

Transforming American University into The “Premier Global University”

Phase I

Report of a Project Team

April 28, 2003

Robert A. Pastor, Vice President of International Affairs, Chair
Robert L. Ayres, Assistant Vice President of International Affairs
Sharon Alston, Director, Admissions Office
Nana An, Executive Director, University Budget and Payroll
Fanta Aw, Director, International Student Services
Ivy Broder, Dean of Academic Affairs
David Brown, Dean, Washington Semester and World Capitals Program
Joseph Eldridge, University Chaplain
Violeta Eittle, Assistant Provost for Administration
Louis Goodman, Dean, School of International Service
Claudio Grossman, Dean, Washington College of Law
William LeoGrande, Dean, School of Public Affairs
Merry Mendelson, Assistant Dean, School of Communication
Kay Mussell, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Myron Roomkin, Dean, Kogod School of Business
Patricia Wand, University Librarian



AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

W A S H I N G T O N , D C

DR. ROBERT A. PASTOR
VICE PRESIDENT OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

April 28, 2003

Dr. Benjamin Ladner
President
American University
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Ladner:

I am pleased to transmit, "Transforming American University into the 'Premier Global University,' Phase 1," the final report of the Project Team. You established the team on March 17 and appointed its members a week later to consider and report on three key issues related to the internationalization of the university: expansion of study abroad by AU students, expansion and revision of the university's World Capitals Program, and an increase in the presence of international students at the university.

The team met formally on four occasions between March 26 and April 22, 2003, to consider these issues. In addition, various sub-groups of the team contributed essential background materials drawing upon university databases, documentary resources, and consultations among members of the sub-groups and with other staff members, administrators, faculty, and students.

The conclusion of the report is that American University, which already has achieved a good degree of internationalization, is poised to rise to the top of the best universities in the world in terms of the internationalized education provided to its students. As a first step toward achieving that goal of becoming the "premier global university," we have identified operational objectives in three areas. Specifically, we recommend a dramatic expansion of our study abroad program, a significant increase in the number of World Capitals sites, a major revision in the character of these sites, and a new and ambitious initiative to attract international students for a semester or a year from numerous universities abroad, including the most prestigious. We recommend these specific goals and offer suggestions on ways to achieve them with the full awareness that implementation will not be easy and will require changes in the culture and operations of AU. But we do so because we believe that such steps would provide a quantum leap forward in the education of our students – so much so that it will demonstrate that we are truly the global university and, by doing so, enhance significantly the reputation of American University.

Our goal is not to train all of our students to be experts in international relations or to work abroad. We do not want to replicate the fine work done by the School of International Service and our other Schools. To the contrary, one of our main goals is to focus our attention on adding an international dimension to the education of those students who are interested in business, public affairs, communications, and arts and sciences.

4400 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20016-8026
202-885-2728 FAX: 202-885-1366 E-MAIL: rpastor@american.edu

As Chair of the Project Team, let me acknowledge, first of all, the invaluable assistance provided by Dr. Robert Ayres, Assistant Vice President of International Affairs, in preparing for the meetings, compiling the data, writing superb drafts of this report, and in helping myself and the members of the Project Team think through the implications of our recommendations. Secondly, our Project Team and the entire university owe a debt of gratitude to Dean David Brown, who has provided outstanding and creative leadership in shaping the World Capitals Program. This report aims to build on that legacy.


The members of the Premier Global University Project Team are:

Sharon Alston, Director, Admissions Office
Nana An, Executive Director, University Budget and Payroll
Fanta Aw, Director, International Student Services
Ivy Broder, Dean of Academic Affairs
David Brown, Dean, Washington Semester and World Capitals Program
Joseph Eldridge, University Chaplain
Violeta Ertle, Assistant Provost for Administration
Louis Goodman, Dean, School of International Service
Claudio Grossman, Dean, Washington College of Law
William LeoGrande, Dean, School of Public Affairs
Merry Mendelson, Assistant Dean for Student Services, School of Communication
Kay Mussell, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Myron Roomkin, Dean, Kogod School of Business
Patricia Wand, University Librarian

In addition, I gratefully acknowledge the participation in the team meetings of Richard Bennett, Associate Dean, School of Public Affairs, and Leanne Dunsmore, Assistant Dean, School of International Service. I also wish to express my appreciation for the contributions made to the team's work by Karen Froslid Jones, Director of the Office of Institutional Research; Mark Huey, Assistant to the President; Amy Morrill Bijeau, Associate Director of the World Capitals Program; and to the following staff of the Office of International Affairs, who helped in the research, preparation, and formatting of the final report: Mr. Christopher Honorio, Executive Assistant, Ms. Paulina Puig, Web Developer, and Ms. Helen McClure, Research Associate. Many other university staff members also assisted the team on specific aspects of its background work. Their assistance is also greatly appreciated.

Finally, I would like to thank you for your sustained encouragement and support throughout the work of the team. Your commitment to the expanded internationalization of the university was the compass that guided the team's work.

Sincerely,



Robert A. Pastor

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Internationalization: a Fashion or a Coherent Goal?.....	1
2. The Current State of Internationalization at AU and the Task Ahead.....	4
A. Study Abroad.....	4
B. International Students at AU.....	5
C. Faculty with International Expertise.....	6
D. Curriculum.....	6
E. Language Requirements or Proficiency.....	6
F. Partnerships with Other Universities.....	6
3. Criteria for Measuring Internationalization and Success in Its Attainment.....	7
4. Expanding Study Abroad: Key Issues.....	10
A. Number of Students Participating in Study Abroad Programs.....	10
B. Length of Time for Study Abroad.....	11
C. Foreign Language Issues.....	11
D. Other Curricular Issues.....	11
E. Business and Communication Schools.....	12
F. University College and Study Abroad.....	12
G. Cost Implications for Students.....	12
H. Cost Implications for the University.....	12
I. New and Expanded Partnerships.....	13
J. Geographical Diversification.....	13
K. Scholar-Athletes.....	13
L. Fear of Disruption.....	13
M. Engaging the Faculty.....	13
5. World Capitals Program: Key Issues.....	13
A. Expanding the Number of Sites.....	13
B. Moving toward a More Integrated Model.....	13
C. Transforming World Capitals Program Sites into “Multi-Purpose Centers”.....	14
D. Attracting More Non-AU Students to World Capitals Program Sites.....	14
6. Increased Presence of International Students at AU: Key Issues.....	15
A. Attracting More and Better Foreign Students.....	15
B. Financial Issues.....	15
C. The “Mismatch” Issue.....	15
D. Other Issues.....	16
Conclusion: The Way Forward.....	16

Tables and Annexes

Table 1: Inventory of Study Abroad Programs.....	18
Table 2: Leading Institutions by Estimated Participation in Study Abroad: Top 20 Doctoral Institutions, 2000/01.....	20
Table 3: Fall 2002 International Students (including permanent residents)	21
Table 4 a: Majors of International Undergraduate Students at American University	22
Table 4 b: Undergraduate International Students at American University by Country.....	22
Table 5: Inventory of Academic Programs Involving International Students	23
Annex 1: Memorandum to the President’s Council	25
Annex 2: “Premier Global University,” Phase 1: Expanding Study Abroad, Revising the World Caps, and Expanding the International Presence at AU: Timetable.....	26
Annex 3: Internationalization of AU: Institutional Goals	27
Annex 4: Internationalization of AU: Cultivation of Student Competencies	28
Annex 5: Summary Narrative of Study Abroad Programs.....	29
Annex 6: Washington College of Law: Summary of International Programs.....	32
Annex 7: Summary Narrative of Programs Involving International Students.....	38
Annex 8: Premier Global University Project Team: The Role of Foreign Language Competency....	39

Introduction

“We will add to our reputation as a Washington-based, global university. Our commitment to become the premier global university in the United States remains firm.” Those were the words of American University’s President, Dr. Benjamin Ladner, in his October 2001 address on the university’s fifteen-point Strategic Plan. In September 2002, Dr. Ladner established a new Office of International Affairs and appointed a new Vice President, Dr. Robert Pastor, to lead the office and the university’s efforts to implement that goal. On March 17, 2003, he asked Dr. Pastor to lead a “Premier Global University” Project Team and to report to him on ways to dramatically expand the study abroad experience, to revise and expand the World Capitals Program, and to increase significantly the presence of international students at American University. Because study abroad and the presence of foreign students on campus are so central to the international experience of AU students, the Project Team focused first on those issues, and it chose to do so at the undergraduate level. All members of the team recognize, however, that this should be only the first phase of a longer-term and highly diversified effort at internationalizing the university.

This report is the product of intensive deliberations and work by the Project Team, convened by Dr. Pastor and assisted by Dr. Robert Ayres, the Assistant Vice President of International Affairs. Annex 1 contains the President’s memorandum establishing the team and presenting its mandate. Annex 2 presents the timetable for the team’s work.

The report is organized as follows: Section 1 discusses the challenge of integrating the diverse internationalization objectives into an overall strategic framework and does that with reference to both institutional goals for AU and the acquisition of student competencies. Section 2 surveys the current status of internationalization efforts at the university and concludes that much has been accomplished but considerably more remains to be done. Section 3 discusses the criteria for measuring internationalization and notes a few institutions that have recently been judged to be leaders in the field. The next three sections then proceed to discuss in some detail the three main topics that the Project Team was mandated to examine by President Ladner—an expansion of the university’s study abroad programs (Section 4), the expansion and diversification of the World Capitals Program (Section 5), and ways to increase the foreign student presence at AU (Section 6). Various issues and options are discussed with regard to each of these areas.

The main conclusion of the Project Team is that advancing boldly with the internationalization of the university is not only highly desirable but absolutely essential for helping our students meet the challenges of today’s interdependent world. Such an advance will require numerous changes in the culture of the university and in how it conducts its affairs, and these will not be easy to do and may take some time. Nevertheless, American University cannot become the premier global university without them.

1. Internationalization: a Fashion or a Coherent Goal?

Madeleine F. Green, Vice President of the American Council on Education (ACE), has argued that study abroad on many (or most) U.S. campuses is little more than “a fragmented hodgepodge of programs and activities that are rarely sufficiently integrated to create maximum institutional impact or to advantage learning.”¹ Green finds that internationalization means different things to different campuses, but for most it is defined by study abroad or the presence of large numbers of international students. The problem is that these affect too few students, and these indicators are usually isolated from each other and from key elements of the curriculum. They are

¹ Madeleine F. Green, “Internationalizing the Campus: A User’s Guide” (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 2003).

rarely integrated into the university's mission at home or the international setting abroad. Another observer of efforts at internationalization has remarked that "the opportunities generally missed through lack of integration of mission and programs within a single institution are obviously costly in terms of the overall quality and resources."²

This is precisely the challenge of American University, which has already internationalized to a substantial degree but has not sufficiently integrated the various components of its internationalization efforts. The Project Team decided to begin its work with a focus on study abroad and the presence of foreign students at AU because these are the two most obvious and important ways that students gain international experience. At a latter stage, the team will explore other dimensions of internationalization and propose ideas for dealing with those. The focus of this report, however, is on study abroad, World Caps, and international students on campus.

