate in tightly controlled processes designed to remove elements of risk, and administrators might not have entrepreneurial dispositions and may focus on institutional processes rather than exploring world horizons and discovering alternative perspectives, priorities, and procedures.

1.3.3. On the one hand, by moving control of activities up the hierarchy of the university there is a risk of losing a sense of ownership amongst those who were formerly instigators of internationalisation. On the other hand, as Shiel (2008) points out: 'Without senior management support and strategy to align initiatives with the institutional strategic direction and committee structures, innovations risk failure. Furthermore "bottom-up" approaches were not sustained unless they were joined at some point by "top-down"' (p8). Fielden (2008) asserts that top-down relationships can be successful, but that chances of success are greater if based on existing bottom-up connections.

1.3.4. One possible solution to the potential problem is suggested by Petford and Shiel (2008, p20 – 25) who describe a hub model to ensure coordination and communication which avoids central control. In that paper they are specifically describing the creation of a globalisation agenda at Bournemouth University; this is an overt declaration of intent to move beyond the most common aspects of internationalisation for most universities (such as student recruitment, involvement in collaborative research, and establishment of transnational programmes), to engender a global perspective amongst all stakeholders and all university activities. This ambitious intention necessitates engagement of all concerned:

> *Our mission at BU is to embrace and integrate three essential aspects of globalisation that together inform our higher education provision: (1) embedding global perspectives in the curricula (2), developing global awareness among our staff and students that feeds into research, enterprise and education, and (3) offering students an international environment, befitting for a context of 'global employability' (p20).*

1.3.5. In the hub model which they describe the Centre acts to coordinate strategy, for example liaising between the university's schools and professional departments, and to liaise with departments such as Human Resources (hence recognising that this agenda necessarily involves staffing issues), to co-ordinate curriculum development and to seek integration of the student body. This is presented very much as a work in progress, and Petford and Shiel are open about the obstacles along the way.

1.3.6. In a case study of another institution, Middlehurst & Woodfield (2007) claim to have found a shared vision of the responsibilities of the Centre and other constituents:

> *there was an expectation at all levels of the institution – from academic units to central services – that strategy development needed to be initiated and subsequently confirmed by those in leadership positions, although ideas, experience and views should come – and be sought – from across the community (p44).*

1.3.7. The sharing of a set of expectations described in this particular case study, however, cannot be taken for granted. It should be noted that the sources referred to so far have mostly come from publications which are aimed at senior management, and so may be describing what can be thought of as the official narrative of an institution, a coherent sharing of a single viewpoint. A more critical examination of any organisation could reveal that it is possible to have different perspectives held by different stakeholders, a possibility of different and conflicting narratives existing

within the same organisation: 'multi-stranded stories of experiences that lack collective consensus' (Boje 2001).

1.3.8. The change which Middlehurst et al (2009) refer to: 'what might have been regarded in the initial stages as "risk-taking" international activity, has now become more tightly managed, with improved quality assurance arrangements and closer alignment with the wider institutional strategy and mission' (p7) implies the challenge of how to maintain entrepreneurial flair within this process of control, to continue to see that risk-taking can have positive aspects.

1.3.9. The following is presented as a possible dilemma relating to balancing bottom-up and top-down initiatives and responsibilities. The Training Gateway[2] describes itself as 'the "one-stop shop" from which to source corporate, vocational and executive training from UK Universities'. It regularly notifies enrolled members of opportunities to submit tenders for the provision of training opportunities. The notification of new tenders sent to members on 17th February 2010 listed nine opportunities, three of which involved some form of international collaboration, specifically: (1) to create a panel of experts to review curricula changes in Nigeria; (2) to evaluate a British Council-funded project in Asia; and (3) to participate in student, staff and ideas exchange with a Textile institute in India. The closing dates for these three tenders were: 11th March 2010; 22nd February 2010; and 18th April 2010. It is easy to see how an entrepreneurial approach (phase 1 in the model described above) could allow a rapid response to these calls, however there is a danger of missing deadlines if the institution has too-centralised processes of giving approval before action can be taken. Staff members who are planning collaborations need to be aware, therefore, of their institution's processes at an early stage, and the senior managers in charge of such processes need to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in the processes which will still allow opportunities to be seized.

