Higher Education
Partnerships for the Future

Edited by Nico Jooste, Hans de Wit & Savo Heleta

Unit for Higher Education
Internationalisation
in the Developing World

Nelson Mandela
Metropolitan
University
for tomorrow

Port Elizabeth & George - South Africa

Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World is a research and engagement arm of the NMMU's Office for International Education. The Unit's research focus is on current higher education internationalisation activities, practices and approaches around the world and specifically in the developing and emerging world.

This book is dedicated to late Professor Joseph Mestenhauser who profoundly influenced the higher education internationalisation field

Contents

Introduction

This book is the culmination of a vision influenced by late Professor Josef Mestenhauser. Prof Mestenhauser, who passed away in March 2015, was one of the first international educators who encouraged his colleagues to be systemic in their approach to internationalisation. He influenced the thinking and ambition to introduce more philosophic and academically founded debates into the discussion and growth of higher education internationalisation. Our ultimate goal, something that Prof Mestenhauser would certainly approve, should be higher education internationalisation as an academic discipline that provides the necessary guidance and academic foundation to internationalisation.

This book is dedicated to Prof Mestenhauser. We were lucky that he graced us with his presence at the colloquium in Port Elizabeth in 2006 to permanently steer our thinking to be founded in scholarship but never shy to innovate and influence.

Higher Education Partnerships for the Future is the first book conceptualised and published by Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's (NMMU) *Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World.* However, this is not the first publication by NMMU's Office for International Education (OIE). Over the years, the OIE has hosted biennial colloquiums during its 'Family Weeks', publishing proceedings that explored key issues in higher education internationalisation after each colloquium.

This book brings together leading as well as upcoming global thinkers and practitioners in the field of higher education internationalisation who explore the trends, challenges, potential and prospects of higher education partnerships. The authors were asked to critically look at institutional partnerships and networks in international higher education and explore future opportunities and challenges. The main focus is on the future – what should happen and what could happen in the world of international higher education and specifically in relation to institutional partnerships and networks.

The first chapter by Dr Nico Jooste from Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, titled *Higher Education Partnerships for the Future: A View From the South,* offers a critical take on the state of higher education internationalisation. It specifically looks at partnerships, challenging the thinkers and practitioners to move away from commercialisation and marketization. The chapter proposes the creation of higher education internationalisation 'global commons' which could take the collaboration and engagement through partnerships and networks to another level in order to establish platforms where collaboration and cooperation based on respect and equality are the norm.

In *Strategic Institutional Partnerships and Comprehensive Internationalisation,* Professor John K. Hudzik from Michigan State University and the NAFSA Senior Scholar for Internationalisation looks at the global factors, motivations and rationales for the growing importance of comprehensive internationalisation of higher education and how these relate to strategic partnerships. The chapter also explores the prerequisites for transformational and strategic partnerships as well as motivations and drivers of partnerships in higher education. On a more practical note, Professor Hudzik provides the readers with key framing elements of a memorandum of understanding and subsequent project agreements between universities.

In chapter three, titled *Ensuring Equality in Higher Education Partnerships Involving Unequal Universities in Divergent Contexts,* Cornelius Hagenmeier from the University of Venda investigates whether international higher education partnerships, as presently constructed, are truly equal. The inquiry is inspired by the inequality evident in the divergent profile in many higher education partnerships. Critical discourse analysis is utilised to extrapolate the present understanding of equality in partnerships and reflect whether equality is a reality in contemporary partnerships. The chapter proposes an international partnership model which promotes substantive equality.

In *Left to Their Own Devices: The Role and Skills of Academics in Partnerships for the Future,* Jos Beelen, senior policy advisor, researcher and consultant on internationalisation at the Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, presents an argument for using international partnerships as a tool for collaboration on the internationalisation of home curricula. The chapter discusses characteristics of such partnerships for the future - partnerships at programme level with academics as key actors. The chapter concludes that a structured approach to learning outcomes is key if the goal of international partnerships is to help bring the benefits of internationalisation to all through internationalisation at home.

In chapter five, titled *Engagement and Partnerships: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's Internationalisation Strategy,* Kate Mey, manager of international partnerships at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, explores the nexus between engagement and international partnerships with specific focus on NMMU's Internationalisation Strategy. Using NMMU as a case study, the chapter focuses on different aspects of the Internationalisation Strategy in relation to institutional partnerships, looking at challenges and possibilities in the quest to comprehensively internationalise teaching and learning, research and engagement and ensure that all NMMU's current and future students graduate as globally competent individuals.

In *Building and Maintaining a Long-Standing Institutional Partnership: St. Cloud State*

University and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Dr Nico Jooste and Shahzad Ahmad write about the long-standing partnership between their two institutions. They stress that the key for longevity lies in the commitment and trust, dedication, open communication and transformational thinking. Through a critical reflection of the lessons learned the chapter lays a blueprint for a successful one-on-one comprehensive institutional partnership.

In chapter seven, titled *The International Network of Universities: Strengthening Global Engagement Through University Consortia Membership,* Dr Lee Sternberger and Felix Wang from James Madison University write about the strategic networks of partnerships/university consortia as platforms for achieving higher education institutions' internationalisation goals. Focusing on the activities of the International Network of Universities, they highlight the challenges and possibilities of university consortia. They stress that consortia are important platforms for universities to engage in deep, thoughtful and sustained discourse with partners around the world and in the process further own comprehensive internationalisation agenda.

In the last chapter, titled *Partnerships for the Future: Trends, Challenges and Opportunities,* Professor Hans de Wit, Director of the Center for International Higher Education at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College, United States, writes about the traditional forms of higher education partnerships, explores recent and current trends and challenges, and highlights the opportunities for the future. Professor de Wit argues that partnerships have to move from transactional, 'simple give and take', to transformational higher education partnerships established on equal terms and focused on common goals.

Higher Education Partnerships for the Future: A View From the South

Nico Jooste[1]

> Our hyper-connected world requires unprecedented collaboration. Reaching consensus on a path forward requires a deep understanding of how the one world affects the many and how the many worlds affect the one. This, in turn, necessitates a deep awareness of local and regional cultures, perspectives and identities, and how they are responding to each other in an era in which cooperation is a prerequisite for progress (Oxford Martin Commission for Future Generations 2013: 11).

It is undeniable that the interconnectedness and growing complexity of higher education institutions engaged in internationalisation is accelerating. Yet what is not being duly appreciated is the fact that higher education in the 21st century, especially as this relates to comprehensive internationalisation, is moving forward in the absence of consensus and a lack of clarity between causal (global) issues impacting the world and how these issues tend to disproportionately impact the countries of the South. In many cases the absence of consensus is used as a justification for procrastination. For example, there are many faculty-led short programmes into numerous African countries with no collaboration between the local and the universities coming in from the North. This represents more academic tourism than true internationalisation benefitting all. Simultaneously, the world is undergoing a reordering of geopolitical realities whilst the transformation of civil society is also beginning to drive change on a global scale. At this point, the only certainty for higher education institutions is that they will be undergoing change, both self-imposed and externally demanded, at a much greater scale and faster pace than what has been experienced previously.

So, while the field of higher education internationalisation is not escaping the impact of global geopolitical re-ordering and global economic, social and political realities and inequalities shaping the regional and global discourses, there is a reluctance on the side of international educators to discuss the issues that are, predictably, contentious. The preference appears to be one that adopts a 'diplomatic' approach that steers away from tense and conflictual but necessary conversations. In some cases, there are attempts to explain away the concerns or, even worse, promote 'rationalisation'.

---

1   Dr Nico Jooste is the Senior Director of the Office for International Education at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa. He is currently the President of the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA).

The warning from the Oxford Martin Commission (2013: 41) is worth emphasising: 'Individuals, communities and nations acting rationally can generate collective failure'. This needs to be taken seriously. While we do not need to rehearse the game theory, especially regarding implications of the 'Prisoner's Dilemma', one can easily acknowledge that the fallacy of composition is at work when people think that it is sufficient for individual actors to pursue their narrow self-interest in the hopes of creating a better collective experience.

There is also an outcry from some role players within and outside the higher education domain stressing the importance of staying focused on conceptualising internationalisation as

> The intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society (European Parliament 2015: 33).

While highlighting this important point, Ha and Barnawi (2015) also challenge the higher education community to consider the impact of the growing commercialisation of internationalisation practices coupled with the neoliberal drive to bring higher education internationalisation into the fold of a market-driven and purely competitive commercial enterprise. Put somewhat differently, the need to re-focus the way internationalisation is currently practised is articulated well by Jennifer Humphries (2014) in a paper presented at the Global Dialogue on the Future of Higher Education Internationalisation hosted in Port Elizabeth, South Africa, in January 2014:

> We have shifted the focus to the commercial aspects of internationalisation. This is in part to persuade leaders who are keen to balance budgets to support our endeavour, and although bottom lines are our everyday fiscal reality, this is now also in part because we have become quite interested in the financial benefits for our own well-being.

Not only international education, but universities in general, seem to have diverged from their fundamental role and responsibility. Budd Hall (2013) quotes Cristina Escrigas, Executive Director of the Global University Network for Innovation: 'It is time to review and reconsider the interchange of values between university and society; that is to say, we need to rethink the social relevance of universities'. Hall further quotes Saleem Badat, Vice-Chancellor of Rhodes University in South Africa: 'The responsiveness of universities cannot only be economic in character; it has to be of a wider social character.' Jennifer Humphries (2014) thinks that international higher education needs to be 'turned on its head'. She sees the true value of internationalisation 'in reaching out across borders

to engage and empower, to advocate and negotiate to ensure that individuals and communities of various capacities and in diverse roles have the opportunity to shape their lives and give input to initiatives that will impact them'. This, however, cannot happen if commercial aspects of internationalisation take over.

The arguments presented here drive home the point that higher education partnerships and institutions of higher learning in the global South should resist the commercialisation and marketisation of higher education unless they are disposed to experience a [post-] colonial occupation once again. What is required is a collaborative approach to internationalisation grounded in the idea of a global commons - a commons that recognises complex interdependent relations all the while resisting the occupying mindset. Furthermore, we always have to keep in mind the fact that there are clear asymmetries in power relations between universities, especially when one considers universities in the developed world and the ones in the global South. The call, then, is for the power dynamics to be somewhat neutralised as an approach that truly lifts all, or is pursued in a less than patronizing and condescending manner. This will require a shift in attitudes.

To make plain the philosophical motivations driving this chapter, it is important to draw out the fundamental nature of the critique. The argument of this chapter presupposes that what we experience as a 'problem' and a 'solution' can occur only against the background conditions experienced as 'unproblematic'. For example, what one would consider 'coercive practices' must appear as 'disruptions', 'disturbances' or 'distortions' of a basically non-coercive frame. How does this relate to point in question? If wealthy universities believe they are entitled, like many multinationals, to 'impose' their presence in the global South to address matters of scale even when they suggest they are contributing to the betterment of the world because the commercialisation and marketisation of higher education means universities are simply behaving like firms trying to maximize their presence and, in many cases their profits, then what would critique look like? Is the World Trade Organisation (WTO) going to rule on mergers, acquisitions and partnerships of higher education institutions?

Most critiques and conversations, however, must seek to demonstrate not merely that we are in a context that renders [problematic] aspects of behaviors invisible, but also that the very invisibility is itself a condition for the reproduction of the very phenomena we believe we oppose. Put differently, as universities expand their reach building satellite campuses akin to multinational facilities taking advantage of cost-of-living differences and labor advantages what is lost is what type of impact, economic, political, social and psychological these encroachments have on the local community.

So, what is required in the internationalisation field, and especially of those engaged in

internationalisation partnerships, is the attention to the fact that commercialising higher education has some very predictable and foreseeable consequences - consequences more detrimental to the universities of the global South than has been mindfully considered up to this point.

This chapter will argue that higher education partnerships, as one of the higher order manifestations of higher education internationalisation, should follow an alternative way and not become part of the commercialisation and marketisation in a classic neoliberal way. The chapter will also introduce the argument that if the collaborative space within which higher education partnerships are practiced is treated as a commons, a more equitable and equal level of collaboration would become the practice.

Higher education partnerships – change agents in an 'unsettled' world?

One of the fundamental concerns for international professionals and educators is to determine how we want to grapple with the geopolitical situation that we are experiencing and whether we believe we can and should play an integral role in shaping the discourse that has the power to continue to shape and influence political and economic policies across the globe. Perhaps a real understanding of international higher education's role as the catalyst in creating on-going and 'borderless' conversations should be conceptualised, debated and implemented by higher education institutions and organisations that promote global cooperation. We must also be attentive to the basic fact that a more sincere appreciation of work done at the local level is of global significance and should be considered a counter-weight to the pressure to adopt national, regional and world ranking schemes that create perverse incentives and distort the value of an approach to comprehensive internationalisation that aspires to promote a global commons. What is needed, then, is a manner of fostering a nuanced understanding of the interplay between local culture and the impact of globalisation (Edwards 2013: 88).

A highly collaborative approach is required in higher education collaboration. This, in turn, would be our response to the current global challenges. Fundamental to this is how institutional partnerships shape this collaboration. It is important that all collaborations are framed in such a way that it will enhance the knowledge specific domains as well as to enhance the broader societal involvement and bring the global and the local closer together.

It is thus essential that we re-think our current practice of 'common space' - our higher education global commons. These common spaces where we as 'global villagers' function are often virtual spaces. How this will function cannot be defined from the outset. We should, however, not be afraid of the unknown. Higher education practitioners must be

tolerant of uncertainties as this will allow innovation to flourish. We have the luxury to define ourselves and not be bound by the historic connection to place. In this regard 'the global environment is the local environment, and global commons are local commons, insofar as our impacts on them demonstrate their 'nearness' to the horizon of civilization' (Hartzog 2003: 19-20).

Working together pre-supposes that we have a 'commons' that we can turn to, a common space that is accessible when functioning locally and globally. Still, suggesting that the commons concept is used to define the space where higher education institutions collaborate has an inherent danger. The danger lies in the fact that the term commons is currently used in places and spaces that do not always reflect its original use. It is necessary to pause for a moment and explore the use of the 'commons' as used in 16th century England. Defining the commons in Britain for the use of the villagers and in many cases the landless was that it served as the place where being part of the village was the determining factor. The practice of using the commons more for the private good and ignoring the need of those that needed it to sustain themselves led to the demise of the commons and ultimately to the formal enclosure of the commons spaces and its conversion to controlled commercial spaces (Hey 1986). One of the fundamental reasons for the demise of the commons, depicted often as 'the tragedy of the commons', was the disregard for the accepted rules that governed the commons. These rules were more a set of values than legislated regulations; however, when the regulation of the commons became an act of Parliament it changed the nature of the relationships and the use of the commons.

The question should thus be asked: Is the commons concept applicable when we discuss partnerships as a driver of higher education internationalisation? It is argued that if this is not part of the philosophical framework defining international collaboration, this practice will also be commercialised and will also become part of the neoliberal practice of higher education that is defined by value added in monetary terms. By seeing the space where higher education institutions collaborate as a commons we accept - as international educationalists - that 'the village' is not only a local place but part of a global village. We would also need to accept certain rules that would guide the behaviour within the commons. To prevent a new form of the 'tragedy of the commons' within the higher education space, partnerships in higher education internationalisation will only serve as spaces where the collaborators see themselves as equals willing to share, innovate and work towards the common good of those 'in the commons' if they agree to a common set of values that will guide them during these activities. Only if values are agreed we will avert the tragedy of the higher education commons and build a 'triumph of the commons' in the future.

It is suggested that the value that could guide the spaces for collaboration and practices of higher education partnerships and that is widely accepted in Africa is the value described as 'Ubuntu'. The focus would be on sincere collaboration and the other and not only on the self. This flows from the meaning of Ubuntu as understood by most to believe that a person is a person through other persons, that my humanity is caught up and bound up in that of the other. Practices are guided by actions focussed on the other and not the self. The realisation that the focus on the other provides much greater harmony as well as successful and mutually beneficial collaboration is also supported by the Japanese value expressed as 'Okage Same De' – I am what I am because of you. It should thus not be too far fetched to suggest that the space and place where higher education practitioners and institutions collaborate internationally should be where knowledge, practices and capacity are shared and not traded or competed over, especially not in those spaces where mutual agreement is reached to collaborate.

The higher education global commons

The global commons for universities is largely defined by its partnerships and how they are put together. The 'Partner Week' or as Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University refers to it the 'Family Week' is an attempt to create a global commons for the university and its partners. It is in this space where we evaluate the current partnerships and re-imagine them for the future. This is also a space that developed into more than just a once-off partnership but into relationships operating collectively across longer-term time horizons.

The concept of developing institutional partnerships into a more concrete cooperative arrangement originates from the visionary leadership of Axel Market. He motivates his decision to bring together the Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen partners, when he states in an interview celebrating the 20th Tübingen Family Meeting that:

> Although electronic communication has made keeping contact between partners a lot easier, getting to know the person behind the email address is still paramount to all of us. After spending some time together in a retreat setting, you cannot help noticing a markedly positive effect on the mutual working relations (University of Tübingen 2010).

Comparing the Tübingen and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's 'Family Weeks', it is clear that bringing together the partners has not only strengthened the host institutions' relationships with the partners but also allowed the partners to connect and develop new inter-institutional partnerships. The participants in the Family Weeks were and are currently mostly those involved in internationalising the universities.

This investment in time as well as the financial investment by all validates the theory that personal contact is of critical importance in any inter-institutional collaboration. The question, however, is how once a common space has been established where partners interact and practice internationalisation at the institutional level can this be used to address the complex and diverse problems that institutions are facing globally? Is it not time that these 'Family Weeks' become the institutional 'global commons' that can be utilised as 'a resource to which no single decision-making unit holds exclusive title. This can mean that it is owned by no one' (Wijkman 1982: 512). If we accept that the meeting of partners is more than just a meeting of professionals, can we create global commons where those utilising the space collaborate institutionally? In doing so the collective should not only address the normal inter-institutional matters, but also begin to address the present day global challenges and develop a real sense of global belonging. This would create a number of 'commons' in the 'global village' where the diversity of challenges and solutions to these challenges can be analysed and defined on a global scale. It would also be the beginning of bridging the existing global socio-economic, political and other divides.

If this concept becomes a reality, it could begin to set its own agenda within a network where trust, institutional respect and a shared vision would be the motivation for collaboration and belonging. In the modern day higher education global commons where partners meet, we should be brave enough to address those matters that are affecting the global village. It should include the broader societal issues such as the state of the global environment, the way that economic development is creating more poverty and disparities and the state of politics and democracy in the world - in addition to the issues that are facing and defining higher education. We should also address the commercialisation of higher education, the role of higher education rankings, the dominance of certain power networks in setting the global agenda, the hunt for academic talent from the developing world and many other pressing issues.

Partnerships in practice

To move from theory to practice, what would this imply for higher education partnerships? Institutional partnerships have been one of the pillars of comprehensive internationalisation. The other three pillars - internationalisation of the curriculum, teaching and learning; internationalisation of research and knowledge creation; and the integration of internationalisation of the university to the broader society - rely largely on international partnerships for their global reach. As such, international partnerships should be multi-dimensional and should have shared values and provide strategic long-

term value in localities that offer a global strategic footprint (Hudzik & Stohl 2012: 61 -63). International partnerships should also play the role of equaliser in a world that is becoming more unequal than in the past. Although the initial interpretation of the effects of globalisation was that it would lead to a world that is 'flat', the current global economic and political re-alignment is not leading to a world that is 'flat' but rather a world that is becoming more 'gated' and unequal (The Economist 12 October 2013). It is thus necessary that partnerships and collaboration amongst higher education institutions should strive towards the collaboration amongst equals, recognising the difference in capacity and resources, but at the same time also realising the inter-relatedness of the developed, emerging and developing worlds. It is a given that collaboration amongst higher education institutions should not be focused on assistance but to be true partners operating in a commons and adhering to the value of 'I am because of you'.

Moving towards a new model in the development and practice of international partners should however continue to comply with the same pre-requisites as before. These are:

- Partnerships need to support and enhance the strategic vision of universities;
- Provide global reach;
- Enhance knowledge innovation;
- Prepare students to be globally competent citizens.

The network or 'family' as knowledge commons in practice

The partner networks, brought together by the collaboration of the institutional partners, will have as a fundamental premise collaboration between equals. The richness that the diversity of institutions brings to the collective functioning on the same global commons requires the understanding of equalness. It is important that institutions participating in this form of global collaboration should understand each other's limitations, weaknesses and needs as well as its strengths and areas of excellence (Canto & Hannah 2001: 31-32). The collaboration amongst equals, engaging from different developmental and societal backgrounds should not be because the one is an interesting object of research but rather because they are research partners.

The collaboration between those functioning in the partners' network can be defined as horizontal partnerships that include:

- The existence of previous knowledge of each other to establish realistic expectations;

- Genuine sharing of each other's experiences;
- The application of each other's knowledge rather than a one-way transfer (Ibid: 32).

A fundamental shift from the past would be the way future partnerships are framed. The current memoranda of understanding that Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University uses, as well as the templates used by the partners, are only concerned with functional matters. We do not spend enough time in defining common goals that are not linked to mobility matters. Matters that will move us towards a common goal are:

- Functioning as part of a global commons;
- Matters of global concern that should be addressed;
- A commitment to the development of a common vision and ambition to address the current global challenges that should contribute to a sustainable world for current and future generations.