We began first by identifying the operational goals that we believe should be the compass by which we steer AU toward greater internationalization and the competencies that we should try to instill in our students. There was a consensus on the institutional goals (identified in Annex 3), which may be summarized as follows:

- a dramatic expansion of study abroad programs, providing a rich menu of choices;
- additional AU study abroad sites, with most sites providing more diversified functions that will increase the university's presence in the host countries;
- an educational experience that is well integrated with the local setting as well as with students' majors and studies;
- innovations in the curriculum that will reflect the increased importance of international issues and their interdependence with domestic concerns;
- expanded partnerships with some of the leading universities in the world;
- an increased presence of highly qualified international students at AU and their integration with the AU curriculum and AU students; and
- international initiatives that will contribute to the financial health of the university.

The realization of these institutional goals will have a direct impact on the acquisition of competencies by our students. The student competencies we should seek to cultivate (identified in Annex 4) as a premier global university also reflect a consensus of the Project Team and include:

- an ability to function effectively in other countries, cultures, and foreign environments, and to appreciate the differences among them as well as the common values that unite humanity;
- increased knowledge and expertise on particular countries and regions of the world;
- competency in one or more foreign languages;
- development of functional skills of high relevance in other countries; and

² Maurice Harari, Internationalization of Higher Education: Effecting Institutional Change in the Curriculum and Campus (Long Beach, CA: Center for International Education, California State University, 1989), p. 4.

- growth in their intellectual curiosity and their sense of personal autonomy.

The report develops ideas for achieving these goals and competencies and discusses options by which they might be realized. We share a belief that becoming the premier global university will mean attaining these goals, and that a well-rounded AU graduate should possess these competencies. At the same time, we recognize that not all students enrolling at AU are coming for the same education. Our goal, therefore, should not be to train all our students to live or work abroad or to become experts in international relations. AU has a superb School of International Service to do that, and we do not want to change our other excellent schools to duplicate its work. The probability is that fewer than 10% of U.S. students at AU will ultimately live or work abroad, and so it would not make any sense to train all of them for that purpose. It does, however, make sense for all our students to get to know the world better—e.g., for would-be biologists to look abroad for ideas, for business students to learn more about the business environments in other countries, for students who want to work in state governments or with local non-governmental organizations to appreciate and learn from other governments or NGOs, and for all our students to realize that, for better or worse, they are part of a much wider world.

While it is desirable that all AU students have an international experience, that need not be the same for everyone. Therefore, an important challenge for our internationalization plans is determining not only how to expand our international programs, but also how to adapt our many domestically focused programs. Meeting this challenge would ensure that all our students and faculty would come to view an international experience as enhancing their education in their chosen fields and enlarging their capacity to work and enjoy their lives to the fullest. To achieve this goal, we will need to work more closely with those faculty and academic units of the university that focus more on domestic issues and to shape an experience abroad so that it achieves a dual purpose—education in their fields and education in the world.

In addition to meeting formally four times, and Dr. Pastor's briefing of the President's Cabinet and the Provost's Council on several occasions, the Project Team undertook the following in order to better understand past impediments and future opportunities:

- surveyed the entire array of AU's existing study abroad programs, most notably the World Capitals Program but not limited to it, and information on the presence of international students at the university;
- briefly reviewed the study abroad programs of other U.S. academic institutions generally considered to be in the vanguard of such programs;
- considered in detail numerous implications for the university of a significant expansion of study abroad—including implications for the curriculum, the potential effects on the faculty, the possible obstacles that might be confronted by specific categories of students, and the many financial issues that would need to be confronted in dramatically expanding AU's internationalization;
- began to survey student opinions concerning study abroad through a questionnaire distributed to alumni of the World Capitals Program, a review of evaluations by returning students, and informal discussions with AU students who studied abroad as well as those who did not; and
- considered the implications of moving to increase substantially the numbers of international students studying at AU.

2. The Current State of Internationalization at AU and the Task Ahead

An assessment of the current status of internationalization at AU reveals that the university is certainly not starting from scratch as it seeks to attain the status of a premier global university. While AU has done much to internationalize, there is still considerable scope for improvement. We have concentrated on our study abroad programs and the presence of international students at AU, but we fully recognize that there are many other aspects of the university's internationalization experience to date.

A. Study Abroad. Since the institutional data regarding study abroad are not centralized, it is difficult to be precise about the total number of AU students studying abroad in a given academic year. However, the Project Team compiled an inventory of study abroad programs from extant data of individual academic units. (See Table 1 for the inventory and Annex 5 for a summary narrative of the study abroad programs. See Annex 6 for a separate and extensive description of all international programs, including study abroad programs, of the Washington College of Law.)

The World Capitals Program is the major university study abroad program. In the current 2002-03 academic year, 427 students—or 7.5% of the total undergraduate student body — are participating in the program (and an additional 56 non-AU students). While the largest and best known such program, World Caps is not the only AU study abroad program. Other study abroad experiences take place under the auspices of “Alternative Spring Breaks,” the Washington Semester Program (fall and spring semester field trips abroad), the semester-long attendance by a group of SIS students—both graduate and undergraduate--at the University of Trento Graduate Research Center in Trento, Italy, numerous summer abroad programs of varying thematic orientation and duration, and a broad array of programs, including summer abroad, under the auspices of WCL. In addition, 212 undergraduate students have directly enrolled in foreign universities or with other university programs since the summer of 2001 by obtaining permits to study abroad. Of these, 24 studied in Australia, 18 in Italy, 15 in England, and 13 in France as the leading destinations.

Data assembled by the Institute for International Education (IIE) for the 2000-01 academic year (in its annual Open Doors report) indicated that 17.5% of the 2001 AU graduating classes (World Caps students divided by total undergraduate and graduate students) had studied abroad (although the length of time spent abroad by such students was not indicated). That percentage placed AU in the twelfth position among the top 20 “doctoral institutions” in the United States in that year. (See Table 2.)

Perhaps the best indicator of the extent of AU study abroad, however, came in the data collected by the Office of Institutional Research from the graduating class of spring 2002. Of a class of 900 graduates, 265—or 29.4%—reported that they had studied abroad as undergraduates. Divided by academic units, the School of International Service sent 59.7% of its students abroad; the School of Communication, 29%; the School of Public Affairs, 26.8%; the College of Arts and Sciences, 19.7%; and the Kogod School of Business, 18.6%.

While our study abroad programs are extensive and have deservedly received recognition, we can point to a number of areas where we might do better. One is simply to increase substantially the number of our students who study abroad. In 2002, as previously noted, nearly 30% of AU's graduating class had studied abroad, but that means that about 70% of AU students did not study abroad for any length of time. More significantly, a survey that year indicated that 56.8% of the entering class said that AU's study abroad programs were “a very important reason” why they chose AU. While this was not the same class that graduated that year, there is reason to believe the figure was not that much different several years before. The point is that only about one-half of those who came to AU because of its study abroad programs actually chose to study abroad. Why? What were

the reasons for their not doing so? Could we double (or more) the number of students going abroad by finding ways to help this group realize their initial dream of coming to AU?

Another area we might wish to address concerns the length of time our students spend abroad. Fewer than 10% of our students who study abroad currently do so for longer than one semester, and many study abroad for a considerably shorter period of time than that (e.g., a summer, winter, or spring break). We could explore ways of encouraging more students to study abroad for a full year.

Expansion of the number of sites is another possibility that merits considerable attention. While the World Caps Program presently offers 15 sites, AU students choose even more sites with other non-AU programs. There is vast scope for diversifying the locales for our study abroad, particularly if the numbers of students going abroad increase significantly as projected.

With some exceptions, study abroad is not well integrated into the overall four-year academic experience of our students (especially their majors). Generally speaking, there is neither a systematic way of preparing them (through coursework, for example) for study abroad nor of providing them with “re-entry” programs upon their return. So this is another area where we need to explore reorientations that would contribute to our internationalization goals.

Most importantly, the majority of AU study abroad programs—including the World Capitals Program sites—are “enclave” programs that arguably do not sufficiently immerse the students in foreign cultures and societies. Either all or most of their classes, for example, are taken with fellow AU students and in English. Internships and home-stays are features of the World Caps Program that do, however, contribute to students’ integration with their host country environments. However, in 2002-03, only about 57% of World Caps students had internships and only about 35% lived in home-stays. These figures indicate the considerable scope for expanding and diversifying students’ interactions with nationals from their host countries and with the countries’ cultures and societies—in class and with other experiences.

B. International Students at AU. International students accounted for 12.7% of undergraduate students in the fall 2002 semester, 21.1% of Master’s students, and 28.8% of doctoral students. In the aggregate, 15.9% of all AU students enrolled in the fall of 2002 were not from the United States (1,863 international students in a total student population of 11,748). (See Table 3 for the data on the total number of international students and Tables 4(a) and (b) for the breakdown by academic units of the university and data on the number of students from individual selected countries.) These proportions reflect a slight decline in international undergraduates from previous years, largely because of the events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent difficulty for many Middle Eastern students to come or return.

An inventory (Table 5) and summary narrative (Annex 7) of the AU programs that bring international students to the university were compiled as part of the background work conducted by the Project Team. A number of dual-degree programs are administered by the School of International Service (SIS). There are student exchange programs, usually at the graduate level and involving relatively small numbers of students, with universities in China, Colombia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and Korea. Short-term summer programs of various kinds bring foreign students to the campus. So do a number of WCL programs.

Another indicator of the internationalization of our student body is the number of countries and languages that are represented on campus, but here the figures are not precise, ranging from 140-160, and we need to develop a better system for collecting them. This is illustrated by the fact that the

university's website has four different numbers for the countries that are represented at AU.³ WCL documents 70 different languages spoken by its students. There are also several hundred (the precise number is not available) “third-culture” students at the university—i.e., American nationals who have previously lived abroad for varying, often substantial, periods of time.

While the number of international students who have chosen to enroll at AU is impressive, a doubling—or more—of that number could readily be envisioned and eminently justified, given that the university is located in the capital of an increasingly interdependent world. Geographical and demographic (e.g., income-level) diversification of the foreign student population could be another important objective for which to strive if increased internationalization is to be a compelling goal for the university. It is, for example, quite astonishing that only nine of our 719 full-time international undergraduate students come from Mexico and only 13 from Canada. Finally, many of the international students who come to AU for a semester or a year usually study in Washington Semester programs, which are separate from the main AU campus and from most AU students. Innovative ways of incorporating these international students into the regular academic curriculum and other aspects of campus life could be sought.

C. Faculty with International Expertise. AU faculty in many units across campus have scholarly and creative areas of expertise related to other countries and cultures. Although certain schools or departments are obviously engaged in international issues (for example, SIS and Kogod's international business program), every department on campus has at least some faculty with such interests. Still, additional efforts will be required to increase the incentives for our faculty to become even more active participants in our internationalization efforts.

D. Curriculum. A very substantial number of courses in the university's curriculum are devoted in one way or another to cross-cultural or international issues, not only in the obvious area of international relations programs but throughout the curriculum. Additional curricular innovations could, however, be envisioned that would both prepare our students better for study abroad and make AU a more attractive locale for study by international students.

E. Language Requirements or Proficiency. AU has no formal foreign language requirement for all its undergraduate students, although a few majors representing a very small proportion of students require proficiency in a foreign language. The proportion of our students enrolled in foreign language courses exceeds the national undergraduate average (22% enrolled in AU foreign language courses vs. a national average of only 8%). Nevertheless, the fact that we currently have no foreign language requirement of all our students, that we do not offer very much depth in the study of many languages (with some exceptions, notably Spanish and French), and that we do not currently provide for language “immersion” suggests that we need to do more and do it better if we decide to move toward greater internationalization.