1.4. Shifting focus of activities

1.4.1. Along with the movement between the three phases of institutional strategic development described in the model above, a separate movement for many institutions (reflected in their internationalisation strategies) involves what can be thought of as changes in ethos, or of paradigm (Luker 2008): for example a shift from a restricted focus on what has been labelled internationalisation 'aboard' (IA), including student

---

[2] http://www.thetraininggateway.com/member-pages

recruitment, creating transnational programmes, and engaging in international projects, towards a growing focus on internationalisation 'at home' activities (IaH), including curriculum changes to engender international outlooks amongst home students, and the development of international perspectives amongst staff. For further elucidation of the internationalisation 'abroad' and internationalisation 'at home' distinction see Koutsantoni (2006b).

1.4.2. A further shift *within* the internationalisation 'abroad' activities for some institutions has been moving from a focus primarily on recruitment of students to one where the universities seek collaborations covering a range of activities. Middlehurst and Woodfield (2007) list possible key areas as including: 'joint or collaborative research projects, capacity building projects in developing countries, joint teaching programmes, staff and student exchange programmes and knowledge transfer with international and private organisations' (p19).

1.4.3. Much of what is done as internationalisation 'abroad' counts as transnational education, and this is covered in 'Chapter Two: Growth of transnational education' and 'Chapter Three: Quality Assurance in International Collaborative Courses', whilst other strategic aspects of collaborations are discussed here.

1.4.4. In a report prepared for the Million+ group of post 1992 universities, Middlehurst et al (2009) point to the increasing importance of such collaborations, and hence show that increasing the number, or deepening the existing partnerships, has become a strategic objective of many universities. Collaborations are also a way of achieving other strategic objectives such as developing research capacity and building reputation and prestige. Some of the links they describe are at faculty level, others at institutional level, and they report that it was not always easy to gather information, for example concerning research collaborations, as this information was not always held at institutional level. This indicates that the three step model described earlier in this chapter, involving a centralisation of information, has not been universally applied.

1.4.5. The report mentions a range of activities and benefits arising from collaborations, including universities using their links to help cities, regions and companies to do business overseas; participation in developing capacity in developing countries; and engagement in research collaborations which bring in funding from the EU and overseas government agencies. Many of the universities how have regional offices around the world, and use these to widen and deepen their collaborations.

1.4.6. Another shift in focus can be seen as involving a change in ideological stance, reflecting a distinction between what has been labelled a marketisation discourse compared with a discourse of sustainability or of development education (Caruana and Spurling 2007). The motivation for the former concentrates on generation of income, for example by increasing student fee income, whereas the motivation for the latter includes engendering a global perspective as with the example given earlier of Bournemouth University.

1.4.7. It cannot be claimed that all institutions have made this change of stance, and indeed any claims to have made this shift need to be looked at critically, particularly in times of financial pinching. Fielden (2006) points out that internationalisation 'abroad' may be: 'potentially more profitable than "internationalisation at home" ' (p7), one can be thought of as generating income and the other as incurring costs, although this would be to take a very short-term view. Bone (2008) sees concentration on recruitment as short-term and risky, and discusses long-term strategies, such as those discussed in 'Chapter Two: Growth of transnational education', which can replace an emphasis on recruitment.

1.4.8. There is a similar shift of ethos apparent in a comparison of the rationales given for the first and second phases of the Prime Minister's Initiative (PMI). The first phase of this was launched in 1999, and largely consisted of a setting out a competitive strategy, recognising the importance of higher education within the world economy, aimed at increasing international student recruitment to the UK over a five year period.

1.4.9. Starting in 2006 the second phase (PMI2) had a more complex agenda: there were now five interconnected projects (marketing and communications, HE partnerships, FE partnerships, student experience and employability). There is still in PMI2 a target to increase further the recruitment of international students, but funding was also given to initiatives aimed at improving the experience of international students, as well as partnership funding (such as Connect[3]) to encourage the creation of partnerships which emphasise collaboration between the partners (the case study 'CS 7: Collaborative development of an online module' is one example of this).