It should thus be agreed that the collaborations between institutions should also contribute to the wellbeing of the global commons.

Over time Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University has refined the 'Family Week' to be a meeting of the partners every two years. Not only did this provide the partners with the opportunity to engage and interact, it has also contributed to a better understanding of each other. The NMMU Family Week has also become a place where NMMU's partners have become partners amongst each other. It has deepened the relationship among institutions that did not have previous links and as such has provided a space for further collaboration and innovation. In the beginning, not more than 15% of the partners were also partners of each other before they joined the 'NMMU Family'. By 2014, more than 60% of the partners had also become individual partners outside the NMMU's network. In practice, what happened was that the 'Family Week' became a commons. Sharing of expertise as well as the sharing of knowledge took place at each gathering. All the partners came into the 'Family Week' that acted as a commons without the desire to benefit individually but rather to share. In doing this, the real benefits for all were far reaching.

Conclusion

It is important that a theory of higher education partners operating in a 'global commons' is developed and implemented through a 'knowledge based Family Week' that would act as a commons. This would move the way that partners collaborate to the next level.

This can function in parallel to the conventional way that institutional partnerships are managed. It indicates, however that the partners can also collaborate in a different way through the utilisation of the global knowledge commons that would take place at least every second year. The theme(s) to be discussed should thus be beneficial to all those that choose to join. It would be necessary for those that participate to understand that during that period institutional sovereignty would to an extent be ceded to the commons and will be guided by the value of Ubuntu. The value of sharing will be reliant on the participants' willingness to bring into the space their expertise, with the desire to share and innovate.

This would introduce a new phase in the 'Family Week' development. From the meeting place of partners sharing the practices of internationalisation (a forum that focuses on the transactional side of internationalisation), it would become more of a place where the transformational issues are discussed and shared. It would be imperative for those participating in the knowledge commons to focus on turning the new knowledge created in this space into collaborative practice. The real value would be in the sharing and internalising of the knowledge creation for each institution as well as finding those areas of collaboration that will not only benefit all, but through collaboration create new knowledge that would not be possible individually. The knowledge based Family Weeks would become a global commons where all share and in the end benefit.

The success of this new way of arranging the 'Family Week' would require an intensified way of collaboration and a clear understanding of sharing. As in all other areas of internationalisation, this would require a set of indicators to measure success and value. The theory of the commons would require that those functioning in the commons jointly determine the value of such collaborative exercises. The value should be based on a set of pre-agreed indicators that will measure the input to the commons, the output of the meetings of the minds and experiences as well as the outcomes. It would require a high order of collaboration and should not be managed as just another event. The 'Family Week' as a global knowledge commons would require real preparation before the partners join the commons, a definite sharing of ideas and knowledge whilst in the commons and a continued engagement afterwards to ensure real impact for all.

The question could be asked if this is only a dream. It could be much more than just a dream if all those participating in higher education collaboration are serious about making a real difference and bringing together diverse institutional partners that are prepared to innovate, collaborate and share as equals in a [still] very unequal global higher education environment.

References

Canto, I. & Hannah, J. (2001) 'A Partnership of Equals? Academic Collaboration Between the United Kingdom and Brazil' *Journal of Studies in International Education*. (5) 1. Pp. 26-41.

Edwards, J. (2013) 'Borderless Conversation' In: Teekens, H. (ed.) *Global Education: A Narrative*. The Hague: Nuffic. p. 88.

Ha, P. L. & Barnawi, O.Z. (2015) 'Where English, Neoliberalism, Desire and Internationalization are Alive and Kicking: Higher Education in Saudi Arabia Today'. *Language and Education*. pp. 1-21.

Hall, B. L. (2013) 'Higher Education, Community Engagement and the Public Good: Where National and International Priorities Intersect'. *Presentation at the Annual CBIE Conference*. Vancouver, Canada.

Hartzog, P. (2003) 'Global Commons: Is Definition Possible?' Bachelor Thesis. Department of Political Science. Salt Lake City: University of Utah.

Hey, D. (1986) 'Yorkshire from AD 1000' *Regional History of England Series*. London: Longman Group United Kingdom.

Hudzik, J.K. & Stohl, M. (2012) 'Comprehensive and Strategic Internationalisation of U.S. Higher Education' In: Deardorff, D., de Wit, H., Heyl, J. & Adams, T (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE. pp. 61-80.

Humphries, J. (2014) 'CBIE's Vision for the Future of International Education'. *Global Dialogue*. Hosted by the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA) in Port Elizabeth, South Africa in January 2014.

Internationalisation of Higher Education. (2015) Brussels: European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies.

Now for the Long Term: The Report of the Oxford Martin Commission for Future Generations. (2013) Oxford Martin School. Oxford: University of Oxford.

The 20th Tübingen Family Meeting – A Retrospective. (2010) Occasional Publication Published by Tübingen International Office. University of Tübingen.

'The Gated Globe'. (2013) *The Economist*. http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21587785-gated-globe.

Wijkman, P.M. (1982) *Managing the Global Commons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strategic Institutional Partnerships and Comprehensive Internationalisation

John K. Hudzik[1]

The importance of cross-border, inter-institutional collaborations is growing because of the expansion of global higher education teaching and research capacity as well as the emergence of more strategic and comprehensive forms of higher education internationalisation. These two factors are related. The development of capacity coupled to financial constraints and pressure to produce results is causing higher education to think and act more strategically overall and in its international collaborations (APLU 2011; Miller 2006; Sporn 2003; Nokkala 2007; Estermann *et al.* 2013).

Collaborations and partnerships can be a cost effective way to enhance capacity in the global higher education marketplace as well as to extend institutional reach and stature globally. Partnerships and related forms of collaboration can help provide structure for global sources of cutting edge knowledge and capacity in a cost effective way.[2] This is especially the case for institutions engaging in internationalisation strategically and comprehensively where resources 'at home' would likely be insufficient on their own.

This chapter begins by laying a context for partnerships and a foundation for the meaning and practice of comprehensive internationalisation (CI). These are connected to the global factors, motivations and rationales for the growing importance of CI and its connection to strategic partnerships. The drivers of both internationalisation and partnerships are mapped as a part of this analysis. With this as a base, the chapter then considers the pre-conditions for, and elements of, effective partnerships. Alternative partnership and/ or collaboration models are noted, along with their pros and cons. The importance of defining and holding partnerships and collaborations accountable to desirable outcomes is of growing importance just as it is for higher education generally.

Defining regional needs and managing varying institutional capacities

The basis of successful partnerships and collaborations is that while common principles apply, they need to be 'tuned' to the objectives and needs of institutions and their regions. For example, as Jowi (2010) points out, globalisation is compelling Africa to deliberately engage internationalisation, partly in response to the needs and demands of knowledge societies. This is a reality that spans the globe. However, Jowi, Knight and Sehoole

---

1   John K. Hudzik is a Professor at Michigan State University and NAFSA Senior Scholar for Internationalization.

2   For wide ranging viewpoints relating to partnerships and internationalisation, see 'Developing Strategic International Partnerships' (IIE 2011). Also see Van der Water et al. (2008) for a general review of the planning steps and issues involved in forming international partnerships.

(2013: 24-26) argue that the African context shapes a strong need to build intra-African partnerships (although not to the exclusion of partnerships with institutions in other regions).

In Jowi's, Knight's and Schoole's view intra-African partnerships should be focused 'through mobility programmes and frameworks for capacity building', as well as harmonisation in various forms across the continent, as a means to build a foundation for growth and development (Ibid. 24-26). The idea has precedence in the Europen Erasmus programme. In their view the absence of strategic internationalisation plans as well as baseline scientific research capacity at many African institutions makes it difficult for them to collaborate with institutions from other world regions on a shared footing. Results of unequal footing include brain drain, curriculum and scholarship development dominated by outside rather than African priorities, and the risks of commercialisation. Partnerships and collaborations among African institutions in the form of harmonising degrees, easing mobility and transferring of credentials, along with collaboration to develop research capacity, all within a context of an internationalisation strategy, could lay a foundation for more equitable inter-regional partnerships. While these points are valid on their own, they do not dissuade from the potential value of partnerships involving institutions outside the African continent.

Mutual benefits from symmetric and asymmetric partnerships

The basis for mutual benefits involves creativity and is possible among almost any combination of institutions. The foundation for mutual benefit is built on the following (Hudzik & Simon 2012):

- Shared vision of desired outcomes;
- Shared values among institutional partners;
- Mutual contribution and co-production to bring value added;
- Documentable benefits all around.

Benefits may be symmetric (similar benefits, for example, straight one-for-one student or faculty exchanges, project grant and research collaborations leading to shared funding and/or revenue) or asymmetric (the benefits are defined and operationalised differently for partners). When capacities and needs differ from institution to institution and region to region, collaboration is possible under an exchange metric that is more asymmetric than symmetric. Asymmetric collaborations require establishing a way to 'equilibrate' the value of different benefits (creating a metric of exchange). Examples include undergraduate

study abroad in one direction banking 'credits' for graduate degrees in the other; research and publication opportunities for faculty from institution 'X' and community capacity building and problem solving at institution and community 'Y'; and developing markets for products from country 'X' in trade for access to valued products from nation 'Y'. Thinking and calculations are in terms of 'we will get A and B from this and you will get C and D'. The key is figuring out the metric of how much A and B equals relating to how much C and D equals.

Comprehensive internationalisation: Meaning, practice and motivations

By its nature comprehensive internationalisation is a catalyst of more complex and comprehensive partnership formation. CI itself can be seen as having four common aspirations or behaviours. How institutions pursue each will and must be idiosyncratic to their particular circumstances. The four are:

- *Mainstream:* Expand faculty and student engagement. Exposure to international content is not for the few but for the many. Increasingly, faculty research must be informed by and connected to global pathways of cutting edge knowledge and creativity. Many forces (discussed below) drive these realities;

- *Integrate CI into core institutional missions:* Internationalisation cannot be afforded if it is an additional mission, but rather must be integrated into traditional core missions of higher education, from teaching and learning, research and scholarship, to community engagement and services;

- *Expand who supports and contributes:* If CI is only the responsibility of the international office, it will fail. Internationalisation is only possible with active engagement through the institutions academic and service units;

- *Interconnect:* Resource constraints require institutions to pursue multiple missions with a given expenditure of resources. Synergies must be sought across teaching, research and service missions in the interest of efficiency.

As a result, CI is defined as,

Commitment and action to infuse and integrate international, global and comparative content and perspectives throughout the teaching, research and service missions of a higher education institution, achieving benefits in core learning and research outcomes and becoming an institutional imperative not just a desirable possibility (adapted from Hudzik 2011 and Hudzik & McCarthy 2012).

As institutions of higher education are idiosyncratic, so are their approaches to CI.

Differences are shaped by an institution's missions, values and priorities, by its starting point for engaging internationalisation, by what seems possible at a given point in time and by the institution's established methods and modes of operation. There is no 'best' model. The best model for any institution is the one that fits its missions and circumstances, because at the core of acting strategically when it comes to internationalisation is the integration and infusion of internationalisation into core institutional missions and values.

It is impossible to successfully pursue the four common aspirations or behaviors associated with CI noted above without an institution-wide commitment to internationalisation imbedded in its ethos and systematically brought to life throughout the institution. Put differently, the kind of internationalisation now practiced at many higher education institutions cannot be achieved through piecemeal efforts by individuals or units here and there, or by a single entity such as the international office.

CI demands not only commitment and action throughout the institution, but also in institutional direction, orchestration and priority setting. The same applies to the formation of institutional collaborations and partnerships which cannot be left only to idiosyncratic initiatives of individual faculty, staff and/or units.

Comprehensive also means strategic internationalisation and partnerships

The elements of a strategic approach to internationalisation are both explicit and implicit within the definition of CI. The essential meaning of strategic is that internationalisation is not viewed as an 'add on' or a fourth institutional mission. Rather, it is purposefully integrated into existing core missions of teaching, research and service. The strategic inclusion of CI means that institutional missions and values are defined in global terms as well as in local or national terms. It is rejection of the false dichotomy that the options for an institution are to be either locally or globally focused. It is recognition that local prosperities are dependent on global co-prosperities, and vice versa.

For many institutions this is a paradigm shift. For the institution to see itself as not just locally and nationally but also globally engaged is of strategic importance (Hudzik & Simon 2012). By the same token, fully successful partnerships are not simply an appendage to the institution, but rather are integrated into the institution and its missions in order to become an integral part of institutional capacity. These kinds of partnerships are increasingly run institutional-wide (across all missions and many programmes) and deep (from the top levels down to the level of specific courses, curricula and individual research projects). A comprehensive approach to both internationalisation and partnerships will include, consistent with Sutton's (2010) view, 'an inward process of

integrating international perspectives into our institutions… and an outward process of positioning institutions in global networks of learning, discovery and engagement'. Sutton labels the preferred kind of partnership as 'transformational' based on the earlier work of Morton and Enos (2002). The United Nations has also used the term 'transformational' in relation to describing successful partnerships between the UN and businesses (Dalberg *et al.* 2011).

Prerequisites for transformational and strategic partnerships

According to Sutton (2010), the essential elements of transformational partnerships are common goals, trading or sharing of resources, genuine reciprocity and mutual expansion of capacity. This is a good start at laying down preconditions for transformational and strategic partnerships. Other preconditions include shared core values, documental outcomes, and co-production in defining problems and solutions (Dalberg *et al.* 2011). Additional preconditions include partners able to learn from one another and partners being flexible enough to adapt practices to one another. Ultimately, what makes a partnership strategic is its connection to advancing the needs of partner institutional strategic plans, priorities and core values. What makes a partnership transformational is that it prompts organisational change and builds organisational capacity in ways not possible outside the partnership.

Partnerships carry costs as well as benefits. Decisions to develop some and not others need to consider the balance of costs or benefits, feasibility and programme priorities. Just as there needs to be an institutional strategic plan for internationalisation, there also needs to be a strategic plan for partnerships and collaborations. There is a relationship to consider between bottom-up and top-down decision making in forming partnerships. Much of the creativity and drive to pursue specific internationalisation projects or partnerships begins with efforts of individuals such as faculty. Personal relationships at the individual and disciplinary unit level across institutions are the seed stock for much successful collaboration. The process of top-down priority setting and coordination needs to be balanced with the diversity coming from bottom up. This kind of balancing effort is inherent in matrix style organisations (Bartlett & Goshal, 1990; Galbraith 2008) and characterises some of the most internationally engaged institutions (Hudzik 2015).

Motivations driving internationalisation and partnerships[3]

Peter Drucker (1969) has popularised concepts of the knowledge society and the

knowledge economy. At the core of these concepts are the widespread generation and sharing of knowledge and its translation into innovation for societies. With globalisation, the capacity of societies to generate and use such knowledge takes on a world-spanning scale. Knowledge becomes a key resource for the economies and cultures of contemporary societies, at least equal to the importance of the more traditional building blocks of 'land, labor and capital'.

The central role of universities in creating, shaping and applying knowledge for social and economic development is widely recognised. An example is the World Bank publication 'How Universities Promote Economic Growth' (Yusuf & Nabeshima 2007). The Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation (OECD) analysis found a strong correlation between higher level literacy, numeracy, and analytical skills, as measured by the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) and GDP per capita (Van Damme 2014), the higher level skills being the product of post-secondary and higher education capacity.

One consequence of growing global development is that the playing field for competition as well as collaboration is shifting from local or national to a global reference frame and is increasingly in ideas and talent. It is also shifting and balancing regionally. Competition and collaboration in ideas require knowledge societies supported by high quality higher education systems. High-quality, cutting edge higher education requires access to global pathways of learning, talent and ideas. Increasingly these pathways are built and facilitated through cross-border partnerships. In other words, higher education institutions become a meeting ground of the local and the global.

Contemporary drivers of internationalisation

The traditional drivers and motivations of internationalisation are political and social and include the need for and benefits arising from building cross-cultural understanding, relations, peace, justice and mutual benefits of development. Knight (2004 and 2012) and de Wit (2004) categorise the traditional drivers as socio-cultural, political, economic and academic. Hudzik (2015) recalibrates and defines these drivers to incorporate the following:

- Recognition that the core missions and business of higher education (knowledge creation, transmission and application) are increasingly conducted across borders, and that higher education institutions function in a global market place;

- A view that customers of higher education, for example students, communities and employers, live and work in a global environment, and that customers 'at home'

are global customers too;

- The over-arching needs of knowledge societies and economies are expanding to become part of a global market place.

These combine to become powerful inducements for higher education to think strategically and comprehensively about engaging internationally, and intertwining the local and the global.

Drivers of partnerships

It is the global development of higher education capacity and trade routes that make more strategic and comprehensive internationalisation among institutions increasingly possible and necessary. Research capacity is spreading globally along with instructional capacity (Ruby 2010; OECD Education at a Glance 2013; Banks *et al.* 2007; Van Damme 2014; National Science Board 2014; Grueber & Studt 2013). Envelope-pushing research and high quality higher education is no longer centered in a few countries and one or two world regions. Rather, it is spreading globally albeit with Latin America and Africa at somewhat different stages of development. This has massive implications for where one looks for cutting edge ideas and for where institutions look to build successful collaborations and partnerships. Where one looks is increasingly everywhere.

While brain drain remains an issue, it appears under amelioration in some regions owing to a wider variety of circulation paths for the mobility of students and scholars (Wildavsky 2010), except in those countries and regions whose higher education systems and economies are insufficiently developed to provide opportunity for the educated and the scholar. Development of indigenous capacity to make productive use of and adequately to reward those receiving higher levels of education is ultimately the solution to brain drain.

In forming partnerships, it is not simply a matter of where the good ideas are, but also affordability. As Stephen Toope, former President of the University of British Columbia, has pointed out, the rising cost of cutting edge research makes it increasingly difficult or impossible for a single institution to afford it. Rather, the institution must look for partners. Increasingly the best partners are found across borders and regions (Loveland 2011).

The spread of global instructional and research capacity changes the geography for accessing progressive knowledge. To be connected and 'competitive', higher education institutions engage global pathways of collaboration. Depending on the disciplinary or subject matter focus of a search for collaborators, and to look for the best of such connections, candidate institutions can be found 'at home'. Rising global capacity,

however, increases the likelihood of finding matches in multiple world regions. The pathways for finding institutional collaborations are multiple and shifting just as they are becoming in the field of student and scholar mobility (Wildavsky 2010).

Networks (one form of inter-institutional collaboration) are emerging to provide flexible access to multiple partners and pathways (OECD 2012; Hudzik & Simon 2012). However, bi- and multi-lateral partnerships, mainly those of a strategic, wide and deep nature between two or three institutions, can similarly provide ready access to talent and ideas among the partner institutions. Another motivation for partnerships relates to building institutional reputation, the assumption being that the right institutional partnerships can enhance global reputation and connections. Some markets and entrepreneurial opportunities are enhanced through access provided by the partner institution. For example, numerous grant agencies such as World Bank, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and scores of others now require inter-regional partnerships, particularly ones that strengthen 'local' presence and capacity development.

The basic partnership options

On the one hand, partnership formation can be strategic and involve multiple missions, connect to general institutional strategy and priorities and have wide reaching implications for people and units throughout the institution. Alternatively, partnerships can be narrowly focused on a particular activity such as study abroad exchange. It may be easier and less risky to 'test the partnership water' for a wider relationship by beginning with a focused one.

There are also issues about the number of partners in a collaboration, and associated pros and cons. Bi-lateral partnerships are probably the easiest to manage and keep focused. Tri- and multi-lateral partnerships expand the talent base and access to resources and connections but are more complicated to manage. Networks can also substantially expand members and therefore access to a greater diversity of talent and resources, but they can become complex and require network management structures. Networks can offer the advantage of 'loosely coupled' relationships (Weick 1991; Kezar 2004) in which network association provides an introduction to a wider range of institutions and where specific project collaborations among subsets of network members can be flexible and shifting.

From individualistic to strategic institutional partnerships

Under more comprehensive and strategic approaches to internationalisation, cross-border partnerships are likely to evolve from single-purpose to multi-purpose (multi-mission) collaborations, for example from student exchanges only to incorporating faculty

exchange, research collaborations, joint bidding on research and projects and dual or joint degrees. Among research and graduate intensive institutions, a strong set of drivers and priority setting for partnerships and collaborations will be driven by research, scholarship and institutional reputation building.

These changes represent a growing preference for strategic, wide and deep collaborations in the interest of both cost effectiveness and achieving synergies across missions. Examples include research collaborations also providing study abroad opportunities, dual and joint degrees providing faculty exchange and graduate education. Joint community development and problem solving projects provide avenues for scholarship and publications.

Internationalisation partnerships will develop under diverse models: bi-lateral, multi-lateral, and network arrangements. They are also likely to be institutionally limited in number so that institutional resources can be focused. At many institutions, the formation of memoranda of understanding (MOU) are already taking on a more institutional and corporate cast, replacing inter-institutional MOU's arising from the interests of an individual or a particular academic unit alone.

For institutions engaging internationalisation comprehensively across all missions and across diverse disciplinary fields, there is likely to be increased attention to developing strategic and deep partnerships. But as no given set of partnerships can hope to meet all needs, the formation of global institutional networks may well take on increased importance. Networks can service a more diverse and complex array of interactions. Networks can be fixed in membership and roles or flexible; for example, working with some members for x-type projects and other network members for y-type projects.