F. Partnerships with Other Universities. AU has about 165 “memoranda of agreement” (not including supplements to such agreements) with foreign academic institutions providing for a diverse array of joint activities and programs. This is certainly an impressive aggregate number. However, as with the other areas of internationalization that have been identified, there is much more we could do. Many of our current partnerships involve a minimal level of interaction (e.g., exchanges of very few students). Some appear to have lapsed although they still remain in our database. Finally, we need to examine the nature of the institutions with which we partner, so that we link with more of

³ The President's Welcome mentions 160 countries. “AU Facts”—Media—asserts 150. “About AU” states that students come from “more than 140 countries.” Finally, the Office of Institutional Research's [Academic Data Reference Book 2002-2003](#) cites 149 countries.

the most prestigious institutions in foreign countries as well as identify institutions that—while not necessarily the most prestigious—nevertheless can enhance our own educational capabilities.

To summarize the preceding discussion: AU is already a global university. However, to become a premier global university, it needs to pursue further initiatives in at least each of the six areas identified in this section of the report. Issues and options regarding many such required initiatives are subsequently put forth in the report. Others, however, will need to be confronted during the implementation phase.

3. Criteria for Measuring Internationalization and Success in Its Attainment

Undertaking efforts to transform AU into a premier global university will oblige us to confront an issue that has not received the attention it demands across the country—viz., what constitutes internationalization at a U.S. academic institution, how it can be measured, how it can be assessed where a given university such as AU falls on a continuum of internationalization, and—in short—precisely what needs to be done to elevate a university to the top of the rankings of global universities.

Such matters are seldom measured systematically, however, and this gives rise to a difficulty encountered by the Project Team, viz., virtually every college and university considers itself a “global university,” and leading American foundations have encouraged them to do so, especially in the aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001. AU’s effort, in brief, is not unique, but genuine success—meaning demonstrable and convincing progress on an internationalization scale—requires us to do what others have not: i.e., formulate specific measures on levels of internationalization.

What efforts have been made to identify good (or “best-practice”) instances of internationalization, and what institutions have emerged as good examples based upon these efforts? The American Council on Education has undertaken a program of “International Initiatives” and, with the support of the Carnegie Corporation, has developed a “Promising Practices Program.” As the Council notes, however, “time, funding, and models for change are in short supply, outcomes are difficult to measure, and the vision needed to effect change is difficult to conceptualize and integrate into overall institutional strategy.”⁴ While the criteria employed by the Council do not appear to be elaborated precisely, it chose eight institutions for their “creative approaches” to internationalization. The eight institutions are Appalachian State University, Arcadia University, Binghamton University, Dickinson College, Indiana University, Kapi’olani Community College, Missouri Southern State College, and Tidewater Community College. The programs cited as innovative span a wide array of initiatives and include the creation of international dormitories and an international café. These and others cited are certainly novel ideas, but they do not yield parameters for measuring internationalization.

In a related vein, the Institute for International Education has created the “Andrew Heiskell Awards for Innovation in International Education.” The awards are given in three areas of activity—study abroad, internationalizing the campus, and outstanding faculty programs. The selection criteria are numerous and include: developing an innovative approach, addressing a specific need, taking advantage of a new opportunity, removing barriers or broadening the reach of international education, contributing to internationalization on campus, addressing changing needs in the post-September 11, 2001 period, demonstrating any documented results, developing partnerships, and cooperating with institutions in other countries.

⁴ See www.acenet.edu.

In the first two years of the IIE program, awards were given to colleges and universities like Fox Valley Technical College (on transnational automotive training), Lake Superior College (for a program of studies in Mexico), and the University of Southern Mississippi (for a Vietnamese Studies Program). The examples cited seem innovative, but there appears to be some imprecision in identifying the reasons for why they were chosen. The winners are simply noted for their “success in removing institutional barriers to international study and broadening the base of participation in the international elements of teaching and learning on campus.”⁵ Additionally, Peter Kerrigan of IIE lists “Twenty Ways to Strengthen International Education on the Campus.”⁶ These include some very practical ideas such as encouraging entering students to obtain a passport and setting up an information table at orientation for new students. AU has adopted many of Kerrigan’s proposals already and should consider others, but these 20 ideas also do not yield a template of internationalization.

More recently, NAFSA: Association of International Educators has published Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities (2003). In the words of the NAFSA report, “for the sake of this project, we elected to define ‘internationalizing the campus’ broadly. Scholarship without boundaries encompasses many dimensions—international linkages through connections among institutions; study abroad by U.S. students; teaching and work abroad; study by international students and scholars in the United States; faculty exchanges; curricular initiatives; co-curricular activities; international visitors; foreign language training; corporate/university partnerships; campus/community interaction; and international development projects.” NAFSA’s highly disparate list of initiatives yielded the following “profiles of success”: Community College of Philadelphia, Dickinson College, Duke University, Eastern Mennonite University, Indiana University, Kalamazoo College, Kapi’olani Community College, Middlebury College, Montclair State University, Randolph-Macon Woman’s College, San Diego State University, St. Olaf College, Tufts University, University of Pittsburgh, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Yale University.

The efforts of ACE, IIE, NAFSA and others are to be applauded for their encouragement of innovations in international education. As noted, however, they do not answer adequately a key question: how should success be measured, and especially how should the success of one institution be compared with others? As noted previously, we need to think far more seriously about answers to these questions. The most commonly cited indicator of an institution’s internationalization is the proportion of its students who study abroad (for varying periods of time) and/or the proportion of foreign students studying at the institution (again for varying periods of time, including possibly their entire degree experience). While perhaps a useful indicator for giving a very rough idea of the extent of a given institution’s internationalization, it needs to be supplemented by other indicators, both quantitative and qualitative. Some institutions, for example, might classify as “study abroad” what others would not, because of differences in either the nature or length of the study abroad experience.

At least six criteria by which AU might measure its efforts at internationalization are suggested by the discussion in Section 2: (a) the extent and nature of study abroad; (b) the presence of international students on campus; (c) the quality and international expertise of the faculty and the degree of their involvement with internationalization; (d) a curriculum geared toward international concerns and enhancing the student competencies noted above; (e) the extent and quality of foreign language offerings; and (f) the extent and nature of partnerships with foreign academic institutions.

No effort is made at this preliminary stage to identify with precision the indicators we might wish to employ for the purpose of assessing how we are doing with regard to meeting these criteria as

⁵ See www.iie.org.

⁶ *Ibid.*

we move forward with the internationalization efforts. The following might, however, be considered as illustrative:

The extent and nature of study abroad. Possible indicators: number of students who study abroad as a percentage of total students (but with precision concerning the criteria used for study abroad); geographical distribution of study abroad students (e.g., number of countries in which they study and the regional diversity of such countries); typical lengths of study abroad; the degree to which the study abroad experience is integrated into host international settings.

The presence of international students on campus. Possible indicators: number of international students on campus as a percentage of total students; geographical distribution of international students (e.g., number of countries from which they come and the regional diversity of such countries); integration of international students into the local curriculum and other aspects of local campus life; provision of academic support services to international students; duration of international students' stays on campus.

The quality and international expertise of the faculty and the degree of their involvement with internationalization. Possible indicators: proportion of faculty from foreign countries; proportion of faculty conducting or having conducted research abroad; number of faculty exchanges and programs for visiting faculty from abroad; proportion of faculty with proficiency in at least one foreign language; proportion of faculty having lived abroad for at least two years.

A curriculum geared toward international concerns and enhancing the identified student competencies. Possible indicators: number of courses in the curriculum devoted to cross-cultural or international issues; global classrooms (e.g., through the Internet, international videoconferencing and virtual classrooms, international chat rooms on topics of current global interest, etc.); integration of curriculum with study abroad programs.

The extent and quality of foreign language offerings. Possible indicators: foreign language requirements (if any); number of foreign languages offered to students; depth of foreign language instruction; existence of immersion programs for learning foreign languages; number of students who have achieved a certain level of language competency as a percentage of the total number of students.

The extent and nature of partnerships with foreign academic institutions. Possible indicators: flow of students to/from foreign institutions; extent of dual-degree programs or other direct institutional linkages; joint research undertakings; geographical diversification of institutional linkages.

Whatever indicators are ultimately chosen, thresholds need to be defined and convincing points of reference or comparison need to be developed. We might wish to compare ourselves with, for example, the national average, Ivy League institutions, our fellow institutions in the Patriot League, other institutions in the Washington metropolitan area, or our "tier-one" or other comparators. This would be an interesting and potentially very fruitful exercise. Work on these and other indicators might suggest some institutions that AU might wish to emulate. While AU should certainly learn from other internationalization programs, however, it need not replicate them all. Rather, the purpose of the suggested exercise would be for the university to focus much more clearly on the specific aspects of internationalization it wishes to emphasize and to formulate indicators that would enable systematic monitoring of its own progress over time. If a serious effort were made to do this, AU would become a university that others would wish to emulate, and the template we develop could be used to determine national rankings.

Having identified the key institutional goals and student competencies associated with internationalization, having taken stock of the current state of internationalization at AU and the

challenges that lie ahead, and having reflected on how we compare to some other institutions and the criteria for making such a comparison, the Project Team then moved to its central task of identifying ways to: (a) expand its study abroad programs; (b) expand and diversify the World Capitals Program; and (c) increase the presence of international students at the university in a manner that enhances the international experience of all AU students.

4. Expanding Study Abroad: Key Issues

A. Number of Students Participating in Study Abroad Programs.

There was a consensus among the group that American University should encourage its students to study abroad during their undergraduate education. Most felt AU should “strongly encourage” its students to study abroad. That experience could be for a semester, a year, a summer, or a spring or winter break. It could involve an internship or a language “immersion” class during a summer. AU should have a wide, flexible, and diverse array of programs from which students could select the one most appropriate for their needs. At the same time, the university should provide incentives and minimize the disincentives so that its students could take advantage of the new opportunities. Such incentives could include more options with regard to program sites and the nature of the programs, assurance that the study abroad experience would “count” toward students’ requirements and majors, the provision of financial assistance when necessary and to the extent possible, and career or graduate placement assistance that would emphasize our students’ broad international experiences.

Beyond this very important point of consensus, however, the group debated a number of other alternatives. One idea would be to require every AU student to study abroad. The President could announce that, by the end of a five-year period, all students would be expected to have a study abroad experience during their undergraduate education. This would certainly mark AU’s distinctiveness as a global university. The International Business Program at San Diego State University received a Heiskell Award from IIE in 2002 for sponsoring “a study abroad program that is fully integrated into the international business curriculum and is required of all 734 international business majors.” No other American academic institution has this as a general requirement for all students, hence if American University were to announce this as a goal, it would certainly mark it as special.

Most members of the Project Team felt, however, that such a requirement would be disruptive. It could deter students from applying, and perhaps encourage only those who were interested in international matters with potentially adverse effects on the rest of the university. The required adjustments in the curriculum would be burdensome, and having an entire class depart – in the absence of replacements – have serious financial implications for the university. Even if the goal of requiring every student to study abroad were desirable, it would be unrealistic for AU to send 100% of its students abroad anytime soon.