1.4.10. A key development in the discourse around recent funding opportunities for collaborative partnerships is that these should

---

[3] http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-pmi2-connect.htm

demonstrate a high level of mutuality, a sharing where both partners have something to give and something to gain, which is explored more deeply in 'Chapter Five: Development and Discourse'. This aim is explicitly stated in collaborations such as PMI2 funded Connect programmes, and also Education Partnerships in Africa (EPA) funded by the UK Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), and is an outcome specifically mentioned in the Million + report reviewed earlier. Bill Rammel, then Minister of State at the Department for Education and Skills, explained at the Going Global conference in 2006:

> *The main difference between PMI1 and 2 is that we are now focussing on improving the experience of international students in the UK – these are our ambassadors for the future – the development of strategic partnerships and a much greater focus on FE than there was in the first phase.*

1.4.11. Luker (2008) in a discussion of the differences between PMI1 and PMI2 suspects that even with PMI2 the ethos may not have changed greatly: 'In practice, however, self interest lurks just below the surface' and points out that this is inevitable, as in fact enhancing the student experience helps to secure an income stream. Luker goes on to suggest that for true collaborations to emerge rather than colonial style relationships, the government should sponsor programmes 'free from any whiff of the colonial/commercial paradigm' (p 13).

1.4.12. Collaboration is also the focus of a report by the UK/US Study Group (2009), which argues for UK/US collaborations to operate in third locations 'a new model of partnership'; this is an example of government inspired collaborations of institutions albeit within a framework of competition:

> *Even as we determine how best to move together within a broader global context to strengthen the ties between our universities, we are each respectively working to strengthen our own institutions. What prevails, then, is something that might be termed 'coopetition', a forceful driver in the global expansion of HE (p2).*

1.4.13. The report suggests that the growth of new intellectual clusters around the world – Saudi Arabia, China, India – creates an opportunity for such third location development: 'The UK and the USA, each and in tandem, are well positioned to influence the emergence of future "idea capitals" around the world' (p 20). However this will require what they call an 'Atlantic Trust' to fund Atlantic researchers and partners, hoping to get this from governments, the private sector, foundations and philanthropists, and the universities. How realistic such a fund is remains to be seen.

1.5. Aspects of strategy

1.5.1. Koutsantoni (2006c) examined the internationalisation strategies of six universities in six different countries: to see how internationalisation was perceived (as an on-going process or as an activity which could be completed); to see if it was central or marginal in the institutions' activities; and to see if the focus was on internationalisation at home or abroad.

1.5.2. One recurrent difficulty reported concerned implementation of intentions to internationalise the curriculum, another concerned how to implement aspirations such as 'valuing diversity' and 'achieving cross-cultural capability'. It is therefore necessary to read university strategic plans with a critical eye, and – as stated earlier – to be aware that there may be alternative narratives, for example those arising from the experiences of students.

1.5.3. The final section is written with reference to several universities' international strategies which have been made publicly available on the internet, but they are not being presented as examples either to follow or to avoid. Rather the intention is firstly to illustrate that different institutions will of necessity choose to focus, or need to focus, on different types of international activity, and hence that practitioners intending to engage in a collaboration need to see how their plan fits (or can be designed to fit) with their institutional strategy.

1.5.4. A second intention is to encourage such practitioners – even if they would describe themselves as innovative entrepreneurs – to recognise that any intended collaboration will have wider impact beyond their own immediate circle of control where strategic planning will be necessary. As this section is intended to be an exploratory exercise, rather than a critical analysis, the specific universities are not identified.

1.5.5. Four UK university strategies were consulted, and after reading each strategy several times a protocol: 'a way to ask questions of a document' (Altheide 1996) for analysis was prepared in order to conduct a qualitative documentary analysis. The categories of the protocol included:

- What type of discourse does this strategy reflect: for example, as in the comparison of 'Marketisation' discourse with 'Sustainability' discourse referred to earlier?

- How does this strategy accord with the stages of strategy development described earlier; how is it being managed and how is senior management involved?
- What mentions are there of specific forms of collaborations; such as institutional and government partnerships, transnational education, engagements with the Bologna process, or seeking collaborative research funding?
- What mentions are there of internationalisation-at-home activities in terms of changes to curriculum, preparation of home students for a globalised world, or links to careers and employability?
- What mentions are there of staffing issues; for example in terms of staff development and recruitment?
- Finally, does the primary focus remain on the recruitment of international students and associated issues such as those relating to the international student experience?