Designing and working toward partnerships and collaborations: Key issues and prerequisites

A central consideration in contemplating and planning partnerships and collaborations is weighing their costs and benefits. Costs and benefits vary by the type of partnership or collaboration being contemplated. They also vary by mission scope, anticipated longevity and intended organisational breadth and impact. This is discussed in more detail below:

- *Mission scope:* How mission encompassing will the collaboration be? Will it incorporate teaching and learning, research and project collaborations and/or community problem solving and development? The wider the mission scope, the greater the costs in terms of people involved and complexity of management, as well as due diligence need in assessing whether there is adequate and sustainable

support in both institutions to partner across the mission domains. However, while costs expand under multi-mission partnerships, so do the opportunities for multiple and cross-reinforced payoffs (synergies) in teaching, research and service. The fixed costs in partnership start and maintenance can be spread across several purposes;

- **Longevity:** What is the anticipated timeframe for the partnership? The answer depends on objectives and complexity. If focused and finite (organise, hold a conference and publish proceedings) an end is in sight. If, on the other hand, the commitment is to an on-going annual series, the time commitment may be open-ended. A decision to establish a dual and joint degree represents a commitment of several years at minimum. Many partnerships begin with a focused or finite project to test the waters and may blossom later to more complex and longer-term ones.

- **Organisational breadth:** How many people and units in the respective institutions need to be involved and provide support to aspects of the partnership? Obviously, the more involved, the higher the costs in personnel time and effort as well as time spent to win support and build willingness to contribute. With people and units involved, costs associated with managing and coordinating an institution-wide effort will increase. However, a partnership that reaches widely throughout the institution builds multiple institutional global connections in a potentially coordinated and more cost effective manner than if they popped up individually or idiosyncratically.

Costs as well as benefits compound across the above dimensions as more missions are involved, when longevity and the organisational involvement are taken into consideration. Yet, it is precisely along these dimensions that wide and deep partnerships between and among institutions can evolve over time to produce multiple benefits and to sustain a more comprehensive and strategic internationalisation.

Due diligence in planning and assessing proposed partnerships

As a way to get at identifying costs and benefits as well as the practicality and sustainability of partnerships, there are a set of framing questions and issues that need attention:

- **Can intellectual drivers and core values be advanced and outcomes achieved?** What are the likely benefits in teaching and learning, research or scholarship, community service, improved access for students, and strengthening institutional capacity in priority areas of programming? The key is whether a reasonably compelling

case can be made that the partnership or collaboration will benefit these core objectives in outcome terms for example learning, discoveries, problem-solving and institutional strengthening. How will success be defined? Numbers of students or customers served and benefitted; faculty, student and others' satisfaction and views of quality; financial viability; accountability? What are the prospects for success?

- ***Who or what is driving the proposed partnership or collaboration?*** Many partnerships and collaborations begin bottom-up and evolve from the cross-border teaching and research contacts of an individual (particularly a faculty member). Many times these collaborations never evolve beyond the start-up individuals. The important thing for the institution to consider is whether even at this limited spread of activity they consume too much time and resources and also contribute sufficiently and positively to institutional capacity and reputation. However, if it is an expectation that these individual efforts should expand or become more institutionalised, other issues arise. If the collaboration is individually driven or supported mainly by the strong personality, what is the plan for sustainability beyond that person? If the proposed partnership is driven by an administrator (top-down), what is the interest and support among faculty and staff to be involved? If involving key teaching and research thrusts, will the faculty offer support? Ultimately, institutional sustainability depends on the staying power of the institutions involved, and this depends on a wide range of support beyond current leadership or the power of an individual personality.

- ***Is there a good fit among the proposed partners (do we have the right partners)?*** The first issue of 'partnership fit' is whether each partner will bring something of sufficient value to the table in the interest of mutual benefits? A second set of issues, equally important and not unlike that needed in a marriage, is whether institutional cultures and values are compatible enough to work together harmoniously, flexible enough to adapt to each other as needed, and open to learning from each other. The third issue is whether partners have a deep and long enough commitment in mind to make the partnership work and a reputation for honoring commitments.

- ***Will key sectors or authorities provide support?*** The most obvious to consider is whether institutional leadership is supportive, but more important is whether the leadership, faculty and staff of key academic, support and service units see value and benefits in the proposed collaboration and are willing to exert time and energy for its success. There are related issues about the likely support of institutional academic governance structures and also accreditation and quality control bodies,

or whether conditions they might propose would be workable? Another question is do government(s) need to approve collaboration? And for those collaborations that will rely on an income stream for financial viability, is there a market?

- *Who brings which assets to the table?* Issues include, among others, name, brand, reputation, investment capital, knowhow and capacity, ability to build access to the market, technical substantive skills and operational management skills. And these are just a start.

Summing Up: The role of the MOU and project agreements

Increasingly, Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) are being fashioned to provide an overarching framework and set of parameters establishing the basis of a relationship between one or more institutions. MOUs set the basic ground rules and over-arching goals and principals for a proposed collaboration. More specific project agreements which follow go into the detail of expectations, responsibilities, structures, and so forth. Specific projects are intended to be consistent with principles of the overarching MOU, but free the MOU from the interminable detail of agreements that would be needed for multiple areas of collaboration that are typical of strategic or comprehensive partnerships. Appendix A is a table that identifies some of the usual topics and issues that are handled under MOUs and specific project agreements respectively. Although the dividing line between what is noted in the MOU and in project agreements is not always neat and clean, Appendix A does provide a reasonable summary of issues needing attention.

Appendix A

Key framing element of an MOU and subsequent project agreements.

MOU ITEMS

MOU origins and purpose	Brief statement on the origins or scope of the MOU including rationale, shared purposes, goals and benefits sought.
MOU mission and programmatic scope	Categories or types of activities and programmes encompassed in the agreement.
Lead parties	Lead administrative unit and principal contact person for each party (and provisions for updating these). Key units of partner organisations that will provide necessary services or supports.

Ancillary project agreements	Description of the MOU as an overarching and parameter setting agreement among the partners and that subsequent agreements will detail project-specific additional mutual agreements, obligations (financial and otherwise) and responsibilities.
	It is typical for the MOU to state that by itself the MOU does not bind the respective institutions to specific financial obligations, these being handled in specific agreements. It is, however, permissible for the MOU to state general principles governing respective financial arrangements if any need to be stated.
General limitations and obligations	Limitations and obligations of parties: scope of commitments, obligations and limitations; duration of the initial MOU agreement; provisions and process for review, renewal, termination and sunset.
	Provisions for settling disputes: applicable jurisdiction; method (such as mandatory arbitration); applicable legal system.
Listing of applicable general laws and institutional policies	Examples: health and safety, non-discrimination, immigration, personnel administration, fiscal administration and accountabilities.
Amendatory process	Provision for amending the MOU.
Authorising official	Approval and signature of the institutional official authorised to commit the institution.

FURTHER ITEMS IN ANCILLARY PROJECT AGREEMENTS

Project scope, purpose, objectives and anticipated outcomes	These should be specific to the project or work being proposed. For example, student exchange, research or grant collaboration, faculty exchange.
Lead project parties	Identification of individuals and units at respective institutions who head the projects and provide overall supervisory responsibility.

Financial	Who is responsible for start-up capital and related resources; who covers financial losses; who makes decisions about managing operational costs; if surplus is planned or emerges who decides its allocation; if there is equity in the operation, who decides distribution and by what criteria?
Liability	Who is contractually and/or legally liable for what?
Strategic and operating control	Who exercises day-to-day operating control, and of what; who decides strategic directions for the operation; who are the project managers in the respective institutions?
Assessment and evaluation	Substantive criteria for assessment such as goals, expectations and benchmarks; and procedural matters such as who is responsible to conduct assessments, when, and how, and expectations for sharing results.
For instructional and educational collaborations	Who or what determines: curriculum, degree, or programme requirements; qualifications of faculty and staff, hires/fires, and determines their rights and responsibilities; degree and other certifications with whose seal(s); curricular and related intellectual property rights; students' rights and responsibilities; academic policies and freedoms?
For research projects	What governs and who assures human subjects' rights and responsibilities; laboratory animal care requirements; ownership of intellectual property and IP rights; distributions of royalties and related income?
Authorisation signature	Signature of the individual(s) at each institution empowered to commit the institution to provision of the project agreement.

References

'Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU)' (2011) *The Voluntary System of Accountability* http://www.voluntarysystem.org [accessed 20 April 2014].

Banks, M., Olsen, A. & Pearce, D. (2007) *Global Student Mobility: An Australian Perspective Five Years On*. Canberra, Australia: IDP Education

Bartlett, C.A. & Ghoshal, S. (1990) 'Matrix Management: Not a Structure, A Frame of Mind'. *Harvard Business Review* (68) pp. 138–145.

De Wit, H. (2002) I*nternationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Drucker, P. (1969) *The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society*. New York: Harper and Row.

Estermann, T., Pruvot, E.B. & Claeys-Kulik, A.L. (2013) *Designing Strategies for Efficient Funding of Higher Education in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: European University Association.

Galbraith, J.R. (2008) *Designing Matrix Organizations That Actually Work: How IBM, Procter & Gamble and Others Design for Success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Grueber, Martin & Studt (2013) '2014 Global R&D Funding Forecast'. www.battelle.org

Hénard, F., Diamond, L. & Roseveare, D. (2012) 'Approaches to Internationalisation and Their Implications for Strategic Management and Institutional Practice: A Guide for Higher Education Institutions' *OECD Higher Education Programme* (IMHE). Paris, France: OECD.

Hudzik, J.K. (2015) *Comprehensive Internationalization of Higher Education: Pathways to Success*. UK: Routledge Publishers.

Hudzik, J.K. (2011) *Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action*. NAFSA. Washington, DC: The Association of International Educators.

Hudzik, J. & McCarthy, J.S. (2012) *Leading Comprehensive Internationalization: Strategy and Tactics for Action*. NAFSA. Washington, DC: The Association of International Educators.

Hudzik, J. & Simon, L.K. (2012) 'From a Land-Grant to a World-Grant Ideal: Extending Public Higher Education to a Global Frame' In: Fogel, D., Malson-Huddle, E. (eds.) P*recipice or Crossroads? Where America's Great Public Universities Stand and Where They Are Going Midway through Their Second Century*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Institute of International Education (IIE). (2011) *Developing Strategic International Partnerships: Models for Initiating and Sustaining Innovative Institutional Linkage*s.

Jowi, J. O. (2010) 'Africa'. In: *IAU 2010 Internationalisation of Higher Education. Global Trends, Regional Perspectives*. Paris: IAU.

Jowi, J.O. (2009) *Internationalization of Higher Education in Africa: Developments, Emerging Trends, Issues and Policy Implications*. African Network for Internationalization of Education (ANIE). Kenya: Moi University.

Jowi, J. O., Knight, J. & Seehoole, C. (2013) 'Africa's Responses' In: Sehoole, C., Chika. & Knight, J. (eds.) *Internationalization of African Higher Education: Towards Achieving the MDGs*. Boston: Sense Publishers.

Kehm, B.M. & Teichler, U. (2007) 'Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education' *Journal of Studies in International Education* (11) doi:10.1177/1028315307303534. pp. 260–273.

Kezar, A. (2001) 'Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations' *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education. Series 28. pp. iii–147.

Knight, J. (2004) 'Internationalization Remodeled: Definitions, Rationales and Approaches *Journal for Studies in International Education* (8) pp. 5–31.

Knight, J. (2012) 'Concepts, Rationales and Interpretive Frameworks in the Internationalization of Higher Education' In: Deardorff, D., de Wit, H., Heyl, J. & Adams, T. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 27–42.

Loveland, E. (2011) 'Place and Promise: An interview with Stephen J. Toope, President and Vice-Chancellor of The University of British Columbia' *International Educator* (20) pp. 22–28.

Miller, C. (2006) *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Morton, K. & Sandra, E. (2002) 'Building Deeper Civic Relationships and New and Improved Citizens' *The Journal of Public Affairs*. (VI) pp. 83-99.

Nokkala, T. (2007) *Constructing the Ideal University: The Internationalisation of Higher Education in the Competitive Knowledge Society*. Academic Dissertation. Tampere, Finland: University of Tampere.

National Science Board (NSB) (2014). *Science and Engineering Indicators 2014*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation Board.

OECD. (2013) *Education at a Glance 2013.* Education at a Glance. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Ruby, A. (2010) *The Uncertain Future for International Higher Education in the Asia-Pacific Region.* Washington, DC: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Sehoole, C. & Knight, J. (eds.) (2013) *Internationalization of African Higher Education: Towards Achieving the MDGs*. Boston: Sense Publishers.

Sporn, B. (2003) 'Convergence or Divergence in International Higher Education Policy: Lessons from Europe' *Publications from the Forum for the Future of Higher Education*.

Sutton, S. B. (2010) 'Transforming Internationalization through Partnerships' *International Educator*. Jan-Feb. pp. 60-63.

Van Damme, D. (2014) 'The Economics of International Higher Education' *Presented at the European Association for International Education 25th Anniversary Event*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Van der Water, J., Green, M. & Koch, K. (2008) *International Partnerships: Guidelines for Colleges and Universities*. Washington D.C: American Council on Education.

Weick, K.E. (1991) 'Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems' In: Peterson, M.W., Chaffee, E.E. & White, T.H. (eds.) *Organization and Governance in Higher Education*. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Wildavsky, B. (2010) *The Great Brain Race: How Global Universities are Reshaping the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Yusuf, S. & Kaoru, N. (2007) *How Universities Promote Economic Growth*. World Bank.

Ensuring Equality in Higher Education Partnerships Involving Unequal Universities in Divergent Contexts

Cornelius Hagenmeier[1]

A collaborative approach to internationalisation through international partnerships is widely practised and considered essential for higher education. International higher education partnerships are seen as a key aspect of internationalisation. This is because universities bear a responsibility to produce graduates who are not only fit for employment in different contexts beyond cultural and developmental divisions, but to also develop them into responsible and globally competent citizens. Universities have to innovate and contribute to finding solutions to global challenges such as climate change and international ideological challenges to peace and security. To achieve this, it is essential for twenty-first century tertiary institutions to be connected to the world of knowledge, which presupposes that they internationalise their core business and forge collaborations transcending developed and developing contexts. Sutton, Egginton and Favela (2012) correctly observe that international affiliations have been repositioned 'as both key strategy and core philosophy for internationalisation'. Radzevicien and Girdzijauskait (2012: 623) point out the importance of partnership diversity, something which universities are only able to achieve if their network of partners includes a wide variety of universities from all corners of the globe.

The theoretical underpinnings of bilateral and multilateral university partnerships remain to be fully analysed and understood. Semali, Baker and Freer (2013: 64) characterise the 'literature of the challenges regarding academic partnerships in higher education' as disparate and observe that 'there have been few systematic and critical studies to examine such relationships' (Ibid: 53). Internationalisation scholars and practitioners have come to realise that research in this area should be prioritised. For example, the Nelson Mandela Bay Declaration on the Future of Internationalisation of Higher Education (2014) has proclaimed that the future agenda for internationalisation should concentrate on 'gaining commitment on a global basis to equal and ethical higher education partnerships'. The signatories have committed their organisations to work on developing and proposing 'a set of international partnership guidelines for adoption by the Network of International Education Associations to ensure equal and ethical practices' (Global Dialogue 2014).

In 2015, the American Council of Education (ACE) published a useful high-level summary of standards of good practice for partnerships (Helms 2015), which provides an overview of the existing documents relating to principles for higher education partnerships. It

---

1   Cornelius Hagenmeier is the Director of International Relations at the University of Venda.

identifies four themes: transparency and accountability, faculty and staff engagement, quality assurance and strategic planning and the role of institutional leadership. These themes relate to programme administration and issues such as cultural awareness, access and equity, institutional and human capacity building, ethical dilemmas and negotiated space related to cultural and contextual issues. The ACE correctly notes the dynamic nature of the higher education partnerships landscape and observes the inevitable diversity of approaches. Generally, it is accepted that partnerships should be founded on ethical and equal principles (Global Dialogue 2014) and select works provide a deeper analysis of principles underlying international higher education partnerships (Philpott 2010; Helms 2015; Sutton 2015).

Theory and practice: Realisation of equality in partnerships

While equality is commonly cited as a core principle underlying higher education partnerships (Global Dialogue 2014), specific literature on equality in higher education partnerships remains scarce. The doctrine is not yet clearly defined and the academic discourse on developing suitable concepts and strategies to achieve it is in its infancy. Sutton (2015) articulates that international higher education partnerships should be viewed as 'alliances amongst equals' and remarks that they should be characterised by 'shared rights, responsibilities and commitment' and should 'address, rather than perpetuate inequalities of resources and imbalances in exchanges'.

Inequalities are inherent to many higher education partnerships, especially when it comes to universities of unequal strength. A brief examination of recent writings on higher education partnerships reveals that grave concerns about power relations and inequalities between unequal partners prevail. Landau (2012) notes that 'international research partnerships enact and expose the inequalities, structural constraints and historically conditioned power relations implicit in the production of knowledge'. Philpott (2010) remarks that 'international collaborations for education risk being imperialistic or driven by supremacist ideologies and similarly accused of exploitation'. De Wit (2015) appropriately identifies the danger of inequality in partnership relationships as a key challenge to the effective functioning of partnerships.

An interesting attempt to address the challenge of inequalities in partnerships has been analysed in a case study about academic collaboration between the United Kingdom and Brazil conducted by Cantoh and Hannah (2001). They examine higher education partnerships which were facilitated by an agreement between Brazilian higher education funding agency Co-ordenacao de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nivel Superior (CAPES) and the British Council. The collaboration was distinct in that the funding from the British

and Brazilian funding agencies was approximately equal. Cantoh and Hannah (2001: 27) note that the underlying rationale was 'to replace traditional North-South relationships of donor and recipient with genuine academic partnerships' with the aspiration to create 'more equal, mutually respectful and beneficial academic partnerships'. The inquiry concluded that 'a framework that is facilitating the development of collaborative partnerships that have moved beyond the traditional, symmetrical model' had been created.

The example of the CAPES-British Council agreement reflects a formal understanding of equality, which entails that all partners are required to make same contributions, be that in money or in kind in order to achieve the common purpose of the partnership. It is remarkable that this was possible in this case as ostensible inequalities in the economic strengths of developed and developing nations result in such equal funding efforts being exceptional. It will remain exceptional for funding agencies in developing nations to undertake efforts similar to those undertaken by CAPES. The question may be asked whether a developing nation should afford such expenditure in an environment of scarce resources and many other urgent needs. In the foreseeable future the prototypical situation will remain that funders from the global North, such as the European Union, the United States through the Fulbright Programme or the German government through the Academic Exchange Service DAAD, will continue to dominate the funding of partnerships and their prerogatives will shape evolving higher education collaboration.

The formal conception of equality may even be used by universities to secure a competitive advantage, especially when the partners are universities which vary greatly in size, shape, research output, reputation and economic strength. It is often impossible for the economically weaker partner to match the financial contributions of the stronger partner. The absence of formal equality poses a threat to the success and sustainability of partnerships and may result in the dominance of one partner over the other partner. The prevalent influence of the dominant, economically stronger partner on the decision-making processes in a partnership can be easily justified by reference to larger financial contributions.

Towards a sound theoretical paradigm for equality in higher education partnerships

A consensus exists that higher education partnerships should be equal or at least equitable, but it remains to be determined how this can be achieved in a global landscape characterised by unequal resources and divergent strength of universities and higher education systems. The brief analysis above has demonstrated that successful

achievement of formal equality will remain the exception in higher education partnerships and that its absence can intensify existing disjunctions between partners. Thus, it is necessary to interrogate whether equality in higher education partnerships should not be defined differently.

Equality conceptions can be fundamentally categorised in those adopting a formal understanding and those taking recourse to a substantive conception (Wentholt 1999). The notion of formal equality is based on the aspect of Aristotelian understanding of equality which espouses that 'things that are alike should be treated alike' and is grounded in a general assumption of sameness (Ibid.). This works well and achieves equitable results in instances whereby equality is to be achieved between entities which are similar in their core characteristics, but has limitations with regard to achieving equality between entities with dissimilar characteristics and with other present disparities.

The main challenge with a purely formal conception of equality is that it falls short of appropriately appraising the second aspect of the Aristotelian understanding of equality, which emphasises that things 'that are unalike should be treated unalike in the proportion to their unalike in proportion to their unlikeness' (Ibid.) and can in the higher education context result in the inequitable tendencies alluded to above. This aspect of equality has been used in the human rights and labour discourses as the basis for the development of a substantive understanding of equality, which concerns the unequal treatment of fundamentally different cases (Apostolopoulou 2004). The principle, originating from the labour context and gender contexts, has been developed in the South African Constitutional Jurisprudence (Albertyn & Goldblatt 2007) and has found limited application in the internationalisation of higher education.

The purpose of substantive equality is to achieve equality of results (Brodsky & Day 2002: 206), but it also accommodates the notions of equality of opportunity and diversity (Apostolpoulou 2004). With regard to the latter aspect, the concept considers the differences between the entities involved in relationship and establishes structures which acknowledge the diversity and achieve an equitable governance structure for their relationship. Essentially, that what is required is 'to abandon the doctrine of sameness without jettisoning the idea of equality' (Provost 2011).