Still another idea proposed by a member of the team would be for the President to announce that AU would seek to double the percentage of its undergraduates going abroad within three years – i.e., from approximately 30% to 60%. The higher number approximates the percentage of the entering class who said that one of the reasons they chose AU was because of the study abroad program. More importantly, if 60% of our students studied abroad, that would place AU at the top of the leading doctoral institutions, and substantially above the current top-ranked institution (i.e., Dartmouth, with 42.6% studying abroad).

The differences among team members on the crucial question of “requirement” vs. “encouragement” should not, however, obscure a fundamental agreement among all the members of

the team—that a dramatic expansion of study abroad is firmly desired, would be to the distinct advantage of both our institution and its students, and should be pursued vigorously and with all the innovation the university can muster.

B. Length of Time for Study Abroad. Most study abroad by students at U.S. academic institutions is for a semester or shorter (e.g., summer, spring break, etc.). As indicated previously, that is also the case at AU. Study abroad for a full academic year would arguably contribute greatly to their absorption of foreign cultures, integrate them more fully into foreign societies, and contribute to deeper knowledge of them. On the other hand, there are many practical obstacles to the year-long proposal. A full year might not “work” for some categories of students or might conflict with other personal considerations. Nevertheless, while members of the Project Team disagree on the desirability of a year abroad, we all agree that the university should provide a richer array of full-year study abroad options. These could encourage a greater proportion of students to study abroad in a year (currently, less than 10% of all study abroad students remain for longer than a semester).

C. Foreign Language Issues. As noted above, there is no general requirement for foreign language study at the university. The Project Team discussed the memorandum prepared by Dean Kay Mussell (Annex 8), which raised questions as to whether to: (a) introduce a foreign language requirement; (b) move toward more depth and less breadth in foreign language offerings; and (c) connect foreign language studies with study abroad programs, perhaps including immersion courses for the summer before studying abroad.

Although most students are likely to continue to want to study in English-language countries, we could encourage more students to study in Spanish- and French-speaking countries, and enhance their abilities by using immersion courses before they commence studying abroad. In addition, an increasing number of students have shown interest in learning Arabic and Chinese as well as some other languages, and we should make sure that opportunities to learn in the language – not just to learn the language—are available.

Requiring a foreign language would not only affect course requirements but also would involve a major shift of resources. It is worth considering, however, a recent national survey conducted by ACE, involving over 1,000 Americans aged 18 and older. Over 85% responded that knowledge of a foreign language was important, and 85% also believe that such knowledge would help them find a better job. More pertinent, in a separate survey of 500 college-bound seniors, 85% said that “the availability of foreign language classes would be a factor in their selection of a college or university.”⁷

Requiring a foreign language at AU might be too much of a leap at this moment, but we certainly could encourage more students to take foreign languages, and provide more opportunities – particularly immersion opportunities in the summer and in connection with study abroad. One additional approach to consider is a “competency-based” language certificate program that would reward students for demonstrated ability to use a foreign language. (See Dean Mussell’s discussion of this in her memo.)

D. Other Curricular Issues. A key issue considered by the Project Team was how the study abroad experience could be better integrated with students’ majors (and minors) and not simply amount to an isolated period of time abroad with no systematic relationship to the students’ overall AU educational experience. Deans and department heads were polled by the Project Team on this

⁷ American Council on Education, “A Report on Two National Surveys About International Education,” 2001, p. 2.

central question. Implementation of this report will require a strategy to engage faculty and departments in the adaptation of courses to use the international experience more effectively.

Initial responses are encouraging. Professor Flavia Ramos, Director of the International Training and Education Program (ITEP), has offered suggestions on ways to link courses in comparative international education and development with study abroad, and has also suggested that some ITEP graduate students could help prepare undergraduates for study abroad. Similarly, Professor Naomi Baron has proposed ways to connect Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) courses with study abroad. More generally, many courses in our current curriculum could be reshaped to help prepare students going abroad. Efforts could also be devoted to the development of overseas minors in many fields. In addition, partnerships could be developed with accredited academic institutions abroad so as to fulfill certain course requirements.

E. Business and Communication Schools. The Kogod School of Business and the School of Communication both use the last two years of undergraduate study to prepare students intensively for their professional careers, and the extent and diversity of Kogod requirements has made study abroad experiences in that school especially problematic. One option for dealing with part of the problem would be for majors in these schools to study abroad in the second semester of their sophomore years. Partnerships with counterpart institutions that could offer similar accredited courses might also be helpful.

F. University College and Study Abroad. An important issue that the Project Team discussed (but not in much depth) concerned the potential effects of a dramatic expansion in study abroad programs on the proposed University College. Study abroad will clearly need to be harmonized with any prospective University College requirements; otherwise, the total requirements on our students might be too heavy. Coordination will be required between those individuals at the university who are currently working on the proposed University College and those who will be working on the implementation of an expanded program of internationalization.

G. Cost Implications for Students. Many AU students work on or off campus to help pay for their education. As it is unlikely that such students would be able to work abroad, the question arose as to how to facilitate their study abroad. Financial aid packages could be developed for these students, or if they already have such aid, it could be used abroad. Second, a committed effort could be made to raise funds for new scholarships that could be used for study abroad. Third, some of these students might prefer to study abroad for less time, perhaps just during the summer. Fourth, the costs of studying abroad vary by sites, and to the extent that students shop among universities based on the cost of education, they might do the same regarding World Caps sites.

H. Cost Implications for the University. World Caps programs have generated an income-expense ratio of about 1.7 for the past several years. There is no reason that ratio should decline, and indeed it could improve if World Caps sites could find ways of generating additional revenue (for example, by becoming alumni and research centers) and reducing costs (perhaps by coordinating more direct enrollment in local universities). The major impact on the university, however, would derive from the larger numbers of students who would be leaving campus. That could be compensated by a substantially larger flow of students coming from abroad, albeit probably at a discounted tuition fee or perhaps by a reciprocal exchange. One way to increase revenues would be to assess a surcharge on AU students studying abroad in non-AU programs, as many other universities currently do, or to preclude AU students from enrolling in such non-AU programs abroad. At the current time, AU has been losing about \$1.5 million per academic year in revenue due to our students' enrolling in non-AU programs abroad. To the extent that AU expanded its programs overseas, there would be less need for AU students to consider non-AU programs.

I. New and Expanded Partnerships. In the course of developing new partnerships with the most prestigious and other attractive universities in the world, AU could consider a variety of reciprocal programs, including exchange programs involving 5-10 students in either direction and paying tuition only to their home universities, direct-enrollment arrangements, expanded dual-degree programs, and the increased use of service providers for our students abroad.

J. Geographical Diversification. The expansion and diversification of sites is a desired objective. Among the potential sites that have been mentioned are Brazil, Canada, India, Ireland, Mexico, Vietnam, a country in French-speaking West Africa, AU Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates, and another Arabic-speaking country. Many more candidates will undoubtedly be suggested as we proceed.

K. Scholar-athletes are often precluded from studying abroad, but they could do so during the summer, and indeed, there are many programs that permit them to study, travel, and practice abroad during the summer.

L. Fear of Disruption. For those students or their families who fear that traveling abroad might be dangerous, they might be encouraged to study in Canada (including French-speaking Canada) or Mexico, or they could remain at AU and perhaps do an inter-cultural experience through an internship with a non-governmental organization working with immigrant groups in Washington, D.C.

M. Engaging the Faculty. The faculty should be encouraged to play an active role in designing study abroad programs and linking them with courses and internships. In addition, World Capitals Program sites could be designed to facilitate faculty development (e.g., opportunities for research). Incentives should be developed to encourage faculty to develop innovative courses related to study abroad.

5. World Capitals Program: Key Issues

Since its inception, the World Capitals Program has made significant contributions to broadening AU students' intellectual horizons while internationalizing the university in numerous and diverse ways. While World Capitals Program sites as currently structured vary considerably in their modes of operation and the experiences offered to students, most are—as noted previously—generally considered enclave programs taught for AU students by AU faculty or AU-contracted program staff and taught in most cases in English. Given the aim of transforming AU into the premier global university, however, now is an appropriate time to take stock of the experience and lessons learned from the program with a view toward the expansion of the number of sites and the revision of the functions they might perform.

A. Expanding the Number of Sites. In developing new sites, we would want to look at those places sought by AU students and those that mesh with other programmatic activities at AU. Moreover, we should develop new partnerships with more prestigious universities abroad to attract their students and send our students. In many of these cases, we might choose to establish World Capitals sites, or, alternatively, use existing sites as “hubs” around which new university partnerships could be created.

B. Moving toward a More Integrated Model. The enclave model may appeal to those AU students who might expect the kinds of hands-on attention and services abroad that they experience on our home campus. Some programs under this model have certainly been structured in ways that provide an excellent educational experience. The Brussels and Prague programs offer unique thematic opportunities that are of great value. We might explore with partner universities developing other thematic seminars – for example, on democratization in Chile, environmental issues in Costa Rica, or

conflict resolution in Africa. However, even in those cases, new ways need to be found to encourage a more fully integrated experience for students. Internships and home-stays are important, but other ways also need to be found to accomplish the goal of better integrating our students into their host country environments.

The problem is an easy one to recognize. Americans studying abroad often feel more comfortable interacting with their fellow American students. It is easy for most of one's contacts to be with one's American compatriots. Therefore, special incentives or programs need to be developed to give AU students a chance to better understand the country within which they are studying and to make as many friends from that country as possible. Our coordinators of current World Caps programs could offer some ideas on how to do this.

Structural changes should also be explored at some sites. Instead of teaching all the AU students in one place, coordinators of the sites could assist AU students to enroll directly in local universities. One orientation course could still be made available for all AU students, but they could be encouraged to take the remainder of their courses in local universities.

The details at this point are less important than the general point: we should move in the direction of integration, so that our students return from their study abroad experiences having thoroughly absorbed the host country's culture, society, economy, and political system. The linkages at the host country end that would be necessary to move in this direction could be many and varied, including with universities, governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, and local community and citizens' groups, etc.

C. Transforming World Capitals Program Sites into "Multi-Purpose Centers." As the university's Strategic Plan mandated, the World Capitals Program sites need to be modified to perform other functions. Sites could be used as recruitment centers for potential foreign student attendees of AU, alumni relations centers, venues where AU faculty could pursue research on cutting-edge local issues, and hubs for organizing student travel. They might design and implement contract research projects in conjunction with local scholars and practitioners. They could provide consultancy services for local groups including the private sector. In sites where AU students desire to enroll directly in local institutions, the sites could facilitate such enrollment. The functions that could be performed by multi-purpose World Capitals Program sites could generate substantial revenue for the university over time.

D. Attracting More Non-AU Students to World Capitals Program Sites. Non-AU students, including international students from the particular country, could be attracted by seminars with decision-makers, local internships, and multi-country field trips. Tuition discounting could be considered to permit AU to compete more effectively with providers like Boston University, Butler University, and the School for International Training. Marketing materials for the program should be improved and sent with Washington Semester direct mail campaigns.

Many other programs could be structured in such a way as to attract students from the neighboring region or elsewhere, e.g., a site in Canada and/or Mexico that featured issues related to the emerging North American community, a site in the Southern Cone of South America that dealt with MERCOSUR, a site in a Sub-Saharan African country that dealt with issues of African economic integration, etc. Sites in virtually any region of the developing world that concentrated on the diverse implications of globalization could prove extremely attractive.