1.5.6. University One

The internationalisation strategy of the first university is primarily couched in a discourse of excellence, exemplified by a repeated restating of a desire to attract the best minds. It lists the institution's membership of reputable networks and world rankings, yet the text still has features of a marketisation discourse with references to students as consumers. The strategy includes a desire to expand the university's recruitment of international students, matched by a commitment to offer a quality living and learning environment. In terms of strategic organisation, a Vice-Principal (international) is supported by Deans (International) for each priority country or region, and there is an overt reference to internationalisation as being a process (the third stage in the model described earlier). There are, however, repeated mentions of the need to be able to respond flexibly to opportunities as they emerge, in seeming recognition of the dangers of loosing entrepreneurial innovation in an overly centralised strategy. In comparison with the other three universities which are examined below, there are many more references to research collaborations (again using terms of excellence) and a stated willingness to fund pump-priming activities which could lead to winning research grants for prestigious partnerships. There is specific mention of using new technologies to enable different forms of transnational programmes, and a statement of intent concerning the development of new taught postgraduate courses. There was also mention of encouragement for both staff and home students to develop international perspectives, with inducements such as scholarships and provision of

short-term overseas programmes, and a link to enhancing employability skills via overseas work placements. For staff development there was a commitment to reflect the acquisition of internationalisation skills in appraisal, pay reviews and promotion.

1.5.7. University Two

The discourse of this strategy document is holistic and inclusive; it invokes the ethos of sustainability, diversity, global perspectives, and development education. The strategy hence sets out an agenda for all its stakeholders. It describes internationalisation as being a process, but sees this as being the responsibility of all, involving a transformation of thinking and behaviour of all staff and students, rather than being achieved by the creation of an organisational structure. It does have an International Dean as the senior manager, who is supported by a pervasive network of internationalisation champions throughout the university and its partners. There are mentions of engagement in transnational education and flexibility of delivery of programmes, yet according to the strategy this is driven by an intention to broaden access to education rather than to increase income. A large element of the strategy covers topics related to internationalisation at home via a curriculum which will introduce international aspects on employment and enterprise. This will be achieved by a range of activities to increase meaningful cross-cultural engagement, such as by volunteering, work placements and exchanges. These student-centred plans are matched by an intention to develop staff awareness and perspectives, also via volunteering, as well as inducements to engage in research and scholarly activity. Recruitment issues are not dealt with in this strategy, but there is a commitment to supply necessary support services for international students. The writers of this strategy seem aware of the dangers of simply producing a wish-list of aspirations, so each item is supported by a description of how it will be achieved.

1.5.8. University Three

The discourse here is one of excellence allied with marketisation; hence this strategy consists in large parts of establishing procedures and setting targets which will lead to a continual reinforcement of its institutional reputation. Delivering excellent service to international students and partners is given high priority, but this is to be done in order to enable it to secure new contacts and establish new links, and to increase its market share in terms of recruitment and entry to new priority markets. The structures described appear to be top-down; reflecting a need to ensure

coordination and to control allocation of resources, and the specific targeting of activities such as recruitment and transnational education. The Vice-Principal chairs the International Board, which gives strategic direction and co-ordination of internationalisation activities. Inclusion of champions from across the university is described as only being a possibility. Partnerships must be with institutions which are of a similar level of reputation, for example other members of the Universitas 21 network, and research funding will be sought from prestigious sources. Transnational programmes are identified as possibly involving risk; hence these will be carried out in collaboration in order to share the costs and risks. There is mention of internationalisation at home and employability, but, unlike university two where this is seen as involving a way of thinking, this is described as involving the acquisition of skills such as language proficiency.