In the context of higher education partnerships, this means that substantive equality should appreciate the differences between higher education institutions. It would mean that nature and quantity of contributions to partnerships would depend on the individual partner but would remain reciprocal. To create certainty and promote equity, it would be desirable to define an understanding of equality which defines clearly the extent of contributions required by partners. A useful example of the application of the principle of

substantive equality in an internationalisation policy is the document originating from the University of Venda in South Africa which adopts an understanding of equality and defines it to mean that 'every partner to a relationship should make contributions which are equally meaningful taking the context of the partner into consideration' (UNIVEN 2013). While this definition may have been developed ad-hoc without a full scientific appraisal of dynamics underlying partnerships and philosophical underpinnings of equality, its essence may form a useful basis from which a scientifically grounded conceptualisation of equality for higher education partnerships could be developed.

Conclusion

The analysis of the discourse on equality in higher education partnerships has revealed that this is presently viewed as an ideal which is often not achieved in practice. It is worrying to note that past research denotes that inequalities and even exploitative undercurrents characterise many higher education partnerships. To achieve greater equality in collaboration and partnerships, it will be necessary to develop a theoretically sound conception of equality in relationships of divergent strength which goes beyond formal equality and rather looks at equality of results. The notion of substantive equality may be a critical aspect of this. Further research will be required to gain a deep understanding of the present paradigm which could serve to inform the required model as well as to appropriately conceptualise a model which can advance genuine equality in higher education partnerships. Prima facia, it appears that the adoption of a substantive understanding of equality may facilitate the development of an equitable and predicable paradigm which would ensure that genuine equality can be achieved in mutually beneficial, reciprocal higher education partnerships.

References

Albertyn, C. & Goldblatt, B. (2007) 'Equality'. In: S Woolman *et al* (eds.) *Constitutional Law of South Africa*. Chapter 35.

Apostolopoulou, Z. (2004) 'Equal Treatment of People with Disabilities in the EC: What Does "Equal" Mean?' Jean Monnet Working Paper, 09/04. *New York University School of Law*. www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/archive/papers/04/040901.pdf.

Brodsky, G. & Day, S. (2002) Beyond the Social and Economic Rights Debate: Substantive Equality Speaks to Poverty *Journal of Women and the Law*. (14) pp. 184-219.

Cantoh, I. & Hannah, J. (2001) 'A Partnership of Equals? Academic Collaboration Between the United Kingdom and Brazil' *Journal of Studies in International Education*. (5) pp. 26-41.

de Wit, H. (2015) 'Partnerships for the Future: Trends, Challenges and Opportunities' Presented at *2014 NMMU Partnerships for the Future Colloquium*.

Helms, R. M. (2015) *International Higher Education Partnerships: A Global Review of Standards and Practices*. CIGE Insights. Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE). Washington D.C: American Council on Education. http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/CIGE-Insights-Intl-Higher-Ed-Partnerships.pdf

Landau, L. B. (2012) *Communities of Knowledge or Tyranies of Partnership: Reflection on North- South Research Networks and the Dual Imperative. African Centre for Migration and Society*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Nelson Mandela Bay Declaration on the Future of Internationalisation of Higher Education. 2014. *Global Dialogue on the Future of Higher Education Internationalisation*. Hosted by the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA). Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Philpott, J. (2010) 'Applying Themes From Research Ethics to International Education Partnerships' *Virtual Mentor*. (12) 3 pp. 171-178. http://virtualmentor.ama-assn.org/2010/03/pdf/medu1-1003.pdf

Provost, R. (2011) 'The Move to Substantive Equality in International Humanitarian Law: A Rejoinder to Marco Sassòli and Yuval Shany' *International Review of the Red Cross*. (93) 882 pp. 437-442.

Radzevicien, A. & Girdzijauskait, E. (2012) *Multilateral Partnership Management in Higher Education: The Network Approach. Contemporary Issues in Business, Management and Education*. pp. 621-632.

Semali, L. M., Baker, R. & Freer, R. (2013) 'Multi-Institutional Partnerships for Higher Education in Africa: A Case Study of Assumptions of International Academic Collaboration' *International Journal of Higher Education*. (2) 2 pp. 53-66.

Sutton, S. B., Eggington, E. & Favela, R. (2012) 'Collaborating on the Future: Strategic Partnerships and Linkages' In: Deardorff, D. K., de Wit, H., Heyl, J.D. & Adams, T. *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. pp. 147-165.

Sutton, S.B. (2015) *Nine Principles for Achieving the Full Potential of Collaborative Partnership*s. International Educator.

University of Venda. (2010) *Internationalisation Policy*.

Wentholt, K. (1999) 'Formal and Substantive Equal Treatment: The Limitations and the Potential of Legal Concept of Equality' In: Loenen, T. and Rodrigues, P. R. (eds.) *Non- Discrimination Law: Comparative Perspectives*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International. pp. 53-64.

Left to Their Own Devices: The Role and Skills of Academics in Partnerships for the Future

Jos Beelen[1]

This chapter explores international partnerships as an enabler for internationalisation of home curricula, what these partnerships would look like and what the role of academics and other stakeholders would be. Student activities within an internationalised curriculum at home, such as online international collaboration, fall outside the scope of this chapter. Instead, the chapter focuses on the role of academics in building partnerships that support curriculum development through the internationalisation of learning outcomes. The chapter begins with a discussion of the state of flux that resulted from the shift towards internationalisation at home. While many universities have embraced this concept, implementation is not without challenges. Two of the main obstacles are discussed, these being the imperfect conceptualisation of internationalisation at home and the lack of skills of academic staff. A symptom of the former is confusion over terminology. A discussion on terminology has no place in this chapter but a reference is made to recent literature that discusses terminology and definitions. The latter obstacle, the lack of skills of academics, is discussed extensively, particularly with regard to the internationalising of learning outcomes. This will reveal that current professional development does not seem effective in addressing the lack of skills of academics.

While academics continue their struggle with the conceptualisation of internationalising learning outcomes, the question is raised as to whether international partnerships could contribute to internationalisation of the home curriculum and if so, how. In order to find an answer, the literature on partnerships is looked at in order to understand to what extent literature is explicit about partnerships that are conducive to internationalisation at home and about the role, character, benefits and requirements of such partnerships.

On the basis of the conclusion that literature is implicit on this topic, the chapter builds an argument for using international partnerships as a tool for collaboration on the internationalisation of home curricula. The characteristics of such partnerships for the future then follows. These are partnerships at programme level with academics as key actors focused on benchmarking the internationalisation of learning outcomes, combining mobility with professional development and linked to quality assurance. The benefits of such partnerships, their organisation and the role of stakeholders are subsequently discussed. Finally, the chapter argues that, without a structured approach to learning outcomes, collaboration will not be effective and international partnerships will not reach

---

1   Jos Beelen is the senior policy advisor, researcher and consultant on internationalisation at the Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences.

their full educational potential. Partnerships for the future, by making internationalisation of curricula a cross-border collaboration, can help to achieve the 'internationalisation' of internationalisation at home.

A state of flux

Over the last decade, internationalisation at home has assumed its position as one of the two main streams in internationalisation, next to traditional student mobility (Knight 2006: 25). It has since found its way into European educational policy (European Commission 2013) and universities have continued to include internationalisation at home, or the related concept 'internationalisation of the curriculum', in their policy documents for internationalisation. According to the EAIE Barometer (Engel *et al.* 2015: 41) 68% of European higher education institutions (HEI's) now include internationalisation of the curriculum and 56% include internationalisation at home in their policies. The survey of the European University Association (Sursock 2015: 32) concludes that 64% of European HEI's have activities for internationalisation at home. It is unclear as to how to interpret these figures as the two terms are freely interchanged and have not been clearly defined in the surveys.

Irrespective of terminology, it is clear that HEI's face problems with the internationalisation of their home curricula. Efforts at implementation have been critiqued for focusing on means rather than aims and shifting into 'instrumental mode' (Brandenburg & de Wit 2010: 16), with a tendency to focus on 'activity and not results as indicators of quality' (Whitsed & Green 2013). There has also been criticism on HEI's pretending to be guided by high moral principles whilst not actively pursuing them (de Wit & Beelen 2014). The International Association of Universities' (IAU) 4th Global Survey (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2014) also indicates that traditional mobility is still the dominant focus of most universities. It is unmistakable, however, that the main focus of internationalisation is shifting from international offices to the academics, who are at the 'coalface of teaching and learning'' (Green & Whitsed 2012: 148). This shift matches an increasing focus on teaching in European universities (Sursock 2015: 80).

Internationalisation of the curriculum is in a state of flux for three reasons. Firstly, the concept is dynamic by nature in the sense that the curriculum is continuously changing in order to address the requirements of the contexts both inside and outside the university. Secondly, the tools to internationalise curricula are also dynamic in nature. Over the past few years, alternative forms of international learning have emerged with varying labels including 'online learning', 'MOOC', 'globally networked learning', 'virtual international classroom' or '(collaborative) online international learning', often within the wider

context of 'blended learning'. Third, in order to implement internationalisation of the curriculum, universities need to change their approach, support and governance for internationalisation from a mobility-oriented past [and present?] to a curriculum oriented future. This requires a redefinition of the role of the main stakeholders: academics, management, quality assurance staff, professional development staff and, of course, the international office. It also requires a reorientation on the role of international partnerships, which for the most part have been entered into with mobility rather than curriculum oriented motives in mind.

It is already clear that universities collaborate in their internationalisation efforts, also called 'the internationalisation of internationalisation' (Sutton, Eggington & Favela 2012: 149). The question here is how universities can make 'internationalisation of internationalisation of the curriculum' a collaborative undertaking that will help to overcome the obstacles to the implementation of internationalised curricula. Of a whole range of obstacles, two related ones will be discussed here: the conceptual confusion on internationalisation of curricula and the lack of skills of academics. These two obstacles are particularly relevant to partnerships for the future.

Confused concepts, definitions and rationales

A main obstacle to the implementation of internationalised curricula is unclear conceptualisation. The terms 'internationalisation at home' and 'internationalisation of the curriculum' are mixed freely, for example in surveys such as the Global Surveys of the IAU and in the EAIE Barometer. In the former, conceptual confusion culminates when a majority of respondents consider outgoing student mobility as the main instrument for internationalisation of the home curriculum (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2014: 101; de Wit & Beelen 2014).

Internationalisation considered mainly as mobility has far reaching consequences for the role and involvement of academic staff. The present 'champions' among academics (Childress 2010: 28-29) will remain in the lead. These are often the champions of mobility, managing projects for a select minority of students, especially those with financial means at their disposal and/or a background that encourages them to become mobile. To stress the fact that internationalisation at home does not include mobility, Beelen and Jones (2015: 76) introduced a new definition:

> Internationalisation at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments.

This new definition will certainly not end the existing confusion. When we see that the respondents in the 4th Global Survey - 44% of them international officers and 30% heads or deputy heads of institutions (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2014: 39) - consider mobility as the key element of internationalisation of the curriculum, it is unlikely that this clarification will come from them into their institutions. This means that partnerships will continue to be regarded primarily, although maybe not exclusively, as a tool for the mobility of students.

Lack of skills of academics

The lack of skills of academic staff stands out as a main obstacle to internationalisation, second only to perceived lack of resources. Limited skills and involvement of staff is considered among the top three obstacles to internationalisation by 68% of universities (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2014: 68). The global surveys deal with skills for internationalisation in general as perceived by the respondents. We can but wonder which skills the respondents consider lacking and how narrowly these are interpreted as skills related to mobility and foreign language proficiency.

In the Australian context, Sanderson (2008: 95) noted that internationalisation has become integrated into universities but has not reached the individual lecturer yet. It is nevertheless assumed that academic staff are equipped, both professionally and personally, to bring about the educational outcomes connected with being interculturally competent. Brewer and Leask (2012: 249), observing that faculty members are not equally equipped or willing to work on internationalisation of the curriculum, conclude that this explains why the need to focus on faculty development, as well as rewards and recognition to internationalise the curriculum, 'is a recurring theme' in the literature.

Since internationalisation of the formal curriculum is synonymous with internationalising teaching and learning, the key skills of academic staff would increasingly include defining internationalised learning outcomes as well as teaching and assessing the achievement of those outcomes.

Under construction: learning outcomes

Skills of academics are all the more needed now that the discussion on internationalisation has increasingly become a discussion on outcomes of international and intercultural learning and their assessment. De Wit and Jones (2012) pose that, while universities may have very different starting points in the internationalisation of their education, they will all have to focus on the teaching and learning and student learning outcomes in order to

reach their aims. Green (2012: 9) states that 'measuring and assessing internationalisation outcomes and impact will take on greater importance as they continue to become more central to the definition of quality in teaching, research and engagement'.

The report of the 4th Global Survey concludes that the practice of defining learning outcomes for international and intercultural learning, both at institutional and discipline levels, is spreading quickly for such a relatively recent phenomenon. Universities, however, are far from having learning outcomes related to international or global competences for all graduates. Only 35% of universities across the world have now defined these at institutional level and the scores at discipline level are even lower (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2014: 117). This may be explained by the fact that it is relatively easy to formulate learning outcomes at institutional level since these are inevitably so general that they cannot be assessed. Both the difficulty and the meaning enter the discussion when learning outcomes are articulated for an individual programme or module.

This is demonstrated when Aerden *et al.* (2013: 69), writing about the Dutch/Flemish context, concluded that the failure of the adequate description of learning outcomes is the main stumbling block for an explicit international dimension of programmes. Skills related to articulating learning outcomes, therefore, have a direct impact on the quality of a programme of study. Jones (2013: 113) observes that the literature only contains a limited number of studies into the achievement of internationalised learning outcomes for all students and notices a 'relative lack of research into the outcomes of an internationalized curriculum for all students'. She poses that more evidence is required of the achievement of these learning outcomes in order to shed light on the benefits and the means of delivering curriculum.

While teaching has already received much attention, particularly in the Anglo Saxon literature, the focus is now shifting towards how to assess outcomes of international and intercultural student learning (Deardorff 2014a; 2014b; 2015). Educational design and the 'crafting' of learning outcomes, in other words what to assess, are still getting much less attention in the literature.

Revisiting professional development

Considering the central role of academic staff and their perceived lack of skills for internationalisation of the curriculum, it could be expected that universities would focus on professional development in order to enhance these skills. According to the 4th Global Survey, however, only 37% of universities include 'professional development for faculty to enhance their ability to integrate international/intercultural dimensions into teaching'

among their top three internationalisation activities (Egron-Polak & Hudson 2014: 99). For some universities this means nothing more than staff mobility without an explicit focus on the development of teaching skills. This is also visible in the Erasmus Impact Study, which concludes that mobility of academic staff is beneficial for the curriculum (European Union 2014: 148). The study does not, however, indicate how and to which extent mobility has a measurable effect on teaching and learning in the home curriculum. Moreover, the conclusion is based on self-reported data from mobile academics. Sursock (2015: 72) even notices a negative effect of internationalisation in the sense of it creating a gap between internationalised staff members (called a 'mobile elite') and those who are not mobile. It seems that professional development for internationalisation of the curriculum is mostly unstructured while its success depends on it being an 'assessed part of a broader strategy, rather than a series of isolated and ad hoc activities with unmeasured outcomes' (Brewer & Leask 2012: 250-251).

Internationalising learning outcomes requires that academics have a complete understanding of the concept of internationalisation at home as well as insights into the international and intercultural dimensions of a programme of study, especially in relation to the employability of graduates. It also requires didactic skills to align internationalised learning outcomes with assessment. In many cases, academics are not trained in those skills, as becomes manifest in Trends 2015. At 75% of European HEI's, training by the university's didactic training unit is voluntary (Sursock 2015: 83). While 40% also offer compulsory courses in didactics, the effect of this should not be overrated as the practice in The Netherlands shows that the compulsory basic courses in didactics at Dutch universities of applied sciences do not address aspects of internationalisation (Van Gaalen *et al.* 2014: 8). This leaves us with a present situation in which, on the one hand, international mobility of a minority of academics is assumed to have a beneficial impact on the internationalisation of teaching and learning at home and in which didactic training is either voluntary or lacking an international orientation, whilst on the other hand, teaching is assuming a higher importance at European HEI's. We will look at how partnerships for the future can provide structured professional development and make academic mobility a meaningful activity for the internationalisation of the home curriculum.

Views on partnerships, networks and associations

A first step to determine how international partnerships and networks can enhance internationalisation of the curriculum is to identify what views exist in the literature. It could be argued that international partnerships are not required per se to achieve

the outcomes (Green & Mertova 2009: 30) of an internationalised curriculum. Internationalisation at home typically makes use of non-institutional partnerships in the local environment to shape the international and intercultural dimension of programmes of study. Especially in urban contexts, with high degrees of diversity and the presence of international and internationally oriented organisations and companies, there are plenty of opportunities for this. Collaboration with HEI's across borders, however, adds a range of opportunities for the internationalised curriculum. Without it, incoming guest lecturers and online collaboration between students, both important tools for internationalisation of the curriculum, would not be available. International partnerships therefore constitute an integral element of an internationalised curricula.

Types of partnerships

When discussing partnerships, Sutton, Eggington and Favela (2012: 152) mention a continuum that ranges from transactional to transformational collaboration. The former is grounded in traditional mobility with individual outgoing students as its minimal form. This may have an impact on the individual student but not on the departments. Incoming student mobility has the potential to effect transformation, but the usually limited volume of it does not make it a suitable tool for a transformational experience for all students (Beelen 2014).

In their description of three overlapping possibilities for outward engagement, Sutton, Eggington and Favela (2012: 149) write that the third of those consists of collaborating in joint projects, resource sharing and mutual benefits as well as engaging outside expertise in curriculum development. This does not, however, seem to be the same as collaborating on internationalisation of the curriculum. Stockley and de Wit (2011: 55) mention joint curriculum development explicitly and include benchmarking and joint curriculum development in their list of activities that take place within networks and partnerships. They note that the emphasis in networking should be on academic and disciplinary collaboration but acknowledge that institutional networks can have their use in facilitating cooperation at discipline level. At the same time, they observe that institutional networks are rather weak and lack commitment at departmental and school levels. The other side of the coin is that partnerships in which administrative staff is involved, are usually stronger than those carried by academics alone (American Council on Education 2015).

The term 'curricular partnership' is found in the literature but does not seem to cover collaboration on the internationalisation of home curricula. Waterval et al (2015) use the term 'crossborder curricular partnership' (CCP) for situations in which the 'home' curriculum is transposed to a 'host' university that then starts recruiting local students.

Sutton, Eggington and Favela (2012: 149) notice a trend towards 'internationalisation of internationalisation' within partnerships, meaning that the process of internationalisation has become internationally collaborative but internationalisation of the curriculum is again not explicitly mentioned. The literature on partnerships narrowly interprets collaboration in internationalisation of the curriculum as joint curriculum development for joint and double degrees. Benchmarking is mentioned but not specifically in relation to the international or intercultural dimension of programmes.

The role of networks

While the literature does not connect partnerships and internationalisation of the curriculum, the value of networks for internationalisation of the curriculum is widely acknowledged. Leask, Beelen and Kaunda (2013: 198) stress the important role that inclusive global networks have to fill in the internationalisation of the curriculum and stress their value as communities of practice across the globe, both in the developing and the developed world.

Academic associations

International academic associations play an important role, facilitating meeting platforms for the exchange of expertise and for training on internationalisation of the curriculum. The European Association for International Education (EAIE) was the first to form a Special Interest Group (SIG) around this theme in 2001, followed by the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) in 2005 and the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA) in 2012. The main target audience of conferences and training events consists of international officers and policy advisors which means that their influence on academics is indirect, but not necessarily less effective.

Summarising the literature

As we have seen, the literature does not give clear indication as to which elements of partnerships are specifically relevant to internationalisation of the curriculum. Nonetheless, Stockley and de Wit's (2011: 57) remark regarding academic and disciplinary collaboration conforms to the discipline-specific approach to internationalisation of the curriculum that has manifested itself as of late (de Wit & Beelen 2012; Green & Whitsed 2012; Leask 2012; Leask & Bridge 2013; Leask 2015). This allows one to paint a picture of partnerships for the internationalisation of the curriculum, with disciplinary collaboration

and benchmarking at its core. The requirements, characteristics and benefits of such partnerships will be discussed in the following section.

Partnerships for the future

International partnerships can make an important contribution to the internationalisation of the curriculum and can help to overcome some of the main obstacles of its implementation. Such partnerships, first of all, require a conceptual understanding of internationalisation of the curriculum that is shared between partners. This understanding involves a mature outlook on internationalisation, which not only goes beyond mobility but also rejects 'add on' or 'infusion' approaches (Bond, Qian & Huang 2003) because they do not lead to purposeful implementation. Instead, partners should agree that they follow a transformational approach to curriculum development, based on internationalising learning outcomes and their assessment. In order to make these partnerships work, there should also be close cooperation, within each partner university, between the main stakeholders who support the academics at the core of the partnership.