6. Increased Presence of International Students at AU: Key Issues

As previously noted, the university already has about 16% of its student body coming from numerous and diverse countries. If AU sends increasing numbers of its students abroad, we could fill the departed places with international students. Among the issues we would need to address in attempting to do so are the following:

A. Attracting More and Better Foreign Students. We could identify and partner with outstanding universities in 30-40 countries. Such a program could be phased in over a period of years. Perhaps as many as ten students from each of the identified universities could attend AU for a period of a year, and a corresponding number of AU students could attend those universities abroad. Such a proposed program might usefully begin on a pilot basis and, if successful, could expand to the point where perhaps as many as 300-400 additional highly qualified students could be brought to AU each year from institutions recognized as top-flight in their home countries.

A second possibility—not mutually exclusive—could be to attempt to increase the number of dual-degree programs such as the highly successful program currently operating between AU's School of International Service and Ritsumeikan University in Kyoto, Japan. In any expansion of such programs, however, an effort should be made to attain equilibrium between outgoing and incoming students.

To attract the best students from abroad, AU would need to build on the success of its Washington Semester Program, but to do so in a manner that would integrate the foreign students much more fully into AU campus life than has been true with foreign students in the program in the past.

We also need to be aware of recently imposed tougher governmental regulations on foreign students that make it more difficult for them to come to the United States to study unless such study is clearly geared toward a degree or a certificate. AU could readily design certificate programs that, drawing upon the specific areas of expertise of its diverse faculty, could attract more foreign students and would qualify them for admission to the United States in conformity with the more restrictive regulations.

B. Financial Issues. Attempting to bring substantially larger numbers of international students to the university is, however, fraught with financial implications—for them and for AU. Many such students—most likely the preponderance of them—would find it difficult to pay the tuition and other costs associated with attending AU. A special fund might need to be created to subsidize the attendance of international students here, especially if it is desired—as it should be—to increase the geographical diversification of the foreign student population among our undergraduate student body. A university-sponsored proposal aimed at bringing highly qualified but economically disadvantaged foreign students, especially from low-income developing countries, to AU for a one-year period of study might well meet a positive response from either foundation or governmental sources. Tuition discounting is another alternative that might be considered once the enrollment of foreign students exceeds a certain minimum goal. Perhaps explicit efforts could be made to target specific countries—e.g., Canada or Mexico—from which we would like to attract substantially more students and to concentrate initial fund-raising efforts on those countries. The most likely approach would simply be a reciprocal one—AU students would pay tuition to AU, and an equal number of foreign students from the country to which AU students would go would pay tuition to their home universities.

C. The “Mismatch” Issue. Currently, 35.2% of the undergraduate international students attending AU major in one of the programs of the Kogod School of Business. Conversely, only 4.3%

major in programs in the School of Public Affairs and 8.3% in the School of Communication. If study abroad students were to be replaced primarily by foreign students, and if the current course and major preferences of foreign students were to remain largely unaltered, then the “demand” for such courses and majors could swamp existing “supply” in some areas (e.g., business), and the reverse pattern could hold in other areas (e.g., the humanities). The implications of these potential developments for the faculty would need to be systematically examined. The pool of international student applicants would have to be screened carefully not only in terms of socioeconomic and geographical diversity but also in terms of the intended fields of study. This is a not unimportant consideration in any proposal for a substantial increase in the international student population on campus. Faculty would face major challenges in course redesign and innovation if large numbers of foreign students were to replace our domestic students who are abroad.

D. Other Issues. A number of other issues arise in connection with the goal of attracting more foreign students. We will, for example, need to enhance greatly our efforts at seeking out qualified students abroad, perhaps by systematically identifying “feeder” secondary schools in a number of countries and by designing and disseminating materials we can use to attract them. We also need to focus on the efforts required of us to help international students gain entry into the United States once they have been accepted to AU. Issues also need to be confronted regarding the academic support we provide to international students once they are here.

Conclusion: The Way Forward

American University is poised to rise to the top of the best universities in the world in terms of the internationalized education provided to its students. As a first step toward achieving our goal of becoming the “premier global university,” we have identified operational objectives in three areas. Specifically, we recommend alternative ways to greatly expand our study abroad programs, increase the number of World Capitals sites and revise the operations of these sites, and attract more and better international students to AU for a semester, a year, or longer.

We recommend these specific goals and offer many suggestions of ways to achieve them with the full awareness that implementation will not be easy. Indeed, we received excellent memoranda during the course of our work describing the obstacles that would have to be overcome to achieve these goals. Instead of yielding to such obstacles, however, the Team explored creative ways to address these problems, and we hope that spirit will extend to the implementation of this report.

The following is a brief summary of the main ideas offered in the report:

1. To expand study abroad, AU could:
 - a. encourage or strongly encourage all AU undergraduates to have an international experience that could include a wide array of programs; or
 - b. require – after a five year period – all AU students to have an international experience; or
 - c. announce a goal that, within three years, AU would aim to send abroad twice as many students as it does today, lifting it to the top of the leading doctoral institutions in the country by this measure.
2. To cope with the expansion of students going abroad, the World Capitals Program would be expanded, and ways would be found to encourage greater integration of the students’ experience with the local setting.
3. To fill the places of students going abroad, to prepare freshmen and sophomores for the experience of going abroad, and to further internationalize the university, new initiatives and partnerships would

be pursued to increase the number and quality of international students coming to AU for a semester and a year, and to more fully integrate them into the AU curriculum and campus life.

4. To improve foreign language proficiency, an arrangement could be developed for “immersion” courses in Spanish and French, new languages could be offered, or a “competency-based” certificate program could be developed.

To accomplish these tasks, the entire university community – including the President’s Council, staff, faculty, students, alumni, and World Caps coordinators – will need to be committed to the goals and will need to be fully engaged to achieve them. A detailed implementation plan with a precise timetable would need to be devised during the next six weeks in order to ensure that the incoming class is apprised of the new priorities.

When our students return in August, we should find additional ways to explain the new programs to them and encourage them to participate.

The faculty should be asked to provide ideas on ways their courses could be enhanced by a study abroad experience. Those faculty with experience abroad might provide a list of foreign universities and administrators who could be approached to establish new partnerships to accept our students and send theirs to us.

Alumni abroad should be tasked to provide ideas, internships, and financial support for the enlarged World Caps sites.

Coordinators at the World Caps sites could be tasked to identify new ways to integrate the educational experience more fully into the local setting.

Working on the basis of the Washington Semester model, a group of faculty could be assembled to devise new courses that could be offered together with other AU courses to incoming foreign students for a semester or a year.

Declaring that a university is “international” is a simple step that most universities have already taken. Deciding precisely what constitutes an “international” university is one that few have done, and fewer still have set their sights to become the “premier global university.” American University has that opportunity now. This report lays out numerous ways to begin to seize that opportunity. We want to continue working with the President to achieve the university-wide goals of internationalization described at the beginning of this report and to enable our students to achieve the competencies we believe are essential for their functioning in an interdependent world.

Table 1: Inventory of Study Abroad Programs

TYPE OF PROGRAM	UNIT/DEPARTMENT	CITY/COUNTRY	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF STUDENTS	DURATION
World Capitals Program	WCP		500	fall, spring, summer
Art in Italy	WCP/CAS	Rome, Italy		fall, spring
Andes to Rainforest	WCP	Chile, Brazil		fall
Australia, New Zealand	WCP	Sydney, Australia		spring
Beijing	WCP	Beijing, China		fall
Berlin	WCP	Berlin Germany		fall, spring, summer
Brussels	WCP	Brussels, Belgium		fall, spring, summer
Buenos Aires	WCP	BA, Argentina		fall
London	WCP	London, UK		fall, spring, summer
Madrid	WCP	Madrid, Spain		spring, summer
Mediterranean	WCP	Madrid, Spain		fall
Paris	WCP	Paris, France		spring
Prague	WCP	Prague, Czech Rep.		fall, spring, summer
Rome	WCP	Rome, Italy		fall, spring
Santiago	WCP	Santiago, Chile		spring
Southern Africa	WCP	So. Africa; Zimbabwe		fall

TYPE OF PROGRAM	UNIT/DEPARTMENT	CITY/COUNTRY	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF STUDENTS	DURATION
Washington Semester				
Peace and Conflict Res. Prog. (3-weeks)	WS	Northern Ireland	30	Spring field trip
		Central, East Europe	30	Fall field trip
International Environment & Development Prog. (3-weeks)	WS	Costa Rica	30	Fall field trip
		Southern Africa	30	Spring field trip
Trento Graduate Program	SIS	Trento, Italy	15	Fall semester
Summer Programs				
Southeast Asia/Globalization	SIS	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia		
Cuba Politics and Society	SIS	Havana, Cuba		
Costa Rica Summer Prog.	SIS	La Paz, Costa Rica		
Comparative Justice Systems	SPA	European Countries	40	
Europe 2003: Legal, Political	SPA	European Countries	30	
Paris-Geneva Comparative Law	WCL	European Countries	40	
Summer Law Program -Chile	WCL	Santiago, Chile	50	
Honors Program in Russia	Honors Program	Moscow, St. Petersburg	20	
Alternative Spring Break Program				
Honors Program in Prague	Honors Program	Prague, Czech Rep.	20	
Cuba Program	Excel, Off. Of Campus Life	Havana, Cuba	15	
Thailand	Office of Campus Life	Thailand		
Vietnam	Office of Campus Life	Vietnam		

Table 2: Leading Institutions by Estimated Participation in Study Abroad: Top 20 Doctoral Institutions, 2000/01

Rank	Institution	City	State	Study Abroad Students	Total Number of Degrees Conferred	Estimated % Participation in Study Abroad
1	Dartmouth College	Hanover	NH	625	1,466	42.6
2	Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Worcester	MA	291	872	33.4
3	Baylor University	Waco	TX	996	3,046	32.7
4	Wake Forest University	Winston-Salem	NC	529	1,619	32.7
5	Miami University (Ohio)	Oxford	OH	1,348	4,430	30.4
6	College of William and Mary	Williamsburg	VA	520	2,032	25.6
7	Pepperdine University	Malibu	CA	619	2,638	23.5
8	Texas Christian University	Fort Worth	TX	354	1,585	22.3
9	Boston College	Chestnut Hill	MA	854	3,982	21.5
10	University of San Diego	San Diego	CA	425	2,006	21.2
11	University of Denver	Denver	CO	466	2,450	19.0
12	American University	Washington	DC	493	2,821	17.5
13	George Mason University	Fairfax	VA	792	5,045	15.7
14	Southern Methodist University	Dallas	TX	383	2,498	15.3
15	Biola University	La Mirada	CA	113	759	14.9
16	Loyola University of Chicago	Chicago	IL	459	3,215	14.3
17	University of New Hampshire	Durham	NH	453	3,282	13.8
18	Duquesne University	Pittsburgh	PA	323	2,355	13.7
19	Colorado School of Mines	Golden	CO	95	696	13.7
20	Ball State University	Muncie	IN	510	3,819	13.4

Source: Institute for International Education, [Open Doors](#) 2002 annual report. Doctoral institutions, as defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, include institutions that typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to a graduate education through the doctorate. They differ among themselves according to the number of doctorates awarded per year and the scope of their doctoral offerings.