1.5.9. University Four

The discourse here involves an intention to *achieve* excellence (unlike universities one and three which can already claim to be world leaders). As with university two the discourse also has holistic elements, describing internationalisation as involving all stakeholders and all types of activity, with detailed plans for both students and staff. There is an intention (rather than an already accomplished achievement) to seek research partnership opportunities and funding as a vehicle to enhancing its reputation. Concerning collaborative programmes, there is an intention to seek partners to develop dual and joint degrees with. There is a firm commitment to internationalisation at home linked to satisfying the demands of international employability, and a description of supplementary awards which students can gain to demonstrate international perspectives, for example by passing modules in various world languages or in International Politics. The strategy also aims to improve student mobility, and to seek opportunities for work placements for home and international students, within the UK and abroad. There are a series of commitments concerning staff development relating to internationalisation; to promote mobility, to encourage curriculum and pedagogic reform, to encourage attending international conferences. There is mention of an intention to expand recruitment, but this is not given as a quantified target

1.6. Good Practice

1.6.1. This is a list of possible good practice statements outlined by Fielden (2008). It is reproduced here not as a template for others to

accept uncritically, but to demonstrate a tool that Fielden suggests senior managers might use to assess their institution's performance. As this chapter earlier suggested a rough-and-ready audit tool of their institution based on the work of Knight (2004) practitioners may want to now repeat the exercise using Fielden's statements: how does your institution rate against these statements, is it possible to improve?

1 The internationalisation strategy is a fundamental element of the corporate strategy and is fully integrated with all the other institutional strategies.

2 The Vice-Chancellor strongly supports internationalisation, but only one member of the SMT is responsible for its implementation and has a senior manager to support that role.

3 Mechanisms are in place to ensure that faculties or schools develop their own plans for implementing the key points in the internationalisation strategy.

4 The university has a central Group or Committee, chaired by the SMT member, to co-ordinate the implementation of the strategy and review progress regularly, using KPIs where relevant.

5 Senior managers chair Country Groups of specialists and active international staff that co-ordinate the university's efforts in target or key countries.

6 There is a clear policy on the development of strategic partnerships showing what is expected of institutional strategic partnerships and the criteria to assess new ones.

7 The university supports the development of strategic partnerships at institutional and faculty level, provides funding where appropriate and monitors their performance.

8 It is accepted that implementation of the internationalisation strategy will require some university funding and an appropriate budget is available.

9 The strategy acknowledges the centrality of academic staff commitment to internationalisation and the university and faculties devote effort to getting them involved.

10 Overseas offices work in conjunction with the relevant country group to provide an all-round support service for academic staff, current students and alumni, as well as undertaking marketing and promotional activity.

1.7. Conclusions

The following bullet points develop the main items identified in this chapter as a series of hints which any staff members who intend to initiate a collaboration might follow.

- **Ch 1.1.** It is a good idea to subscribe to the newsletter of The UK Higher Education International Unit, 'Global Opportunities for UK Higher Education'[4].

- **Ch 1.2.** An essential first step is to examine how your proposed activity would fit (or more usefully could be amended to fit) within institutional strategies.

- **Ch 1.3.** It is essential to identify both the people who must be consulted and you need to involve, and the processes which you have to follow to bring your plans to fruition.

- **Ch 1.4.** It could be useful to identify aspirations which are not currently being fulfilled, and then to adapt your intended collaboration as a way of enabling the institution to do this; this could be a way of getting institutional support for your plans. For example if the strategy talks about enhancing students' employability as global workers, then it is advantageous to be able to point out how your collaboration would do this.

- **Ch 1.5.** It is useful to write your proposal in a way that it accords with the stance of your institutional strategy, for example if the strategy talks about 'a desire to attract the best minds' or 'to expand the university's recruitment of international students', or 'a transformation of thinking and behaviour of all staff and students'. See the analysis of examples of university strategies in 1.5.6 - 1.5.9.

- **Ch 1.6.** It will be very advantageous to be specific about how your proposal will enable institutional priorities to be achieved, such as the recruitment of international students; or a focus on developing international perspectives across the institution; or engendering international perspectives amongst home students.