Characteristics of partnerships

A main characteristic of partnerships, with a focus on internationalisation of the curriculum, is that they are partnerships at programme level. Collaboration for internationalisation of the home curriculum is fundamentally different from curriculum development for joint or double degrees as it is highlighted in the literature. It does not include a mobility component and works on the assumption that students do not become mobile (Beelen & Jones 2015: 76). A second characteristic is that the key actors are academics who collaborate on the benchmarking of learning outcomes and assessment with their counterparts. This, in turn, leads to a third characteristic: the role of these partnerships in quality assurance of the programmes and their components. Finally, these partnerships are characterised by a combination of academic mobility along with professional development.

Partnerships of this type can only be successful when the academics are supported by the key stakeholders in the process of internationalisation of the curriculum, such as management, international office as well as educational developers and quality assurance staff. An added dimension of these partnerships is that they provide opportunities for the supporting stakeholders to engage with their counterparts at the partner university. For international offices, this is standard practice but educational developers and quality assurance staff do not often collaborate across borders. We will now look in more detail

at these characteristics, the ways to organise these partnerships, their benefits, and the factors that determine their success.

Partnerships at programme level

International partnerships initiated 'bottom up' at the level of programmes of study could achieve the academic collaboration at disciplinary level that Stockley and de Wit (2011: 55) consider desirable. When individual programmes initiate partnerships with their counterparts, though, this may lead to a potentially unlimited number of partnerships. When de Wit (2011: 15-16) argues that it is a misconception that more partnerships means more internationalisation, he refers to dormant institutional partnerships. When partnerships are characterised by active collaboration at programme level, it may be argued that more partnerships indeed does mean more internationalisation.

The international office has an essential role in the initiation and management of partnerships for the future. It can determine which existing institutional partners have 'mature' views on internationalisation, enabling cooperation beyond student mobility. These views can then be put into operation by activities of a transformational nature, such as mobility of academics which includes benchmarking learning outcomes of internationalised programmes. International offices have long struggled with academics who are protective of their contacts with counterparts abroad, for fear that others would take these contacts over or the international office would interfere. Partnerships for the future acknowledge the key role of academics and can therefore set academics' minds at rest on this score.

Academics working with learning outcomes

Learning outcomes and their assessment are the core of the teaching and learning process. They also form the focal point of partnerships for the future, aimed at internationalising the curriculum. Learning outcomes make transparent what the international and intercultural dimensions of a programme of study consist of. The benchmarking of learning outcomes highlights the differences and similarities in the international and intercultural dimensions of programmes. It leads to insights into choices that programmes have made in their specific and unique contexts (Leask 2012). While programmes may work on more or less universally accepted transversal or employability skills, they may also have a specific local dimension. Benchmarking is not aimed at eliminating these differences and therefore does not contribute to isomorphism. Insights into choices, similarities and differences forms the basis for the development of activities, such as the online collaboration of

students.

As we have seen, an element often overlooked is that most academics are not trained in working with learning outcomes and their alignment with assessment. Therefore, the support of educational developers, who are the specialists in teaching and learning, is of great importance. They assist academics in the benchmarking process and its sequence and the redesign of curricular on the basis of the re-articulation of learning outcomes. Without a strong focus on learning outcomes there is a tendency for academics to limit themselves to comparing and exchanging practical and input related practices as could be observed in meetings of academics.

Partnerships and quality assurance

Comparison of learning outcomes is the basis for international benchmarking of programmes. Benchmarking can be considered 'a process of self-evaluation and systematic and collaborative comparison of practices' (Burquel 2013: 7). This implies that partnerships for the future are relevant to quality assurance for internationalisation. Through the benchmarking, quality assurance officers receive input for the international benchmark that they are usually required to perform for accreditation purposes. In the literature on benchmarking, design of curricula with learning outcomes is considered a qualitative indicator of internationalisation (Ibid: 10), but this refers to institutional benchmarks for curriculum design, not to benchmarking the actual learning outcomes at programme level. Quality assurance officers should be involved in the preparation of the teaching visits of mobile academics as well as in the debriefing.

Combining mobility and professional development

The mobility of academics becoming an element of a structured plan of professional development will allow departmental managers to move beyond ad hoc activities in the professional development for internationalisation (Brewer & Leask 2012: 250-251). It will also enable them to engage lecturers beyond the obvious mobile minority of 'champions' who often tend to monopolise the mobility options, thus creating a distance between them and the other academics (Sursock 2015: 72).

In partnerships for the future, mobility will not only consist of teaching but also of benchmarking components of the curriculum. In this way, academic mobility, organised in a purposeful way, can function as a tool for structured professional development that goes beyond the ad hoc approach shown in the Erasmus Impact Study. Instead of following didactic training at a central unit of the university, academics will be trained where they

'live', in other words within the context of their programme of studies. A context specific approach has already been developed (see de Wit & Beelen 2012; Green & Whitsed 2012; Leask 2012; Leask & Bridge 2013; Leask 2015), but without incorporating international partnerships or academic mobility.

Quality assurance staff and educational developers both have an important role in the preparation of staff mobility with the academics. They should discuss the goal of the visit before it occurs as well as provide guidelines and approaches for the benchmarking exercise. After the visit, they should discuss and record the outcomes and determine follow-up actions for the home curriculum. This is also the moment that the mobile lecturer reflects on the achievement of the goals of the visit and on further steps in professional development. The visits are therefore also relevant for human resource management and as a result also for the manager of the academic. The latter will also have a role in allocating extra time and resources if these are needed for benchmarking.

Conclusion

It is widely acknowledged that academics are the key actors in internationalisation at home. At the same time there is awareness that academics lack the skills to play their roles. What these skills are exactly is less clear. While teaching and assessment are frequently discussed as components of the role, the process of articulating or 'crafting' learning outcomes has received much less attention. Considering that internationalisation of learning outcomes is a strong trend, academics will increasingly need to engage with this, also as learning outcomes and their assessment are considered the backbone of quality of education. However, it has been argued here that academics are mostly left to their own devices when it comes to the development of their educational skills. This situation can partly be explained by another main obstacle that has been discussed here: the conceptual confusion around internationalisation of the curriculum. This conceptual fog surrounds all stakeholders in the process and prevents them from undertaking the required actions to support academics.

The literature on networks, associations and partnerships deals mainly with mobility and collaboration in curriculum development for joint and double degrees. It is implicit about the character, benefits and success factors of partnerships for internationalisation of the curriculum in regular programmes. These aspects have been explored here and it has been argued that partnerships for the future can contribute to the process of internationalisation of the curriculum and help to overcome two main obstacles that are time and again emerging in the debate on internationalisation, namely the lack of skills and the involvement of academics in relation to internationalisation.

Benchmarking the internationalisation of learning outcomes provides a focus to both staff development and staff mobility. Since internationalised learning outcomes are at the core of these partnerships, academics are too. This implies a new role for academics in international partnerships. Only when the other stakeholders converge to support academics in these partnerships, can they make internationalisation contribute to the quality of a programme of study, something that is often claimed but rarely achieved.

References

Aerden, A., De Decker, F., Divis, J., Frederiks, M.& de Wit, H. (2013) 'Assessing the Internationalisation of Degree Programmes: Experiences from a Dutch-Flemish Pilot Certifying Degree Programmes'. *Compare*. 43(1) pp. 56-78.

American Council on Education (2015). *Innovating to Expand Student International Experiences*. Quick Hits 1. www.acenet.edu.

Beelen, J. (2014) 'The Other Side of Mobility: The Impact of Incoming Students on Home Students' In B. Streitwieser (ed.) *Internationalisation of Higher Education and Global Mobility.* Oxford: Symposium Books Ltd. pp. 287-299.

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015) 'Redefining Internationalization at Home' In: A. Curai, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi & P. Scott (eds.) *The European Higher Education Area: Between Critical Reflections and Future Policies*. Dordrecht: Springer. pp. 67-80.

Bond, S. L., Qian, J., & Huang, J. (2003) 'The Role of Faculty in Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum and Classroom Experience'. *CBIE Research Millennium Series*. Research Paper (8). Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE).

Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2010) *The End of Internationalization*. Boston College Newsletter, 62 (Winter 2011). pp. 15-17.

Brewer, E., & Leask, B. (2012) 'Internationalization of the curriculum' In: Deardorff, D., de Wit, H., Heyl, D., and Adams, T (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of International Higher Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 245-266.

Burquel, N. (2013) 'Benchmarking; A practical tool to measure the quality of internationalisation'. In: Verlag, J.R. *Handbook internationalisation*. Berlin: Raabe.

Childress, L. K. (2010) *The twenty-first century university; developing faculty engagement in internationalization.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing Group.

Deardorff, D. (2014) 'Outcomes assessment in international education'. *International Higher Education*. Number 75. Boston, MA: The Boston Center for International Higher Education. www.bc.edu/research/cihe/ihe/. pp. 9-10.

Deardorff, D. (2014) 'Some thoughts on assessing intercultural competence'. *National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment*. http://illinois.edu/blog/view/915/113048.

Deardorff, D. (2015) *Demystifying outcomes assessment for international educators: A practical approach*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

de Wit, H. (2011) 'Law of stimulating arrears? Internationalisation of the Universities of Applied Sciences, Misconceptions and Challenges' In: de Wit, H (ed.) *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Amsterdam: CAREM. pp. 7-24.

de Wit, H., & Beelen, J. (2012) 'Socrates in the Low Countries: Designing, Implementing, and Facilitating Internationalisation of the Curriculum at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences' (HvA). In: Ryan, J (ed.) *Cross-cultural Teaching and Learning for Home and International Students: Internationalisation of Pedagogy and Curriculum in Higher Education*. London: Routledge. pp. 156-167.

de Wit, H., & Beelen, J. (2014) 'Reading Between the Lines: Global Internationalisation Survey' *University World News*. 318. www.universityworldnews.com

Egron- Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2014) *Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing Expectations, Essential Values*. IAU 4th Global Survey Report ed. Paris: IAU.

Engel, L., Sandström, A.M., Van der Aa, R.,& Glass, A. (2015) *The EAIE Barometer: Internationalisation in Europe*. Amsterdam: EAIE.

European Commission. (2013) E*uropean Higher Education in the World. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions*. 11 July 2013. Brussels: European Commission.

European Union. (2014) *The Erasmus Impact Study. Effects of Mobility on the Skills and Employability of Students and the Internationalisation of Higher Education Institutions.* Brussels: European Union.

Green, M. (2012) *Measuring and assessing internationalization*. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Green, W., & Mertova, P. (2009) *Internationalisation of teaching and learning at the University of Queensland: A report on current perceptions and practices*. Brisbane: The University of Queensland.

Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2012) 'Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalisation of the curriculum across disciplines' *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 17 (2) pp. 148-164.

Knight, J. (2006) 'Internationalization of higher education: New directions, new challenges' *2005 IAU Global Survey Report*. Paris: IAU.

Leask, B. (2012) I*nternationalisation of the curriculum in action: A guide*. Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Leask, B. (2015) *Internationalizing the curriculum*. Oxon: Routledge.

Leask, B., Beelen, J., & Kaunda, L. (2013) 'Internationalisation of the curriculum: International approaches and perspectives' In: de Wit, H., Hunter, F., Johnson, L. & van Liempd, H.G (eds.) *Possible futures: The next 25 years of the internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: EAIE. pp. 188-204.

Leask, B. & Bridge, C. (2013) 'Comparing internationalisation of the curriculum in action across disciplines: Theoretical and practical perspectives' *Compare*. 43 (1). pp. 79-101.

Sanderson, G. (2008) 'A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self in higher education' *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 12 (3). pp. 276-307.

Stockley, D. & de Wit, H. (2011) 'The increasing relevance of institutional networks' In: de Wit, H (ed.) *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Amsterdam: CAREM. pp. 45-58.

Sursock, A. (2015) *Trends 2015: Learning and Teaching in European Universities*. Brussels: European University Association.

Sutton, S., Egginton, E. & Favela, R. (2012) 'Collaborating on the future: Strategic partnerships and linkages' In: Deardorff, D., de Wit, H., Heyl, D. & Adams, T (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of International Higher Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 149-165.

Van Gaalen, A., Hobbes, H.J., Roodenburg, S. & Gielesen, R. (2014) *Studenten internationaliseren in eigen land: De praktijk* [Students internationalise in their own country; In practice]. The Hague: Nuffic.

Waterval, D., Frambach, J., Driessen, E., & Scherpbier, A. (2015) 'Copy but not paste: A literature review of crossborder curriculum partnerships' *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 19 (1) pp. 65-85.

Whitsed, C., & Green, W. (2013) 'Internationalisation begins with the curriculum' *University World News*. 00311. www.universityworldnews.com.

Engagement and Partnerships: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's Internationalisation Strategy

Kate Mey[1]

This chapter will explore the nexus between engagement and international partnerships with the focus on Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's (NMMU) Internationalisation Strategy. The chapter will provide a deeper understanding of the focus areas derived from the NMMU Vision 2020 and their objectives, with particular reference to the future of engagement and partnerships for NMMU. It will also clarify why these objectives are relevant to higher education in South Africa and globally. This chapter projects the ideal outcomes of each of these objectives for the ultimate benefit of students who choose to study at NMMU and will therefore play a role in ensuring 'globalisation of higher education as a change agent' (Hudzik 2014) for students as well as the country, region, continent and the world.

The finalisation of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's Internationalisation Strategy is a long and interesting story to be told. It begins with the broader story of a country with a devastating history facing challenging and potentially an exciting future. The years of apartheid in South Africa left the higher education system in a state of well needed repair by the time the 1994 democratic elections came around. Fourteen different higher education Departments had to be merged into one national Department[2]. This, understandably, left much else to be dealt with before an 'idea' such as internationalisation could even be considered. Professor Colin Bundy, then Vice-Chancellor of the University of the Witwatersrand, described the situation in his 1997 International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA) conference paper entitled A World of Difference? Higher Education in the Global Era:

> I do not suppose that we will ever know how many overseas scholars simply refused to come to South Africa during the high noon of apartheid; nor how many South African scholars were left off invitation lists or cold-shouldered when they attended international conferences. The brain-drain of South African academics over forty years of apartheid rule has never been accurately measured. And I am not sure that even now, South African universities fully realise how damaging was their partial exclusion from the global community of scholars.

---

1   Kate Mey is the Manager: International Partnerships at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

2   Fourteen higher education departments were made up of four provinces and ten 'homeland' states. During South Africa's apartheid years, the country was divided into what was called 'Homeland States' as part of the policy of separate development. These were areas set aside for specific racial/ethnic groups to live independently and separately from the white South Africans.

Despite the challenges that the country has faced after 1994, there were, however, leaders in the South African higher education system at the time who understood the need to play 'catch up' with the world and countries which had already been actively internationalising their higher education systems for quite some time. Looking beyond the 'now', these pioneers believed in 'the notion that a well-educated person today must be exposed to ideas and people without regard to national boundaries' (Wildavsky 2010: 5).

Notwithstanding the lack of support from the government, two senior higher education administrators, Dr Roshen Kishun and Dr Derek Swemmer, foresaw the greater purpose in establishing and promoting internationalisation of South African universities and began actively strategising with universities whilst at the same time rallying other higher education professionals to work together towards internationalisation in higher education in the country. This action resulted in the founding of the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA) in 1997 (Kishun 1998). Over the years since then, South Africa has come a long way, becoming a leader in many areas on the African continent. One of these areas is higher education as well as the internationalisation of the sector. A recent article in The PIE Review magazine, titled Africa Rises, aptly describes this growth:

> As a study destination, South Africa is the region's main education hub with international enrollments growing from 12,000 to over 60,000 from 1994 to 2006. According to the Institute of International Education's Project Atlas, international students made up eight per cent of all South African tertiary enrolments in 2009 (Custer 2014: 28).

A tale of success

Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University began to play a part in South Africa's internationalisation story when in 2000 a senior faculty member approached the Vice Chancellor of the then University of Port Elizabeth with the idea of establishing an international office. The Office for International Education was founded with the full support of the Vice Chancellor and university management. Just five years later the story again took a turn when Vista University, Port Elizabeth Technikon and the University of Port Elizabeth were merged to form what is today a comprehensive university, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Twenty years of democracy in South Africa and the resulting effect on internationalisation in higher education have dramatically changed the country and the higher education sector. Lives have literally been changed through the internationalisation policies and activities of South African universities and through the opening of their doors to Africa and the world. Countless students have graduated out of South African universities from

various African and other countries and the stories of how this has changed their lives and affected their home countries still need to be gathered. Thousands of students have also come to South Africa for a semester abroad and have returned home transformed by the harsh realities of life for many but also by the incredible warmth and hope those same people live their lives by.

The drive towards comprehensive internationalisation is still, however, in its infancy in South Africa, with Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University proudly leading the way after winning the 2012 IEASA Golden Key Award for Good Practice of a Comprehensive Internationalisation Strategy. The question, of course, which needs to be answered is: where to from here?

Internationalisation of higher education in South Africa is facing an exciting future and recognition has finally been given at an even higher level with the South African Department of Higher Education and Training's White Paper for Post-School Education and Training released in November 2013, which for the first time in South African history has an entire section on internationalisation. The paper recognises that the different elements of internationalisation are 'important for improving peace and cooperation, and for finding solutions to global challenges such as sustainable development, security, renewable energy and HIV/AIDS' (2013: 40). NMMU's Internationalisation Strategy therefore takes into account not only the NMMU Vision 2020[3] but also the national focus areas highlighted in the above mentioned White Paper.

From policy to strategy

Some of the key questions we asked ourselves during the development of NMMU's Internationalisation Strategy were: How do we ensure as a university that we are not only 'an important contributor to the whole global economy as a primary engine of economic growth' (Foskett 2012: 35) but that we also develop globally competent graduates who are able to contribute to a better world? We have a duty to our students, our city, our nation, our continent and the world to constantly ask ourselves the 'why' of what we do and remind ourselves where we stand in the moral contest universities face (Docherty 2014).

A new Internationalisation Strategy for Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University was finalised in November 2013 with a tendency in the Office for International Education towards what was referred to in the 1970's as 'logical incrementalism' or a 'strategy that evolves rationally in response to changes in the environment' (Stonehouse *et al.* 2004: 23).

---

3   NMMU's Vision 2020 was initiated by the current Vice-Chancellor, Professor Derrick Swartz, in 2008. Its purpose is to define NMMU's academic purpose and identity, revisit its strategic directional statements and determine strategic priorities that will secure the long-term sustainability of the institution. Vision 2020 has a section on internationalisation.

In November 2013, the Office for International Education (OIE) management as well as the Deans of Faculties and NMMU DVC: Research and Engagement, developed a new Internationalisation Strategy linked to the university's Vision 2020 and embedded in the NMMU Strategic Planning Framework. Emerging from the new strategy, the OIE's strategic priority is 'to comprehensively internationalise teaching and learning, research, engagement, systems and infrastructure'. A decision was made to move away from the Internationalisation Policy, which was written in 2004, to a strategy document in order to rather develop policies out of the established strategy. University's Internationalisation Committee, comprised of both the senate and university management committees with all seven Faculty Deans as members, has taken an active leadership role not only in the formulation and finalisation of the strategy document but in the 'roll-out' of the Strategy into different Faculties and Departments.

Teaching and learning

NMMU's Internationalisation Strategy states that one of university's strategic goals is to, 'through teaching and learning, create and sustain a global learning environment'. Bennett et al (2012) defined this goal and its challenge when they wrote:

> Ours is a world being transformed by transnational flows of goods and capital, peoples and practices; by the unraveling of the nation state; and by the rapid rise of new forms of instantaneous electronic communication. There is an urgent need to prepare young people to negotiate such complexity, and to enter into thoughtful stewardship of initiatives, resources, languages, and cultures.

The first objective of this NMMU strategic goal is 'to provide a learning experience incorporating a global dimension'. This objective speaks to the concept of 'Internationalisation at Home' and the 'experience' that NMMU students, both local and foreign, have whilst at our university. Much has been written about Internationalisation at Home as a concept since its introduction to the world of higher education internationalisation in 1999, with the aim 'to make students interculturally and internationally competent without leaving their own city [or country] for study-related purposes' (Crowther et. al. 2001). This speaks of connecting and engaging locally whilst also addressing all aspects of what a student needs to learn in order to graduate as a globally competent adult.

Complimenting this, the second objective aims 'to establish infrastructure and technology that will enable a global learning environment'. Many experts have described how technology and especially the advent of the internet have affected education. Internationally competitive infrastructure and technology on all NMMU campuses will play

a key role in not only establishing NMMU as an internationally competitive university, but also in the drive towards comprehensive internationalisation.

The 'how' of internationalising the curriculum is a constant challenge that universities face globally and yet this is an aspect of comprehensive internationalisation of higher education which cannot be ignored, approached casually or implemented in an ad hoc manner. The third objective in this goal, 'to embed in the curriculum an international component', draws attention to this area. The challenge facing academics is aptly described by Vivienne Caruana (2012: 51) in her journal article, Global Citizenship for All: Putting the 'Higher' Back into UK Higher Education,

> In order to understand their practice, higher education teachers need to reflect on the moral and political attitudes, values and beliefs that are influential and presuppose particular renditions of what global citizenship in the context of an internationalized curriculum means.