Table 3: Fall 2002 International Students (including permanent residents)

Degree Objective	Full-Time International Students with the F-1 Visa Status 1)	Other International Students 2)	Total International Students 3)	Student Population 4)	International Students as % of Total
Undergraduate	453	266	719	5,662	12.70%
Washington Semester	0	89	89	470	18.90%
Nondegree	40	37	77	413	18.60%
Master's	376	221	597	2,829	21.10%
Doctoral	91	71	162	563	28.80%
Law	105	114	219	1,652	13.30%
Certificate	0	0	0	159	0.00%
Total	1,065	798	1,863	11,748	15.90%

Sources:

- 1) Open Doors Survey compiled by the Office of Institutional Research, December 2002.
- 2) Includes 448 permanent residents, 261 other visa types and part-time students, and 89 Washington Semester students.
- 3) Academic Data Reference Book 2002-2003, Table 10 (1,774 students) plus Washington Semester noncredit students (89 students).
- 4) Academic Data Reference Book 2002-2003, Table 1.

Table 4 a: Majors of International Undergraduate Students at American University 2002-03
(includes non-permanent and permanent residents; includes full-time and part-time students)

	Number of International Students	Total Number of Students	International Students as % of Total
Kogod School of Business	253	891	28.4%
College of Arts and Sciences	207	1772	11.7%
School of International Service	168	1044	16.1%
School of Communication	60	873	6.9%
School of Public Affairs	31	1082	2.9%

Note: According to these data, 35.2% of all undergraduate foreign students major in one of the programs in the Kogod School of Business.

Table 4 b: Undergraduate International Students at American University by Selected Countries 2002-03

Total Number=719

Japan	70
Korea	32
Saudi Arabia	32
Kuwait	19
Great Britain	18
India	16
United Arab Emirates	15
Panama	15
France	14
Brazil	13
Canada	13
Germany	11
Colombia	11
Nigeria	10
Russia	10
Haiti	10
Pakistan	10
Turkey	10
Mexico	9

Note: There are 513 “non-permanent” foreign students and 206 “permanent” foreign students (i.e., with a resident visa).

Source: Academic Data Reference Book 2002-2003.

Table 5: Inventory of Academic Programs Involving International Students

TYPE OF PROGRAM	UNIT/DEPARTMENT	CITY/COUNTRY	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF STUDENTS
Washington Semester Program Non-Credit Certificate	Washington Semester	various	163
Dual Degree Programs			
Ritsumeikan University	SIS (Undergraduate)	Kyoto, Japan	50
Ritsumeikan University	SIS (Graduate)	Kyoto, Japan	3
Sookmyung Women's Univ.	SIS	Seoul, Korea	10
UN Univ. Of Peace	SIS	La Paz, Costa Rica	1
Korea University	SIS	Seoul, Korea	
Exchange Programs			
Ritsumeikan University	SIS - (Undergrad. & Grad.)	Kyoto, Japan	Most exchange program agreements cover 1 to 6 students per semester and unless noted are usually graduate program levels.
Ritsumeikan-Asia Pacific U.	SIS	Beppu, Japan	
Korea University	SIS	Seoul, Korea	
Sciences Po	SIS	Paris, France	
Trento University	SIS	Trento, Italy	
Bucerius Law School	WCL	Hamburg, Germany	
Hongkong School of Law	WCL	Hong Kong, China	
Yonsei Univ. College of Law	WCL	Seoul, Korea	
University of Paris-Nanterre	WCL	Paris, France	
Pontificia Universidad Javer.	CAS	Bogota, Colombia	

TYPE OF PROGRAM	UNIT/DEPARTMENT	CITY/COUNTRY	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF STUDENTS
Dauphine University	KSB	Paris, France	
HHL Leipzig Sch. (Inactive)	KSB	Leipzig, Germany	
Short-Term Programs (Summer)			
Global Human Rights Inst.	SIS	various	
Seikei University	CAS/SIS	Tokyo, Japan	
Chuo University	CAS/SIS	Tokyo, Japan	
Sookmyung Summer Prog.	SIS	Seoul, Korea	
Peacebuilding/Development	SIS	Cyprus	
European Univ. of Madrid	SOC	Madrid, Spain	
North American St. Inst.	WS/OIA	Canada, Mexico, US	

Annex 1: Memorandum to the President's Council

MEMORANDUM

March 17, 2003

TO: President's Council

FROM: Ben Ladner

SUBJECT: "Premier Global University" Project Team—Phase I

As you know, a central element of the new 15-Point Plan explicitly commits us to secure American University's reputation as a premier global university. I have asked Bob Pastor to lead a university-wide effort to identify and implement key factors that will enable us to accomplish this goal. He will chair a new project team and be assisted by Dr. Robert Ayres, the new assistant vice president of international affairs, with David Brown as a principal advisor.

The overall mandate of the project team is to evaluate AU's global character and potential compared to other universities; review and assess our international programs, partnerships, and other activities aimed to enhance our presence abroad; and identify the unique international expertise of our faculty and propose strategies for leveraging their talents in new ways.

In the first phase of the work of the Team, I am asking its members to think boldly and creatively, and within a few weeks to prepare a report with respect to the following:

- to suggest ways to improve and expand the study abroad experience for all students;
- to prioritize geographical areas for targeted expansion of programs and activities;
- to re-conceive and enlarge the operations of the World Capitals Program sites and integrate them with the local environment, in accord with the 15-Point Plan;
- to expand the presence of international faculty and students at AU; and
- to consider new ways to integrate key elements of the Washington Semester Program to serve as an incentive for foreign students to come to AU.

The Project Team will submit a report to me by April 29th, which will be the basis of a discussion with the President's Council. With this memo, I am seeking your recommendations for members of the Project Team, which I hope to appoint by March 21 to permit their first meeting on March 26th. Though all recommendations cannot be accepted due to the size of the Team, I hope you will give serious consideration to persons in your units who can make a significant contribution to the agenda as outlined above. Dr. Pastor will present the terms of reference for the work of the Team to the President's Council on April 1. Thank you for your assistance with this important initiative.

Annex 2: “Premier Global University,” Phase 1: Expanding Study Abroad, Revising the World Caps, and Expanding the International Presence at AU: Timetable

Monday, March 17: Memorandum from President Benjamin Ladner to President’s Council establishing the Project Team, defining its mandate, and asking the Council members to recommend representatives.

Thursday, March 20: Dr. Robert Pastor briefs the Provost’s Council on the mandate and goals of the team.

Friday, March 21: President’s Council recommends representatives of Project Team.

Monday, March 24: President selects members of the team, and Dr. Robert Ayres notifies them of their selection.

Wednesday, March 26: First meeting of the team to discuss the issues and assignments

Tuesday, April 1: Pastor briefs the President’s Council and identifies several key issues for discussion.

Wednesday, April 9: Second meeting of the team.

Tuesday, April 15: Pastor briefs and discusses issues at President’s Cabinet meeting.

Tuesday, April 15: Third meeting of the team.

Thursday, April 17: Pastor briefs the Provost’s Council and asks for a memo on ways Departments can encourage study abroad.

Tuesday, April 22: Pastor briefs the President’s Cabinet.

Tuesday, April 22: Fourth meeting of the team to discuss the draft report.

Monday, April 28: Distribution of final report to President Ladner and team members.

Tuesday, April 29: Pastor meets with President Ladner to discuss final report. President Ladner meets with team to share comments and suggestions stemming from the report and the next steps.

Annex 3: Internationalization of AU: Institutional Goals

Goals for AU

To have American University known in the United States and abroad as a “premier global university,” meaning an internationally recognized university exploring the frontier of internationalization through service-learning initiatives, conflict resolution opportunities, academic diplomacy, and other ways.

To expand and strengthen AU’s partnerships with the best universities in the world.

To provide an international educational experience for AU students at AU and abroad that is of the highest quality and well integrated into the particular international setting and well integrated with students’ majors and studies, and when appropriate, theses.

To open AU (though not necessarily all Schools) to greater numbers of more highly qualified international students for short-term as well as full-term study, and to ensure that their educational experience is well integrated with those of our U.S. students.

To ensure that the curriculum reflects contemporary changes in the world and to ensure that students recognize the interconnectedness of the domestic and the international.

To provide a rich menu of international choices for all students.

To contribute to the financial health of AU.

To establish multi-purpose sites abroad that will not only assist AU students abroad but also develop alumni networks, research centers, internships, and exchange opportunities.

Annex 4: Internationalization of AU: Cultivation of Student Competencies

All AU students should:

Learn to function effectively in other countries, cultures, and foreign environments.

Gain knowledge and expertise in a particular region of the world.

Achieve language competency in a second language.

Gain a functional expertise of use in other countries (e.g., development, conflict resolution, cinema) and improve methodological skills of analysis.

Gain a curiosity for the world and a confidence in one's ability to travel and appreciate the differences among countries, cultures, and peoples, as well as the common values.

Achieve personal growth and a sense of autonomy.

Annex 5: Summary Narrative of Study Abroad Programs

WORLD CAPITAL PROGRAMS

Art In Italy – mostly graduate art students (Master of Fine Arts) attend this program based in Corciano, Italy in the fall and moves to Rome in the spring semester. Direction of this program is under the Art Department, College of Arts and Sciences.

Australia & New Zealand – based in Sidney, Australia with field trips to New Zealand and the Great Barrier Reef. Major fields are economics, politics, environment, media and aboriginal culture. Facilities used and services provided are through the Australian Catholic University in Sidney.

Andes to Rainforest – a new fall semester program based in Santiago, Chile with field trips to Brazil and the Andes. Major fields are environment and international development. All program services are contracted through consultants/independent contractors and facilities used are at Diego Portales University in Santiago, Chile.

Beijing & Hong Kong – a fall semester program based at the University of Beijing. An on-site AU faculty directs the program focused on Chinese language, economy and international business. Extensive travel to Southern China and Hong Kong included.

Berlin – a program offered in the fall and spring semesters with a new summer component. Major fields are in European history and politics taught by an AU faculty on site who also directs the program. Facilities used are at the Freie University in Berlin and cost shared with John Carroll University.

Brussels – a program offered in the fall and spring semesters with a new summer component. Major fields are European politics, economics, and international business. The program is directed by an AU faculty on site. Extensive academic field trips through Eastern Europe.

Buenos Aires – program offered in the fall semester at the University of Belgrano facilities. All services are contracted through independent contractors. Major fields are Spanish language, Argentine culture and history.

London – program offered in the fall and spring semesters with a summer component. All services contracted through CAPA. Major fields are Humanities, Communication, Theatre, political science. Extensive academic field trips throughout the UK.

Madrid – program offered in the spring semester with a summer component. Program is directed by on-site AU faculty with emphasis on Spanish language, culture and history. Academic field trips throughout Spain.

Mediterranean – program offered in the fall semester and based in Madrid, Spain. Program is directed by on-site AU faculty with emphasis on EU and the Mediterranean region's culture, history and language. Academic field trips to Athens, Greek Islands, Istanbul and Rome.

Paris- program offered in the spring semester with focus on French language immersion. Academic facilities used are at the Sorbonne University with other administrative services contracted with ACCESS.

Prague – one of our most popular programs offered in the fall, spring and summer. Program is directed by on-site AU faculty and has two tracks – Humanities and Czech Culture track held at

Charles University facilities and Film track held at FAMU. Extensive academic field trips throughout Eastern and Central Europe.

Rome— program offered in the fall and spring semesters. Students may choose from course offerings at American University of Rome (through Spring 2003) and starting in the fall 2003, at John Cabot University in Trastevere, Rome.