---

[4] http://www.international.ac.uk/home/

- **Ch 1.7.** It is essential to approach the most senior person responsible for internationalisation early on, to share ownership of the initiative.
- **Ch 1.8.** From the beginning of any collaboration it is necessary to identify other stakeholders across the institution who need to be contacted.
- **Ch 1.9.** It is essential to get support for your plan from senior management. Remember: 'Without senior management support and strategy to align initiatives with the institutional strategic direction and committee structures, innovations risk failure.'
- **Ch 1.10.** Senior managers need to be mindful of the dangers of loosing innovative and entrepreneurial spirits if they move the institution to more tightly centrally controlled processes which are designed to remove elements of risk.
- **Ch 1.11.** It may be necessary to persuade key decision makers to consider wider options. Hence, as an example, if your institution's strategy is restricted to internationalisation abroad activities, such as the recruitment of international students or the establishment of transnational programmes, then you will need to demonstrate that other agendas, (for example concerning engendering world citizenship, or increasing employability of your graduates) can bring benefits, and your intended collaboration is a way to realise these.
- **Ch 1.12.** It is necessary to recognise that internationalisation is connected to staff development, both as an objective and as an enabler.
- **Ch 1.13.** It is important to recognise that all international activity is 'risk-taking', so you need to identify the risks in your intended collaboration and present a risk management strategy to accompany it.
- **Ch 1.14.** It is important to recognise that all international activities will incur costs and require resources, so it is important to identify how these costs will be met within your proposal.
- **Ch 1.15.** If the proposed collaboration is a form of transnational education then consult 'Chapter Two: Growth of transnational education' and 'Chapter Three: Quality Assurance in International Collaborative Courses' covering this.
- **Ch 1.16.** If the proposed collaboration is a form of a developmental link, then consult 'Chapter Five: Development and Discourse' covering this.

References

Altheide, D. L. (1996) *Qualitative Media Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Böhm A. et al (2004) *Vision 2020: Forecasting international student mobility.* London: British Council.

Boje, D. M. (2001) *Narrative Methods for Organisational & Communication Research*. London: Sage.

Bone, D. (2008) *Internationalisation of HE: A Ten-Year View*. Department for Innovation, Universities & Skills [DIUS].

Bourn, D., McKenzie, A. and Shiel, C., 2006. *The global university: the role of the curriculum.* London: Development Education Association.

Caruana, V. and Spurling, N. (2007) *The Internationalisation of UK Higher Education: a review of selected material*. York: HEA.

Fielden, J. (2006) Internationalisation and Leadership – what are the issues, in *Leadership Summit 2006*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Fielden, J. (2008) *The Practice of Internationalisation: Managing International Activities in UK Universities*. London: UK Higher Education Unit Research Series/1.

Knight (2004) Internationalisation Remodelled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales, in *Journal of Studies in International Education* **8** (1) pp 5 -31.

Koutsantoni, D. (2006a) Internationalisation in the UK, in *Leadership Summit 2006*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Koutsantoni, D. (2006b) "What is internationalisation?"in *Leadership Summit 2006*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Koutsantoni, D. (2006c) Some international examples of internationalisation and their implications for the UK, in *Leadership Summit 2006*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Luker, P. (2008) The Internationalisation of Higher Education: shifting the paradigm, in C. Shiel and A. McKenzie (eds) *The Global University: the role of senior managers*. London: DEA.

Middlehurst, R. (2008) Leadership and Internationalisation, in C. Shiel and A. McKenzie (eds) *The Global University: the role of senior managers*. London: DEA.

Middlehurst, R. and Woodfield, S. (2007). *Responding to the internationalisation agenda: implications for institutional strategy*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Middlehurst, R., Woodfield, S., Fielden, J., and Forland, H., (2009) *Universities and international higher education partnerships: making a difference.* (Project Report) London: Million+.

Petford, N. and Shiel, C (2008) A holistic approach to the Globalisation Agenda at Bournemouth University: the role of senior management,

in C. Shiel and A. McKenzie (eds) *The Global University: the role of senior managers*. London: DEA.

Shiel, C. (2008) Introduction, in C. Shiel and A. McKenzie (eds) *The Global University: the role of senior managers*. London: DEA.

Teichler, U. (2008). The Internationalisation of European Education: debates, Policies, trends. In M. Gaebel et al (eds) *Internationalisation of European Higher Education*. EUA/ACA.

UK/US Study Group (2009) 'Higher Education and Collaboration in Global Context 2009'. A private report to Prime Minister Gordon Brown [online]. Available at: http://globalhighered.files.wordpress.com/2009/07/final-report_28_7_09.pdf Accessed 11.01.2011.