It is therefore a challenge facing all NMMU academics to not only think of their particular curriculum in an international context but also, as we put it in the Strategy, 'to create and sustain an enabling environment that fosters global awareness and competence in staff and students'. This can be considered daily in classrooms by simply acknowledging and taking advantage of the many different nationalities[4] in classes and allowing students to learn from each other and about each other's countries and contexts in the process.

Choudaha and Contreras (2014) note that recent surveys have revealed that even though more universities are showing further interest in internationalisation, the majority are not effectively assessing the impact internationalisation is having on their campuses, staff and students as well as teaching and learning in general. This has certainly been true in the past for NMMU but will from hereon be addressed through regular online surveys targeting both the students and academic staff.

Research

The second area of focus in NMMU's Internationalisation Strategy is to 'through research create and sustain an environment that encourages and supports globally oriented research and innovation'. This goal plays a key role not only in complimenting NMMU's Vision 2020 but also in pushing the university into the forefront of universities in Africa, BRICS and ultimately the world. An objective within this goal is 'to develop and sustain knowledge partners and knowledge networks that will enhance research aligned to the institutional research themes'. The South African Research Chairs Initiative (SARChI) has

---

4   *NMMU currently has students from more than 60 countries.*

been established in order to considerably increase the scientific research base of South Africa so that national research and development policies can be implemented with adequate support. NMMU's nine research chairs will form the starting point of assessing where international 'knowledge partners' can be beneficial to the university. Knowledge networks can then also be formed between more than one university with a strength in a certain area.

This also speaks to the objective 'to develop and sustain strategic research partnerships across the developing, emerging and developed world'. The question which emerges here is why the extension 'developing, emerging and developed' is used. At the Global Dialogue on the Future of Higher Education Internationalisation held in Port Elizabeth in January 2014 which was attended by representatives of 23 top higher education internationalisation organisations from across the world, the position and role of the previously marginalised countries was discussed. The Nelson Mandela Bay Declaration (2014) came about as a result of the Global Dialogue, with all participants stating their 'commitment to emphasise the importance of decision-making and practices in the development of internationalisation activities that are imbued with ethical considerations and inclusivity'. This in turn becomes our responsibility too to not only think about our own benefit, but to continually work towards the growth of others as well through collaborative research partnerships. The South African Department of Higher Education and Training (2013: 40) encourages this by stating:

> In particular, research partnerships involving African countries and other developing countries, including the BRICS nations, should grow to overcome their relative neglect in the past, but without prejudicing established and new relationships with developed countries.

Finally, the effectiveness of the above objectives will be complimented with the objective 'to expand opportunities for international research mobility'. The greatest minds in any field certainly can achieve more working together and this cannot happen unless researchers are able and willing to travel to engage and work with each other.

Engagement and partnerships

The third focus area of NMMU's Internationalisation Strategy is engagement and partnerships. The strategic goal to 'through engagement create opportunities for staff and students to connect and collaborate locally, in the region, in Africa and globally in a manner that contributes to enhanced quality of life and sustainability' is a great challenge to the university. The desire to 'enhance quality of life' is a feat which can only be achieved through continual cognisance in all that we do whilst developing ourselves further as a

university. All previous goals and objectives lead to this final achievement.

The objective to 'create an agreed on international partnership strategy for the university' is essential to the growth and development of NMMU into a university that is able to compete effectively on a global scale. This is different to the partnerships mentioned in the previous section as those will be research focused. Institutional partnerships are designed to be comprehensive, focusing on as many aspects and areas and working with universities around the world to increase the benefits of internationalisation through collaboration and engagement. As a university in a world that is now 'smaller' than ever before, the challenge is to find the higher education global commons 'in order to ensure that Africa's vastness and progress continues to be a source for opportunities for both students and countries committed to working with Africa' (Custer 2014: 35). It is only through comprehensive partnerships and the working relationships that emerge from this that we as an organisation can gain the knowledge needed to create new knowledge. In this area too, the South African Department of Higher Education and Training's White Paper acknowledges that 'international partnerships and links can contribute to an increase in knowledge production, intellectual property and innovation in South Africa…[and] can assist in strengthening our institutions' (2013: 40).

'To bring the benefits of internationalisation to the broader community' is an objective that requires mindfulness of what we do and why. The 'community' is not only the city or country we are based in. As an African university, we have an obligation to our continent to assist other universities in their development and growth for the greater good of Africa as a whole. As Stonehouse et al (2004: 15) state, 'there are many causes of poverty but it is widely accepted that education is an important factor in its reduction'. The world has changed irrevocably with the advent of the internet and this has further linked local and global. At the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Family Week Colloquium Partnerships for the Future held on 14 August 2014, Professor John Hudzik reiterated this point when he stated that, 'to pretend the local and global are not affecting each other that they are in any way separate from each other, is naïve'. Hans de Wit also commented on this when he wrote that the 'increased inter-relation between local and global… is an essential part of the future of internationalisation' (de Wit 2014). It is with this in mind that we as a university take up the responsibility to connect and collaborate positively and effectively with all the communities we find ourselves part of.

A glimpse into the future

It is with pride and an understanding of the challenges ahead that we as the Office for International Education continue the journey towards comprehensively internationalising

Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University to the benefit not only of our current students but for future generations in our constantly and fast changing country, continent and the world. The question is 'to what extent changes in higher education institutions in response to globalisation and internationalisation be fundamental changes, rather than just image development' (Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka 2012: 65)? This is our challenge and one we take on bravely and with a continued commitment to grow and fundamentally change the university for the better, especially with regards to the future of engagement and partnerships in order to ensure our students graduate able to thrive in the complex world.

References

Bennett, D. C., Cornwell, G. H., Jamal Al-Lail, H. & Schenck, C. (2012) *An Education for the Twenty-First Century: Stewardship of the Global Commons. Liberal Education.* (98) 4. http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-fa12/bennett_cornwell_al-lail_schenck.cfm [accessed on 14 July 2014].

Bundy, C. (1998) *A World of Difference? Higher Education in the Global Era.* International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA) 1998 Conference.

Caruana, V. (2012) 'Global Citizenship for All: Putting the 'Higher' Back into UK Higher Education' In: Foskett, N. and Maringe, F. (eds.) *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: Theoretical and Strategic Management Perspectives.* London: Continuum International Publishing Group. pp. 51-64.

Choudaha, R. & Contreras, E. (2014) *HE Internationalisation – What Gets Measured, Gets Funded.* University World News. http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140702133825465 [accessed on 2 August 2014].

Collis, B. (2005) 'E-Learning and the Transformation of Education for a Knowledge Economy'. In: Castells, M. & Cordoso, G. (eds.) *The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy.* Washington, DC: John Hopkins Centre for Transatlantic Relations.

Crowther, P. *et al*. (2001) *Internationalisation at Home: A Position Paper.* Amsterdam: EAIE.

Custer, S. (2014) 'Africa Rises' *The PIE Review.* No. 4. pp. 28-35.

White Paper for Post-School Education and Training: Building an Expanded, Effective and Integrated Post-School System. (2013) South African Department of Higher Education and Training. http://www.dhet.gov.za/SiteAssets/Latest%20News/White%20paper%20for%20post-school%20education%20and%20training.pdf [accessed on 22 June 2014].

Docherty, T. (2014) 'Whose Side Are We on in This Moral Contest?' *Times Higher Education.* http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/whose-side-are-we-on-in-this-moral-contest/2012791.article [accessed on 5 August 2014].

de Wit, H. (2014) 'Misconceptions About (The End Of) Internationalization' *University World News*. http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=2014071611562927 [accessed on 19 July 2014].

Foskett, N. (2012) 'Global Markets, National Challenges, Local Strategies: The Strategic Challenge of Internationalization' In: Foskett, N. & Maringe, F. (eds.) *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: Theoretical and Strategic Management Perspectives*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group. pp. 35-50.

Hemsley-Brown, J. & Oplatka, I. (2012) 'The Globalization and Marketization of Higher Education: Some Insights From the Standpoint of Institutional Theory' In: Foskett, N. & Maringe, F. (eds.) *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: Theoretical, Strategic and Management Perspectives*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group. pp. 65-80.

Hudzik, J. (2014) *Building Successful Inter-Institutional Partnerships for Comprehensive Internationalisation*. Presentation at the NMMU Family Week Colloquium: Partnerships for the Future. Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Kishun, R. (1998) 'Internationalization in South Africa' In: Scott, P. (ed.) *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

NMMU Vision 2020 Strategic Policy. Port Elizabeth: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Nelson Mandela Bay Declaration on the Future of Internationalisation of Higher Education. (2014) Global Dialogue on the Future of Higher Education Internationalisation. Hosted by the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA) in Port Elizabeth, South Africa in January 2014.

Stonehouse, G., Campbell, D., Hamill, J. & Purdie, T. (2004) *Global and Transnational Business: Strategy and Management*. 2nd edition. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Wildavsky, B. (2010) *The Great Brain Race: How Global Universities are Reshaping the World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Building and Maintaining a Long-Standing Institutional Partnership: St. Cloud State University and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University

Nico Jooste and Shahzad Ahmad [1] [2]

Higher education is constantly changing and evolving. Today's higher education (HE) landscape appreciates the concept of internationalisation as a key piece of the entire university system. Universities are expected to expand and enhance their international presence through improving curriculum and research capabilities and making travel abroad opportunities available at every level of the institution. This movement also presents new burdens and challenges to staff, faculty and leadership. Internationalisation cannot be done hastily or without a proper strategy. A key step toward comprehensive internationalisation at any university is the establishment and maintenance of mutually beneficial partnerships with universities around the world. As partnerships become more common in higher education, it is becoming increasingly easy to create 'empty partnerships' with no commitment, which are not more than agreements or memorandums of understanding that are never implemented.

This chapter will lay a blueprint for a successful comprehensive institutional partnership, with the focus on St. Cloud State University (SCSU) from the United States and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) from South Africa. SCSU and NMMU have been partners since 1996. This partnership was originally founded with help from the Bremer Foundation. The foundation gave a generous grant of US $40,000 to St. Cloud State University to support the scholarly work of students from a South African university. SCSU welcomed two South African students from the then University of Port Elizabeth (which became NMMU after a merger of a number of institutions in 2005) in the second semester of 1996 and since then the partnership has evolved and grown into a very important comprehensive institutional relationship for both universities.

The chapter begins with a brief disscussion about key factors for succesful partnerships. The authors will discuss how comprehensive institutional partnerships are established and maintained. The chapter will also examine the challenges and dangers that can potentially damage a comprehensive partnership. This will result in a reflection of the lessons learned by the colleagues from the two universities through their experience with this long-standing partnership. Lastly, critical issues for the future of HE institutional partnerships will be noted and discussed.

Key factors for successful HE institutional partnerships

Much of the research compiled on institutional partnerships illustrates that some of the most important factors for a successful partnership are the presence of shared and common goals. Furthermore, long-lasting and successful partnerships display the following traits: communication, commitment, trust and being mutually beneficial to both partners (Duffield, Olson & Kerzman 2013).

Partners need to be able to communicate effectively. It is necessary for key partnership stakeholders to have an open dialogue about the goals of the partnership, expectations of each institution and how to engage the campus community at every level. It has been found that communication which is open, honest and clear helps develop trust within a partnership (Heffernan & Poole 2005). It is important to establish effective communication norms from the beginning of the partnership. This allows partners to create a shared commitment based on the expectations of each institution and the benefit to merging the values and desires of those involved (Suarez-Balcazar, Hammel, Mayo, Inwald & Sen 2013). There are areas of communication that can make for a weak, empty partnership. Cultural sensitivity and understanding should be shown at all levels of the partnership. If this is not shown, a lack of respect and communication can occur (Heffernan & Poole 2005). Open communication allows the partners to establish mutual trust in one another. This trust is necessary for developing and changing the terms of the partnership. When it comes to NMMU and SCSU, activities such as the first year experience programme for St. Cloud State University students at NMMU would not have been successful if mutual trust had not been established. Sending first year students abroad requires suitable support systems prior to departure and during their stay in the other country and each institution must be able to trust those support networks will be there for the students.

Another important aspect of a successful partnership is commitment. Both universities need to be fully committed to established goals for the sustainability of the partnership. Partnerships must be willing to contribute equal human and financial resources to ensure success (Schlor & Barnes 2014). These resources ideally come from all departments at all levels of the university to reflect the role of the partnership in the institutional culture (Ibid.). The partnership between NMMU and SCSU reaches multiple levels in both universities which contributes to its sustainability. From senior administration to student affairs staff and university deans, every level of NMMU and SCSU is engaged in this partnership. The commitment should be shared between partners and resources need to be equally invested to maintain a successful partnership (Ibid.). With established commitment, the goals of the partnership need to be mutually beneficial. If a partnership is beneficial to all parties it is more likely to be sustainable (Duffield, Olson & Kerzman

2013). Institutional goals and missions change over time, so it is necessary for partnerships to be dynamic and meet the needs of both partners to survive the life cycle of the university (Ibid.). Since the agreements are designed to be mutually beneficial, a give and take of sorts is required. Sometimes short-term sacrifices are necessary to ensure the longevity of a partnership (Heffernan & Poole 2005).

Administration, faculty and students at both universities continue to benefit due to the rapport that has been built through this grassroots institutional partnership over the years. Nevertheless, the relationship needs to be maintained and this requires lots of effort and support. For the partnership between NMMU and SCSU to continue to be successful, both institutions will need to continue adapting the traits of a successful partnership. By communicating at all levels of the partnership, maintaining trust and respect and making sure there is a solid commitment from all levels of each institution to be mutually beneficial, this partnership can continue to be comprehensive and successful.

Comprehensive institutional partnership

Mestenhauser (2003) points out that many university administrators around the world feel they can send their students abroad and they will come back as internationalised individuals. They do not see the need to do anything else. The partnership between NMMU and SCSU has flourished over the years because both institutions have understood that mobility is not the only aspect of the relationship. A comprehensive and long-standing partnership takes many key ingredients to endure the challenges of internal changes and the external environment. Mobility is only one of these ingredients. Mobility of not only students, but also faculty and staff, can, however, contribute greatly to the deepening of a meaningful and mutually beneficial partnership.

A productive and comprehensive partnership requires multiple factors, including adequate resources, well-written contracts and the use of appropriate decision-making models (Heffernan & Poole 2005). An essential piece that is often overlooked, however, is the grassroots support. The foundation can simply be two faculty members from different universities inspired to collaborate on a topic that is relevant to both. The partnership between SCSU and NMMU formed due to the Bremer Foundation grant and has grown extensively over time with the commitment of certain faculty and administration across both universities. Regardless of the individuals or the goal, the aspirational motivation must be in place. Both parties must be willing to put in the time and energy that their partnership will require in order to grow. They must also be able to gain support from student service offices, such as the local center for international studies or education abroad office. These individuals will know how to mobilise the student, faculty and/or staff,

complete the required paperwork and prepare all the logistics of travel.

If the individuals or groups want to expand this relationship, they will need to fully develop and understand what makes the partnership a necessity for both institutions. What advantages will each university gain from it? What are the diverse qualities that each institution brings to the partnership? What are the challenges they are willing to overcome in order to make this partnership solid? Are the individuals involved going to be around to help evolve the relationship? Is each university willing and able to make this relationship a priority? A strong infrastructure must be in place to fully support the collaboration. If these questions can be answered, the individuals or groups can begin to discuss a strategy of how the partnership will be managed and expanded. Once SCSU and NMMU had created a strong infrastructure, the next step was the broadening of the partnership and the creation of cultural learning opportunities.

While the initial grant was originally set in place for students, it was clear the faculty and staff could also utilise opportunities for professional development. There was a high demand for short-term faculty and staff professional development opportunities, so in 2002 the Bremer Foundation authorised the expansion of the use to grant to faculty and staff exchanges. The partnership continued to expand and many new programmes were developed. Faculty sabbatical, semester long study abroad programmes and short-term visits were created to allow mobility of faculty, staff and students across the two universities. Both universities were very intentional on deciding which programmes and groups to send abroad, depending on the diverse qualities of the host institution. One programme to note is the unique first-year experience semester-long programme for SCSU students. Formed in 2006, students are able to take advantage of a study abroad programme with comparable costs to a semester at SCSU.

Comprehensive institutional partnerships require patience, strategy and genuine effort. They cannot grow without meaningful individual relationships. How does one develop this deep, effective relationship? Each participant must be open and honest about what they are hoping to gain from the partnership and equally interested in helping their colleagues achieve these goals. Ideally, these goals and objectives will be similar. This relationship requires consistent visits and quality assurance (Heffernan & Poole 2005). Each participant must trust that they can rely on the other to provide positive outcomes. Once this relationship is established, it can begin to touch other areas of the institution and become comprehensive.

Comprehensive partnerships must engage all levels of the two universities. This key aspect will allow them to withstand the changes in leadership as well as the changes in student population. Primarily, the original individuals need to engage other colleagues that are

willing to collaborate and establish credible programmes. They also need to discuss the value of the partnership with the university leadership. This could help the initiators gather funding to support their efforts. This support can also help the participants test out programme ideas and reach to the outer parameters of their limits. Most importantly, while the initial investment from the leadership on both sides is key, the most important factor is that the internal environment is able to withstand leadership changes. Universities and trends in higher education are constantly changing. If the collaboration is truly comprehensive and has threads in all aspects of the university, it will whether any storms.

Finally, partnerships require continuous evaluation and improvements. The partnership must examine if its goals are being met. It is also essential to evaluate if the international experiences are having positive impacts on the students and staff. In order to gather this information, follow up research studies must be done during and after student and staff activities to ascertain the effectiveness of the programmes. Partners also need to be ready to change their plans and activities based on the research findings.

Transformative partnerships

Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University hosts a unique event every other year called the 'Family Week'. This is not an event that invites the families of students or staff to visit the campus; rather, it is a special gathering of all the meaningful institutional partnerships that NMMU collaborates with on a regular basis. It is called 'Family Week' to encourage the understanding that these partnerships are not merely memorandums of understandings (MOU's), but deep, effective and mutually-beneficial relationships that bring value to each participating institution. Part of the Family Week is a colloquium, where partner universities engage in in-depth discussion of the higher education internationalisation field, including partnerships, their challenges, trends and future goals. These events are truly unique and remain an example that the dedication required to maintain long-lasting partnerships is worth it.

In order for comprehensive institutional partnerships to endure, transformative thinking must be in place. Those involved in maintenance of partnerships must always consider the following questions: What area of the university or community does this partnership have yet to reach? What aspects of the relationship need more attention and focus? Are there new faculty, staff or student populations that could enhance our collaboration? These constant evaluations will help a partnership grow and advance with the university and the culture of higher education in each country.

Partnerships can also bring internationalisation to those who cannot travel abroad.

For example, visitors from NMMU to SCSU are invited to speak in classrooms and meet local students, participate in meetings with colleagues to discuss ideas and potential collaboration, and attend social events with many university personnel. It's important that the partnership does not limit its globalising effect to only those who can travel, but reach and engage with as many individuals as possible. This extension includes local communities beyond the university. When SCSU students visit NMMU, they visit many places around South Africa to learn about South African history and to meet local people. Students, faculty and staff who visit NMMU are given the opportunity to interact with children, local entrepreneurs and every-day individuals. On the other hand, NMMU students who visit St. Cloud State University are expected to have much of the same interactions. For example, NMMU nursing students are required to complete a certain number of practical experience hours whilst at SCSU. These students, working in local hospitals, are in the presence of nursing staff and community members from St. Cloud who might not have been able to go abroad and can share their experiences about the culture and health care system in South Africa. Experiences like these make the partnership one-of-a-kind and long-lasting.

Lessons learned

The comprehensive partnership model comes with its challenges. Both institutions must devote a substantial amount of energy, time and resources to the partnership. Therefore, universities are advised not to take on too many comprehensive partnerships. They can become too business like, based only on empty contracts and little or no engagement and activities. These partnerships will not be maintained in the long-run or bring the benefits of internationalisation to either university. In order to develop stable, lasting and mutually beneficial partnerships, it is better for universities to grow strong professional and academic relationships with a limited number of institutions.

The SCSU and NMMU partnership have been longstanding in part due to the continuity of staff who manage the relationship at both universities. Many have remained involved in the partnership for over a decade. A fundamental point of departure for the partnership, from the outset, was the recognition that this is a North-South partnership, bringing with it the challenges of an unequal world. Notwithstanding this, both institutions have treated each other as equals and as such have developed a financial model that have made activities at all levels possible.

All involved have invested time, money and effort to ensure exchanges occur at every level of each institution. A few successful examples are: most deans as well as the university Presidents and Vice-Chancellors have visited the partner university; countless other staff,

faculty and personnel have gone across the oceans to visit, including the library staff and staff working in the student records, registration, admissions, counseling and career services. In short, any division, department or service that plays a role in this partnership has had the opportunity to visit the partner university.

The leaders have also created unique and creative opportunities for multiple student groups. For example, the well-known NMMU choir hosted the SCSU choir in 2012 in South Africa. Both choirs collaborated and gained special intercultural experiences they would not have had without this partnership. Nursing students have also been engaged in student exchange for years. These students gain diverse, hands-on experience in a culture entirely different from their own. This enhances their education and gives them unique experiences. Another group of students that has benefited from this relationship are Masters/graduate students in the college counseling and student development programme at SCSU. It is still quite uncommon for graduate students to have opportunities to go abroad during their studies. This group of students travel to South Africa and spend a few weeks learning about the student services offered at NMMU and the challenges the NMMU student population faces when compared to SCSU students. The graduate students gain knowledge of the importance of intercultural skills when working in student affairs. This is quite a unique learning experience for all involved.