Santiago – program offered in the spring semester based at the Universidad Diego Portales in Santiago, Chile. Other administrative services are contracted through independent contractors. Academic field trips throughout Chile.

Southern Africa – program offered in the fall semester with an on-site AU faculty director. The program focuses on the environment, development and emerging democracies. Academic facilities used are at the University of Namibia and in Cape Town. Academic field trips include a safari in South Africa.

WASHINGTON SEMESTER

Fall and spring semester field trips abroad are included in the Peace and Conflict Resolution Program and the International Environment and Development Programs. These field trips are for 3 weeks each semester to Northern Ireland or Central/East Europe for PCR program and in Costa Rica or Southern Africa for the IED program.

TRENTO GRADUATE PROGRAM

A group of SIS graduate students attend a full semester of academic courses and research at the University of Trento Graduate Research Center in Trento, Italy. The program is directed by an AU faculty on site.

SUMMER PROGRAMS

Globalization and Southeast Asia – students spend 3 weeks in Malaysia, traveling to Kuala Lumpur and conducting field research in the Taman Negara rainforest.

Cuban Politics and Society – students spend 3 weeks in Havana, attend lectures from Cuban artists and intellectuals and visit historic sites.

Costa Rica Seminar – in partnership with the University for Peace, students spend 3 weeks in Costa Rica examining the challenges of global environmental protection, economic and social development.
Europe 2003 – directed by an AU/SPA faculty, students travel to Amsterdam, Brussels, Luxembourg, Strasbourg and Paris focusing on international trade and commerce, international security and human rights.

Comparative Justice Systems – directed by an AU/SPA faculty, students travel throughout England and the Netherlands to gain in-depth knowledge about two nations whose legal and criminal justice systems differ from those in the US.

Paris-Geneva Comparative Legal Systems – directed by an SPA/WCL faculty, students travel to Paris and Geneva to gain in-depth knowledge and contrast the two systems compared with the US.

Summer Law Program – Chile – directed by a WCL faculty, students attend lectures and seminars at the University of Santiago regarding international law and comparative legal systems.

Honors Program in Russia – a new program for summer 2003 directed by Honors Program director/faculty. Students will travel for 3 weeks to Moscow, St. Petersburg and surrounding areas to learn about the local culture and history.

Annex 6: Washington College of Law: Summary of International Programs

Master of Laws (LL.M.) in International Legal Studies Program

The International Legal Studies Program (ILSP), directed by Professor Daniel Bradlow, offers law graduates and lawyers from around the world and the U.S. the opportunity to obtain a master of laws degree (LL.M.). The LL.M. program gives students the opportunity to structure their own studies, meeting their individual needs by engaging in advanced research and specializing in the field of their choice. The program also offers externships and other practical experiences.

Students in the LL.M. program in International Legal Studies may specialize in International Business Law, International Organizations, International Protection of Human Rights, International Environmental Law, or Gender and the Law.

As part of its ongoing efforts to enrich the educational experience it offers to all its LL.M. and JD students, the ILSP recently established two **dual degree programs** from either *City University of Hong Kong* or *Yonsei University* in Korea.

WCL has also created a **joint LL.M. program in International Trade and Development Law** for African lawyers with the [University of Pretoria](#) (South Africa), [University of the Western Cape](#) (South Africa), [Makerere University](#) (Uganda), and [Erasmus University](#) (the Netherlands).

Number of students enrolled in the LL.M. program in Spring 2003 by region:

Africa	19
Caribbean	5
Central America	5
East Asia	24
Eastern Europe	11
Middle East	9
North America	15
Oceania	1
South America	29
South Asia	15
Western Europe	14
Total = 147 Candidates from 60 countries	

Number of Languages and Dialects Spoken by ILSP LL.M. Candidates, SJD Candidates and Humphrey Fellows: 70

Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Azeri, Bahasa, Bambara, Bamileke, Bana, Bangangte, Bulgarian, Cantonese, Chao Zhou Hua, Chewa, Chinese, Creole, Czech, Diola, Duala, Dutch, English, Ewe, Farsi, French, Gbandi, Georgian, German, Guan, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Kpelle, Krio, Kurdish, Lithuanian, Lorma, Macedonia, Mandarin, Mandingo, Mandinka, Marathi, Mbo, Metta, Mongolian, Polish, Portuguese, Pushto, Romanian, Russian, Shanghai, Sichuan, Sinhala, Slovak, Spanish, Swedish, Taiwanese, Tamil, Temne, Thai, Tibetan, Tombuka, Turkish, Twi, Ukrainian, Urdu, Zulu.

Master of Laws (LL.M.) in Law and Government Program

Established in 1998, this LL.M. program provides lawyers with the opportunity to undertake advanced study of United States public law and legal institutions. Capitalizing on the school's location

in Washington, D.C., LLM students can design an individualized curriculum that focuses on academic offerings in administrative law and practice, business and financial regulation, constitutional and civil rights, and regulatory law and policy. In *The Washington Lawyer Seminar*, LLM candidates investigate major legal doctrines of administrative law, regulatory law and policy, and constitutional law, and submit a paper that reflects original research and analysis of an issue, problem or theory dealing with U.S. public law

Similar to other joint degree programs at WCL, the Law and Government Program also has a **joint degree program** with the *University of Hull* in Britain. This dual LLM degree program allows students interested in the LLM Program in Law and Government to apply at the same time for an LLM in European Public Law from the University of Hull's Masters' Program.

Joint Degree Programs

WCL offers a valuable interdisciplinary approach to training for a career in international law through several joint degree programs that culminate in a JD from WCL and a master's degree from another department at American University.

The JD/MA in international affairs program, directed by Professor Paul Williams, pairs the JD from the Washington College of Law with a master's degree in international affairs from American University's School of International Service (SIS). Students in the JD/MA program gain a multidisciplinary perspective on international legal issues by combining their JD courses with courses at SIS that emphasizes the political, historical, and economic dynamics of transnational interactions.

WCL is currently in the process of establishing an *international dual degree program with the University of Ottawa in Canada*, where WCL students will obtain a JD and a LL.B. after only four years of study. Several other international dual degree programs are being studied and WCL hopes to implement programs in Spain and France in the near future.

International Moot Court Competitions

Moot court competitions are a standard feature of U.S. law schools, providing students with the opportunity to simulate the courtroom experience in a competitive setting.

The Inter-American Human Rights Moot Court Competition is the only trilingual competition (English, Spanish, Portuguese) of its kind to focus on the Inter-American human rights system. The Competition at WCL, currently in its eighth year, has brought together over 800 students from 20 countries, to argue the merits of a hypothetical case based on the Inter-American Human Rights legal system.

The Jean-Pictet Competition is an international humanitarian law competition that draws teams from universities throughout the world. Unlike a moot court competition, the students engage in simulated bilateral and multilateral negotiations, demonstrating their skill in oration and diplomacy as well as their knowledge of international humanitarian law.

Students at WCL also participate in the *Rene Cassin Human Rights Moot Court Competition* in Strasbourg, France. WCL, the only U.S. school represented in this competition, has participated every year since 1994. The competition is the only moot court competition based on the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

Study Abroad Programs

The opportunity to study abroad is an invaluable asset to any law student in today's interconnected world. WCL offers study abroad programs in a variety of different cultural and legal settings and with a number of different academic focuses. Programs are offered in France, Switzerland, China, Chile, Mexico, and Canada, focusing on subjects such as international trade, international human rights, international environmental law, and comparative law. Students may choose between summer and semester programs.

The *European-American Consortium for Legal Education* (EACLE) promotes the deeper understanding of European legal institutions in the United States, and of American legal institutions in Europe, the progressive development of the rule of law in both continents, through legal education. EACLE was established in the year 2000 as a cooperative project of Erasmus University Rotterdam, the University of Ghent, the University of Helsinki, American University, University of Baltimore, and Hofstra University.

Increased regional activity since the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) continues to place demands on U.S. law students to become familiar with the legal systems and cultures of their neighboring countries. In 1995, under the title "Law School Cooperation and North American Integration," nine law schools in Canada, Mexico, and the U.S. formed the *NAFTA Lex Consortium*. Through the consortium, students from WCL may spend a semester at any of the six consortium law schools in Mexico or Canada. The consortium includes the following universities: *American University, Universidad de Guanajuato, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, University of New Mexico, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, University of Western Ontario Faculty of Law, Université de Montréal* and *University of Ottawa*.

Now in its seventh year, the ABA Cooperative Program between the Washington College of Law and the law department of the *University of Paris X-Nanterre (UPX)*, directed by Professor Peter Jaszi, offers second- and third-year students at WCL the opportunity to study for a semester at an internationally recognized French law school. The Semester Program is conducted in French, and offers students an opportunity to learn about European legal culture and the development of the European Union, while improving their French language skills. The *Comparative Law Summer Program in Europe* is a six-week program where participants attend class in London, Paris, and Geneva, and visit Brussels, Luxembourg, and Strasbourg. The program consists of three courses: International Economic Law: The New European Legal Order; International Institutions and Sustainable Development; and International Human Rights Law: Changing Concepts, Approaches, and Enforcement

Latin America provides one of the most important sites for the United States to develop trade relations and international cooperation on numerous issues that affect the Inter-American region as a whole. WCL's *Summer Law Program in Chile*, coordinated by Associate Dean David Jaffe, is an intensive introduction to evolving legal structures in Chile and Latin America as a whole, offering an exciting opportunity to explore all of these issues. The Chile Program, now in its 14th year, is implemented in collaboration with the *University Diego Portales School of Law* and the *University of Chile Law School* and offers students and attorneys an intensive five-week introduction to the evolving legal structures in Latin America.

Since 1996, WCL has successfully exchanged students with the *City University of Hong Kong (CUHK)*. Through this ABA Cooperative Exchange Program, directed by Professor Peter Jaszi, WCL students can spend a semester at CUHK and earn credit toward their JD degrees. The integration of Hong Kong's existing legal system with the legal system of China presents unprecedented educational and cultural opportunities for law students. In the 2002 Fall Semester, WCL exchanged its first student

with *Bucerius Law School in Germany*. This program provides students with an excellent opportunity to study International and Comparative Business Law.

Since the year 2000, WCL has received two students from *Utrecht University* in the Netherlands and looks forward to continuing this exchange by providing our students with an opportunity to spend a semester in The Netherlands. This exchange program also includes a faculty exchange component.

The *Summer Law Program in Haifa, Israel*, is directed by WCL Professor Janet Spragens, it offers courses on Trade and Investment Law in Israel and Selected Topics in Israeli Law. WCL is currently exploring many other exchange and study abroad programs with a variety of foreign institutions. WCL and *Monash Law School*, in *Melbourne, Australia*, hope to exchange the first group of students in fall semester 2003 and have regular faculty exchanges. Other current projects that are not yet fully implemented include student and faculty exchange programs with *Macquarie University in Australia* and the *National University of Mongolia*.

WCL Publications in International Law

WCL produces a number of publications that focus entirely or primarily on international law, including the *American University International Law Review*, the *Inter-American Human Rights Digest*, the *Human Rights Brief*, and *Sustainable Development Law and Policy*. All except the *Inter-American Human Rights Digest* are completely student-run. Other WCL publications which occasionally publish articles on international topics include the *American University Law Review*; the *Journal of Gender, Social Policy, and the Law*; and the *Administrative Law Review*.

The Center for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

As part of Washington College of Law's long-standing commitment to International Human Rights and the Rule of Law, WCL established the Center for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law in 1990. The Center provides hands-on legal research, practical training and innovative programming experience for WCL students; coordinates and facilitates faculty scholarship on relevant subjects; and is a resource to the international community on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law issues. The Center is dedicated to creating opportunities through advanced legal training, innovative research projects, conferences, seminars, and publications.

The Center serves as an incubator for innovative projects and initiatives. Over the years, a variety of impressive projects were created by the Center and have spun off into independent initiatives. These include the War Crimes Research Office (which provides legal research for war crimes tribunals around the world), the Academy for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law and the Inter-American Digest Project. The Center is led by a group of five distinguished faculty Co-Directors who each have an international reputation in the field of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law: Dean Claudio Grossman, Professor Herman Schwartz, Professor Robert Goldman, Professor Diane Orentlicher, and Professor Rick Wilson. The Center's Executive Director is Hadar Harris, a well known scholar and adjunct in the human rights field.

Among the current projects of the Center are:

- *The Indigenous Rights Training Institute*, an intensive bilingual training course on emerging issues in public international law. This institute is designed for Indigenous lawyers, activists and experts on the rights of Indigenous peoples.

- *Munching on Human Rights*, which is a meeting series that gives students a “taste” of human rights outside of their first year, mandatory law school curriculum. This popular non-credit lunch-and-learn series gives students the opportunity to learn the basics of human rights and humanitarian law issues before they are eligible to take international law classes.
- *The Human Rights Film Festival* is a series of film screenings and discussions open to the public on various topics of interest to human rights advocates around the world.
- *The Human Rights Speakers and Conference Series* brings speakers and panels to discuss cutting edge and emerging issues in international human rights and humanitarian law to the WCL community.
- *Human Rights Training Workshops* are designed to educate foreign lawyers, judges, NGOs, human rights ombudsmen, and others about ways to establish, reform and implement laws which protect and promote human rights.
- Fellowship Programs include the US-Israel Civil Liberties Fellowships and the new Aryeh Neier Fellowships.
- *Student Research Teams/Project Development Task Forces* are initiatives which involve students at every level of the conceptualization, research, design and implementation of a project in development.
- *The War Crimes Research Office (WCRO)* was created with financial support from the Open Society Institute (OSI). The core task of the WCRO is to promote the development and enforcement of humanitarian and international criminal law by providing legal research assistance to international criminal courts and tribunals. The WCRO also provides legal research assistance to other intergovernmental clients on a highly selective basis. In addition, it participates in the dissemination of new developments in humanitarian and international criminal law by regularly drafting and publishing summaries of ICTY and ICTR jurisprudence in the Human Rights Brief. It also regularly publishes Status Reports on proceedings before the ICTY and ICTR.

The Academy on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

The *Academy on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law* is the only program in the world in English and Spanish that offers three weeks of intensive summer courses in regional and universal human rights law, international humanitarian law, and other thematic courses. It is designed to meet the needs of counselors in international organizations, government lawyers, international relief agency workers, policymakers, NGO representatives, academics, and students specializing in human rights. Faculty in the Academy have included WCL faculty and worldwide experts in human rights and in law including: Leo Zwaak, Sir Nigel Rodley, Philip Alston, Víctor Abramovich, and Antonio Cançado Trindade

The Israeli Civil Rights Program: Promoting Peace and Cooperation

This is a two-year fellowship program for Israeli lawyers at WCL, which provides them with the practical skills and legal theory necessary for strengthening civil liberties in Israel. During the first year, participants pursue an LLM at WCL and work closely with American public interest groups, such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), women’s rights groups and others. Their second year, which is funded by the New Israel Fund, is spent in Israel working with Israeli public interest organizations. Efforts are made to choose men and women equally from the Jewish and Palestinian communities in Israel.

The program has been so successful that it was expanded to include lawyers from Central and Eastern Europe, now run by the Open Society Institute and is the model for another Open Society

Institute program that is being started in South Africa to train young lawyers in Angola and Mozambique.

Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program

The Humphrey H. Humphrey Fellowship Program is a highly competitive international program that brings accomplished professionals to the United States for a year of study and related professional experience. This Program provides a basis for establishing long-term, productive partnerships between citizens of the United States and their professional counterparts abroad. WCL was recently awarded a grant by the Institute of International Education (IIE) to host the Humphrey Fellowship Program in law and human rights for the next five years.

Annex 7: Summary Narrative of Programs Involving International Students

1. Washington Semester Program – Non-Credit Certificate for International Students.

This Program offers similar curriculum and internship to international students as the Washington Semester Program but without the credit component. International students pay a discounted tuition and receive a certificate at the end of the semester. Academic credit is given by the students' home school. Students come predominantly from Europe, Asia and South America.

2. Dual Degree Programs – with Ritsumeikan University, Korea University, Sookmyung Women's University and United Nations University of Peace are administered through the School of International Service (SIS). Agreements with the respective schools provide for an agreed upon number of credits to be completed by participating students at the home schools and at American University. Upon completion of AU requirements, students graduate and receive a degree and diploma from AU, return to their home schools to complete final requirements and graduate/receive their second degree.

3. Exchange Programs – with several international schools. Most exchange agreements allow for an even exchange of students from participating schools over the term of the agreement. The Ritsumeikan University agreement also allows for exchange of faculty. The Dauphine [Paris] Exchange allows four to five Kogod students go to Dauphine in either fall or spring semester for courses in various aspects of business. The courses are in French. In return, seven to eight graduate students from Dauphine come to Kogod in the fall semester for graduate business courses.

The agreement with Euro-American Institute of Technology (EAI Tech) in Nice, France sends 12-13 undergraduates to Kogod each spring. They take all their courses in English across various business disciplines. These include several courses in the Kogod core curriculum.

4. Short-Term Programs – held during the summer term.

Global Human Rights Institute – participants are educators from countries around the world. The program focuses on building and training for peace and conflict resolution skills.

Seikei University, Chuo University, and Sookmyung Women's University – short programs for students traveling to Washington, DC to learn about culture and the English language.

Peacebuilding/Development- Greek and Turkish Cypriot students attend a peacebuilding and community development program funded by the US State Department.

European University of Madrid – an internship program for EUM students in the School of Communication.

North American Studies Institute – a new summer institute in North American Studies. Participants are students and faculty from several universities in Mexico, Canada, and the US.

Annex 8: Premier Global University Project Team: The Role of Foreign Language Competency

Memo prepared by Kay Mussell,
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Foreign Language Requirements

American University has an entrance requirement of two years of language study in high school but no requirement for language study at the university. Nevertheless, as compared to a 1998 average of 8% of US undergraduates studying languages, 22% of AU's undergraduates were enrolled in basic foreign language courses in AY 2002-2003. Some of these students are fulfilling language requirements associated with their majors, but others simply want to learn to use a foreign language for a variety of individual reasons. The strong interest of many AU students in international affairs in every field surely contributes to this trend. The percentage of our student body engaged in language study also gives us a firm foundation upon which to build our reputation as a global university.

Breadth and Depth

Nationally, about 2/3 of language enrollments are in Spanish; at AU, that figure is around 35%. French is second with 25%. Surprisingly, because we offer neither a major nor a minor, Italian is third with just under 10%. Other languages, including German and Russian for which we offer degree programs, share the remaining portion. Like other US institutions, we have experienced a drastic decline in Russian enrollments since the fall of the Soviet Union. Our somewhat anomalous distribution of language enrollments reflects AU's diversity and the strong international interests of our students. There are clear indications that we should add other languages; particular interest has been expressed in offering Korean, Farsi, and Turkish. While we cannot sustain majors and minors in many languages, by hiring qualified adjuncts who are native speakers we can meet the many of our students' needs for basic instruction when there is a critical mass with the same interests. It also allows us to respond quickly to emerging needs. When we added an additional section of Beginning Arabic after 9/11, it filled immediately. After Italian, Arabic enrollments continue to be the highest among the languages for which we do not offer majors or minors.

Competency-based language learning

In recent years, many language learning experts have expressed frustration with the standard model of instruction, based in the classroom and defined by credits earned. Experiments in other institutions have included attempts to individualize instruction in languages, key that instruction to individual student motivations for language study, and focus on the development of language competency rather than grades and persistence through a required number of semesters. Institutions increasingly emphasize the importance of understanding individual students' reasons for language study, which may range from instrumental motives to desire for cultural enrichment to ability to read and write a language they learned to use orally in the home.

Although AU has not done so, many high quality US institutions wanting to strengthen their language offerings have turned to NASILP (National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs), based at the University of Arizona. For \$250 for 3 years and \$100 annually thereafter, AU could obtain access for students to study in 50 languages, many of which are not commonly taught in the US at all. Materials provided include multi-media support and access to a native speaker who acts as tutor.

Students are expected to spend an hour or two each day in study (in lieu of attending class two or three times a week). Exams document student progress.

Drake University, headed by a former chair of the National Foreign Language Center, has scrapped its traditional language classes and replaced them with a new program in which students demonstrate competency in the foreign language through a variety of means, including individualized programs of study, partnerships with international institutions for exchange, on-campus language discussion groups, technology-based learning, language across the curriculum sections, and off-campus internships and service learning placements. Demonstrated competency is certified on the students' transcript.

Connecticut College has for many years offered a highly competitive language certification program with a required internship abroad, during which students must demonstrate their ability to conduct office and business matters in the target language.

Connections to study abroad

For the most part, language study has not been connected in any significant way with our Study Abroad programs. Indeed, students majoring in foreign languages frequently cannot earn major credit on our programs because the instruction is largely in English and only courses taught in the target language can be used for major or minor credit.

The role of foreign language study at AU is separate from the issues surrounding Study Abroad options, but could and probably should be part of the planning for additional international opportunities.

While there is clearly a desire among many AU students for our traditional cohort-based Study Abroad programs, these offerings do not consistently promote foreign language competency. Most of the programs do not require study in the language before the student goes abroad and may not require such study while the student is on the program. We clearly have an opportunity to enhance students' foreign language skills (and understanding of the cultures in which they study) through providing alternative foreign language experience when appropriate, including opportunities before students leave AU for their semester abroad, during their time away, and after they return. For example, summer internships in foreign-language speaking communities, either in the DC area or in the students' home towns, might be an important feature of such a program. Credit or non-credit short-term immersion programs could also increase student language competency before their study-abroad experience. Stand-alone language immersion programs would also be valuable for many students. Students with enough knowledge of a language could enroll in classes taught in the target language at international institutions. On-campus conversation groups could be encouraged. In addition, we might consider allowing students returning from an AU study-abroad program to enroll free (space available) in courses in the language to keep up and enhance their skills after they return to the university.

Recommendations

Given the number of credits already committed in the undergraduate curriculum and the questions raised about traditional foreign language instruction, a language requirement at AU would be highly controversial and possibly unworkable. We could, however, without adding overwhelming resources, develop a competency-based language certificate program that rewarded students for demonstrated ability to use a foreign language. Successful study in the target language, required use of the language in the workplace, completion of an extensive translation project, and oral or written examinations might be components of the certification process. Significantly, given our student population, such a certification program might be of interest to international students whose first language is not English, since these students presumably qualify almost automatically for certification. This program would be

easily adaptable to help us prepare students planning to study abroad as well as support their continuing language learning after they return to AU. Moreover, it would undoubtedly be an attractive element of our recruitment efforts.