The partners have learned that it is crucial to be able to respond to variations in financial situations. This means they need to keep the partnership mutually beneficial for both universities by adjusting their programmes and needs based on the student population changes. Also, the partners create consistent opportunities for dialogue. The best way to stay on top of changes and trends at both universities is to have an open line of communication with the key personnel. This includes face-to-face formal discussions and exchanges as well as communication via phone, email and video conferencing.

Finally, the partners feel the partnership has thrived due to constant self-evaluation of the programmes. Each university asks for feedback from the faculty, staff, departments and students who have participated in the exchanges and visits. It is crucial that all participants feel they are benefiting from the relationship and gaining unique experiences they would not have gathered otherwise. Without all of these pieces - engaging every level of the two institutions, maintaining year-to-year programmes with the ability to engage new student groups for compatibility, responding to variations in financial situations, open communication and evaluation of programmes - this partnership would have crumbled a long time ago.

Implications for the future

This partnership is currently considering how partnerships in the future will be different from how they operate today. International education is experiencing a number of changes and challenges: growing demand for international education experiences, increased concern for security of people participating, government visa regulations becoming more costly and complex, the availability of technology to enhance distance communication, to mention only a few. Institutions must recognise the potential of technology to enable partner institutions to maintain continuous communication but it should not displace personal contact of administrative personnel.

NMMU is embracing a future idea called 'the global commons'. NMMU Vice Chancellor, Prof Derrick Swartz spoke highly of this concept SCSU's commencement ceremony in 2014 which he was invited to speak at. This is being considered the next phase of partnership networks. The global commons is a platform that includes respect for the creation of knowledge and the understanding of differences in order to develop students as globally competent citizens. Multiple universities can be part of the global commons through valuing the importance of collaboration and respect for others. The universities do not need to have the exact same desires or ways of engaging their students' in developing global competence or in making the world a better place for all. It just needs to be a highly valued aspect of their mission.

Conclusion

To date, more than 700 faculty, staff and students from St. Cloud State University and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University have visited one another and benefited from education opportunities provided by both institutions. In the future, we will continue with the unique first-year student programme model, student exchange, more short-term faculty teaching opportunities and continued faculty and staff visits to enhance department-to-department collaborations.

Internationalisation can influence and even change the way we think about the structure of higher education. While universities are eager to enhance their curriculum and create partnerships, it is important to take time and create meaningful, mutually beneficial and comprehensive relationships. These solid foundations will develop into student, staff and faculty mobility and cooperation that results in more globally minded campuses. With the individual grassroots, dedication, open communication and transformational thinking that SCSU and NMMU have demonstrated, this partnership will march forward and hopefully inspire other institutions.

References

Duffield, S., Olson, A. & Kerzman, R. (2013) 'Crossing Borders, Breaking Boundaries: Collaboration Among Higher Education Institutions' *Innovative Higher Education*. (38) 3. pp. 237-250.

Heffernan, T. & Poole, D. (2005) 'In Search of 'The Vibe: Creating Effective International Education Partnerships' *Higher Education*. (50) 2. pp. 223-245.

Mestenhauser J. A. (2003) 'Building Bridges' International Educator. (12) 3. pp. 6-11.

Schlor, W. & Barnes, T. (2014) 'The Strategic Management Challenge for Research Universities' In: Rumbley, L. (ed.) *Global Opportunities and Challenges for Higher Education Leaders: Briefs on Key Themes*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. pp. 29-33.

Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Hammel, J., Mayo, L., Inwald, S. & Sen, S. (2013) 'Innovation in Global Collaborations: From Student Placement to Mutually Beneficial Exchanges' *Occupational Therapy International*. (20) 2. pp. 94-101.

The International Network of Universities: Strengthening Global Engagement Through University Consortia Membership

Dr Lee Sternberger and Felix Wang[1]

In the last 25 years, internationalisation of higher education institutions (HEIs) has become a key component of higher education thinking and planning, driving curricula, research and student programming at HEIs around the globe. The push for more internationally-focused institutions is fueled by complex and interacting internal and external forces that have led to a near revolution in the activities of universities. Stockley (2010) describes these forces as:

- Changing global demographics: declining birthrates in the West with resulting skill shortages, the 'massification' of higher education with rising global participation rates and the rapid economic growth in many parts of the world;

- Education as a global market: the implementation of fees for service, the demand for English speakers whether for the job market, research or publications;

- The student as 'customer': the necessity of the portability or employability of qualifications, the student as lifelong learner, students as 'choosers' of education or qualifications;

- Declining public funding with the concomitant pressure to generate revenue: the university as a 'business', education as a commodity that can be sold on the international market, public and governmental demand for transparency and accountability;

- Increasing flexibility of educational 'products' and delivery modalities: the proliferation of qualifications such as diplomas, certificates, and programmes; the increase in for-profit providers; the rapid rate of technological advancement in education delivery;

- Branding and positioning: the fact that all institutions have a market position that is governed by those within and without the institution, the number of international ranking systems, the growing emphasis on one's rank as a branding tool;

- The growth in transnational education by physical or electronic means: the increasing number of twinning, dual and joint degrees, the growth in education

franchises and commercial enterprises;

- The decline in the hegemony of Western education: the significant government investment in education systems in China, Singapore, Malaysia, South Korea and other nations; the growth of education 'hubs' in non-Western regions.

In an attempt to explain what shapes internationalisation of higher education, scholars note the profound shifts in national economies and the role of governments as well as the harmonisation of higher education (for example, the Bologna Accords) as well as the increasing pressure to engage in research whilst also engaging in high quality teaching and service (Sporn 2001; Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley 2009). This dynamic intersection of processes and policies has blurred traditional disciplinary boundaries and even the boundaries of the institutions themselves. Universities now have to re-conceptualise themselves as relational entities, always in connection, comparison and competition with a range of other institutions, whether traditional HEIs or other enterprises.

The response to this dynamic reconsideration of the role and activities of higher education - and the consequent push for internationalisation - has led HEIs to engage in activities that function as both products of and responses to the forces described above. Internationalisation itself fuels further internationalisation. These activities, in general, include:

- The development of internationalisation strategies;
- Increased student and staff mobility;
- The implementation of 'internationalisation at home' programming;
- The development of shared curricula, degrees or programmes (delivered at home, at partner institutions, and/or in electronic format in part or in full);
- The recruitment of international faculty and students and the provision of support for them;
- Increased international research, consultancies and other projects.

These international endeavors, which often existed at the margins of some HEIs, have become central to the mission of many universities around the world and, like all new initiatives, require planning, personnel, time, and funding.

The era of consortia creation

The formation of strategic networks of partnerships - university consortia - emerged as a

key strategy and platform for achieving higher education institutions' internationalisation goals. While many consortia focus nearly exclusively on student mobility, a number of consortia focus on a broader portfolio of activities, with joint research and shared curricula as cornerstone activities for many organisations. Stockley and de Wit (2011) define these 'institutional networks' as 'a group of academic units which is united for, in general, multiple academic or administrative purposes, is leadership driven and has an indefinite lifespan'. While academic consortia are usually 'single mission', institutional networks tend to have a 'general framework objective'. It is this type of organisation that is emerging over the last two decades. For example, during the late 1990s, Universitas 21 (U21) in 1997, the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU) in 1997 and the Worldwide University Network (WUN) in 1999 were created, among others. All three are consortia of mainly research-intensive universities, with complex portfolios of activities.

Universitas 21 describes itself as 'the leading global network of research-intensive universities, working together to foster global citizenship and institutional innovation through research-inspired teaching and learning, student mobility, connecting our students and staff and wider advocacy for internationalisation'. Moreover, all Universitas 21 member institutions 'are research-led, comprehensive universities providing a strong quality assurance framework to the network's activities'. The members engage in a range of activities including student, faculty and staff mobility; special interest groups formed to promote collaboration (for example, in health sciences, health organisations and management, human resources and international officers) as well as shared research activities and joint programmes and conferences, to name a few. U21 member presidents take an active role in the oversight and direction of the consortium. The Secretariat, with offices in the UK, US, Australia and Canada provides overarching coordination of activities, working with staff at each member institution[2].

The Association of Pacific Rim Universities, with 45 members, engages in a similar set of activities, including summer programmes and workshops, undergraduate and graduate student conferences and regular meetings of presidents, provosts and deans. Foci for the consortium include leadership development, global health, aging population in Asia, leadership development and equity and access in higher education, among others[3].

Finally, the Worldwide University Network has a vision

> To be one of the leading international higher education networks, collaborating to accelerate the creating of knowledge and to develop the people required to address the challenges and opportunities of our rapidly changing world… [the network] is a flexible, dynamic organisation that uses the combined resources and intellectual

power of its members to achieve collective objectives and to stretch international ambition (Worldwide University Network).

Through virtual environments, conferences, workshops and faculty or graduate student mobility, the WUN focuses on research on four 'global challenges': responding to climate change, understanding cultures, global higher education and research and public health and non-communicable diseases[4].

To act in a network of like-minded partners has been seen as an efficient and effective imperative strategy for the internationalisation of higher education. Membership in a network can be leveraged to attract scarce resources (including external funding, which often demands multiple institutions) as well as to increase market visibility and enhance branding. It can also assist in the lobbying of stakeholders and in providing access to political or policy channels. Such memberships can maximise positions within ranking systems, allow for the sharing of knowledge, expertise and facilities (most often highly specialised research facilities), increase student and staff mobility and streamline curricula and project development whilst reducing transaction costs (Beerkens 2002; Chan 2004; Beerkens & van der Wende 2007). Along these lines, many HEI leaders have seen consortia as something of a panacea for the pressures generated by the call to internationalise, and, in particular, diminishing government support for higher education in the developed world. Yet the potential of consortia - with their promised set of positive outcomes - has proved difficult to realise.

The complexities of consortium success

The complexities of managing one higher education institution, let alone a consortium, are many. Challenges facing university networks include insufficient funding, little institutional commitment, poor communication, lack of staff support and a poorly defined or insufficiently shared mission. To ensure success, the mission of the consortium must be deeply shared and in congruence with missions and strategies of members, rather than with history or geography (de Wit 2004, quoted in Stokley & de Wit 2011). Commitment and active engagement must exist at all levels of the university, with staff designated to serve as liaisons to the consortium. The liaisons must actively engage in consortium activities, communicating with partners as well as effectively communicating consortium activities to colleagues at home (Sternberger 2005). Staff turnover at member institutions must be addressed, as 'buy-in' can wane and communication diminish. All consortia must balance member institutional priorities (and use of resources meeting these priorities) with the benefits gained from collective action. In some instances this could mean moving

---

4   See www.wun.ac.uk

resources toward consortia over institutional priorities with the expectation of future gain.

De Wit (2004 quoted in Stockley & de Wit 2011) notes that institutional leaders need to be cognizant of the balance between interests at the institutional level versus interests at the 'decentralised' level. Successful membership requires enough of the latter for 'buy-in'. Dynamic consortia count on similarities and differences. Chan (2004: 39) writes that 'complementarity is as important as commonality because cooperation makes sense only when in addition to similarities, differences in expertise are used'. Member resources and expertise must be of strategic value to other members across networks to justify the cost of membership, whether monetary, personnel or time. Indeed, membership should not be driven by the collection of dues, placing the consortium in direct competition with its own members (de Wit 2004, quoted in Stockley & de Wit 2011). Short-term successes are imperative to inspire long-term commitment and activities and to propel consortia and their subgroups forward. Finally, consortia require nimbleness on the part of members - the willingness to respond, support and act quickly as the consortia react to internal and external shifts.

Consortia as spaces for deep, thoughtful and sustained discourse

The global trends driving the internationalisation of higher education discussed at the beginning of this chapter not only remain relevant but have accelerated the process of internationalisation. Students are increasingly mobile as credentials become harmonised and portable. The number of full degree programmes in English is growing, encouraging further mobility. The electronic delivery of programmes, whether in part or in full and in synchronous or asynchronous form, continues to gain momentum. The demand for post-secondary education will exceed the resources of national governments, thus encouraging efficient mechanisms to provide educational programmes, including private and commercial enterprises. In short, university networks continue to provide a powerful model of collaboration and innovation, harnessing what can be shared, that can work to meet the challenges and opportunities that globalisation presents.

Yet behind the globalisation and internationalisation of higher education and the attendant push to internationalise HEIs lie assumptions regarding the benefits of international education. These assumptions of the desirability of international education and the models deployed to execute internationalisation plans - stemming almost entirely from the developed world - are held by many sophisticated faculty and administrators with little or no reflection of such assumptions, their origins and their effect. A number of questions remain to be answered: How well do we understand the impact of an international student in the classroom, joint research in a foreign lab or sharing best

practices with a colleague at a partner institution? How is an off-shore programme different from students working collaboratively online? Do we understand our own assumptions that shape the activities we promote and the impact of those assumptions on the internationalisation goals and objectives we set for our students, faculty and staff? Do we have a deep comprehension of the changes in beliefs and values that are facilitated by contact with 'the other' (Wandschneider et al. forthcoming)?

Consortia create spaces for deep, thoughtful and sustained discourse regarding the meaning and impact of internationalising higher education. They provide avenues where leaders in higher education and the subfield of international education may encounter and learn from one another, sharing systems and strategies for why we engage in the work that we do. Indeed, a less commonly discussed value of consortia membership is its impact on those participating directly in the consortia. As Hulstrand (2012: 113) notes, consortia provide

The opportunity to put into practice on the academic and administrative levels what we preach to our students who are planning to study abroad: flexibility is necessary; ambivalence will be around every corner; you must be prepared to interact with others whose values and priorities are different from yours. Our willingness to travel outside of our institutional comfort zones makes for a richer and diverse experience for all of us.

Given that senior international officers (SIOs) at universities are often the key advocates for internationalisation, consortia can provide the critical space to engage, understand, and learn, and, in turn, consortium participants can inform and shape policy at home and within the field at large.

Case Study: The International Network of Universities

The International Network of Universities (INU) was established in 1999, during the 'era of consortia creation,' with goals similar to other consortia - to enable like-minded institutions to attract expertise, ideas and resources, thus creating a unique institutional and collective profile and shared set of teaching, research and service activities. Current members include Europa-Universität Viadrina (Frankfurt-Oder, Germany), Flinders University (Adelaide, Australia), Hiroshima University (Hiroshima, Japan), James Madison University (Harrisonburg, Virginia, USA), Malmö University (Malmö, Sweden), Ritsumeikan University (Kyoto, Japan), Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University (Beppu, Japan), Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (Port Elizabeth, South Africa), Universidad Nacional del Litoral (Santa Fe, Argentina), Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Milan, Italy), Universitas Katolik Parahyangan (Bandung, West Java, Indonesia) and Universitat Rovira i Virgili

(Tarragona, Spain).

The INU's early focus was on exchange agreements and easy student access across partners, a straightforward aim accepted as a priority by all members. To provide more opportunity for students (and in future, staff), a parallel effort involved attracting more members in order to meet the INU's defining goal - to exchange at least 100 students among member institutions. Yet, as the INU's first five years unfolded, the consortium worked slowly and at times inefficiently, through issues of identity and the development of additional projects. Meetings were held biannually and rotated across the Network, building shared knowledge and support. Tangible activities beyond student exchange proved more difficult. Nonetheless, over time the professionalisation and maturation of the field itself and of the international offices at each institution led to the expansion of INU activities and direction.

As a result the INU, which had been founded by and for vice-chancellors and presidents, moved to become a SIO-led endeavor. Increasingly, SIOs saw the value of the INU as they were tasked with developing their own institutional internationalisation strategies and began to serve as liaisons to the consortium. The field of international education was changing rapidly, and increasingly, HEIs and their leaders required multi-faceted plans to reach internationalisation targets in teaching, research and service/engagement. INU members were no exception. Thus, the mid-2000s saw the development of an INU staff 'shadowing' programme as well as a small, unique portfolio of undergraduate and graduate programmes.

Hiroshima University led in the conceptualisation and development of these programmes via summer short courses to be held annually in parallel with Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony. In 2004, the INU took the decision to hire a full-time project manager to coordinate communication and meetings, streamline joint projects and document activities. After initial funding by La Trobe University in Melbourne, Australia, which held the presidency at the time, significantly-increased membership fees finally supported this position. The project manager facilitates processes of creating an identity and brand, implementing student and staff programmes, presenting at international conferences and increasing visibility in the field of international higher education.

The first Student Seminar for Global Citizenship and Peace, an undergraduate programme, took place in Hiroshima in August 2006, followed two years later by the Summer Master School for graduate students. The Student Seminar has addressed a wide range of topics under the INU theme of 'global citizenship', including peace and nuclear warfare, climate change, migration and refugee policy and the UN Millennium Goals, amongst others. To date, over 500 undergraduates have participated in the Student Seminar. The Master

School has examined similar topics but at a graduate level. This programme, which targets students in the fields of political science, international relations and peace studies, has seen more than 60 participants thus far. These two successes propelled the network forward, leading to the creation of additional programmes. Two new Master Schools, one focusing on environmental sustainability and the other on disaster nursing, joined the existing programmes, and they have grown to over 50 participants up to present. Moreover, two member institutions have since used the INU undergraduate seminar model to design their own programmes at home. Importantly, for the last five years, the Hiroshima programmes have been supported by a US $3.5 million grant from the Japanese government that funds faculty and student travel, room and board for summer schools. This funding ends after the summer of 2015, creating an important question for the INU regarding the long-term sustainability of the summer schools.

In addition to the summer programmes, participation in the staff shadowing exchange programme has increased (more than 80 participants to date), and a number of bilateral degree programmes emerged or were finalised across four member institutions. Currently under consideration is the development of an INU 'seed money fund' of up to US $5,000 that would support joint projects. Finally, each member institution has been asked to identify programmes where INU members might participate, such as a language programme at a member institution or a research fellowship for doctoral students. Spaces in these programmes would be 'held' for INU members.

The INU, and consortia like it, have a number of advantages. As a small but flexible organisation, the INU can respond relatively quickly to certain kinds of programmatic needs and ideas, such as the implementation of student and staff exchange and joint workshops (or similar, relatively simple projects). Governance and communication are straightforward, and bureaucracy is minimal. By making each other a priority, and given that member representatives can respond, act and communicate relatively quickly, the INU plays a significant role in member internationalisation planning, activities and strategies. With relationships cemented, more complex programmes (whether bilateral or involving more or all members) can emerge, such as joint degree programmes and research collaborations, to name a few.

In the last five years the INU has matured as an organisation, clarifying the role and term of the presidency and project manager, building new programmes and better understanding the complexities of working as a collective enterprise. The organisation has lost members over the years, for the very reasons cited above: the INU simply did not fit the profile and strategic goals of the particular institution, and the value added did not match INU fees. At the same time, the network's identity - a collection of relatively young (in many cases), collaborative, entrepreneurial and dynamic institutions with

internationalisation at the forefront of their priorities - has emerged. With the INU's clearer identity, broader portfolio of activities and greater geographical representation, the recruitment of new members has become more targeted and sophisticated. Each new member brings positive complementarities and commonalities that propel actions and shape new notions of the internationalisation of higher education.

Conclusion

International education is not a value-free proposition. It presumes there is good in providing opportunities for students, faculty and staff to engage with 'difference' and subsequently, to grow from it. Higher education leaders, and SIOs in particular, have a great deal of influence in positioning consortia to provide a place for examining assumptions, sharing beliefs and ideas, finding consensus and understanding incompatibilities, so that as senior leaders we consequently shape our institutions. Our 'worlds' in higher education are going to become only that much more interconnected in the years ahead. Membership in an international consortium offers rich opportunities to realise institutional potential as a hub for internationalisation in ways that are both unique to the strengths of member institutions and shared with sister institutions all over the globe. As Tadaki (2013: 375) rightly observes,

> Consortia are highly valued and acknowledged as a space where global relationships are imagined and then collectively produced through the material practices that result. As consortia continue to reorganize around the collective recognition that practices and skills matter, an opportunity arises in which new moralities of internationalisation may emerge as academic faculty and staff can work together to practice a progression vision of global interconnectedness.

Rather than reacting to a rapidly changing global landscape, HEIs, working collectively, can affect that landscape. Consortia are in the position of developing and implementing internationalisation theories and practices - those 'new moralities' - that work for the collective good of our communities.

In the final analysis, education generally and higher education in particular not only equip students around the world with knowledge, skills and abilities to meet the practical needs of our day but also show us why we can and must do so. Yet to meet the most pressing challenges of an increasingly interdependent world, these institutional 'parts' must join together as part of a larger 'whole' to meet the needs and take advantage of the opportunities. Toward such means and ends, consortia offer a compelling frame through which we may individually and collectively pursue these pragmatic and aspirational goals

for the benefit of us all.

Within the relatively small organisation that is the INU, members have seen and embraced the broad advantages of the consortium model as they grapple with the fundamental question of what international education means. Council meetings give representatives the chance to engage in healthy dialogue with peers who see the world differently and who come from quite varied higher education systems. INU efforts have resulted in increasing geographic diversity (South-North, West-East), thus putting new moralities into practice, capitalising on existing programmes, building on member strengths and supporting one another in internationalisation plans and activities whilst benefiting from the increasing direct involvement of different levels of HEI leadership to develop innovative solutions (for example, the seed fund and staff shadowing). What emerges from these philosophical, ethical and practical considerations are the tools to enable institutions and their faculty, staff and students to engage in a more comprehensive worldview and the confidence and enthusiasm to employ those tools in building international connections among institutions throughout the world.

References

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009) *A Report Prepared for UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education. Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. pp. 1-23.

Beerkens, E. (2002) 'International Inter-Organisational Arrangements in Higher Education: Towards a Typology' *Tertiary Education & Management*. 8 (4). pp. 297-314.

Beerkens, E., & van der Wende, M. (2007) 'The paradox in international cooperation: Institutionally embedded universities in a global environment' *Higher Education*. 53 (1). pp. 61-79.

Chan, W. W. (2004) 'International Cooperation in Higher Education: Theory and Practice' *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 8 (1). pp. 32-55.

Global Trends in Higher Education and the Connection with International Partnerships. Workshop presented at the European Association of International Education Conference. Nantes, France.

Hulstrand, J. (2012) 'Expanding Horizons: Opportunities and Challenges of Consortia' *International Educator*. 21 (3). pp. 110-113.

Sporn, B. (2001) 'Building Adaptive Universities: Emerging Organisational Forms Based on Experiences of European and US Universities' *Tertiary Education and Management*. 7 (2). pp. 121-134.

Sternberger, L.G. (2005) 'International Higher Education Consortium: Partnering for Success'. *International Educator*. 14 (4). pp. 12-21.

Stockley, D. (2010) 'Key issues in managing international partnerships' In: *Carlecrantz, G* (Chair)

Stockley, D., & De Wit, H. (2011) 'The Increasing Relevance of Institutional Networks' *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalisation of Higher Education*. pp. 45-58.

Tadaki, M., & Tremewan, C. (2013) 'Reimagining Internationalization in Higher Education: International Consortia as a Transformative Space?' *Studies in Higher Education*. 38 (3). pp. 367-387.

Wandschneider, E., Pysarchik, D. T., Sternberger, L.G., Ma, W., Acheson-Clair, K., Baltensperberger, B. & Hart, V. (in press) 'The Forum BEVI Project: Applications and Implications for International, Multicultural, and Transformative Learning' In: C.N. Shealy (ed.) *Making Sense of Beliefs and Values*. New York: Springer Publishing.

Partnerships for the Future: Trends, Challenges and Opportunities

Hans de Wit[1]

Partnerships have become a defining feature of higher education and an essential element of internationalisation. They are the foundation on which international cooperation in education, research and service to society are built. Their strategic significance has increased in the past few decades. Internationalisation and globalisation in higher education find their expression in the way partnerships in the sector develop new dimensions and challenges, in particular in the relationship between the North and South and between commodification and civic engagement (Maringe & de Wit 2015).

As Van Ginkel (1996) observes, networking has been one of the key words in higher education. Increasingly networks are of an international rather than a national character. The American Council on Education (ACE) notes that 'the world of higher education has always been networked' but 'what is different today is that international networking has become inculcated as a key factor in the fabric of higher education' (ACE 2015: 3). Networks exist in many forms; some small, others large; some local and internal, others global and transnational; some extractive and exploitative, others mutual and participative; some temporary and project based, others more long term and programme based. Increasingly, networks take the form of joint or dual degrees.

Partnerships are one of the three pillars in the internationalisation strategy of the European Commission, titled 'European Higher Education in the World' (European Commission 2013). The term partnership is used here to describe any formal or informal working together by two or more higher education entities in pursuit of common goals (Bullough & Kauchak 2010). As Maringe and de Wit (2015) state, the partnership concept, recognises that such working together exists in multiple forms including those that differ in size; in geographical dispersion; in resource availability; and in prestige, power and influence. In higher education, partnerships exist between universities or departments therein; between universities and schools such as those designed for teacher training; between governments and universities; between industries and universities, such as those that facilitate work experience elements of university training; between local and overseas universities.

---

1   Professor Hans de Wit is the Director of the Center for International Higher Education at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College, United States.

Traditional forms of networks and partnerships

International networks and partnerships generally cover a range of activities, most commonly one or more of the following (Stockley & de Wit 2011):

- Student exchange;

- Academic and administrative staff exchange;

- Research cooperation;

- Researcher exchange;

- Benchmarking;

- Delivery of transnational education;

- Joint bids for international projects;

- Joint curriculum development;

- Joint or double academic programmes;

- Shadowing programmes;

- Short course programmes;

- Developmental projects in a third country;

- Relationships with the private sector.

Stockley and de Wit (2011; see also de Wit & Maringe 2015) identify important dichotomies and issues associated with partnerships. These include:

1. *Exclusiveness or elitism in partnerships*

   On the one hand the formation leads to exclusiveness, in particular those who incline to   stay small and look for alliances of the top institutions or disciplines. On the other hand, this can lead to elitism and exclusion of institutions and regions, in turn potentially dividing the higher education space.

2. *Diversity versus harmonisation*

   Related to the first issue, there appears to be broad consensus on the need to maintain a diverse space of higher education and that networking should reflect that diversity.

3. *Institutional versus academic or disciplinary networking*

There is a broad consensus that the emphasis in networking should be on academic or disciplinary collaboration. Institutional alliances can be useful in facilitating cooperation at the disciplinary level. However, the emphasis should be on academic collaboration, even in these networks.

4. *Branding of alliances versus branding of institutions*

The discussion regarding whether alliances should be institutional or disciplinary leads to the question as to whether the emphasis should be on the alliance or on the institutions.

5. *Small versus big alliances*

There appears to be agreement that smaller alliances are more effective than big networks, but at the same time it is recognised that this can lead to elitism and exclusiveness (see point 1 above).

6. *The importance of new technologies*

The role of new technologies and their use by universities is very important. However, there is also a strong feeling that virtual networking cannot replace real contact.

7. *The role of different stakeholders in networks*

Networking should not be exclusive as far as different stakeholders are concerned, both within the universities (leadership, faculty, students) and between the universities and the outside community (NGOs, private sector, governments).

8. *The added value of alliances to the institution*

Alliances should not only be based on a feeling of partnership, of being connected, but there should be an emphasis on the added value and complementarity that the partnership will bring to the institution.

Trends in partnerships

In the discussions during the colloquium 'Partnerships for the Future' at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University on 14 August 2014, several times the metaphor of a wedding was used. There is some relevance in this metaphor, as most higher education partnerships are started without a preliminary testing phase in which the 'engaged couple' try out if the partnership works sufficiently to give it a permanent character through 'marriage'/formal agreement. One can even speak in many cases of 'arranged marriages', in which the

couple is forced to marry rather than doing so on their own based on mutual attraction and interest. This can be because of funding opportunities or agreements signed by the leadership of the university, without the knowledge and/or prior agreement by the Faculty that have to work together. In other cases, individual academics may force the whole department or institution into the arrangement.

The metaphor is also relevant when it comes to divorces. It is easier to have a wedding and start a marriage (as well as a higher education partnership) than to end them. Many partnerships, like weddings, continue without being active, just because there is a signed agreement and it is embarrassing and cumbersome to break them. Like marriages, partnerships can be on unequal footing, with one dominant player which defines the agenda, brings in the main funding and has the most benefits out of it. This is in particular the case when it comes to the North-South partnerships.

What trends can we observe in international higher education partnerships?

- From bilateral to multilateral, working more in networks than between two institutions;
- From partnerships more focussed on numbers of exchanges to qualitative relationships, where the content and outcomes are more relevant;
- From ad hoc and marginal partnerships to more strategic and central relationships; from transactional to transformational (Sutton 2010);
- From single purpose to multipurpose partnerships in which several activities, including education, research and benchmarking, are taking place;
- From a cooperative type to a more competitive type of a relationship, in which partners work together and compete with others that are not part of the relationship;
- From higher education partnerships to partnerships including other stakeholders, such as local governments, the private sector and NGOs;
- Building educational partnerships on joint programmes, joint degrees and double degrees.

Some challenges can also be identified:

- Most partnerships lack creativity and innovation and do not look out of the box of the traditional forms of international cooperation, in particular exchange of students and staff;

- A lack of balance between the global commons focus of partnerships, development of global engagement and citizenship and the more market oriented partnerships focussed on recruitment of talents and cross-border delivery of education;
- The danger of inequality in the partnership relationship.

Moving away from lack of innovation and creativity

In order to move away from the lack of innovation and creativity in developing partnership relations, below suggestions may be useful:

- Include other stakeholders in the partner relationship;
- Strive for more complementarity instead of focussing on similarity as driving rationale;
- Look for partners that are in the same playing level field with a focus on mutual benfits;
- Make more use of information technology (IT) in partnership activities;
- If there are tensions in the relationship, bring them to the open, discuss them and look for solutions instead of ignoring the tensions and continuing an inactive relationship;
- If the partnership is focussed on student exchange, do not only look at study abroad. Try to combine study, work placement, service learning and language and culture training. Find ways to help each other in work placements in the local industries and service learning activities in the local communities where partners are located;
- In the case of the universities in the South, look for regional partnerships, in particular between partners from other emerging and developing economies;
- Make the academic staff the 'owners' of the partnership relationship; move it out of the hands of the international offices and institutional leadership, although leadership commitment is important for funding and sustainability reasons.

De Wit and Maringe (2015) provide important remarks about higher education partnerships:

- Partnerships leverage the potential for the growth of a new global knowledge episteme in higher education;

- They enable physical access to dispersed knowledge systems in the interrogation of increasingly connected challenges in higher education;

- They do not equitably create the international capital sought by all participating institutions. The distribution of the benefits of working together traces asymmetrical contours that favour the universities of the North more than those of the South;

- The contribution that partnerships make to the roles and aspirations of universities, while significant in many ways, are nevertheless compromised by inherent structural, ideological and cultural inequities which they tend to reproduce and perpetuate.

They conclude that 'partnerships are being promoted on goals which are uncritically assumed to be a good thing yet the evidence suggests they can entrench and perpetuate asymmetries of inequality in higher education' (Ibid 2015). This is important to keep in mind when discussing the future of partnerships, in particular between the North and South.

In this context it is also relevant to refer to Manuel Heitor, who, building on the concept of the Triple Helis of university-industry-government relationship, states:

> A new paradigm of international academic, scientific and technological relationships is emerging as shaped by a new era of international affairs. They consider activities that are fundamentally different from the traditional role of universities, involving, most of the times, capacity building and institution building, together with forms of social and economic appropriation of knowledge.

He continues:

> Those relationships may act as a new narrative in university-government-industry relationships, requiring national policies oriented beyond the traditional boundaries of "national systems of innovation". The new model of academic cooperation that includes but does not seem to be a hostage of traditional forms of services and international commerce, may derive its uniqueness from the very nature of the academic communities (Heitor 2015: 16).

This new model, in particular, is relevant in the context of emerging and developing countries as it helps them in their capacity and institution building. In other words, partnerships have to move, with reference to ACE (2015: 36), from transactional, 'simple give and take', to transformational, defined by Sutton (2010) as partnerships that

'develop common goals and projects over time, in which resources are combined and the partnerships are expansive, ever-growing and relationship-oriented'. One could add 'and are on equal terms'.

References

ACE. (2015). *International Higher Education Partnerships: A Global Review of Standards and Practices.* CIGE Insights. Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE). American Council on Education: Washington D.C.

Bullough JR., R.V. & Kauchak, D. (1997) 'Partnerships Between Higher Education and Secondary Schools: Some Problems'. *Journal of Education for Teaching.* (23) pp. 215-234.

European Commission. (2013) 'European Higher Education in the World' *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.* Brussels: COM (2013) 499 final. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0499:FIN:en:PDF [accessed on 10 June 2014].

Heitor, M. (2015) 'How University Global Partnerships May Facilitate a New Era of International Affairs and Foster Political and Economic Relations' *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.01.005.

Maringe, F. & de Wit, H. (2015) 'Global Higher Education Partnerships: Equity and Epistemic Concerns with Distribution and Flows of Intellectual Capital'. Forthcoming.

Stockley, D. & de Wit, H. (2011) 'Global Trends in Higher Education and the Significance of International Networks' In: de Wit, H (ed.) *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalisation of Higher Education.* Amsterdam: CAREM. pp. 45-58.

Sutton, S.B. (2010). 'Transforming Internationalization Through Partnerships'. *International Educator.* (19) 1. pp. 60-63.

Van Ginkel, H. (1996). 'Networking and Strategic Alliances, Dynamic Patterns of Organization and Co-Operation'. *CRE-Action 109.* Geneva: CRE. pp. 91-105.

Acknowledgements

About the authors

Dr Nico Jooste is the Senior Director of the Office for International Education at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU). He has been in this position since July 2000. He was responsible for the development of the Office as a self-funding entity. The comprehensive internationalisation of the university has been implemented during this period as a strategic imperative of NMMU. Dr Jooste is involved in the re-thinking of higher education internationalisation globally and has helped arrange the Global Dialogue on the Future of Higher Education Internationalisation which was held in January 2014 in Port Elizabeth, South Africa. He is currently the President of the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA). Prior to his appointment at NMMU, from June 1998 to June 2000, he was the Executive Director of the Eastern Cape Higher Education Association. He was the Deputy Registrar Academic from January 1993 and acting Registrar of the University of Fort Hare from January 1995 to December 1996. Dr Jooste was also a senior lecturer in the Department of History and Economic History at the University of Fort Hare from February 1982 to February 1992. His areas of specialisation are the history of the Eastern Cape and South Africa's international relations during the Cold War.

John K. Hudzik is a Professor at Michigan State University (MSU) and the NAFSA Senior Scholar for Internationalisation. He is past President of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) and also past President and Chair of the Board of Directors of NAFSA-Association of International Educators. From 1995 to 2010 he was Dean of International Studies and Programmes at Michigan State University and then Vice President for Global Engagement and Strategic Projects. He is President of the Scientific Committee of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at UCSC, Milan Italy. He was Acting University Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs at MSU in 2005. He has served on numerous international policy and advisory boards, is a frequently invited speaker at global conferences on higher education internationalisation and publishes frequently on the topic. His most recent book was published in late 2014 by Rutledge Publishers with the title 'Comprehensive Internationalization of Higher Education: Institutional Pathways to Success'. Prof Hudzik is the recipient of several awards for his scholarly work in judicial systems and in international education, including the AIEA Charles Klasek Award for outstanding service to international education. He was a Fulbright Senior Scholar in Australia in 1987.

Cornelius Hagenmeier is an international education administrator and legal academic who is rooted in the German and South African jurisdictions. Hagenmeier's academic focus includes the internationalisation of higher education. He obtained his qualification to be appointed as a judge in Germany before he decided to settle in South Africa in 2002. He holds a South African LL.B. degree (UNISA) and a South African LL.M degree (UCT). He is a non-practicing attorney of the High Court of South Africa. He accepted an appointment at the University of Venda in 2007 in the Department of Public Law and now serves at the same institution as Director of International Relations.

Jos Beelen is researcher and consultant on internationalisation of the curriculum at the Centre for Applied Research into Economics and Management at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences. He is also Senior Policy Advisor for internationalisation at the School of Economics and Management at the same university. In addition, he is a chair of the Expert Community: Internationalisation at Home of the European Association for International Education (EAIE) and visiting fellow at Leeds Metropolitan University's Centre for Academic Practice and Research in Internationalisation (CAPRI). Jos was the editor of EAIE's 'Toolkit' Implementing Internationalisation at Home (2007) and an author of a number of articles on the same topic. Jos has contributed to workshops, training sessions and conferences and has acted as a consultant for universities in Europe, Asia and Australia. He is coaching academic staff at universities in The Netherlands in the design and implementation of internationalised curricula. One of the issues he focuses on is developing the skills of academic staff that enable them to assume ownership of curriculum internationalisation. Jos is currently doing research about the implementation of the international dimension of higher education curricula in a global perspective, in cooperation with researchers from Europe and Australia.

Kate Mey is Manager: International Partnerships in the Office for International Education at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. She has been in the HE internationalisation field for the past three years. Prior to this, she taught English as a Foreign Language in many countries and worked in media and advertising as a producer and scriptwriter.

Shahzad Ahmad is the director of the Multicultural Student Services at St. Cloud State University (SCSU) in Minnesota, United States. He has been in this position since 1995, managing all aspects of Multicultural Student Services, developing global educational opportunities for students, faculty and staff and assisting with international recruitment

efforts and development of strategies for expansion of international partnerships. Prior to this, he was an assistant director of Minority Student Programmes at St. Cloud State University. Over the years, Shahzad has hosted many international scholars and university staff at SCSU and initiated and coordinated study abroad and short programme trips for SCSU students in South Africa, Thailand, Laos, Malaysia and Vietnam. He has attended numerous international higher education and diversity conferences around the world and has presented on student mobility, diversity leadership and strategic partnerships at numerous conferences.

Dr Lee Sternberger is an Associate Provost and Executive Director of the Office of International Programmes at James Madison University (JMU). She currently leads a campus-wide effort to internationalise university curricula, research, services and programmes, and coordinates global and international activities across JMU's eight colleges. She also directs JMU's activities within its international consortium—the International Network of Universities—and serves as President of the consortium. She has published and presented on a number of interrelated topics, including the relationship of various psychological perspectives to the discipline of art history, the development of a global curriculum for the training of clinical psychologists, the assessment of international learning, and international consortium management. An experienced and devoted advocate of international education, Dr Sternberger has taught, conducted research, led students, and served as an administrator and counselor in a diverse range of countries and cultures including Hungary, Korea, England, Turkey, Germany, and Portugal. Dr Sternberger earned her BA in Economics from the University of Missouri, MS and PhD in Clinical Psychology from Washington State University, and an MA in Architectural History from the University of Virginia.

Felix Wang is the Director of Study Abroad at the James Madison University. He is responsible for planning, coordinating and promoting study abroad programmes and opportunities for JMU faculty, staff and students. A native of Taiwan, he spent most of his life in the Dominican Republic. He earned his BBA and MBA from Campbell University in North Carolina and MEd in College Student Personnel Administration from James Madison University. In addition, he serves as a liaison to JMU colleges and departments on international opportunities, initiatives and partnerships. Felix presents numerous workshops on diversity and internationalisation on campus and abroad. Currently, he is pursuing a PhD at the Center for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI), Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy.

Professor Hans de Wit is the Director of the Center for International Higher Education at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College, United States. He has been the director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. He is also a Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at the School of Economics and Management of the Hogeschool van Amsterdam, University of Applied Sciences and a research associate at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World. Hans is a founding member and past president of the European Association for International Education. He has been a director of the Office of Foreign Relations, Vice-President for International Affairs and Senior Advisor International at the University of Amsterdam during the period from 1986-2005, and director of International Relations at Tilburg University from 1981-1985. He was an assistant professor in Latin American Studies at Utrecht University from 1979-1981. He is the founding editor of the Journal of Studies in International Education. He has (co)written several books and articles on international education and is actively involved in assessment and consultancy in international education for organisations such as the European Commission, IAU, UNESCO, World Bank, IMHE/OECD. He also publishes a monthly blog in University World News on internationalisation of higher education.

Dr Savo Heleta [one of the editors of this book] works as the Manager of Internationalisation at Home and Research at Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's Office for International Education (OIE) and is a researcher in the OIE's Research Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World. Savo's research focuses on higher education internationalisation, higher education in post-war settings, conflict analysis and post-war reconstruction and development in general.

About the Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World

The purpose of research is to gather data, establish facts, develop new knowledge, improve current practices and inform action and policy making. Whatever we do, without quality research it is difficult to understand where we stand and where we should go. When it comes to higher education internationalisation, South Africa, Africa and the developing world have over the years lacked effective research bodies in this field.

To try to affect change in this area, in May 2014 NMMU's Office for International Education (OIE) established the Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World. The Unit will research current higher education (HE) internationalisation activities, practices and approaches around the world, specifically in the developing and emerging world. Given South Africa's position and role in Africa and the BRICS, specific focus will be paid to the African continent and BRICS countries.

The Unit's research objectives are to conduct research on practices, approaches and theories of HE internationalisation - including internationalisation at home, internationalisation of the curriculum, international partnerships, student and staff mobility and other related activities and practices - and develop new and more equitable practices and approaches appropriate for the developing and emerging world. In addition, the Unit will engage with universities, research institutions, academics, researchers and experts from South Africa, Africa, BRICS and other countries on research projects and research collaboration aimed at the transformation of higher education internationalisation globally.

Contact details

Dr Nico Jooste
Nico.Jooste@nmmu.ac.za
+27 41 504 2161

Dr Savo Heleta
Savo.Heleta@nmmu.ac.za
+27 41 504 4780

Unit for Higher Education
Internationalisation
in the Developing World

Higher Education Partnerships for the Future is the first book conceptualised and published by Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University's (NMMU) Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World.

This book brings together leading as well as upcoming global thinkers and practitioners in the field of higher education internationalisation who explore the trends, challenges, potential and prospects of higher education partnerships. The authors were asked to critically look at institutional partnerships and networks in international higher education and explore future opportunities and challenges.

The main focus is on the future – what should happen and what could happen in the world of international higher education and specifically in relation to institutional partnerships and networks.